All speakers in the debate must construct arguments to support their side of the motion. With the exception of the Prime Minister, all debaters must refute arguments made by the other side, and rebuild arguments made by their own side. Previous chapters focused on general principles for constructing arguments—principles that can be used by anyone supporting or opposing a motion. Upcoming chapters will focus on how the different speakers engage in the process of constructing, refuting, and rebuilding arguments. The particular kinds of arguments that speakers will make vary depending on their speaking positions. The focus here is on the First Government Team—the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister—and how they construct, refute, and rebuild arguments in support of the motion.

Role of the Prime Minister

The construction of the speech ordinarily is a joint effort of the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister, who cooperate to outline the case during their preparation time. That speech is particularly important because it sets the direction and focus for the entire debate. Other debaters supporting the motion (the Second Government Team) are obliged to advocate the same position taken by the First Government Team, although they may use different arguments to do so. If the Prime Minister’s speech is poorly constructed, or if the position taken by the Prime Minister is unclear, then the remainder of the debate will likely be unclear, as well. Although a good speech by the Prime Minister does not assure that the rest of the debate will be a good one, a good Prime Minister speech is essential to starting the
debate on the right track. To get the debate started in a positive manner, the First Government Team, in both its preparation and briefly in the Prime Minister’s constructive speech, needs to give some attention to the analysis of the motion.

*Analyze the Motion*

Methods of analyzing a motion were covered in Chapter 4. Analysis of the motion is an important prerequisite to creating the Prime Minister’s speech, even though the speech will not include all of the elements of analysis. The background of the topic, the type of motion to be debated, the definition and interpretation of that motion, and a catalog of the potential issues will help the Prime Minister construct the speech, but will not become the speech itself.

All of the work that the First Government Team did when they analyzed the motion need not be presented in the Prime Minister’s speech. Sometimes, statements about the background of the controversy will be important to clarify for the judges and audience the focus of the arguments presented by the Prime Minister. Sometimes, the controversy will be so clear to everyone that stating its background would be redundant. Usually the Prime Minister need not state what kind of topic, value or policy, is being debated. However, the kind of topic is implicit in the Prime Minister’s advocacy. If the motion is about policy, the Prime Minister will ordinarily advocate some policy proposal. If the motion is about value, the Prime Minister will not advocate a policy proposal but will clearly state how a certain object does or does not possess a certain value.

The part of the analysis of the motion that is perhaps most important to the Prime Minister’s speech is the definition of ambiguous terms and interpretation of the motion. The Prime Minister needs to include in his or her speech ideas about definition and interpretation of the motion and, must clearly state what will be the primary focus of the debate. The purpose of this part of the Prime Minister’s speech is to ensure that the other debaters and the audience will clearly understand the focus and direction of the debate.

The final part of analysis, *discovering potential issues*, will not specifically be a part of the speech, however, the most important of those issues will constitute the substance of the Prime Minister’s speech.

Analyzing the motion is a very important precursor to supporting it. Taking the time to think about the ways they want to focus the debate, the direction they believe the debate should take, which arguments are central and which are peripheral, will help debaters construct a persuasive and sound case for the motion. By clearly analyzing the motion, the debaters come to see exactly what that they need to be prepared to support.
Creating a Case for the Motion

Creating a case for the motion can be considered in three steps: (1) defining and interpreting the motion, (2) describing the approach the First Government Team will take, and (3) creating one or more arguments to support that approach.

Step One: Defining and Interpreting the Motion. Because they speak first, as noted in Chapter 4, the First Government Team has the right and responsibility to define and interpret the motion. That means that they are the team who will decide the ultimate direction and focus of the debate. As discussed earlier, some motions can be debated in a number of legitimate yet different ways. In cases like those, the First Government Team has the right to decide which of those legitimate areas will be the focus of the particular debate. The decision they make is one that the other three teams are obliged to follow. If the motion is “Nations of the world should take greater responsibility to curb pollution,” the First Government Team might decide to focus on countries of the developing world and on air pollution. If they do, that focus will guide the entire debate. The other teams cannot elect to change the focus from the developing world to, say, the developed world, or from air pollution to water pollution, for example. The convention of allowing the First Government Team to decide about defining and interpreting the motion is a good way to ensure that a debate begins and ends with a particular focus rather than wandering from topic to topic.

