In this course we will examine theories of reasoned-based argumentation in the oral mode, and then incorporate those theories into the practice of making effective speeches that advocate for particular positions on arguable issues of public concern. We will analyze and critique oral arguments as they function in the realm of public debate. For our purposes, oral advocacy is an act of inquiry and a search for shared understanding. This means you have to listen as carefully as you speak. Further,

**Learning objectives:**

1. Students will develop assessment criteria for effective oral advocacy, and students will be asked to use those criteria to evaluate themselves and their peers.
2. Students will develop the skills to practice and evaluate effective oral argumentation in controversial matters of public concern with attention to fundamental theories of ethics and rhetoric.
3. Students will develop practices of listening, speaking, responding, discussing, and researching to enhance their invention of arguments and their positions as informed advocates in a discourse community of thinkers and inquirers.
4. Students will cultivate habits of noting, examining, and responding to the various and multiple reasonable and unreasonable positions one can take on controversial matters. To discern what divides “reasonable” and “unreasonable” will be our ongoing challenge.

**Due Dates and Assignments**

12:59 PM on due date uploaded to Canvas:

- IQ2US Five Judgments (10%)
- Book Interrogation (10%)
- Lincoln-Douglas debates (20%)
- Oregon Cross Examination

Each (non-debate class)

- April 30-May 2, 7, 9:
- May 16, 21, 23: (20%)
June 4 and 6: Parliamentary debate (20%)
June 12 (12:59 PM uploaded to Canvas) Paper (20%)

Week One

April 2: Monday:
- The First Argument: A Reflection
For April 2 - IQ2US Western Society is Threatening Suicide
https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/western-democracy-threatening-suicide

April 4: Wednesday: Theory of Oral Argumentation
Presentations on the First Argument
Judgment of IQ2 First Debate
Book interrogation
Reading *Engima* 1-48
For April 4: Blame Elites for Trump
https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/blame-elites-trump-phenomenon

April 5: Thursday Two IQ2 Debate Judgments

Week Two

April 9: Monday: Structure of Argument
Judgment of IQ2 Second debate
Book Interrogation
*Engima* 107-127
For April 9: IQ2US Pay College Athletes
https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/pay-college-athletes

April 11: Wednesday: Tests of Evidence
Book Interrogation
Reading *Engima* 107-127
For April 11: The Less we need God
https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/more-we-evolve-less-we-need-god
For April 11:
April 12: Thursday Two IQ2 Judgment

Week three

April 16: Monday: Oral Argument
- IQ2US Liberals Hold The Moral High Ground
https://www.intelligencesquaredus.org/debates/liberals-hold-moral-high-ground
Book Interrogation
Reading *Engima* 128-202
April 18: Wednesday -UO debate team debate: Dr. Trond Jacobsen (Director)
April 19: Thursday IQ2 Judgment

Week Four

April 23: Monday: Critiquing and Judging Argument
April 25: Wednesday: Structure of Debate
Book Interrogation
Reading Enigma 203-261

Week Five
April 30: Monday Lincoln-Douglas Debates
    LD Debate One: Lauren Auer and Bronwen Bowen Campbell
    LD Debate Two: Jarrett M Boynton and Megane Browne-Allard
    LD Debate Three: Katie Calder and Chase Callahan
Book Interrogation
Reading Enigma 262-298

May 2: Wednesday Lincoln-Douglas Debates
    LD Debate Four: Kaylee Finnegan and Yuri Ezaki
    LD Debate Five: Cassidy Martin and Michaela Kurinsky-Malos
    LD Debate Six: Riley Sickler and Courtney Thomas
Book Interrogation
Reading Enigma 299-327

Week Six
May 7: Monday Lincoln-Douglas Debates
    LD Debate Seven: Monika Minnigerode and Daniel J Outwater
    LD Debate Eight: Jonathan Rifkind and Abhinav Sharma
    LD Debate Nine: Keegan Williams-Thomas and Montse Mendez Higuera
Book Interrogation
Reading Enigma 299 -327

May 9: Wednesday Lincoln-Douglas Debates
    LD Debate Ten: Jason Bibeau and Yuri Ezaki
    LD Debate Eleven: Book Interrogation
Reading Enigma 336

Week Seven
May 14: Monday Debate preparations
May 16: Wednesday Debate preparations

Week Eight
May 21: Monday Oregon Cross examination
    Team One: Lauren Auer and Bronwen Bowen Campbell
    V.
    Team Two: Qi Tai Wong and Megane Browne-Allard
    Team Three: Katie Calder and Chase Callahan
Team Four: Kaylee Finnegan and Yuri Ezaki

May 23: Wednesday Oregon Cross examination
Team Five: Cassidy Martin and Michaela Kurinsky-Malos
Team Six: Riley Sickler and Courtney Thomas

