

# International Bioethics Debate Tournament 2008

at Kyushu University

## Tournament Guide



**Tournament Committee**

Narahiko INOUE (Director)

Adam BONNIFIELD

Akira MIYAMOTO

Yosuke ISHIJIMA

March 17 & 18, 2008

Kyushu University Ropponmatsu Campus  
4-2-1 Chuo-ku, Fukuoka City  
810-8560 JAPAN

## Preliminary Tournament Schedule

Date: March 17 (Mon.) & 18 (Tue.)

March 17

13:00 Opening

14:00 Preliminary rounds 1

16:00 Preliminary rounds 2

18:00 Lecture "Issues in the Euthanasia Debate" by Dr. Carl Becker, Kyoto University

19:00 Reception Party

March 18

9:00 Preliminary rounds 3

13:00 Semi-finals

15:00 Final

16:00 Comments/Lecture

17:00 Closing

## Preface

As medical science progresses, the ethical question of life and death, or more broadly bioethics, has become all the more important in decision-making in both public and private domains. Since informed debate is one of the effective ways to examine such vital questions, this debate tournament is a timely opportunity in which we can test how debate helps our understanding of one important question in bioethics, i.e., the legalization of euthanasia.

This tournament is a test case of intercultural communication in many senses, beyond a simple sense of an international tournament in which people from different countries participate. In debating bioethics, we have debaters of different backgrounds--medical and non-medical students as well as judges of different backgrounds--those debaters, competitive debate experts, and medical and medical ethics professors. In the style of competitive debating, some participants have been competing in Parliamentary Debate (extemporaneous style) and in Policy Debate (research-based style called "Academic Debate" in Japan).

Because of this "intercultural" nature of the tournament, we hope that each debate round will not simply be a competitive game but also an opportunity to exchange different opinions and perspectives about bioethics and debating. We hope that all the participants including audience members will enjoy both well-researched speeches and witty exchanges on the spot. Moreover, we will all learn more about the controversy around euthanasia and more broadly challenges in bioethics we are facing in this modern world.

I believe that this tournament is the first attempt of this kind and it has been materialized thanks to the help of many people including debaters and judges. I am also grateful to the tournament committee members, especially Adam Bonnifield, who helped me organize the tournament from the beginning of the planning and drafted this guide.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge with sincere gratitude that this tournament is generously funded by Kyushu University Interdisciplinary Programs in Education and Projects in Research Development (P&P), Kyushu University Faculty of Languages & Cultures (FLC), and Kyushu University FLC Department of English.

Narahiko INOUE

Professor, Kyushu University Faculty of Languages & Cultures

## Tournament Format

Participants will convene to debate the motion/resolution:

### **Resolved: That Euthanasia Should Be Legalized.**

#### Parameters

- (1) The resolution should be considered as a generic/universal proposition, rather than a specific policy statement in a particular country.
- (2) Euthanasia may include active and/or passive euthanasia.
- (3) The contents of the legalization may be subject to debate

Two two-person teams represent the affirmative and negative sides of the resolution that “Euthanasia should be legalized” in each round.

Each team debates once on the affirmative, once on the negative, and judges one round in the preliminary, which will lead to the semi-final and final rounds. Each round is judged by at least one debate expert/subject area expert and two debaters (from participating teams).

The dedicated judges will include the following invited experts:

Dr. Carl Becker, Professor of Medical Ethics, Kyoto University,

Dr. Shuji Shimizu, Associate Professor, Kyushu University Hospital,

Mr. Loke Wing Fatt, President of Society for Associated Inter-Tertiary Debaters (SAID), Singapore,

Mr. Logandran Balavijendran, Professor of Communication, Chung Ang University, Korea

Participating teams will consist of four international teams with debaters from Ewha Womans University (Korea), Kyunghee University (Korea), Hong Kong University, University Technology MARA (Malaysia), Cambridge University, Harvard University, and Cornell University; and four Japanese teams from Kyoto University, Kobe University, Kyoto Pharmaceutical University, and Kitakyushu University.