The right to define and interpret the motion gives the First Government Team a certain advantage in the debate. For this reason, the right to define and interpret the motion carries a responsibility to do so in a reasonable fashion. That responsibility to define and interpret the motion in a reasonable way helps to ensure a good debate for all participants rather than being a self-serving method of helping the First Government Team “win” the debate. The criterion that should be employed to determine if the definition and interpretation is appropriate is what might be called a “reasonable person” standard. Would a reasonable person agree that the definitions and interpretations are legitimate? Would a reasonable person agree that the definitions and interpretations are such that they have the potential to lead to a good debate on the topic? If the answers to each of those questions is “yes,” then the First Government Team has fulfilled its responsibility with regard to defining and interpreting the motion, and the other teams are, therefore, obliged to follow these definitions and interpretations for the remainder of the debate.

Some motions are relatively clear from the beginning and others are somewhat ambiguous. The more clear and concrete the motion; the less defining and interpreting will be needed. The dual processes of defining and interpreting are related to each other, yet are conceptually distinct. Defining the motion simply refers to providing clear meanings for any words or phrases that might not be understood by the audience, or that might have multiple meanings. Interpreting the motion ordinarily involves narrowing and focusing the motion for debate. Defining and interpreting the motion are two processes used to set the focus and direction of the debate.
Consider, for example, the motion that “The People’s Republic of China should abolish capital punishment.” This motion is so clear that it likely requires little, if any, definition. The important phrases, “People’s Republic of China” and “capital punishment,” are likely to be understood by audience members and do not seem to have more than one important meaning. Furthermore, the motion is concrete in terms of both the suggested actor and the proposed action so that it needs little interpretation in order to have a clear and focused debate. The actor is clearly specified in the motion as the People’s Republic of China. Had the motion stated, “Nations of the world should abolish capital punishment,” the debate might reasonably be about policies in the U.S., the Arab world, or parts of Asia. In that case, further interpretation might be required to focus the debate. In addition to the actor being clearly specified, the statement of the motion is also clear and requires little interpretation of the action to be undertaken. Had the motion used the words “reform capital punishment” rather than the words “abolish capital punishment,” the motion would have been more abstract and open to interpretation. One could envision reform of capital punishment as involving a range of possible actions such as limiting the kinds of crimes for which capital punishment is used, limiting the age of persons who might be executed, specifying the methods of execution, specifying the conditions under which capital punishment is called for, etc. But this motion, by using the word “abolish” clearly calls for an end to rather than a reform of capital punishment and, thus, very little interpretation is needed beyond the direct statement of the motion.

When a motion does need to be focused and limited, the Prime Minister may want to say a few words to justify the emphasis. Consider, for example, the motion that “Capital Punishment should be reformed.” Suppose that the debaters want to focus the motion on the Middle East and on the particularly cruel methods used to execute people. They might justify their focus by mentioning the common use of capital punishment in the Middle East and by briefly describing the cruelest methods of capital punishment—stoning, beheading, hanging, etc. Since that interpretation does involve a more limited discussion than one might expect in a typical debate about capital punishment, the opposing debaters and the adjudicators will probably be looking forward to some kind of justification of the limitation. Some potential justifications might include the frequency of capital punishment in the Middle East, the frequency of particular methods of capital punishment, and the existence of alternative methods that are less cruel. Because that interpretation is more limited, it also may require more justification than a more standard interpretation that, for instance, involves limiting capital punishment to first-degree murder, or ending capital punishment of juveniles or mentally disabled people.

