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The first half of the debate ends with the speeches of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The second half of the debate begins with Member Speeches—Member of Government and Member of Opposition. Those speakers have dual responsibilities: First, they need to exhibit loyalty to their colleagues in the upper house (first half of the debate); and second, they need to move the debate forward. Each debater in the first half of the debate, Government and Opposition, has advanced a limited number of arguments. Now the Member of Government and the Member of the Opposition have the opportunity to expand the number and kind of arguments in the debate. If the debate were to continue for eight speeches with only the arguments introduced by the upper house, the debate might be stale or boring by the end. In moving the debate forward by introducing new arguments, the Member of Government and Member of Opposition have the opportunity to breathe new life into the debate.

The Member of Government and the Member of Opposition have responsibilities for refutation as well as for argument construction. The first responsibility of the Member of Government and Member of Opposition speakers is to engage in refutation of the case presented by the opening teams on the opposing side. The process of refutation will be discussed more fully in the Chapter 10. Both member speakers also are responsible for argument construction in ways that differ from those of the speakers on the opening teams. The Member of Government and Member of Opposition speakers are responsible to construct arguments in a way that moves the debate forward by extending arguments. The next sections of this chapter will discuss the concepts of refuting and extending arguments.

Refuting Arguments in Member Speeches

As stated earlier, both the Member of Government and Member of Opposition are obliged, at least in a general manner, to continue the refutation of the arguments introduced by the
Government and Opposition Teams in the first half of the debate. The amount of time devoted to this obligation is minimal because the primary difference in the second half of the debate is to move the debate forward into a new series of arguments. Thus, the Member speakers should focus only on the most important points of refutation with regard to the first half of the debate, and should focus their refutation on those arguments introduced by the Deputy Prime Minister and by the Deputy Leader of Opposition. Although those responsibilities are important, the time devoted to them should be limited. Because the responsibility to extend the debate will require quite a bit of time, the Member of Government and Member of Opposition should try to limit their refutation to two or, at the most, three minutes. One way to limit the amount of time spent on refutation is to provide general refutation to the arguments from the Prime Minister and from the Leader of Opposition, and only specifically refute the extension offered by the Deputy Prime Minister and Deputy Leader of Opposition.

Because so many arguments will have been presented before their speeches, the Member of Government and Member of the Opposition may be tempted to spend too much of their time on refutation. Those speakers need to remember that their most important responsibilities involve extending and moving the debate forward, so they should not invest too much time on refutation. Still, refutation of the general position of the opposing team is important. With the time considerations in mind, the Member of Government should limit his or her refutation to two or three minutes, refuting the arguments of the two opposition speeches that preceded his or her speech. The Member of Opposition should do the same with regard to refutation of the arguments of the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister, while remembering that the most important responsibility with regard to refutation is to refute the extension offered by the Member of Government. Refuting the extension presented by the Member of Government is most important because the Member speech is the last opportunity for the Opposition Team to join the issue offered by the Member of Government.

In summary, refutation is an important responsibility of the member speeches, but care must be taken not to spend too much time on refutation. The most important task of the member speakers is to move the debate forward by creating extension arguments. The creation of arguments will be considered in the next section.

**Extending Arguments**

Every debater needs the opportunity to develop and demonstrate his or her skill at constructing arguments as well as refuting them. If the members of the Second Government and Second Opposition Teams were simply to follow the same arguments presented by the First Government and First Opposition Teams, they would not be in a position to develop or to use their own argument construction skills. Therefore, members of the Second Government and Second Opposition Teams develop what is called an extension argument.

In addition to giving the members of the closing teams the opportunity to construct new arguments, the process of creating extension arguments has two advantages for both of the
closing teams. First, the extension serves to develop a unique identity for the closing teams. The members of the First Government and First Opposition Teams create an identity that is in large part tied to the arguments they presented. Thus, if the Second Government and Second Opposition Team fail to present new arguments, they are contributing more to the First Government and First Opposition Teams than to themselves.

Of course, the extension argument made by the closing teams should be consistent with and supportive of the arguments made by each opening team. By creating an extension, Member of Government speakers, for example, need to show that they support the First Government Team and, at the same time, have unique ideas of their own. Thus, the extension presented by the Member of Government needs to be an argument that supports the First Government position and, at the same time, establishes an identity for the Second Government Team that is unique and separate from that of the First Government Team.

