THIRD CONFERENCE
22-24 October 2010
Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor
Maribor, Slovenia
THINKING AND SPEAKING A BETTER WORLD
Third International Conference on Argumentation, Rhetoric, Debate and the Pedagogy of Empowerment

FIRST CONFERENCE
24-26 November 2006
Faculty of Humanities, University of Koper
Koper, Slovenia

SECOND CONFERENCE
11-13 April 2008
Faculty of Public Administration, University of Ljubljana
Ljubljana, Slovenia

THIRD CONFERENCE
22-24 October 2010
Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor
Maribor, Slovenia

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE FOR THIRD CONFERENCE
Bojana Skrt, Za in Proti, Slovenia
Alfred Snider, World Debate Institute, University of Vermont, USA
Boris Vezjak, University of Maribor, Slovenia
David Williams, Florida Atlantic University, USA

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FROM
Stephen Boyle, University of Vermont, USA
Frans van Eemeren, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
Loke Wing Fatt, SAID, Singapore
Peejay Garcia, Korea
Maja Nenadović, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
Debbie Newman, UK
Danilo Šuster, University of Maribor, Slovenia

SPECIAL THANKS
Peter Mesarec
Third international conference on argumentation, rhetoric, debate and the pedagogy of empowerment - thinking and speaking a better world

- Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor, Slovenia (Oddelek za filozofijo, Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Mariboru, Slovenija)
- World Debate Institute (University of Vermont USA)
- ZIP (Za in proti, zavod za kulturo dialoga/Pro et contra Institute for culture of dialogue Slovenia)

Friday, 22nd October 2010
13.00 – 14.30 Registration, Lobby

14.30 Welcome Remarks from hosts and organizers, Main Auditorium

Dr. Lučka Lorber, Vice - dean of Faculty of arts, University of Maribor - host
Boris Vezjak, University of Maribor - host
Alfred Snider, University of Vermont, USA - organizer

15.00 – 17.00
Argumentation, room 1, chair Boris Vezjak, University of Maribor, Slovenia

Public Argument and Debate

- “Climategate”: Good Science, Bad Arguments, and Problems for Public Discourse, Steven Woods, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA and Misa Haring, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA
- Argumentation in the Online Media Debate on the Blogs, Ivanka Mavrodieva, Sofia University, Bulgaria
- Rhetoric of B. Obama, Natalija Kocijan
- Latino National Identity and the 2006 English as the National Language Debate, Donathan L. Brown, Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY, USA

Debate, room 2, chair, Korry Harvey, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA

Debate and Social Progress

- Debate as agency: Preparing students for civic engagement, Allan Louden, Wake Forest University, USA
- Debate as a tool for social progress, Arlan A. Narvaez R., Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela
- The role of trust in political culture when teaching debate: The Kosovo case study, by Leela Koenig, Netherlands and Maja Nenadović, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
- Challenges of on-line deliberation: the case of Citizen’s forum, Simon Delakorda, & Matej Delakorda , Institute for Electronic Participation (InePA), Slovenia

Pedagogy, room 3, Sam Greenland, University of Sydney, Australia

Argument and Debate in Different Social and Cultural Contexts

- Critical Thinking in Indian High schools – the TIC experiment, Ameya Kilara and Aditya Verma
- Debating and argumentation skills in the speaking strand of Qatari National English and Arabic Curriculum Standards: A critical review, Abdul Gabbar Al – Sharif, Qatar Debate
- The critical social and political thinking and the methods of educating students in secondary level education, Georgios D Bikos, University of Athens, Greece
- Attending the process in philosophical discussion, Rudi Kotnik, University of Maribor, Slovenia

17.00 – 17.30 Coffee break

17.30 – 19.30

Panel discussion: Cultural Variation and Debate, Main Auditorium, chair Alfred Snider, University of Vermont

Abdul Gabbar Al – Sharif, Abdel Latiff Selami, Debbie Newman, Arlan A. Narvaez R., Masako Suzuki Takahashi, David Williams
Saturday, 23rd October 2010

9.30 – 11.00 Presentations

Argumentation, room 1, chair Steven Woods, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA

Processes of Rhetoric and Argumentation

- Pain as rhetoric: Photographic depictions of suffering as an argumentative strategy, Taylor Hahn, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
- Aesthetic Public Deliberation, Michael Bruner, Georgia State Univ., USA
- Motivational Consubstantiation as Starting Points for Arguments of Rhetorical Identification: A Burkean Approach, David Cratis Williams, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, USA

Debate, room 2, chair Debbie Newman, UK

Explorations in Competitive Debating

- Judging paradigms, Andrej Schulcz, Slovak Debate Association
- Power pairing for Worlds Schools Debate Championship, Alfred C Snider, University of Vermont
- Assessing the role and use of international relations theory in competitive debate, Samo Novak, University of Leiden, Netherlands

Pedagogy, room 3, chair Sam Greenland, University of Sydney, Australia

Active Methods in Different Learning Environments

- Introducing a model for blending together traditional and modern teaching methodologies, George Yeoman, Slovenia/UK
- Argumentative learning style of Arab learners of English as a second language, Abdel Latiff Selami, Qatar Debate, Qatar

11.00 – 11.30 Coffee break

11.30 – 13.00 Keynote, Main Auditorium
Debbie Newman, The Noisy Classroom: Thinking aloud

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 15.30 Presentations

Argumentation, room 1, chair: Michael Lane Bruner, Georgia State Univ., USA

Fallacies

- Logical Fallacies = Rhetorical Fallacies?, Monika Kavalir, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- Aristotle and »ad hominem« arguments, Boris Vezjak, University of Maribor, Slovenia
- »Begging the question« in a philosophical argument - epistemic or pragmatic?, Danilo Šuster, University of Maribor, Slovenia

Debate, room 2, Allan Louden, Wake Forest University, USA

States of Debating in the USA

- When classes collide – suburban and inner city debaters, Chris Wheatly, Aspen Colorado Schools, USA
- Failure in the public eye: The need for renewed engagement of the public sphere in academic debate communities within the United States, Taylor Hahn,
Clarion University of Pennsylvania, USA

- Outcome based life choices: An outcome assessment confirmation study measuring positive social outcomes beyond undergraduate experiences for participants and society in competitive intercollegiate debate, Jack E. Rogers, Department of Communication, University of Central Missouri and Arthur Rennels, Interim Director of Forensics, University of Central Missouri, USA

Pedagogy, room 3, chair David Williams

New Approaches to Active Education

- Critical understanding as an issue of problem solving in mathematics and physics education, Patronis Tasos, University of Patras and Rouxiakis George, Greece
- Numerical thinking, Simon Belak, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- Theory of knowledge versus debate – parallel universes or two sides of the same coin, Matus Kurian, Gymnazium Jura Hronca/Slovak Debate Association, Slovakia

15.30 – 16.00 Coffee break

16.00 – 17.30. Sam Greenland, Keynote, Main Auditorium
Facilitating more debates in more classrooms: A simple assessment tool for every student and teacher

Debate, room 1, chair Samo Novak, University of Leiden, Netherlands

Active Learning About Communities and Minorities

- Debate as a praxis for global citizenship, Anja Šerc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia and Alfred C Snider, University of Vermont, USA
- An approach to analysis on discourse toward minority, Masako Suzuki Takahashi, Research Center for Foreign Language Education, Keio University, Japan

Debate, room 2, chair George Yeoman, UK/Slovenia

Encounter Society Through Debate

- Youth understanding politics – how youth initiatives can create an impact in society with debate, Monika Sobočan, University of Maribor
- Why do people start debating? Helena Felc, Faculty of Administration, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- Debate as a tool response for Venezuelan situation, Alejandro Duque, Universidad Central de Venezuela

Pedagogy, room 3, chair Anja Šerc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia/Zaznaj proti, zavod za kulturo dialoga, Slovenia

Designing and Implementing Debating in Schools

- Secondary schools debates with visiting experts or how to implement debate in the interdisciplinary approach of curriculum and empower youth for active citizenship, Romana Čemažar, Gimnazija ESIC Kranj, Slovenia
- Culture of debate in High school Domžale, Sofija Baskarad, Srednja šola Domžale, Slovenia
- Tayloring debate formats for your specific educational goals, Manuele de Conti, University of Padua, Italy

18.00 – 19.30 Presentations

20.00 BANQUET
Sunday, 24th October

10.00 – 11.30 Presentations

**Argumentation, room 1, chair David Cratis Williams, Florida Atlantic University, Florida, USA**
- Philosophizing Without Argument, Nenad Miščević, Central University Budapest, Hungary
- Level of Generality as a Rhetoric Device, Katarzyna Kobos, University of Lodz

**Debate, room 2, chair Bojana Skrt, Za in proti, zavod za kulturo dialoga Slovenia**

**Debating Scenarios on Three Continents: Europe, East Africa and Japan**
- The transfer from debater to coach – how experienced debaters can contribute to the quality of high school debate education, Monika Sobocan, University of Maribor, Slovenia
- Debate for Youth Empowerment in East Africa, Takako Mino, Claremont McKenna College, USA
- Debate in Japan, Andrew Nishizaki, Japan

**Pedagogy, room 3, chair Masako Suzuki Takahashi, Research Center for Foreign Language Education, Keio University, Japan**

**Using Debate in the Classroom**
- Teaching rhetoric at continuing education courses, Boštjan Debelak, Ljudska univerza Koper, Slovenia
- Instructional Communication as a rhetorical process: political speech as a model of persuasion to be taught and studied, Irina Antonova, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia
- Active methods and debate in a classroom, Karlina Koželj, High school for tourism Celje, Slovenia
- Debate in the classroom, successful experience in Venezuela, Arlan A. Narvaez R., Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