Different motions require different levels of definition and interpretation depending on whether the motion is more or less concrete or is worded in a more or less ambiguous manner. Consider two examples: one that has some limited room for interpretation, and another that has a much wider range of legitimate interpretations. The first example is, “The Republic of South Africa should significantly alter its policies regarding the Kruger National Park.” The motion is fairly concrete, but still leaves room for definition and interpretation. Like the earlier motion, this one contains a very clear actor, the Republic of South Africa. Unlike the earlier motion, this one contains one term with which some of the audience might be unfamiliar, and yet another term that is open to interpretation and clarification. Some of
the audience might be unfamiliar with the “Kruger National Park.” Thus, the debaters ought to define it for the audience so the debate could proceed with clarity. Also, the term “significantly alter” can have a variety of interpretations, so the First Government Team needs to provide their interpretation of “significantly alter” in order to set a clear direction for the debate. “Reform” of policies regarding the Kruger National Park might be thought of as changing the ways the government tries to protect endangered species within the park, or changing admission policies within the park, or changing water policies inside the park. Thus, this motion requires some definition and interpretation.

A different motion might be even more ambiguous and, thus, may need more definition or interpretation. Consider, for example, the motion that the “Nations of the world should take greater responsibility for protection of the environment.” In that example, although the individual terms are clear and need little definition, the topic needs to be narrowed and focused in order to have a good debate. Three key phrases, “nations of the world,” “greater responsibility,” and “protection of the environment,” all need to be narrowed and focused. Otherwise, the resulting debate will be too general and will not result in specific arguments. Thus, the First Government Team should make clear how they intend to focus the debate: Which “nations of the world” will be emphasized? What kind of “greater responsibilities” should be expected of those nations? Which areas of “protection of the environment” should be the subject of the debate? By focusing and narrowing the scope of the debate in these three areas, the First Government Team will help to start the debate in a productive direction.

Step Two: Describing the Position the Government Team Will Defend. Clearly describing and specifying the position that the Government Team will advocate flows directly from their definition and interpretation of the motion. The second step is simply a clearer and perhaps more specific way of explaining the First Government Team’s definitions and interpretation. The Prime Minister’s responsibility with regard to this second step is simply to provide a very clear statement of what the First Government Team will advocate and defend.

If the motion is a value motion asking debaters to assess some object (person, idea, institution, etc.), then the Prime Minister should clearly specify the person, idea, or institution to be assessed, and should note the specific value or principle that will be used to evaluate that object. For instance, if a motion states, “Health care is a fundamental human right,” the Prime Minister needs to clarify how he or she will focus the debate, especially in terms of health care. Perhaps the First Government Team will decide to focus on emergency medical care, or on preventive medical care. In such a case, the Prime Minister might fulfill his or her responsibility by stating, “We believe all citizens have a fundamental right to emergency health care and we further believe that providing such care is a fundamental responsibility of our government.” This statement describes the object they intend to evaluate (emergency health care) as well as the value or principle (fundamental responsibility of government) they will employ to create the evaluation. Their statement not only describes the position that the First Government Team will defend, but it also describes the direction that the rest of the debate will take as well. All other teams will then be obliged to discuss emergency health care, not preventive health care not reproductive care, etc. Certainly, other teams can
appropriately bring other values or principles to bear on the evaluative process (cost, well-being, etc.), but all of those values will be discussed in terms of emergency care.

The statement of the position that the Government Teams will defend makes explicit all of the decisions that were implicit in the definitions and interpretations. The definitions and interpretations are thus explained in order to make clear that the debate is not about the motion as a whole, but rather about a more focused and clearly defined position to guide the debate.

The examples above refer to instances where the motion is one of value, attaching a value to an object. One other common kind of motion will involve an evaluation of a proposed action, usually a policy proposal. In debates about those kinds of motions, a very clear “model” may be helpful because it can offer a rather specific examination of the kind of action the First Government Team is prepared to support. The specification of what the First Government Team will defend is provided in terms of its “model” of the motion. The “model,” as its name implies, is not a statement of the motion as a whole, but of the focused specification that the Government team will defend with regard to the overall motion.