Consider an analogy to a parliamentary form of government where the majority is composed of two or more coalition partners. Members from each coalition party should be loyal to one another so as not to risk dissolving their coalition. At the same time, each of the coalition parties, even though they may support the same policies, may do so for different reasons. So, while members of one party might focus their support for a health care policy on financial considerations, the other party might focus theirs on preventive care. Arguments about financial considerations and those about preventive care can be seen as supportive of one another because they can both be used as arguments to support a change in health policy. But those two arguments give members of each of the different parties the opportunity to show that they have ideas that are unique and distinctive from their colleagues in the coalition.

In the next section, this text will discuss some qualities extending arguments, qualities of a good extension, types of extensions, and will then conclude with some important considerations about extensions.

**Qualities of a Good Extension**

A good extension is ordinarily a *new argument*; one not discussed by the First Government or by the First Opposition Teams. A new argument allows the closing team to demonstrate their skills at constructing arguments. A new argument shows that the closing teams are moving the debate forward rather than just depending on the arguments introduced in the first half of the debate. A new argument also allows the closing debater to better demonstrate the distinctiveness of his or her team’s position. For instance, if the First Government Team focused on the social concerns of their model, the Second Proposition might discuss economic concerns. Thus, the second team can distinguish itself from the first by focusing on the economic rather than the social concerns. They should do so in a way that maintains the consistency of the social and economic concerns. If the Member speaker cannot present a totally new argument, it should at least be a new interpretation of an old argument. For instance, an extension might employ a more in-depth analysis of the old argument, or an extensive case study in support of the old argument.
A good extension must be consistent with and supportive of the positions of the opening team on your side. Most importantly, the extension should in no way contradict anything said by the opening team. Furthermore, if the debater is able to integrate the extension into lines of argument made by the First Government Team, the entire approach becomes more convincing because it begins to look like the arguments of both teams constitute a coherent whole.

A good extension distinguishes the Second Government and Second Opposition Teams while maintaining their loyalty to the First Government and First Opposition Teams, respectively. A goal of the Member of Government or Member of the Opposition should be to show their teams as different from the other Government and Opposition Teams. To the extent the member speakers do that in their arguments, they will be seen as more persuasive because the combination of the extension arguments with those of the First Government arguments will create a larger and more coherent whole than either set of arguments without the other.

So, a good extension is consistent with but distinct from the arguments offered in the first half of the debate. Of course, many different types of extension arguments exist. The next section of this chapter will discuss three of the more common types.

Types of Extensions

Three types of extension arguments to be discussed in this chapter include (1) an additional line of argument, (2) an argument containing more in depth evidence, examples, and reasoning, and (3) a focused case study. As stated earlier, those are not the only kinds of extension arguments that are possible, but are among the more commonly used ones.