11.30 – 12.00 Coffee break

12.00 – 13.30 Presentations

**Argumentation, room 1, chair David Cratis Williams, Florida Atlantic University, USA**

**Critical Thinking and Debate**
- Reason in the Balance: Teaching Critical Thinking as Inquiry, Sharon Bailin, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada and Mark Battersby, Capilano University, Vancouver, Canada
- Rhetoric, oratory and philosophy in the debate, Cattani Adelino, University of Padua, Italy

**Debate, room 2, chair Steven Woods, Western Washington University,Bellingham, WA, USA**

**Different Paths to Debate in the USA**
- National policy debate circuit in U.S.A, Chris Wheatly, Aspen, Colorado Schools, USA
- Debate as transformative experience, Amanda Feller and Kelly Ryan, Pacific Lutheran University,
- Negotiating expertise: Translating debate techne into community practice, Jeff Kurr and John Rief, University of Pittsburgh

**Pedagogy, room 3, Allan Louden, Wake Forest University, USA**

**Training Citizens and Training Debaters**
- An argumentation and debate text book for not debaters: Understanding Argument: the journey from consumer to critic, critic to advocate, Korry Harvey and Paul Bingham, Western Washington University, USA
- Training model: Debate academy, Alfred Snider, University of Vermont, USA and Bojana Skrt, ZIP, Slovenia

13.30 Closing, Main Auditorium
Friday, 22nd October 2010

15.00 - 17.00

Argumentation, room 1, chair Boris Vezjak, University of Maribor, Slovenia

Public Argument and Debate

“Climategate”: Good Science, Bad Arguments, and Problems for Public Discourse, Steven Woods, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA and Misa Haring, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA

One of the largest obstacles to public policy and individual action related to environmental issues involves the complexity and uncertainty of scientific information and data. The controversy over climate change typifies how the incorporation of scientific data and findings in public discourse is often utilized to make the situation more problematic to address than to rationally or objectively resolve disputes or lead to a course of action. The utilization of rhetoric that mimics scientific method and presentation and reports on disputes in the scientific community outside the context of the scientific community often undercut actual understanding in the public. How this rhetoric can lead to replacing scientific findings with opinions that affirm economic and personal preferences is analyzed by looking at how the media has handled the validity of Global Warming research, specifically the construction of the “Climategate” controversy.

Argumentation in the Online Media Debate on the Blogs, Ivanka Mavrodieva, Sofia University, Bulgaria

This study examines specific features of argumentation in the online media debate organized by one of the biggest weekly newspaper in Bulgaria named Capital on the blogs and particularly on Bulgarian blogosphere. The subject of the research includes four stages of online debate, rules, communication roles, over the period of 20 days. Blogs are relatively new phenomena but they are developing dynamically during the last five years in Bulgaria. The main goal of the current paper is to investigate the sources of arguments used by participants in the online media debate, the kinds of arguments, and the appropriateness and effectiveness of argumentation. The second research goal includes survey of specific verbal and virtual arguments.

In the first part of the paper are introduced and interpreted the main terms: blog, blogger, blogosphere, Web 2.0, virtual communities, arguments, argumentation and fallacies. The second part is devoted to a methodological frame. The topic exists to apply interdisciplinary approaches from different sciences (Virtual Communication, Argumentation Theory, and Rhetoric). The third part includes results of the research on the online media debate. The main debaters prefer traditional manners to present their arguments in monologue; more of them are not ready to take part in interactive communication and to refute arguments presented by participants in this kind of dialogue. Other participants in the forums as a part of this debate are active, critical and relatively competent participants in this virtual debate on the signification and scope of the notion “blog”.

Rhetoric of B. Obama, Natalija Kocijan, Slovenia

The purpose of the paper is to examine political discourse, in particular rhetoric by the American president Barack Obama. Obama is interesting to observe and examine from the linguistic point of view since his oratory skills have been compared numerous times to those of Martin Luther King, John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan (Gallo, 2008: 18). After all, his skills as an orator might have been one of the factors in his victory.

The paper will be a study of how Barack Obama utilizes language to convince and persuade the audience. This will be done by analyzing figurative language in his speeches, by taking into account Aristotelian means of persuasion - pathos, logos and ethos. The paper will reveal whether Obama uses the inclusive language and the references he makes. The most frequently used words and metaphors will be highlighted. An analysis of Obama's oratory in terms of content, structure, and delivery will be performed.

The paper will try to establish what Obama's major concerns are, what values he cherishes and promotes, what quotations he includes in his speeches and what promises he makes. Which
themes are covered in his speeches?
The primary data for this paper are transcripts of Barack Obama’s six speeches – Obama’s South Carolina Victory Speech, the speech Our Time Has Come given on Super Tuesday, Victory Speech, Inaugural Address, Speech to Congress and Speech on Race.

Latino National Identity and the 2006 English as the National Language Debate, Donathan L. Brown, Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY, USA

2006 was a unique year for those interested in race, rhetoric and public policy. As a nation engulfed in debate over immigration reform, particularly pertaining to immigrants from Mexico, Oklahoma Republican Senator Jim Inhofe introduced an amendment to declare English as the national language. With an understanding of the changing demographic landscape of the country, proponents argued that the Inhofe amendment was needed to “bind us together as a nation,” or to “preserve and enhance the role of English.” While proponents in both chambers denied the racial overtone of this amendment, this essay argues that a masked racial order, one that mirrors the age old Great Chain of Being was employed from the outset to secure the passage of this amendment along with naming and defining who is and is not “American.” This argument will become more transparent through a rhetorical analysis of proponents floor statements, official press releases and comments released to national and international newspapers.
Friday, 22nd October 2010
15.00 - 17.00
Debate, room 2, chair, Korry Harvey, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA

Debate and Social Progress

Debate as agency: Preparing students for civic engagement, Allan Louden, Wake Forest University, USA
Debate is often thought educationally as a method of skill acquisition largely aimed toward future vocational applications. Critical thinking, research ability, public arena presence, social elasticity, among other capacities are said to be uniquely trained using debate. Most involved in debate would agree with a recent commentary published at insidehighered.com that the activity’s characteristics are the “very building blocks of civility . . . The basic elements are the same across formats: Argument, evidence, forced reciprocity and dialogue, equal time, and mandatory listening” (Herbst 2009).
My project evaluates not the acquisition of skill sets for a distanced future but rather the use of debate as the means to accessing other civic enterprises. I draw upon five years of directing the Ben Franklin Transatlantic Fellows Institute, a month long State Department summer program hosted by Wake Forest University. Participants are students selected by US embassies from forty countries and US students. Debate has been employed to more quickly equip students for entry into a variety of civic endeavors. Over the years we have experimented with using debate to prepare for projects of public deliberation, media access, governance, community service and civic engagement.
The advantage of debate training is it more quickly grounds understanding of application arenas, and does so in a way that enhances individual ownership. Entry into applied civic engagement is based on activity, leading to individual empowerment. The model of debate as precursor to civic activity is to value both to knowing about and more importantly knowing as personal responsibility.

Debate as a tool for social progress, Arlan A. Narvaez R., Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela
For more than 25 years, aggravated during the last ones, the education in Public Sector Schools has many deficiencies and can be characterized as one of very poor quality; these and other problems related to the rough social conditions in many of the areas where they are located, particularly when they are in barrios (shanty towns) or low income neighborhoods, conspire together against both school attendance and the possibilities of a future better life or social progress. Students from those schools find very little motivations for studying and learning, most of them fall into a sort of resignation that they will have no better opportunity in life and that they have to accept their fate as poor.
In this framework we have started a program for teaching and coaching Debate teams in Low Income Areas Public Sector Schools (LIAPSS), as part of our project to sow and develop Debate in Venezuela. LIAPSS is a social venture, totally free of charge for the participating students and also for the Schools.
The first move was to request permission from the Principal of the School in order to conduct the program; we started with two Schools, “Juan Bautista Castro” and “5th of July” (this one located in a very rough area) with two groups of about 15 students in each school. The students came voluntarily to a selection interview and they committed to have two sessions every week and to submit the homework punctually. The instructors are university students, all of them debaters from 4 different Debate Clubs related to our organization, AUDAS.

The role of trust in political culture when teaching debate: The Kosovo case study, by Leela Koening, Netherlands and Maja Nenadović, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
This article draws on debate training experience that took place in Pristina in the summer of 2008. As part of the effort to jumpstart debate in Prishtina’s universities we held a workshop introducing the British Parliamentary debate format. Soon into the training, however, it became apparent to us that certain underlying preconditions are essential in order to have a debate at all. To debate government and
opposition roles, participants do not only need to understand the formal role these occupy in a democratic system, but also more crucially they should actually trust that these roles will be performed. Surely, any debater needs to be under the assumption that governments indeed perform their roles, but little did we know how the structural failure of a government to function in such a manner would, for example, affect ability of a participant to set up a simple first proposition case.

Teaching debate in substantially different political contexts can be a great challenge for coaches. The purpose of this article is to discuss these challenges and offer suggestions to deal with them. Although this article was inspired by our experiences in Kosovo, its findings are applicable to a wide array of cases, such as teaching debate in post-conflict societies or authoritarian-totalitarian regimes. The suggestions offered here are simply a starting point for developing a method for preparing to teach debate in areas where there is little faith in government.