In general, a model of this kind will involve three specifications:

1. Who is the proposed actor? In some cases, the proposed actor is named in the motion, e.g. the People’s Republic of China. Even so, the First Government Team may decide to further specify who ought to take action. Should action be taken by a municipality? By members of a family? By the provincial government? By members of a club or organization? By the central government? As stated earlier, the Prime Minister may want to explain why the First Government Team has decided to specify a particular actor.

2. What are the essential elements of the proposed action? The First Government Team needs to describe the broad details of the proposed action. Because time is limited in most debates, the model can only describe the most essential elements of the proposal, not the fine details. Because of time constraints, the Government Team can only outline its plan, but it should be ready to provide greater explanation if required later in the debate.

3. What other elements of the proposal, such as details of implementation are needed to make the proposal feasible? These elements may include how the plan will be funded, how the plan will be enforced, how various agencies in the plan are expected to work together, etc. Because the Government Team has limited time, it cannot present these elements in great detail. By briefly describing those three elements of their model, the Government Team makes clear what it intends to advocate and defend during the entirety of the debate. A model is an aid to help all four teams focus the debate on more specific issues in order to have a good, clear debate.

In some cases, even when the motion is about a policy, a specific motion may be unnecessary. Sometimes the motion is so clear and unambiguous that specifying a particular course of action may be redundant with restating the motion. For instance, a motion that
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states simply “The PRC should abolish capital punishment” may be so clear that further specification of a model is completely unnecessary.

Thus, whether by a model or simply by a clear statement, the Prime Minister needs to help focus the remainder of the debate on a particular position that the Government Team will advocate. The basic responsibility of the Prime Minister in this step is to clarify the position to be advocated by the First Government Team and, as a result, the position that will be the focus of the rest of the debate.

Step Three: Creating Arguments to Support Government’s Interpretation of the Motion. The final step in creating a case for the motion is the most substantive—creating arguments to support the Government Team’s interpretation of the motion. As stated earlier, a case can include one or more arguments in support of the Government’s interpretation. Usually, the case will consist of two or three arguments. More than three arguments may mean that the Prime Minister does not have adequate time to develop each argument. Creating arguments is the most important step in creating a case because it focuses the debate on the reasons for accepting the motion. These arguments are the substance of the case for the motion.

Other concepts important to creating arguments for First Government Teams were briefly introduced in Chapter 3. In that chapter, the notions of principles and consequences were briefly discussed. In this current chapter, examples of First Government arguments using both principles and consequences will be provided. Discussions of consequences and principles will not be repeated in this chapter but will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 19.

Chapter 20 will describe further how to create an argument or even a complete case by combining claims of description, association, and evaluation. A case, as described earlier, is an argument or series of arguments to support the motion. One pattern whereby a series of claims can be coherently combined is what this text will call the describe, associate, evaluate pattern. The describe, associate, evaluate pattern, used throughout the text will be briefly introduced here and later expanded on in Chapter 20. That basic pattern asks debaters to create an argument or arguments supported by the following kinds of claims: (1) a claim that describes a feature of the object, concept, or policy to be evaluated, (2) a claim that associates that feature with a consequence or a principle, and (3) a claim that evaluates that concept or principle. This basic pattern will be used in this chapter to illustrate arguments that can be used to support a case.

This chapter will create two rather complete outlines of cases that might be made by the Prime Minister. Those outlines can be used as examples by beginning or experienced students as a way to create a case. Both outlines involve evaluative motions. The first uses a value motion that applies a value to an object and the second uses a policy motion that advocates a change in an action or policy.
Outline of a Prime Minister Speech Supporting a Value Motion

Introduction

Motion for debate: “Traditional Chinese medicine has an important place in overall health care.”