### Team Notes and Time Standards

There are two teams: Affirmative/Government (comprised of the First Speaker or Prime Minister and the Second Speaker or Member of Government) and Negative/Opposition (comprised of the First Speaker or Leader of Opposition and Second Speaker or Member of Opposition). The speeches of each side will occur in the following order and duration:

1st Affirmative Constructive Speech_____	6 minutes
Cross-Examination by the 2nd Negative Speaker_____	3 minutes
1st Negative Constructive Speech_____	6 minutes
Cross-Examination by the 1st Affirmative Speaker_____	3 minutes
2nd Affirmative Constructive Speech_____	6 minutes
Cross-Examination by the 1st Negative Speaker_____	3 minutes
2nd Negative Constructive Speech_____	6 minutes
Cross-Examination by the 2nd Affirmative Speaker_____	3 minutes
1st Negative Rebuttal Speech_____	4 minutes
1st Affirmative Rebuttal Speech_____	4 minutes
2nd Negative Rebuttal Speech_____	4 minutes
2nd Affirmative Rebuttal Speech_____	4 minutes

8 minutes of preparation time will be allowed in flexible amounts to each team, and may be used at any point before a team's speech or questioning in cross-examination, including before rebuttal speeches.

Debaters are requested to adhere to the time standards outlined above. After the limit of each speech, a 15 second grace period shall be extended to the speaker. Judges are instructed to disregard any argument made after the 15 second grace period unless: (1) a previous speaker on the opposing team exceeded the 15 second grace period; or (2) the remarks reasonably conclude the topic, and the speech ends immediately after.

Judges are permitted to penalize the debater's speaker points if the speech is unreasonably long, and are requested to take speech length into consideration when assigning ranks.

Debaters are not allowed to interrupt the opposing team during their constructive or rebuttal speeches for any reason. It is the responsibility of the judge to intervene in a speech if appropriate.

During the Cross-Examinations period, the speaker who has delivered the immediately preceding speech is questioned by one of the speakers from the other team as specified above. The examiner may only ask questions and may not make a statement. The examinee may only answer questions and may not ask a question except for clarification. The examiner shall control the cross-examination; he/she may interrupt the examinee when deemed appropriate.

## Notes on Cultural and Style Difference

Rounds in this tournament are unique in that debaters might (a) have different assumptions about what constitutes relevant types of evidence and argumentation and (b) will possess very different English language abilities. For the sake of judging consistency, the following broad guidelines should be observed:

### *Evidence and Argumentation*

Arguments that cite quotations are permitted. Quotations may be judged persuasive because of their author's academic or professional esteem, because of their rhetorical force, or because they substantiate a relevant fact. They should be documented and a source (bibliographic information) must be given if requested.

Debaters are not expected to provide quotations to substantiate their arguments, and should not be penalized outright for not relying on them. Quotations can be challenged by debaters in the round, however, as if they were the original speaker's own words, and the speaker is expected to defend them in the same way. All things being equal, an argument might appropriately be deemed more persuasive if it is substantiated by a quotation from a noted authority than if it is not.

Debaters should not be penalized outright for building a case primarily on a fact-driven basis or logic/intuition-driven one. More important in the judging process is whether the arguments of their case meet its assumptions, and whether overall it proves to be a compelling affirmation or negation of the round's resolution. A case whose premises require a set of facts to be substantiated might be deemed appropriately unpersuasive if those facts are not defended convincingly in the same way as a case whose premises require a rigorous analytic structure might be deemed appropriately unpersuasive if that structure is not defended convincingly.

Engaging the opposing teams arguments is a key responsibility of both teams, and is consistent with the overall responsibility of proving the strength of each team's case.

### *English Language Ability*

The tournament will be conducted in English, but as an international event, English ability alone should not be conflated with impressive style. In fact, judges should make a good faith effort to pay attention to each team's speech and to be vigilant against any bias to preference teams with a stronger command of the English language.

Impressive stylistic quality can be appropriately be demonstrated in any number of ways (effective time management, organization, creativity, emotionality) which might be helped by but should not be excessively limited by language fluency alone.

### Judging Assessment Guide

After the conclusion of the round, judges shall make independent determinations of which team won, and without conferring with other judges on the substance of the round, assign ranks and speaker points to each speaker.

Judges will rank the speakers in the round individually in order of 1 through 4 and assign speaker points (1-10) individually according to the scoring standards listed on the following page. No half-point scores such as 7.5 are allowed.

Judges are not permitted to assign low-point wins; the winning team shall have speaker-points greater and/or ranks lesser than or equal to those of the losing team.

Judges should assign automatic losses to teams that do not arrive to their rounds within 15 minutes of releasing pairings, and who are not prepared to debate within 20-25 minutes.