Challenges of on-line deliberation: the case of Citizen’s forum, Simon Delakorda, & Matej Delakorda, Institute for Electronic Participation (InePA), Slovenia
This paper examines theoretical assumptions that democratic potentials of the Internet based communication can strengthen citizen’s deliberation and consequently empower them to take more participatory role within present decision-making procedures. The case study of Citizen’s forum facilitating on-line public debates and consultations with elected members of the European parliament from Slovenia is presented in order to highlight current challenges and issues of on-line deliberation such as accessibility, quality of communication and e-democratic impact.
Critical Thinking in Indian High schools – the TIC experiment, Ameya Kilara and Aditya Verma

A pioneering project in critical thinking pedagogy in India has recently taken flight. A team of young law graduates from the National Law School of India University, Bangalore were determined to get school students to start critically thinking about an increasingly complex world. They designed a program, ‘Think! It’s Critical’ (TIC), to provide rigorous practical training in applying the principles of logical enquiry to communication, decision-making and problem-solving processes. As a pilot project, TIC was conducted in high schools in different geographical locations in India over six months. The initial results, based on anecdotal experiences of TIC trainers and empirical data (primarily program feedback) make us cautiously optimistic about the potential for TIC to serve as a model for critical thinking education at the high school level. The social ramifications of such a project for an educational system that remains entrenched in a culture of rote-learning cannot be over-emphasized.

This paper discusses the strengths and challenges presented by the specific choice of format, content and teaching methodology in TIC programs. It contextualizes the TIC project as part of a larger effort to revamp the Indian educational system, frequently criticized for being “information-heavy” and insular to change. While some “top-down” attempts to reform the curriculum are certainly being made, the problems of creating relevant content and training existing instructors have remained. The TIC program could become an important complement to these attempts. Moreover the highly interactive, enjoyable and non-competitive nature of TIC programs make it well suited to achieve what mainstream curricula cannot. The paper finally explores technological and other means by which TIC can fulfill its potential and expand its reach across geographical location and social strata without losing its pedagogical edge.

Debating and argumentation skills in the speaking strand of Qatari National English and Arabic Curriculum Standards: A critical review, Abdul Gabbar Al – Sharif, Qatar Debate

The importance of speaking for debate and argumentation is more than crucial. This paper provides a critical review of the set of curriculum standards under the SPEAKING strand of the English and Arabic curriculum standards in the State of Qatar to investigate the opportunities that these standards provide for Qatari students to develop debating and argumentation skills. The paper proposes a multi-level developmental model of argumentation and maps this model on the debating and argumentation skills provided in these curriculum standards to decide on what level of argumentation the Qatari national curriculum standards in language arts aim to place learners by the end of each grade and by the end of school education. The aim of the paper is to assess the educational environment in which QatarDebate is working and suggest appropriate recommendations for QD and for Qatari schools on how to foster these important skills in classroom pedagogy and translate them into actual classroom activities. The findings of this critical review will significantly help QD to draw future policies regarding cooperation and coordination with Qatari schools and educational authorities. It will also provide QD with benchmarks that clearly specify where Qatari students stand in relation to this multi-level developmental model of argumentation and what needs to be supplemented to students in the form of extracurricular training on debating and argumentation.

The critical social and political thinking and the methods of educating students in secondary level education, Georgios D Bikos, University of Athens, Greece

To begin with after pointing out the main characteristics of critical thinking, we then come to define the features of critical social and political thinking and the relation between general and social-political thinking and also between the social and political conception of
The world.
The first part of this introduction is a brief presentation of the reasons that make it necessary to understand modern social and political life in a more critical way than before, as it is a very popular thesis about the end of ideology, together with the belief that politics has more to do with a public policy and a technocratic science mostly dealing with public affairs, rather than the “art of possible” which sets political courses and creates changes in the fields of polity, economy and society.

Then, we develop the teaching methods and ways through which this kind of thinking can grow into the minds of secondary education students. We present the teaching material, techniques and means which if included into the social and political subjects’ curricula, will provide teachers with the ability to develop their students’ critical minds towards the understanding and explanation of social and political status. One of the main methods we suggest is one that is based on the in-class conversations on controversial topics, on public affairs and on public policy issues, basically argumentative structured / debating like conversations.

Attending the process in philosophical discussion, Rudi Kotnik, University of Maribor, Slovenia
Within teacher education focused on developing skills for guiding philosophical discussion student teachers usually have difficulties which can be overcome. The paper, therefore, explores two essential aspects of guiding philosophical discussion. One is related on the process of developing philosophical skills where in the context of experiential learning special attention is focused on the conceptualisation of the process of philosophical discussion, i.e. to develop student teacher’s ability to notice what is happening, to recognise philosophical potential and to find appropriate intervention.

The other is related to the obstacles of this flow: how student teachers prevent themselves from learning. This is focused on the psychological aspects and helps students to recognise how they interrupt the contact. When they become aware of their process (what is happening with them when they have difficulties in noticing, recognising or intervening) they can restore the contact, the flow and thus enable their learning and the learning of students.
Friday, 22nd October 2010

17.30 – 19.30

Panel discussion: Cultural Variation and Debate, Main Auditorium, chair Alfred Snider, University of Vermont

Abdul Gabbar Al – Sharif (Oman)
Abdel Latiff Selami (Morocco)
Debbie Newman (UK)
Arlan A. Narvaez R. (Venezuela)
Masako Suzuki Takahashi (Japan)
David Williams (USA)
Saturday, 23rd October 2010
9.30 – 11.00 Presentations

Argumentation, room 1, chair Steven Woods, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, USA

Processes of Rhetoric and Argumentation

Pain as rhetoric: Photographic depictions of suffering as an argumentative strategy, Taylor Hahn, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

Images depicting intense suffering have been used by countless groups in order to raise awareness and sympathy towards the plight of others. While visual rhetoric is not a new phenomenon, increasing dependence on visual communication in digital public spheres makes the usage of graphic imagery increasingly important to those working to raise awareness of intentionally violent acts. Advancing the work of scholars including Susan Sontag and Hannah Arendt to meet the needs of instant information access, this paper addresses the role of photography and visual rhetoric in awareness campaigns and calls to action. Specifically, this paper will analyze the way in which photographic depictions of horrific events function as a catalyst for justice-seeking behavior in democratic societies. For example, how would the U.S. react if graphic pictures from Darfur were distributed in daily newspapers? How did the instantaneous exchange of images affect the election riots in Iran? How does our use of technology and images in the classroom serve as a catalyst for student involvement? These questions are extremely timely given the continued advancements in new media technology and global information distribution. This paper works to continue the study of photography as a potentially critical factor in successful argumentative strategies.

Aesthetic Public Deliberation, Michael Bruner, Georgia State Univ., USA

In this essay, I argue that artful forms of protest against corrupt states and the artful shaming of organizations are two forms of public argument that can progressively transform corrupt political (and argumentation) environments. As opposed to direct action, or serious revolution, aesthetic resistance is more conducive to peaceful political transformation and greater public reason. As case studies in support of these claims, I will draw upon the resistance strategies of Orange Alternative against Polish communism, Otpor against Milosovic's Serbia, and the Immokolle workers against Yum corporation. I will then relate these forms of argument to deliberative education.

Motivational Consubstantiation as Starting Points for Arguments of Rhetorical Identification: A Burkean Approach, David Cratis Williams, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, USA

Drawing upon Kenneth Burke’s theory of Dramatism, this paper argues that motivational structures (or “ratios”) manifest in argumentative discourse may serve as the basis for “consubstantiality” between a speaker and audience or between discussants. Through consubstantiality of motivational structures, identification with specific lines of argument may also be attained. Examples of the process are drawn from Russian political argumentation; specifically those lines of argument which advance diverse political claims yet share common motivational ratios (such as Scene/Act or Scene/Agent).
Saturday, 23rd October 2010

9.30 – 11.00 Presentations

Debate, room 2, chair Debbie Newman, UK

Explorations in Competitive Debating

Judging paradigms, Andrej Schulcz, Slovak Debate Association

The paper will apply the concept of paradigms to the current practice of judging debates, with a special emphasis on Central and Eastern Europe. In general terms, paradigms are established ways of thinking about or dealing with certain situations. Paradigms of judging are an important, yet neglected, aspect of debate programs, because they have a significant impact on what debaters and coaches make of debating. Typically debate programs either do not have judging training developed to a level at which they would deal with conceptual issues, or they work within a single paradigm without being able to critically examine their approach to debating and compare it with the approaches of other debate programs. The concept of paradigms was introduced into debate judging training in Slovakia three years ago, and it has since proven to be a success. Perhaps if judges at international events approached differences among them through the prism of paradigms, there would be less confusion than what is nowadays characteristic of any larger tournament.

Power pairing for Worlds Schools Debate Championship, Alfred C Snider, University of Vermont

The World Schools Debate Championship is the most important international tournament at the high school level. Forty or more countries each enter a team of students for the competition. It is also one of the very few major tournaments in the world that does not use power pairing as a scheduling and pairing technique. Power pairings is a technique whereby after the pre-set rounds teams meet other teams with similar records. Reasons will be given as to why this would be a good practice, suggested problems will be addressed, and then several different methods for implementing this procedure will be discussed. This paper will form the basis of a proposal that will be made to the tournament's governance.

Assessing the role and use of international relations theory in competitive debate, Samo Novak, University of Leiden, Netherlands

Theories of international relations (IR) represent an integral part of the academic study of world politics. They can be characterized as distinct, often mutually exclusive conceptual frameworks that allow researchers to systematically analyze events in the realm of international relations and give them a methodological tool for conducting relevant research. Different theories are used to help understand and explain events in fields of international relations, ranging from war, economy and international law, to the role of non-state actors such as NGOs and individuals in IR.