Definition and interpretation: “Traditional Chinese Medicine” is defined as having a tradition of over 2000 years. The tradition includes herbal medicine, massage, acupuncture and other non-invasive techniques. Traditional Chinese Medicine is interpreted for the purposes of this debate as acupuncture because it is so central to TCM.

“Important place in overall health care” is interpreted to mean that TCM is one of a range of options that should be included in health care. We are not saying it is the only option that should be available, just one appropriate method.

Statement of advocacy: As the Government, we will argue that acupuncture is one technique that deserves a place in the overall system of health care. We do not argue that it is the only, or even the most important technique; simply that it is one important technique.

Speech preview: During the remainder of this speech, I will present two arguments: (1) that acupuncture is a useful technique for certain conditions and (2) that acupuncture is not harmful to patients. My colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, will then argue that acupuncture will help to eliminate unnecessary surgery.

Argument 1: Acupuncture is a useful technique for certain conditions.

Sub-claim 1: descriptive claim. Acupuncture uses needles to correct imbalances of qi through the body’s meridians.

Sub-claim 2: associative claim. Correcting imbalances of qi can reduce pain caused by certain conditions.

Sub-claim 3: evaluative claim. Pain reduction is important for a number of patients.

Argument 2: Acupuncture is not harmful to patients.

Sub-claim 1: descriptive claim. Acupuncture, unlike Western medicine does not involve surgery.

Sub-claim 2: associative claim. Western medicine is associated with unnecessary surgery.

Sub-claim 3: evaluative claim. Unnecessary surgery is harmful to tens of thousands of patients annually.

Conclusion
As can be seen from the outline above, the actual Prime Minister speech has a few features not mentioned before. For instance, this speech, and all other speeches in the debate should begin with an introduction. One of the main purposes of the introduction is to establish the credibility and competence of the speaker. In most cases, the debater is speaking to a judge or audience who is unfamiliar with the debater and, thus, does not have much information about him or her. By beginning with a strong introduction, the debater can communicate an image of competence. Because first impressions are frequently long-lasting impressions, making a good first impression in the beginning of the speech is important. The introduction can be short, lasting ordinarily no more than 30 seconds.

After the introduction, the debater will ordinarily state the motion for debate, and then will present the First Government Team’s definitions and interpretations of that motion. As stated earlier, the definitions and interpretations are important because they set the stage for the rest of the debate. As important as this part of the speech is, it can be accomplished quite well in a short period of time, usually 30 seconds to 1 minute.

Before actually getting to the case, the Prime Minister will ordinarily offer a statement of advocacy and preview of his or her speech in terms of naming the arguments to be presented. Following the preview, the debater will present an advocacy statement to clarify the approach that the First Government is taking so that everyone will be clear about the focus of the debate. The purpose of the advocacy statement and preview is to set the arguments clearly in the mind of the judge so the judge will recognize the arguments when they are presented. Presentation of the preview and advocacy statement takes very little time, no more than 30 seconds.

The previous example was a typical outline of a Prime Minister speech on a motion of value. A Prime Minister speech on a policy motion contains similar categories but has some subtle differences. An outline of a speech on a motion of policy is included below:
Outline of a Prime Minister Speech Supporting a Policy Motion

Introduction

Motion for debate: “The United Nations should adopt a Declaration of the Rights of Great Apes.”

Definition and interpretation: “Great Apes” are defined as chimpanzees, bonobos, gorillas, and orangutans. The definition of a “Declaration of the Rights of Great Apes” is the one adopted by the Great Apes Project that includes the rights to life, protection of individual liberty, and protection from torture.

The Government interprets this motion to mean that the UN should adopt a declaration stating that all Great Apes have the right to life, liberty, and protection from torture.