As stated earlier, the most common and perhaps best kind of extension is an additional line of argument not mentioned in the first half of the debate. This is the most straightforward method of extending the argument of the First Government or First Opposition Team. For instance, shifting from an examination of consequences to an examination of principles and philosophical considerations can create an extension that differs in both method and content. If the first half has focused on consequences or pragmatics, changing the focus to principles or philosophy can be a good extension strategy. On the other hand, if the First Government Team focused on principles or philosophical considerations, an appropriate type of extension might involve an examination of consequences or pragmatics. If the first half has focused on principles or philosophy, this extension can change the direction of the debate. In both of these cases, the extension succeeds in changing the focus of the debate from what was introduced by the First Government Team without indicting that approach. An example of extension arguments that might be used in a motion about smoking are presented in the diagram below:
Motion: China should actively discourage the smoking of tobacco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Government Arguments</th>
<th>Potential Extension Arguments by Member of Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would improve citizens’ health.</td>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would create a healthier environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would reduce health costs.</td>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would have a positive impact on the younger generation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Opposition Arguments</th>
<th>Potential Extension Arguments by Member of Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking interferes with the free choice of lifestyle.</td>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would decrease technological advancement to make air cleaner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would have negative economic impacts.</td>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would contribute to the black market.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes, circumstances will arise when the debaters feel they cannot or should not offer an entirely new argument. In one case, the First Government Team may have made all of the available arguments, or at least all of the available good arguments. In such a circumstance, the debater has other options. For one thing, he or she can provide *further and more in-depth evidence and reasoning for an argument made by the other team*. In the case where the First Government Team made an argument that contained three sub-claims, and one of those claims was not particularly well developed, the Member of Government might develop it more fully by providing more evidence and more reasoning. For instance, if the First Government Team focused primarily on a problem and only secondarily on providing a solution to the problem, the Member of Government might say something such as, “Our colleagues on the Opening Government Team did an excellent job of identifying a very significant problem. We would like to extend their argument with greater focus on the cause of the problem and on its solution.” By providing more in-depth argument about the cause and solution, the Member of Government can move the debate forward in a way that maintains consistency with the First Government Team yet moves the debate in a new and fuller direction. In another example, perhaps the Opening Government did focus on the solution to the problem but provided less information about the positive effects the proposal would have. The Member of Government might extend the debate by talking about the extent of those effects—the number of people that might be affected or the precise nature of the effects that the proposal would have. Either of these are good examples where a Member of Government speaker can move the debate forward without introducing an argument that is totally new to the debate. The chart below provides examples of Member of Government extensions that use more in-depth evidence and examples.
Extension Arguments Using More In-Depth Evidence and Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Government Arguments</th>
<th>More In-Depth Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would improve citizens’ health.</td>
<td>• More exacting numbers on the number of young people who would be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would reduce health costs.</td>
<td>• More precise analysis on the effects of smoking on young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would have a positive impact on the younger generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Opposition Arguments</th>
<th>More In-Depth Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking interferes with the free choice of lifestyle.</td>
<td>• More precise numbers concerning loss of tax revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would have negative economic impacts.</td>
<td>• More exact analysis about how the loss of tax revenues will effect the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would contribute to the black market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This kind of extension will be more successful to the extent that the in-depth reasoning and evidence have made the argument unique and distinct from the way it was presented by the First Government Team.

Yet another method of extending the debate without developing an entirely new argument is to present a focused case study to support the First Government Team’s argument. This kind of extension focuses the arguments made by the first half on a particular group of people (such as, children, elderly, minorities, etc.) An extended development of a case study can succeed in making an argument different and hence unique. For instance, if the motion is about smoking and the First Government’s arguments focus generally on the health consequences of smoking, the Member of Government might extend the debate by focusing on children as a case study of health effects of smoking. The diagram below illustrates how a focused case study might contribute to extending the debate.
Extension Arguments Using a Focused Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Government Arguments</th>
<th>Potential Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would improve citizens’ health.</td>
<td>• Case study about banning smoking on school campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would reduce health costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would have a positive impact on the younger generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Opposition Arguments</th>
<th>Potential Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking interferes with the free choice of lifestyle.</td>
<td>• Case study about the particular elements of the black market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would have negative economic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discouraging smoking would contribute to the black market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In either of the cases, the team will likely be more persuasive if the approach they take is different from that of the First Proposition.

*Extending the Debate: Important Considerations*

By way of summarizing the idea of extending arguments, three important considerations should be emphasized regarding the choice of extensions. The Member Speaker offering the extension should be able to answer all of the following questions in the affirmative.

First, does the extension maintain *loyalty* to the Member speaker’s colleagues in the first half of the debate? If the extension in any way contradicts the positions made by colleagues in the first half of the debate, the Member speaker will be seen as disloyal. Furthermore, the more the extension can be integrated with the arguments of the First Government Team or the First Opposition Team, the stronger the extension will be.

Second, does the extension show how the Member speaker is *distinguished* from his or her colleagues in the first half of the debate? Being loyal to yet distinct from the First Government Team or First Opposition Team is a subtle but necessary process. Just as one party in a coalition government wants to retain an identity distinct from the other party, so each of the closing teams in the debate wants to be distinguished from their corresponding opening team.

Third, can the extension provide a *distinct perspective* from your team while simultaneously keeping the debate on track? The extension argument must not, in the case of the Second
Government Team, move away from the model. In the case of the Second Opposition Team, the extension must not move away from the position (statement of advocacy) established by First Opposition Team. The extensions of both Member Speakers need continue to support the position of the Lower House while setting a distinct perspective by the First Government and First Opposition Teams.