The rationale for using international relations theory (IRT) as a preparation tool for debate lies in the fact that most international debate tournaments today include a variety of IR topics that are sometimes difficult to handle successfully even by political science students. This paper is an attempt to show that many if not all theories of IR have a direct role in the preparations for debate tournaments and an applicative value in the construction of individual debate cases. The first chapter addresses the value of IRT in social science in general and puts forward a short overview of the most commonly used theories in the field. The second chapter establishes a clear link between the purpose of IRT and competitive debate. It discusses its role in conducting research for debates, picking out the most appropriate pieces of evidence, and constructing cohesive arguments and consistent team lines. The final chapter illustrates the applicative value of IRT in competitive debate. Four major theories of international relations (Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism, and Marxism) are used to construct cases on four different topics from major international debate tournaments.
Active Methods in Different Learning Environments

Argumentative learning style of Arab learners of English as a second language, Abdel Latiff Selami, Qatar Debate, Qatar
The presentation explores some salient features of the argumentative writing style of Arab learners of English as a Second Language (ESL). In particular, it seeks to decipher how counter argumentation proves to be a real challenge to these learners. Based on student written script data, the presentation shows that an understanding of the roles and values associated with Arabic is crucial to aiding learners develop their (argumentative) writing skills. Additionally, it underscores the pressing need to recognize the individual voices of Arab learners of English in their own right, and not as individuals striving to emulate native speakers. In so doing, the implications for educators and practitioners are also discussed.

Hosting competitive debates at the Faculty of arts in Ljubljana, Mirjana Željezić, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
In the spring semester of 2010 the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana, department of English, hosted a series of three debates performed by the experienced debaters of Zavod ZainProti. The debates were made part of the course material for Practical English Classes, with students having to play a rather active role: they had to be critical listeners, decide about the winning team, comment and/or ask questions after the debate, contribute to a class discussion, respond to my prompts, and submit a debate report. The project had a number of specific aims, such as, for instance, giving our students an opportunity to observe information-packed presentations of controversial topics and learn about the world they live in from their peers, and acquainting them with both a new method of acquiring speaking skills and its possible end result – a highly efficient and persuasive speaker. Yet it also gave rise to many unexpected questions and observations, making students move beyond their comfort zone, challenging their views and opinions, raising awareness also in relation to issues we had not planned to address.
As a teacher, the experience made me revise my syllabus and rethink my priorities in class, so I now intend to incorporate debate in the programme on a more systematic and regular basis.

Introducing a model for blending together traditional and modern teaching methodologies, George Yeoman and Manuela Molnar, Slovenia/UK
Over the last ten years or so, a great deal of discussion, argument, and even hostility has taken place, and still is, regarding an overall review on how best to introduce more modern concepts into teachers' methodologies. All kinds of projects, schemes and plans have been and are being introduced, often hastily and without trials and consultations. Many of them seem to be based on the concept of complete change to modern technological methods -- it must be either one thing or the other. My research assistant and I disagree with this concept. The proposed model is an attempt to blend the traditional with the modern. It concerns the teaching of English but its concept can be adapted to the teaching of other languages and even other subjects. It blends certain aspects of the textbooks, or their equivalents, with a more modern approach using international media sources. The methodology is multi-faceted and provides teachers with much more flexibility in their individual approaches to topics.
The main aims and goals of this model encompass several areas: competence in English as an internationally spoken language by including internationally used vocabulary and phraseology. Creating awareness and knowledge of the world they live in by numerous methods, including developing the four main skills using interesting national and international topics and moving from total spoon feeding' by introducing 'in-depth' research techniques and the personal organization and disciplines necessary.
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11.30 – 13.00 Keynote, Main Auditorium
Debbie Newman, The Noisy Classroom: Thinking aloud

Debbie Newman has experience of teaching debate around the world at all levels. She is now focused on using debating and other active techniques to improve classroom methods. She is a previous English national debating champion, president of the Cambridge Union Society and world champion schools debate coach. She has been on the faculty of the World Debate Institute, IDAS and the UK Debate Academy and is a former Head of the Centre for Speech and Debate at the English-Speaking Union in London. Although Debbie is an experienced university trainer, her focus is on schools debating: both working with children, from 8-18, and also working with teachers to help build their skills and confidence in training and judging debate. Debbie believes that training is always tailored to meet the needs of the learners and should aim to be both challenging and enjoyable. Whether beginners learning skills for the first time, or the more advanced looking to hone their talents, all students and teachers should develop their abilities in a supportive and positive environment.
Fallacies

Logical Fallacies = Rhetorical Fallacies?, Monika Kavalir, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
It is often claimed that rhetoric is a branch of logic (e.g. Corbett, and Connors 32), and despite the fact that Aristotle posits three modes of persuasion, ethos, pathos and logos, the latter is the most important as the enthymeme, or rhetorical syllogism, is “the most effective of the modes of persuasion” because “we are most fully persuaded when we consider a thing to have been demonstrated” (Aristotle 9; cf. Mills, and Petrie 260). It would follow from this that logical fallacies should at the same time also represent a serious breach of rhetorical conventions. Using recent examples from the Slovenian media, the paper attempts to show that there is a continuum of logical fallacies and their uses in rhetoric, from cases where they can be dismissed as rhetorical fallacies as well to those where another fact overrides logical reasoning. In a number of cases, the validity of the argument will also depend on the benevolence of the audience.

Aristotle and »ad hominem« arguments, Boris Vezjak, University of Maribor, Slovenia
»Ad hominem« arguments usually divide into two forms: abusive and circumstantial type. There is a long debate on historical origins and roots of the argument, however it is unclear in what sense Aristotle’s elaboration of »ad hominem« fits the modern usage of it. For example, did Aristotle discover the circumstantial ad hominem argument? While Chichi (2002) believes there is at least some evidence for such a claim, Walton (2004) thinks the opposite. In »On Sophistical refutations« Aristotle proposes that we should examine the discrepancies of the answerer’s position either with his own statements, or with those derived from person’s character. In other words, he distinguishes between solutions directed against the person (pros ton anthropon) or directed against the argument – probably he’s thinking of violation of person’s own principles or concessions. The paper discusses some textual evidence of

»Topics«, »Metaphysics« and »On sophistical refutations«, which clearly indicates that Aristotle mentions various kinds of the usage of »ad hominem«, all of them being used either in rhetorical or logical manner. I will argue that the rhetorical/logical distinction is the only one Aristotle follows: on the logical side he seems to know the arguments from commitment, but these exclude circumstantial ad hominem, on the rhetorical side the ethos of an arguer is taken as a target.

»Begging the question« in a philosophical argument - epistemic or pragmatic?, Danilo Šuster, University of Maribor, Slovenia
From the philosophical point of view no topic in informal logic is more important than begging the question. But the issue is subtle and complex. Aristotle is typically ambiguous - “The fallacy of ‘petitio principii’ or begging the question is committed when someone ‘tries to prove by means of itself what is not known by means of itself’ (Prior Analytics II 16).” I will call this the "epistemic reading". In Sophistical Refutations Aristotle discusses arguments used in competitions and contests and in such a dialectical context it is said to be a fallacy to win such a contest by relying on the opponent’s granting the point at issue. I will call this the "pragmatic reading" - this approach has nowadays been developed by pragma-dialectical school and other defenders of pragmatic approach in informal logic (Walton). There was some philosophical discussion on the pragmatic/epistemic distinction (Biro, Sanford) but the issue has re-emerged with respect to Moore's proof (“This is a hand, therefore the external world exists”). According to modern interpretations (Pryor) Moore is epistemically OK but loses the argument against skeptic (begs the question) from the dialectical point of view. I will sketch both approaches to petitio and analyze the case of Moore's proof. Something’s only being a dialectical or persuasive failing doesn’t mean that it isn’t properly speaking an epistemological failing.
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Debate, room 2, Allan Louden, Wake Forest University, USA

States of Debating in the USA

When classes collide – suburban and inner city debater, Chris Wheatly, Aspen Colorado Schools, USA
After rising by an average of almost 50% for the previous ten years, firearm related deaths and injuries among juveniles in the U.S. reached an all time high in 1993, (National Center for Health Statistics). Entire neighborhoods in U.S. cities became ‘off limits’ for members of other neighborhoods. Debate, in the form of the Urban Debate League began as a way to address this national crisis and embarrassment. The successes and disappointments of the efforts to use debate as a pedagogical tool of empowerment and fellowship are those arising from twenty plus years of experience in Atlanta, Georgia and five plus years in Aspen, Colorado, this paper seeks to identify the advantages and potential sources of conflict occurring when cultures meet in the middle and/or high school debate tournament competition. Debate has been able to bring together and foster conversations among and between extremely diverse neighborhoods and communities. Debate can also reflect and magnify differences in ethnicity, culture and socio-economic status. This paper will attempt to explain and describe as many as possible.

This paper/presentation would seem to be central to the conference theme of, " Rhetoric, Debate and the Pedagogy of Empowerment – Thinking and Speaking a Better World." This author/speaker has had the pleasure of watching high school debate applied towards personal, familial, academic, social, political and economic empowerment and leadership.

Failure in the public eye: The need for renewed engagement of the public sphere in academic debate communities within the United States, Taylor Hahn, Clarion University of Pennsylvannia, USA
Identified as a core of intelligent and engaged academics, the debate community has historically enjoyed a privileged position in American culture. Unfortunately, the majority of these communities have developed into isolated groups of intellectuals whom rarely utilize their rhetorical skills for the good of public argument. Focusing specifically on policy debate in the United States, this paper argues that debate communities must increase their collective engagement of the general public. Offering multiple options on how to engage a wider audience, this paper identifies both debate competitors and their coaches as forces capable of increasing public engagement and debate through event organization and skill development. What was once a keystone of democratic dialogue, collegiate debate communities are now failing to appeal to groups and cultures outside of their own comfort zones. Working to bridge the gap between academic debate and public deliberation, this paper is an effort to call debaters and their mentors to action. As a former policy debater and current debate coach, I outline two critical goals of this paper. First, to identify flaws in the current system of collegiate policy debate in order to improve the activity. Second, to issue a word of caution to other debate communities, both domestic and international. Policy debate in the United States, while the most identifiable system in need of reform, should function as both a warning and an insight into developing holistic problems for debaters and their educators across the globe.