Statement of advocacy: The Government model of this motion is as follows: (1) the actor is the United Nations, (2) the action proposed is a declaration of the rights of Great Apes stating that all Great Apes have the right to life, liberty, and protection from torture, (3) the action should be enforced by UN peacekeepers to the extent enforcement is needed.

Speech preview: During the remainder of this speech, I will present two arguments: (1) the Declaration of the Rights of Great Apes should be adopted as a matter of the principle of liberty and (2) that the Declaration of the Rights of Great Apes is financially beneficial. My colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, will then argue that the declaration of the Rights of Great Apes is scientifically beneficial.

Argument 1: Declaration of Rights of Great Apes is in accord with the principle of liberty.
Sub-claim 1: Descriptive. The DRGA includes the right to life, liberty, and protection from torture.
Sub-claim 2: Association. A UN DRGA would help to secure these rights.
Sub-claim 3: Evaluation. The rights to life, liberty, and protection from torture are important to Great Apes

Argument 2: Declaration of Rights of Great Apes is financially beneficial.
Sub-claim 1: Descriptive. The DRGA would be enforced by UN peacekeepers who would enforce non-poaching laws.
Sub-claim 2: Association. Enforcement of non-poaching laws would increase the population of Great Apes.
Sub-claim 3: Evaluation. Larger populations of Great Apes would increase tourism to regions in which they live.

Conclusion
As can be seen by examining the previous outline, the Prime Minister’s speech on a motion of policy is not much different from a speech on a motion about value. Some differences as well as similarities between this speech and the last are worth noting. First, both speeches contain an introduction, statement of the motion for debate, definitions and interpretations. The statement of advocacy is different in the policy motion because it specifies a model including the actor and action to be taken, a specification that was not necessary in the value motion.

Both speeches should contain a preview of the main arguments that each of the speakers will be expecting and, obviously, both speeches will include substantive arguments in support of the Government interpretation of the motion. Thus, the speeches are more alike than different, but still contain subtle differences.

The previous section of this chapter dealt generally with arguments for the First Government Team, but particularly with the Prime Minister’s speech. The next section will focus on the speech to be given by the Deputy Prime Minister.

**Role of the Deputy Prime Minister**

In some ways, the Deputy Prime Minister provides a supporting role for the Prime Minister, but serves an independent role, as well. The Deputy Prime Minister needs to accomplish the following in his or her speech: (1) refute arguments presented by the Leader of Opposition, (2) rebuild the arguments provided by the Prime Minister, and (3) construct at least one additional argument in support of the motion as interpreted by the First Government Team’s case.

First, the Deputy Prime Minister should refute arguments presented by the Leader of Opposition. Refutation is the topic of Chapter 10 and that process will be more fully discussed there. For now, it is sufficient to say that the Deputy Prime Minister should challenge the best of the arguments offered by the Leader of the Opposition. Refutation is an important part of the speech, but the Deputy Prime Minister should not devote a majority of speech time to this process. Although the amount of time used in refutation of the Leader of Opposition’s argument will vary according to the situation, that process probably should not take more than one or two minutes. Debaters need to remember that devoting time to an opponent’s argument is a necessary feature of a good debate speech, and gives added credibility to that opponent’s argument, as well.

Second, the Deputy Prime Minister should support the arguments presented by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister will have already presented one or two arguments in support of the motion as he or she interpreted it. Then, the Leader of Opposition will, in all likelihood, have refuted those arguments. The role now for the Deputy Prime Minister is to rebuild those original arguments. That process of rebuilding the Prime Minister’s arguments must include refutation of the Leader of Opposition’s arguments that were raised against them. So, the process might unfold something like this: the Deputy Prime Minister will very briefly review the Prime Minister’s argument then state the Leader of Opposition’s objections. Then, the
Deputy will refute those arguments raised by the Leader of Opposition and, in so doing, will rebuild the Prime Minister’s argument. The Deputy Prime Minister needs to remember that the second step needs to be accomplished by following the outline of the Prime Minister, not the outline of the Leader of Opposition. By following the outline of the Prime Minister, the Deputy keeps the Prime Minister’s case in focus.