Using Preparation Time to Prepare for Member Speeches

Preparation time for a Member speech differs in a few ways from that of an opening speech, such as that of First Government and First Opposition. The First Government and First Opposition must use their preparation time to prepare arguments for two speeches. As a closing team, the Second Government and Second Opposition only need to focus on constructive arguments for one speech. While preparing arguments for a single speech seems easier, those teams will need to prepare even more arguments because of the nature of an extension. Opening teams are able to prepare the arguments with a guarantee that they will be able to use those arguments. As a team in the bottom half, the arguments created in preparation time may be used in the top half of the debate and, thus, will not serve the member. Ways to use preparation time differ. This section will offer only a few of the possible strategies for coming up with unique arguments during preparation time. To ensure that a team’s arguments constructed in preparation time will be useful, the following are a few recommended strategies for preparation time for bottom half teams.

Possibly the easiest way to use preparation time as a bottom half team is to come up with a case study. This is easier than creating a multitude of other arguments, though Member speakers will not often have the depth of knowledge needed to create a case study for each motion. As stated before, case studies are an efficient and effective way to give more in-depth analysis of an argument. Also, if the subject of the case study was not mentioned in the top half of the debate, that subject can become an entirely new line of argumentation. However, if a case study is not a good possibility, other relatively easy methods exist to generate different arguments. The remainder of this section will focus on two such possibilities.

Another strategy for creating unique arguments is identifying and evaluating all the different parts of the motion. For example, in the motion “China should maintain control over boats in the Nicaraguan Canal,” at least three different topics are mentioned. The first is the Chinese, second is the Nicaraguan Canal, and third is the boats, or those who own the boats. In this way, a Member speaker can create general arguments for why the motion is good or bad for each different group. The first teams will not likely touch on all of these groups, which means that the Member speaker will have a new line of argumentation to contribute to their speech.

A second way to generate new and varied ideas is by approaching the motion in both principled and consequential ways. A clever member speaker can prepare arguments of value, such as the importance of the sovereignty of the value of avoiding neocolonialism. Those values differ from the consequential arguments such as how the Nicaraguan economy
will be affected, or how international relations will be impacted. By dividing arguments in terms of consequence or principal, the bottom half teams are able to distinguish themselves from the first half of the debate, the First Government or First Opposition will not usually present arguments in terms of both consequence and principle.

This section has focused on strategies for preparing for the Member speech of a bottom half team. Preparation time is not needed to focus on the Whip speech because that should be written during the debate, as the Whip speaker will not know the main points of clash until the debate is underway.

**Summary**

This chapter has covered the unique responsibilities of the Member speeches and ways to use preparation time to effectively fulfill those requirements. The Members of Government and Opposition should contribute an extension of ideas heard in the first half of the debate that are loyal and consistent with the first half, yet, are unique and distinguishable. Three simple ways to do accomplish loyalty and consistency include a new line of argumentation, an in-depth analysis, or a case study.
Terms and Concepts From Chapter 8

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

- Qualities of a good extension argument (new argument, consistent with first half, distinguishes Member from speakers in the first half).
- What are some different types of extension arguments (additional line of argument, more in-depth reasoning and evidence, focused case study).
- What are some important considerations when choosing extension arguments? (loyalty, distinguished from first half debaters, demonstrates a distinct perspective).

Discussion Questions For Chapter 8

- How and to what extent should both Member speakers invest effort in supporting the general direction and case of the teams from the first half of the debate?
- What are the different considerations that a Member of Government speaker should make with regard to refuting arguments from the first half of the debate and from refuting arguments of the Member of Government?

Exercises For Chapter 8

- Exercise #1 for Member of Government Speech: Have a group of debaters listen to the first half of an on-line debate. Such a debate can be found at: Willamette.edu/cla/china_debate or at a variety of other places on the internet. Then have the debaters in groups of two discuss possible extension arguments that might be made in the Member of Government speech. Then the debaters should take two minutes to present their ideas to the other members of the group.
- Based on the information generated in Exercise #1, have the debaters construct and present a complete Member of Government speech to be followed by constructive criticism.
- Exercise #2 for Member of Government Speech: Based on the information generated in Exercise #1, have the debaters construct and present a complete Member of Government speech to be followed by constructive criticism.
• Exercise #3 for Member of Opposition Speech: Have a group of debaters listen to the first half of an on-line debate. Such a debate can be found at: http://willamette.edu/cla/china_debate/curriculum/index.html. Then have the debaters in groups of two discuss possible extension arguments that might be made in the Member of Opposition speech. Then the debaters should take two minutes to present their ideas to the other members of the group.

• Exercise #4 for Deputy Leader of Opposition Speech: Based on the information generated in Exercise #1, have the debaters construct and present a complete Member of Opposition speech to be followed by constructive criticism.