Outcome based life choices: An outcome assessment confirmation study measuring positive social outcomes beyond undergraduate experiences for participants and society in competitive intercollegiate debate, Jack E. Rogers, Department of communication, University of Central Missouri and Arthur Rennels, Interim Director of Forensics, University of Central Missouri, USA
In Fall1997, 200 first-year students (100 debaters and 100 non-debaters) were selected to participate in a four-year longitudinal study. The purpose of the study was to determine if active participation in competitive, intercollegiate forensics led to more significant positive student outcomes for the 100 debate participants as compared to 100 non-debate participants. At the end of each year, an 84-item survey was
administered. The participants were compared in five specific areas: 1) social responsibility; 2) cultural understanding and tolerance; 3) academic success; 4) moral and ethical issues; and 5) psychological multipliers. The study, published in 2002, concluded that in almost every case, in almost every area, participation in debate had significant positive outcomes for the respondent population. A second study, published in 2005, followed those research participants, both debate and non-debate, into the post-graduation world. The study compared debate and non-debate populations as they matriculate through graduate and professional programs, earned advance degrees, and make first career choices. Some job performance data was included. It also compared continued expressions of social responsibility, cultural understanding and tolerance, moral and ethical issues, and perceptions of mental well being and confidence between groups. The study concluded that again, in almost every case, in almost every area, former forensic participation had led to significantly more positive life outcomes beyond graduation for the debate population than for their non-debate peers. This study continues to follow our study participant groups, but focuses in on comparisons of continued social responsibility; cultural understanding and tolerance; and moral and ethical issues. In this case, participants were asked questions regarding behavioral involvement in politics, not-for-profit and social causes, fund-raising, the education and academic environment, and political decision-making. As in previous studies, in almost every case prior involvement in academic debate led to more significant, positive outcomes for not only the debaters but for the society as a whole.
New Approaches to Active Education

Critical understanding as an issue of problem solving in mathematics and physics education, Patronis Tasos, University of Patras and Rousiakis George, Greece
Problem solving, argumentation and understanding of texts in Mathematics and Science are considered as crucial factors in the development of thinking of future citizens. There is a vast literature on these subjects, but only few cognitive issues have been the subjects of critical theorizing. In addition, the important subject of conceptual change has been developed almost entirely outside of Critical theories of education. In the present paper we first introduce the concept of "critical understanding", as a socio-pedagogical issue of the problem solving process in general, and then we specialize in mathematics and physics education. We define critical understanding as the drive and capacity of thought to interpret and reflect on a text (in particular the formulation of a problem or of an argument) against social or individual prejudices and stereotypes. This drive and capacity of thought requires a kind of mental change, but this change need not be always purely conceptual; it could simply be a change of viewpoint. As indicative examples, problems from Mathematics (especially Geometry) and Physics (e.g. the Pendulum, with or without computer simulation) will be discussed, which require reflection and conceptual change in order to be solved.

Numerical thinking, Simon Belak, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
We are at a point where sufficient data is readily available to derive almost any analysis from first principles. Such an interpellation is necessary for argumentation to be anything more than appeals to authority of analysts and mathematical models. However doing so requires moving beyond classical logic and reasoning to include statistics, uncertainty and appreciation of orders of magnitude; neither of which is commonly associated, nor indeed taught, with critical thinking. In the following paper I introduce numerical thinking -- a new pillar of critical thinking -- by arguing that 1) there is a category of cognitive bias that turns mathematics against intuition; that 2) it takes active effort for rationally to trump intuition; that 3) neither peer-review nor The Economist editorial board are sufficient guard against these fallacies; therefore 4) any mathematical model dealing with unconstrained (real-world) phenomena should be treated with suspicion; that 5) classical logic and reasoning are ill-suited to the task; therefore 6) critical thinking needs to be augmented to 7) include tools to critique mathematical models; and 8) offer insight into systematic (and system-wide) cognitive bias underpinning our reasoning.

Theory of knowledge versus debate – parallel universes or two sides of the same coin, Matus Kurian, Gymnazium Jura Hronca/Slovak Debate Association, Slovakia
The aim of the paper is to provide a comparison of Theory of Knowledge and Debate from a teacher's point of view, with the aim of identifying common leading guiding principles and possible synergies. First, we use the founding documents of the corresponding curricula to find the areas of (non) correspondence, and try to establish their relation on a level of fundamental principles. Second, the perspective of a teacher of both subjects will be outlined by a short overview of aims, methods, and approaches. This will be based on the author's own experience. Last, we will try to discuss effects of teaching both subjects on students, and outline areas of their positive and negative interference. Since we suspect that similar patterns arise whenever Debate and another course of critical thinking are in contact, our observations could have a wider application.
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16.00 – 17.30. Sam Greenland, University of Sydney, Keynote, Main Auditorium

Sam Greenland is currently President of the World Universities Debating Council. Sam has debated for Oxford and has also been a successful schools coach, directing the Hong Kong team at numerous World Schools Debating Championships. Recently he has been representing the University of Sydney Union in competitions, and reaching the WUDC semifinals among other advanced elimination rounds. He has been very active in creating the standards for non-native speakers to participate in international tournaments such as the WUDC. Sam has also been working on how debate can be used as a tool for teaching English and how debating improves the overall academic performance of students.

Curriculum documents and broader educational statements place increasing emphasis on critical thinking and rich assessment tasks. Classroom debates have been used in a number of secondary and tertiary contexts to assess student performance against curriculum learning outcomes. However, a number of authors have questioned the worth of debating as a classroom activity, in part due to the low level of research on how it can be accurately assessed and on the extent to which debating does or does not favour certain pre-determined groups of students.

This keynote presents a new assessment tool for classroom debates aimed at teachers who are not themselves debating experts, and analyses the performance of that assessment tool when used in a number of classroom contexts in Hong Kong secondary schools. It further explores whether the data presented from those interventions supports claims made in the literature that debating is an activity biased in favour of students who are male, high academic achievers and with high levels of English literacy.

The presentation finds that the new assessment instrument allows debating performance to be measured successfully by instructors in a classroom context. It also implies that debating does not possess the biases that some authors attribute to it, and therefore should gain wider acceptance as a useful classroom activity for developing and assessing critical thinking. It concludes with an exploration of the possible impacts of these results on classroom pedagogy and programme design for both curricular and extra-curricular activities.
Active Learning About Communities and Minorities

Debate as a praxis for global citizenship, Anja Šerc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia and Alfred C Snider, University of Vermont, USA

With the rise of the awareness about the negative backlashes that globalization has caused on the relations between people and our relation to the environment there is also a growing need to address this problem in different social realms. The educational process has been no exception and a number of international agreements and declarations calls upon states to react and implement the learning about the complexities of globalization into the school curricula and to open up the ways of educating that will equip the students also with the social skills necessary to better and fairer handle the growing complexity of interpersonal and intercultural relations in the conditions of globalization. The term that has come to symbolize these processes is summarized under the umbrella term of ‘global education’.

The theory of global education stresses the need to recognize that in order for individuals to deal with the complexities of globalization the school system has to equip students with values, skills and knowledge the mutually reinforce each other – it is therefore not enough for the school system to follow the paradigm of maximizing the amount of knowledge an individual receives through education but it also has to equip them with the values of solidarity, equality and responsibility to the fellow human being and the environment and equip them with the skills necessary to implement them in real life.

This paper will look at how debate through its method, setting and the selection of themes contributes to the development of all the constitutive ends of the global education triangle. This will be done through first, the synthesis of the relevant literature on the theory of global education, secondly we will analyze the methodology, organization and the selection of themes in line with the goals and methods proposed in the realm of the theory of global education and lastly the paper will look at the possible further developments in debate as to how it can better address the goals of global education and vice versa how can the prevailing proposed model of global education benefit from incorporating debate as its praxis.

An approach to analysis on discourse toward minority, Masako Suzuki Takahashi, Research Center for Foreign Language Education, Keio University, Japan

This research aimed to analyze problems in language expressions towards minority groups of the society frequently appearing in communication among plurilingual/pluricultural parties.

In our increasingly pluricultural world, it is essential to respect each other regardless of cultural, religious, ethnic, gender, (dis)abilities and economic background. New task for language education is to provide students opportunities to grow their ability to understand pains of others with different identity. In order to raise students who can advocate their views without hurting others, we first need to understand what expressions should be avoided.

There has been many insightful research works in the past namely Said’s “Orientalism” and Foucault’s “Maladie Mentale Et Psychologie”. However, background of minority is more diverse in the current society and so as shapes of oppression. An individual who belongs to minority in terms of one aspect of his/her identity can belong to majority in terms of another. Studies on bilateral relationship of groups are therefore not enough relevant in the current society.

What we need now is more decent definition of insensitivity in general. Quantitative analysis on appeared insensitivity in the community must be very helpful in understanding the problem as well.