The process of supporting the arguments raised by the Prime Minister is an important one. Judges and audiences alike have the right to assume that the arguments raised by the Prime Minister are among the most important arguments the First Government Team will make. If those arguments are refuted by the Leader of Opposition and then not supported again, the arguments will lose a considerable amount of their credibility.

Finally, the Deputy Prime Minister should add at least one new argument to the debate—an argument that is different from yet supportive of the arguments presented by the Prime Minister. The purpose of the new argument is to demonstrate that the Deputy Prime Minister takes more than a supportive role in that debate—that he or she is able to construct independent arguments as well as refute and support previous arguments.

Summary

This chapter has focused on how the First Government Team creates arguments in support of their interpretation of the motion. Because of its importance in the overall debate, much of the focus has been on the speech of the Prime Minister. The chapter introduced the components of the First Government case, including defining and interpreting the motion, clarifying and specifying the position that the First Government will advocate and defend, and constructing a series of arguments to support the case.

The chapter then focused briefly on the role of the Deputy Prime Minister. That role includes refuting arguments offered by the Leader of the Opposition, supporting arguments made by the Prime Minister, and constructing independent arguments to support the Prime Minister’s interpretation of the motion.
Terms and Concepts From Chapter 6

Check your memory and comprehension by describing or defining these key terms and concepts:

- Four kinds of motions (description, definition, association, evaluation)
- First Government Team’s right to define and interpret the motion
- Reasonable person standard for definitions and interpretations
- Prime Minister’s responsibility to describe the Government Team’s position
- Model of the motion
- Three specifications common to a model
- Deputy Prime Minister’s obligations (refute, rebuild, construct)
- Describe, associate, evaluate pattern of argument construction

Discussion Questions For Chapter 6

- How does the Prime Minister’s obligation to provide a statement of advocacy for a value motion differ from the obligation to provide a model for a policy motion?

- Discuss the Prime Minister’s right to define and interpret the motion and the concomitant responsibility to do so in a reasonable fashion.

Exercises For Chapter 6

- **Exercise #1 for Prime Minister Speech:** Present a motion to a group of debaters who are divided into teams of two persons each. Give them 15 minutes to discuss the motion and to create a Prime Minister’s speech for the motion. Give each team 3 minutes to present an outline of their speech. After each team has presented their outline, discuss the cases focusing on the arguments suggested as well as whether the outline suggests the speech meets the fundamental obligations of the Prime Minister speech.

- **Exercise #2 for Prime Minister Speech:** Modify the exercise listed above by presenting the motion to a single team of two persons and have one of those persons present a full Prime Minister’s speech. Discuss the speech in terms of the cogency of the arguments and how well the speech fulfills the basic obligations of the Prime Minister speech.

- **Exercise #3 for Deputy Prime Minister Speech:** Have a group of debaters study one of the outlines of a Leader of Opposition speech as presented in Chapter Seven. Give each debater 10 minutes to construct potential points of refutation and constructive arguments that they might present. Then give each
debater 3 minutes to discuss how they might refute the arguments introduced by the Leader of Opposition and what new constructive arguments they might present.

- **Exercise #4 for Deputy Prime Minister Speech:** Modify the exercise listed above by having the debaters listen to a sample speech by the Leader of Opposition. These samples can be found at [http://willamette.edu/clas/china_debate/curriculum/index.html](http://willamette.edu/clas/china_debate/curriculum/index.html) or at a number of other places on the Internet. Give each debater 3 minutes to discuss how they might refute the arguments introduced by the Leader of Opposition, how they might rebuild the arguments introduced by the Prime Minister, and what new constructive arguments they might present.

- **Exercise #5 for Deputy Prime Minister Speech:** Using the materials that students developed in Exercises #3 and #4, have one or more students present a full Deputy Prime Minister speech followed by constructive critique.