Team Seven: Monika Minnigerode and Katherine McMahon
Team Eight: Jonathan Rifkind and Abhinav Sharma

Week Nine
May 28: Monday Oregon Cross Examination
Team Nine: Keegan Williams-Thomas and Montse Mendez Higuera
Team Ten: Jason Bibeau and Yuri Ezaki

May 30: Wednesday - TBA

Week Ten
June 4: Monday - Parliamentary Debate
June 6: Wednesday Parliamentary Debate

Whigs
Lauren Auer – Party Leader
Bronwen Bowen Campbell – Party Leader
Qi Tai Wong
Megane Browne-Allard
Katie Calder
Chase Callahan
Kaylee Finnegan
Yuri Ezaki
Sean Kelly
Michaela Kurinsky-Malos
Cassidy Martin

Tories
– Party Leader
Katherine McMahon – Party Leader
Monika Minnigerode
Jason Bibeau
Jonathan Rifkind
Abhinav Sharma
Riley Sickler  
Courtney Thomas  
Keegan Williams-Thomas  
Montse Mendez Higuera  

12:59 PM on due date uploaded to Canvas: IQ2US Five Judgments (10%)  
Each (non-debate class)  
Book Interrogation (10%)  

April 30-May 2,7,9: Lincoln-Douglas debates (20%)  
May 16, 21, 23: Oregon Cross Examination (20%)  
June 4 and 6: Parliamentary debate (20%)  
June 12 (12:59 PM uploaded to Canvas) Paper (20%)  

**Book Interrogations**  
On selected days, students will respond to questions posed by the professor about the readings assigned for that day.  

Criteria for grading  
1. Student has read the material  
2. Student can respond with cogent answers to questions on the reading assignments.  
3. Student can apply the theory in the book to help explain argument.  

**IQ2 Debate Judgments** Submit your paper on Canvas on the due date  
Assignment details  

1. Sign up for IQ2US  
2. Go to the assigned debate.  
3. Cast your pre-debate vote and write it down.  
4. Read the research on the menu above the pre-debate vote.  
5. Read the research reports.  
6. Watch the debates and identify the major arguments and evidence.  
7. Vote for who you think has the strong arguments.  

Write a one-page judgment of the debate with this organizational structure. Please use these questions as your signposts.  

1) The reasons for my pre-debate vote. (100 words)  
2) The two or three major arguments in the debate (100-200 words).  
3) What evidence was most important to you? (100-200 words)  
4) Who was the best oral advocate and why?  
5) What was your post-debate vote? Give your reasons (100-200 words)
Submit your paper on Canvas on the due date

**Final Paper June 12 (12:59 PM uploaded to Canvas)**
10 pages  
MLA Stylesheet

Using the issues debated in this class, how can Mercier and Sperber’s theory of argumentation contribute to and fortify genuine democracy, better decision-making, and mutual tolerance?

**L-D debate: Resolved – Donald Trump is a good president.**
Even numbered teams will take the affirmative (support the resolution)
4 minutes: First Affirmative: Central point – the Resolution  
Three points in support with evidence
2 minute CX - Two questions
4 minute: First negative – Central point: against the resolution.  
Refute three points using four step refutation
2-minute CX – Two questions
One-minute preparation
2 Minute affirmative rebuttal
3 Minute Negative rebuttal
1 Minute affirmative rebuttal
Three-minute assessment

**Oregon Cross Examination – The University of Oregon should pay its varsity athletes.**

5 minutes: First Affirmative: Central point – the Resolution  
Three points in support with evidence
1 minute CX - Two questions
5 minute: First negative – Central point: against the resolution.  
Refute three points using four step refutation
5 minute: First negative – Central point: against the resolution.  
Refute three points using four step refutation
1-minute CX – Two questions
One-minute preparation
3 Minute Negative rebuttal
3 1Minute first affirmative rebuttal
3 Minute second negative rebuttal
3 minute second affirmative rebuttal
Three-minute assessment

Parliamentary Debate: Resolved: **The University of Oregon should pay its varsity athletes.**
Whigs: Affirmative  
Tories: Negative
Day One - 80 Minutes

20 Minute: Whigs constructive
20 Minute: Tories constructive
10 Minute: Whig Refutation
10 Minute: Torie Refutation

Judge’s Issues

Day Two – 80 minutes
20 Minute: Whigs constructive
20 Minute: Tories constructive
10 Minute: Whig Refutation
10 Minute: Tories Refutation

Criteria for debates

1. Quality of evidence.
   Evidence is qualified from the best authorities on the topic
   Evidence is recent
   Evidence is credible

2. Quality of presentation
   Advocate is organized
   Advocate is clear
   Advocate speaks well

3. Quality of civility
   Advocate is humane to opponent
   Advocate presents evidence of tolerance