This research first analyzes Code of Conducts/Ethics of diverse international assemblies to discuss on general direction of pluricultural communities. Second, we discuss on possible definition of insensitive speech toward minority comparing with fallacy analysis by Pragma-Dialectical approach. Last, we discuss on further possibility to classify the insensitive speech using example statements collected at international and domestic debating events.
Youth understanding politics – how youth initiatives can create an impact in society with debate, Monika Sobocan, University of Maribor

In August 2010, Youth Understanding Politics held its second youth meeting in Brussels, Belgium. Originally it is a programme aimed at disadvantaged youth in the ages from 14 to 18 years from Belgium, Germany, Moldova, Romania, Slovenia and Ukraine and what makes it unique is that it was created by 17 and 18 year old youth leaders, so that it truly is an initiative of peer to peer education. In the programme youth gets educated firstly about the basics of debating, with short instructional lectures and extensive workshops. For many of the participants, this is the first time they engage in debate and especially tackle topics of social and political problems with critical thinking. The debate sessions then culminate in a public debate about politics where participants present their newly gathered skills to a broader audience. After debating sessions, the programme focuses more on gaining essential knowledge about human rights and the functioning of European Union politics. Through role plays participants learn about discrimination in society (human rights workshops) and then also by themselves participate through a simulation of the European Parliament in European politics. Through participation in the project, many of the participants became more tolerant towards different culture and belief, and also gained a lot of motivation to become youth leaders and create projects of change in their communities.

Why do people start debating? Helena Felc, Faculty of Administration, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Often debate clubs struggle for members. Only if the process of recruiting new members is carried out efficiently and we spark enough interest in people, we can continue working in our debate clubs. So it is a solid question to ask ourselves what works best when recruiting for debaters? We also need to acknowledge that the more people join our club the more likely the quality of debaters and debates is going to improve. So it is in our and students’ interest to spread debate enthusiasm in schools.

So in order to make this step easier for all of us, I’ve decided to make a survey among debaters all over the world asking them for reasons why they started debating. What made them join the debate team - was it a funny poster, a recommendation from a friend, a public debate or maybe even a simple flier? Many debaters all over the world answered the questionnaire of over 100 questions and I’ve discovered many interesting facts and correlations.

I’ve found out what the best and most successful debaters did at the very start of their debating careers and what makes debate fun for beginners. Debaters provided many answers on what debate is giving them and what would make debate even more interesting. Listen and you will find out the most efficient guaranteed way to promote your debate club and get the best debaters.

Debate as a tool response for Venezuelan situation, Alejandro Duque, Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

During the almost 12 years in office, the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, has tried to establish a singular regime based on a mix of old authoritarian communism with traditional demagogic populism, which he calls 21st Century Socialism. The advances in that direction have been possible since he has electoral support from a considerable portion of the hopeless, the very large poor population in Venezuela; that backing derives from populist policies which waste the gigantic oil revenues in different projects that, apart from huge uncontrolled corruption, translate into a direct subsidy to them.

However, hypnotized by those apparent benefits, the electoral fails to realize that the regime violates constitutional democratic values and liberties, advancing towards a dogmatic, one predominant and mandatory belief for every one: that of the party in power. Obviously this has been suppressing basic human rights such as individual freedoms (economic, speech, press and conscience).

In that context our Debate group (AUDAS) will soon initiate a project to promote, conduct and educate in Debate abilities in some communities, particularly in low income ones to give those people the opportunity to be able to understand and to contrast ideas and/or political situations which might affect their lives, in order to be able to decide rationally by themselves.
Secondary schools debates with visiting experts or how to implement debate in the interdisciplinary approach of curriculum and empower youth for active citizenship, Romana Čemažar, Gimnazija ESIC Kranj, Slovenia

This proposal fits to the third theme of program for the conference: critical thinking/pedagogy, it extends the debate, discussion and argumentation from classroom to whole community in school. The comprehensive phenomenon are treated separately in conventional lessons of secondary school, in the contemporary processes of curricular connections and collaborations between teachers of various school subjects the debate is getting very important role. The debate methodology addresses teachers to cooperate in preparing so called school debates; the mentor of school debate club has the central role.

I want to present the school debates implemented on secondary school Gimnazija ESIC Kranj in a few recent years, their concept, goals and debate formats. The basic concept: we choose the theme or actual problem and debate resolution that relates to this theme. We invite the guest – an expert and well-known person who participates in debate and discusses with participants. We also invite teachers of various subjects to treat the theme in their lessons, to participate in preparing of debate and to discuss with guest. The number of participants is less then 50, so the active role of motivated youths is ensured; we disseminate the debate findings with broadcasting and publishing. The issues of these debates are focused on upgrading the conventional lessons with interdisciplinary approach and the empowering youths to active citizenship. My presentation will also tell the story of developing this concept and will be illustrated with examples from concrete debates.

Culture of debate in High school Domžale, Sofija Baskarad, Srednja šola Domžale, Slovenija

With the help of the debate club it is possible to organize lots of quality events such as literary evenings, round tables, discussing all sorts of social and political themes, preparing students for viewing more demanding films etc. The debate club of high school Domžale meets once a week to discuss various claims, given to us by the institute for the culture of dialog Za in proti (Pro and con), but mainly the debate club helps to organize various cultural events such as literary evenings and round tables. In this article we present how we organized the literary evenings with Aleš Štegr, Goran Vojnović and Boris Pahor. Preparations for the literary evenings do not only take place during the debate club, they are also a part of the regular school curriculum, again with the aid of debate. Our starting point is: With the help of debate in the class we wake the curiosity in our students for literary events in and out of the school. This in itself is not the only reason why we use debate in the classroom. By using debate techniques we teach them to be more independent and active.

Students often think that the educational process alone does not provide them enough opportunities to be active and does not inspire independent thought. Our theory is that if you actively include students into the educational process by implementing active work methods, you encourage them to think critically and independently; also they participate in the class more actively. So because of that, a larger number of students attends literary events and are actively involved in their creation.

Tailoring debate formats for your specific educational goals, Manuele de Conti, University of Padua, Italy

In this paper, we investigate issues that impact on the selection and development of debate formats tailored to specific educational goals. We use the term “debate format” to refer to the rules that regulate, structure, and characterize the debate and facilitate its linear development. From a pedagogical perspective, the debate format is an essential tool to guide and develop students in conscious thinking skills and critical analysis. As varying the format of the debate impacts on the skills that students acquire, care must be taken to select and develop an appropriate structure. We address this issue by evaluating the essential characteristics of various debate formats and correlating these with the resulting acquisition of skills. We present a summary table of some debate formats that may serve as a useful tool to determine the pedagogical possibilities of specific structures. Our findings may also assist in evaluating new debate formats or developing existing ones.
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10.00 – 11.30 Presentations

Argumentation, room 1, chair David Cratis Williams, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, USA

Philosophizing Without Argument, Nenad Miščević, Central University Budapest, Hungary
The paper discusses the work of some very successful and famous contemporary philosophers (or “theoreticians”, like for instance Jacques Lacan in his later phase) who systematically avoid any sort of explicit argumentation in their work. Philosophizing without argument here means doing philosophy without any visible argumentation-like steps. Of course, most examples can be reconstructed, in fact re-interpreted in terms of argument, but the argument form is strictly avoided. (An interesting intermediate form is “pure description”, often advocated by classics of phenomenology).
How did the non-argumentative writing gain its place in twentieth-century philosophy? The paper proposes a philosophical account, resting on the assumption that the authors in question are following an intellectual strategy. Assuming that a-rational aspects of human existence (desire, passion, and the like) are of central interest they accept an implicit methodological principle: the cognitive style, the language, style and the method of studying an a-rational domain D should follow the language, style and the manner of D itself. In particular, for such a-rational domains, the cognitive style and the linguistic expression should minimize the use of (or perhaps completely eschew) traditional rationalist methods of enquiry and presentation. The paper concludes with the general comparison between the more argumentative manner and its less or an-argumentative counterpart, and looks at the possibility of dialog between the two.

Level of Generality as a Rhetoric Device, Katarzyna Kobos, University of Lodz, Poland
In my prospective presentation I would like to attend to the issue of whether the level generality of the argument is topic-neutral or whether it affects the scope and choice of the subject-matter. Related to this question is the query to what extent particular topics are to be considered at fixed levels of generality.
It is my contention that generality does matter with respect to the material scope of the discussion, especially within the philosophy of mind for which I shall provide support drawn from my original analyses as well as from the studies published by Shoemaker and van Fraassen. I will show that related to the particular level is the first-person perspective while theoretical or general level is associated with the third-person perspective. I will analyze what are the limitations of the third-person account in the treatment of mental phenomena and on what conditions, if at all, the two could be equivalent. I will inspect the claims Tamar Gendler advances to the effect the choice between general versus particular means of articulation is not so much a difference of precision but of adopting the proper vantage point and thus securing that the reasoning be adequate to the subject-matter involved. I will advise for the less general treatment of issues relevant to mental phenomena as general accounts seem an appropriate means.
I shall also take up the issue of propositional imagination as directly pertaining to how general imagined situations or state of affairs might be. I will tie in the discussion with the positions entertained by Tamar Gendler, Steven Yablo, Timothy Williamson, Shaun Nichols, Jonathan Ichikawa, Gregory Currie, among others.
Debate, room 2, chair Bojana Skrt, Za in proti, zavod za kulturo dialoga Slovenia

Debating Scenarios on Three Continents: Europe, East Africa and Japan

The transfer from debater to coach – how experienced debaters can contribute to the quality of high school debate education, Monika Sobočan, University of Maribor, Slovenia

Enabling high school students to acquire appropriate debate knowledge to compete at tournaments right from their freshman year on is one of the major concerns of many public high schools in Slovenia. Especially in the remote areas it is difficult to find skilled instructors for debate that would engage with students and give them the possibility to gain specific debate knowledge, beyond the basics. That is why one of the practical options is that juniors and seniors in high schools are slowly introduced to become debate coaches and take over responsibilities of organizing debate workshops and different debate drills. This article analyzes the implementation of peer to peer debate education and its impact on the workshop executers with a case study based at the high school Gimnazija Franca Miklosica Ljutomer (Slovenia). Results of the method are promising: new generations of debaters are inspired to give back to their high school and when reaching junior year, actually have the motivation to take over some of the workshops and dedicate part of their free time to instruct new generations in debating.

Debate for Youth Empowerment in East Africa, Takako Mino, Claremont McKenna College, USA

Debate empowers youth by teaching them the skills needed to make strong, defensible arguments and to express their views with confidence. This paper will discuss the challenges involved in developing and strengthening debate programming in East Africa, based on the author's experience conducting teacher and student public speaking and argumentation trainings at primary and secondary schools in rural Uganda and Kenya. The author introduced the Public Debate Program (PDP) format to many hundreds of teachers and students. Teachers and students found that this particular form of public debate, which included questions and comments from the audience during debates, to be the appropriate model for debate training in the context of East Africa. Challenges to debate program development and student participation include the low level of English comprehension, inexperience with refutation skills, lack of time for additional school tasks, lack of access to informational resources, and the lack of existing infrastructure for interscholastic competition. The strengths of the PDP include the simplicity of the format, the low costs of implementation, the availability of textbook, video, and online support, and the grassroots spread of knowledge from school to school. The author hopes to share the lessons learned and expand prospects for school debate programming in Africa.

Debate in Japan, Andrew Nishizaki, Japan

I will review the situation concerning debating in Japan. I will do this by dealing with more general difficulties faced by those wishing to debate in Japan, especially in English, and then deal with more specific barriers. I will conclude with a discussion of my work to promote debating in Japan and how I deal with these barriers. First, I will deal with the difficulties in mastering English in Japan based on the educational system and the cultural orientation towards English speaking. Second, I will deal with cultural barriers that might inhibit the free expression of disagreement, especially as applied to the young. Third, I will discuss the role of English in higher education and how it is undervalued as a skill that students should have, with its resulting de-emphasis on the part of students. Fourth, I will discuss the role of debating as a peripheral activity in Japanese universities, resulting in a lack of support for debating activities. Fifth, I will discuss my work in promoting debate in Japan and how I have attempted to overcome these very substantial barriers.
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Using Debate in the Classroom

Teaching rhetoric in continuing education courses, Boštjan Debelak, Ljudska univerza Koper, Slovenia

People's university in Koper is the only public adult education institution on the Slovenian Coast. It is active in the area of Koper Municipality which is also the founder, as well as in Izola and Piran municipalities, where it has its units. Students are offered various language programs, secondary programs to obtain degrees and retraining programs, free time workshops and programs for personal growth, and primary school for adults, funded by the Ministry of Education and Sport. Rhetoric has been introduced to the People's University in Koper since the new primary school system had been introduced. This is unique because there isn’t any other people's university in Slovenia with the program like that.

Despite a conscious decision and substantive considerations, rhetoric teachers are facing many problems and challenges. We have been successfully solving them for many years.

In my professional report I will present: factors that gave rise to the decision to teach rhetoric - opinions of the director and professional staff, who is leading primary school for adults; structure of the students; the attempt to adjust the curriculum (curriculum in normal elementary school, the extent of 32 hours in the ninth grade, at the people's university there are only 18 hours available); several methods, which have proved the most successful; teachers' and pupils' / students' responses and opinions.

Instructional Communication as a rhetorical process: political speech as a model of persuasion to be taught and studied, Irina Antonova, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, Russia

From a rhetorical perspective, teachers use verbal and non-verbal messages with the intention to influence or persuade students, as well as to help them sharpen their own persuasive skills.

In her paper, the author analyzes three models of communication applying them to the instructional/teaching process and thus proving that the rhetorical strategies of persuasion are to be used in the classroom as the most natural and suitable methods of teaching.

Persuasive (not informative!) discourse presupposes the choice of a political (including presidential) text as the material to be studied because its function has traditionally been that of persuasion realized by canonic (logos, ethos, pathos) and non-canonic methods.

The Way to success for students with special needs – A case study at Secondary school for catering and tourism, Celje, Karina Koželj, High school for tourism Celje, Slovenia

The purpose of my article is to present that students, involved in active teaching methods, like for example debate or round table discussion, reach better results on tests for a specific topic than their schoolmates, involved in classical teaching techniques. I will also write about students with special needs and their improvement if they cooperate at lesson, where a teacher is using active teaching methods. Basically I want to research if active teaching methods really help students with special needs to improve their outcomes on written tests.

Debate in the classroom, successful experience in Venezuela, Arlan A. Narvaez R., Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Debate has become an invaluable tool for both achieving the learning objectives and evaluating some of my courses in the School of Economics, Universidad Central de Venezuela.

For four continuous term semesters half of the syllabus has been developed using an adaptation of the British parliamentary debate format, particularly for the course on “Current Economic Problems in Venezuela”.

At the beginning of the course the students are organized in 5 or 6 groups of 4 students each and they have to be prepared for conducting a Debate every week, based on a very recent economic situation.

The experience has been so successful that, for two semesters now, it is used in all of the courses of the same subject; furthermore, it has started to be used in other courses such as “Current Social Issues”, “Epistemology”, “State and Society” and “Oral Skills for Law Practice”.

The presentation will share with the participants some outstanding features and results of this experience.
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Critical Thinking and Debate

Reason in the Balance: Teaching Critical Thinking as Inquiry, Sharon Bailin, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada and Mark Battersby, Capilano University, Vancouver, Canada

We have argued that coming to a reasoned judgment on complex issues is at the heart of the kind of critical thinking which actually takes place both in the disciplines and in everyday life. Arriving at reasoned judgments is a dialectical process involving the comparative weighing of a variety of contending positions and arguments (Bailin & Battersby 2009; Battersby & Bailin 2010). Recognizing this dialectical dimension, we have developed an inquiry approach to critical thinking pedagogy which focuses on the kind of comparative evaluation which we make in actual contexts of disagreement and debate (Bailin & Battersby 2010). Our approach goes beyond the critique of particular arguments to focus on the various aspects that go into the practice of inquiry, including identifying issues, identifying the relevant contexts, understanding the competing cases, and making a comparative judgment among them. Key features include an emphasis on: 1) the dialectical dimension of critical thinking, including the current state, history, and context of the debate; 2) conducting inquiry dialogues; and 3) the spirit of inquiry. We also focus on inquiry in specific contexts, including science, social science, philosophy, and the arts.

Rhetoric, oratory and philosophy in the debate, Adelino Cattani, University of Padua, Italy

Between philosophers and orator-rhetoricians, there is an ancient confrontation and fight, because of their rivalry and difficulty/impossibility to communicate. This problematic relationship is shown by the judgments usually pronounced by philosophers about rhetoric, considered intrinsically vicious on epistemic, methodological, ethical and social grounds. Namely, rhetoric is:

- vicious reasoning because it is groundless or based on a-rational/irrational elements;
- a fallacious method based on superficial, enthymematic and aphoristic formulations;
- blameworthy for being deceitful and responsible for simulating pseudo-truths;
- dangerous because of its partiality, demagogy and seductive tendency.

Furthermore, when rhetoric is applied to debating, many people fear that debating creates very smart persons who always have answers for all questions and in every circumstance, that is, someone who is able to find argumentations and untruths, who always knows how to answer and how to lie. But since the philosopher decided to ask himself about the truth (if any) and since the rhetorician decided to (re)cultivate the “dialectical gracious gifts,” and not only “rhetorical gracious gifts,” something changed in their relationship. In particular, since the philosopher deals seriously with language, “how to say something” (the nice form) is not just in conflict with “what to say” (the sound content). Finally, since the philosopher settles accounts with controversy, he must call disputation, too, to account. So, today we can say that, in addition to the above mentioned faults, to rhetoric are also ascribed the following values, which are all related to the debating process:

- from an epistemic point of view, rhetoric offers argumentative schemes heuristically valid and apt to grasp the manifold aspects of reality;
- from a methodological point of view, it is associated with critical open-mindedness; from an ethical point of view, it is associated with prudence, anti-authoritarianism and challenge;
- from a social point of view, it represents and promotes broad-mindedness, anti-dogmatism, democracy and tolerance.

Certainly, both the orator and the “discussant” have to be gifted with logical and rhetorical tools, but the first does not necessarily have to be clever in disputation, while the debating person has to be a good orator.
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Different Paths to Debate in the USA

National policy debate circuit in U.S.A, Chris Wheatly, Aspen, Colorado Schools, USA

This presentation will seek to describe and explain the amazing phenomenon that is national high school policy debate. The job description for a successful national high school policy debater would include but not be limited to the following: Be one of the most academically and intellectually gifted students in the U.S.A. Have access to financial and academic resources similar to those of a corporation or research institute. Maintain a working knowledge (database) of hundreds of schools, teams and judges. Travel thousands of miles on varied systems of transportation while enduring constantly changing schedules, minimal sleep and questionable nutritional habits. The job rewards seem to be the opportunity to be included among the elite of U.S. political and legal actors. The friendships made during their time as national high school policy debaters often become the basis of important lifetime social networks. Finally, these same student-debaters also ‘raise the bar’ for those around them and become a powerful tool of pedagogical empowerment for those around them as well, in and out of the classroom.

This presentation is based on twenty plus years of celebrating student-debater performances that resulted in championships and elimination round appearances at virtually every major national high school tournament—and over fifteen consecutive state high school debate championships.

Debate as transformative experience, Amanda Feller and Kelly Ryan, Pacific Luthern University, USA

What is the purpose of competitive inter-collegiate debate? What are the learning outcomes for the individual? What is the mission of the larger collective? The answers to such questions are treated as obvious by some. However, this article proposes that it is long past time to not simply review these questions and debate them within the same tired framework; it is time to treat these questions in a new way.

This is a call to understand and experienced debate as a transformative practice. Along the way, this article provides a vocabulary and conceptual framework for those forensic educators and participants aligned with this sense of debate serving a larger purpose.

Negotiating expertise: Translating debate techne into community practice, Jeff Kurr and John Rief, University of Pittsburgh

Debate practitioners throughout the U.S. are currently engaged in outreach efforts mainly in the form of Urban Debate Leagues (UDLs) that focus on giving inner city youth access to research, critical thinking, and speaking skills (debate techne). The hope is that these students will be more attractive recruits at major universities given their improved speaking abilities and potential contributions to collegiate academic debate programs. Some debate scholars have described this model of debate pedagogy as a form of “escapism” claiming that UDLs often focus on liberating high school students from their communities rather than contributing directly to the quality and quantity of deliberation and social change in their communities. Without undermining the expertise of community members who already have a role to play in empowerment and social change at a local level, we argue in this paper that debate practitioners might envision other forms of outreach that go beyond the UDL model.

Working in tandem and largely in agreement with individuals currently developing UDLs in the U.S., we argue that debate practitioners should think outside the box, seeking inspiration from models throughout the international community, and develop a form of outreach that not only provides students with access to debate competition but also provides support and resources for community level deliberation and dialogue on the most pressing issues of the day. Such a model for outreach would view debate techne as a form of expertise that can and should be translated into modes of community-based deliberative practice and public advocacy.
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Training Citizens and Training Debaters

An argumentation and debate text book for not debaters: Understanding Argument: the journey from consumer to critic, critic to advocate, Korry Harvey and Paul Bingham, Western Washington University, USA

Although there are already several fine argumentation and debate texts in print, in writing this text we hope to address argumentation from more of a practical perspective than solely an academic or theoretical approach. In our experience, argumentation makes the most sense when we can see the application it has to our everyday lives. While recognizing that there is undoubtedly an important purpose for the more highly specialized debate handbooks available, most people will never actually participate in a school’s competitive debate program, therefore this effort is directed less toward the argument theorist or experienced academic debate student than toward a more general audience. Indeed, everyone faces conflict and challenge in their lives. Everyone is subject to a myriad of political and social messages on a daily basis. Everyone is regularly tasked with making a wide range of difficult decisions. It is our hope that this text can assist the reader in understanding the intricacies of argumentation, and in so doing act as a guide along the journey from being simply a consumer of argument to becoming a critic of argument, and then acting as an advocate for the ideals and positions they hold. Rather than passively being bombarded by arguments (via the media, religious institutions, the government, political campaigns, social movements, peers, etc.), our intention is to help people develop the skills necessary to recognize when argument is being directed at them, to critically assess it for validity, and then to respond appropriately. In a world that is changing as rapidly as ours currently is, such skills are of great value to everyone.

Training model: Debate academy, Alfred C Snider, University of Vermont, USA and Bojana Skrt, ZIP, Slovenia

The authors have held many debate training sessions throughout the world, such as in Europe, Southwest Asia, Northeast Asia and North America. During these nine years of experience a model of debate training has been developed that has come to be called the »Debate Academy« model. In this presentation we will outline the design and implementation of this model. First, we will discuss the basic design principles behind this model. Second, we will discuss implementational elements in the model. Third, we will discuss the results in terms of student achievement and evaluation. This model has already been copied, both in name and substance, by other debate training programs around the world, and we hope that this paper will help those individuals and organizations to appreciate the substance as well as the name.
The Faculty of Arts at the University of Maribor addresses three basic areas of study: the humanities, social studies, and teacher education or pedagogical studies. Students enroll in programmes which prepare them for pedagogical and nonpedagogical professions in disciplines developed by eleven departments offering both undergraduate and postgraduate study programmes. The faculty is firmly integrated into the system of European universities, and it cooperates with several well-known universities and institutions of higher education in Europe. This assures compatibility of its study programmes, student and staff exchange and cooperation of professors and students in international study and research projects. Successful cooperation depends above all on a partnership relation founded on an equal basis which means that we receive benefits from our partners, but at the same time we need to offer them something in return. Yet we can only give if we are sufficiently interesting and especially if we have knowledge to offer. We need to bear in mind that only the creation of new knowledge brings results that will allow us to assert ourselves at home and abroad. The presence of the faculty on the international university stage enables collaboration and cooperation and demonstrates a commitment to the development of modern study programmes, which will be successful only if we know how to cooperate and together develop efficient study and research activities. International cooperation by the Faculty of Arts offers important educational, research and intellectual relationships within the common European university region - it connects the traditions of European university education with new demands framed by the Bologna process and shows how European tradition and the young Maribor University can successfully supplement each other. The Faculty of Arts is a recognized centre of development of the humanities and social sciences at the University of Maribor, a promoter of positive regionalism in the country, and open for cooperation with the best European faculties and universities. It develops and organizes study programmes and research activities in cooperation with home and European universities and academic institutions. It offers its students an excellent education and professors good conditions for research and pedagogical work. A primary goal of the Faculty of Arts is to expand the research activities of its professors and to encourage their participation in international projects. International cooperation is a significant part of the University of Maribor’s agenda on entering the European interuniversity market.

http://www.ff.uni-mb.si
ZIP, Za in proti, zavod za kulturo dialoga/Pro et contra, institute for culture of dialogue was established in 1998 as a non-governmental and non-profit organization. It co-ordinates, informs, educates, researches and promotes debate activities in order to improve the quality of the culture in dialogue in Slovenia. ZIP considers itself a creator of a peaceful coexistence and communication, it contributes to development of democracy and raises civil awareness of people. ZIP activities among young and other and dissemination of the above mentioned ideas create a better new world.

ZIP main activities are:

- coordination of a network of 60 debate clubs at middle school, high school and university level, annually 1000 young people and 120 teachers involved;
- organising regional, national and international debate tournaments for middle school, high school and university debaters;
- organising and running different debate and advocacy trainings for youth, youth workers, teachers, elderly, different NGOs ...
- organising international debate academies;
- creating different curricula, teachers and students manuals, on-line training materials for formal and un formal education;
- organising and promoting round table discussions, public, Radio, TV debates, e-debates on different topics all over Slovenia.

ZIP has a long history of successfully implemented projects which involve big number of participants and a lot of activities. In the last five years ZIP together with its network of 60 debate clubs at middle school, high school and university level annually organized more than 150 events for almost 5000 participants, including workshops, forums, conferences for youth and teachers, debate tournaments, public debates, round table discussions, TV and radio debates ... in Slovenia and in other countries. From 2010 – 2009 we had a weekly 50-minutes debate programme named Tekma at national TV, created by youth programme of national TV and our organisation. There were almost 100 emissions prepared on variety of different topics. We published numerous teachers and students manuals e.g Let's debate about equal opportunities 2008, Let’s debate about European Parliament, 2007 ... which bring some theory about debate and other active methodologies about different content, lessons plans, tips how to develop a multidisciplinary approach towards problems of contemporary world.

The quality of Slovenian debate programme reflects also in the achievements we have at the big international events:

- at the high school level 3 times Worlds English Foreign Language Champions; 2010 Worlds English Second Language Champions; two times Worlds Best EFL speaker;
- at the university level European ESL Champion 2010, Worlds University Best EFL speaker, Worlds University 2nd and 3rd best ESL speaker.
The World Debate Institute [WDI] has been training people in the arts and skills of debating since 1982. It has trained many thousands of people in more than thirty-four countries and from more than fifty countries.

The purpose of WDI is to support a global network of debate activities, especially trainers who know what they are doing, have an established reputation and record, and are willing to go where there is not yet an active debating community and help establish or nurture one.

The other purpose is to provide technical expertise and assistance to any new or developing debate program in the world. Use our 28 years of experience! Contact us at alfred.snider@uvm.edu.

Our trainers are skilled and dedicated. They are authorized to carry out the training of students, teachers, trainers and organizers and grant them certificates bearing the authority and the imprint of the World Debate Institute, a globally recognized brand. They are devoted to this work not to earn money or fame, but to forward the belief that a global community that has vibrant debating and is populated and eventually run by those with a debating background will be more peaceful, more just and more conducive to the achievement of the human potential.

"A boot camp for the brain, and for free speech as well." -New York Times

http://debate.uvm.edu/debateblog/wdi/
http://worlddebateinstitute.blogspot.com/
About QatarDebate

QatarDebate is the National Debating Organization for Qatar and a member of Qatar Foundation for Education, Science, and Community Development in the aim of developing, supporting and raising the standard of open discussion and debate among School and University students in Qatar and across the Middle East, which contributes in shaping the Global Citizens of today and the intellectual leaders of tomorrow.

History of QatarDebate QatarDebate is the National Debating Organization for Qatar and a member of Qatar Foundation for Education, Science, and Community Development. QatarDebate was established in September 2007 with the aim of developing, supporting and raising the standard of open discussion and debate among students in Qatar and across the Middle East, shaping the Global Citizens of today and the intellectual leaders of tomorrow.

At an international level, QatarDebate selects and trains the Qatar National Debating team. The inaugural team attended the 2008 World Schools Debating Championships in Washington DC in September 2008, winning 4 of their 8 debates and setting a new world record as a first-time entrant to the competition in the process. The national team has subsequently attended the 2009 WSDC in Athens in February 2009, again winning 4 out of their 8 debates.

In February 2010, QatarDebate hosted the 22nd World Schools Debating Championship (WSDC) in Doha from February 8, 2010 to February 18, 2010 with the participation of 57 countries.

To date QatarDebate has trained over 7000 students in Qatar, regionally and internationally.

www.qatardebate.org
www.wsdc2010doha.com
Contact: qatardebate@qf.org.qa