It will be left to the discretion of the chief judge to provide time for comments from the judges after the conclusion of the round. Judges are encouraged to provide substantive feedback, but not to reveal their decision in the round or otherwise make that decision obvious.

Scoring Standards

Speaker points will be assigned based on three subjective categories: Overall Quality, Stylistic Quality, and Argumentative Quality.

<b>Quality (Points)</b>	<b>Overall Quality</b>	<b>Stylistic Quality</b>	<b>Argumentative Quality</b>
<b>Poor (1-2)</b>	The speaker fails to perform important duties of his or her speech. This speech may contain some serious technical errors (diverges from the time standards). The speaker failed to address several important arguments/themes.	This speech is of poor quality. The speaker might have become flustered and failed to recover or was incoherent.	The arguments of this speech were unimpressive or incomprehensible; simple or superficial analysis proves them incorrect.
<b>Fair (3-4)</b>	The speaker performs nearly all of the duties of his or her speech. This speech may seriously diverge from the time standards. The speaker failed to address several moderately important arguments/themes.	This speech is of moderate quality; it is not impressive in creativity, tone or theme, and may contain serious rhetorical errors. The speaker may pause, become flustered, or seriously lack clarity.	The arguments of this speech are not impressive, and possibly refuted through simple analysis. The speaker may contradict his- or her- self.
<b>Average (5-6)</b>	The speaker performs all of the duties of his or her speech. This speech may diverge from the time standards. The speaker may fail to address several moderate to unimportant arguments/themes.	This speech is of moderate quality; it is not stylistically impressive, nor stylistically abrasive. The speaker may pause shortly, have moments of creativity and rhetorical flourish, might become momentarily flustered but recover, or lack clarity.	The arguments of this speech are neither obviously impressive nor clearly incorrect. The speaker attempts to address important arguments with new responses or examples.
<b>Good (7-8)</b>	The speaker performs all of the duties of his or her speech. This speech may slightly diverge from the time standards.	This speech is of above average quality. It contains several demonstrations of stylistic ability—is persuasive, thoughtful, or funny—but still contains some errors.	The arguments of this speech are more impressive than not. Important arguments are addressed with new responses. The speaker does not contradict his- or her- self unless by misspeaking.
<b>Excellent (9-10)</b>	The speaker performs all of the duties of his or her speech. This speech may only slightly diverge from the time standards.	This speech is of excellent quality. It consistently demonstrates creativity and thematic ability and may contain few errors that are barely noticeable.	The majority of the arguments of this speech are very impressive. Important arguments are addressed with new responses. The speaker does not contradict his- or her- self unless by misspeaking.

## Speaking Roles and Responsibilities Guide

The following is a general guide as to what is expected in speeches and cross-examination but not intended as absolute rules. Participants are advised to debate with good intentions so that fruitful exchanges of ideas about euthanasia may be promoted.

**Cross Examination:** During Cross Examination periods, a questioner will have uninterrupted time to ask questions of a debater under question. The questioner will control the time during these periods, and has the right to interrupt the debater under question at his/her discretion and to move onto new questions. Debaters are advised, however, to be respectful to one another - to deliver brief answers under questioning and allow speakers to finish answers unless there is a compelling reason to interrupt.

**First Affirmative Constructive (1AC):** As the First Speaker of the Affirmative (Prime Minister), this speaker's responsibility is to advance a clear case statement consistent with the resolution/motion and its parameters. He/She is encouraged to offer any explanation or background of his/her case statement as necessary, including a definition of the resolution/motion stating the parameters within which the debate is to occur. This speaker may present a specific plan within the limit of the resolution/motion, which would (1) produce significant advantage(s) over the absence of such a plan, or (2) solve the serious problem(s). Finally, he/she must present a series of constructive arguments that support the case statement. The 1AC case will ordinarily consist of a proposed plan (or a definition of the resolution/motion) and three to five major arguments that support the case statement he/she has made.

**First Negative Constructive (1NC):** As the First Speaker of the Negative (Leader of Opposition), this speaker must state any important objections to the 1AC's case or the resolution/motion. The speaker is encouraged to attack the case proposed in 1AC (including any objection to the 1AC's definition of the resolution/motion and predicted disadvantages to be produced from the plan proposed in 1AC). He/she must also construct the negative team's independent arguments, including predicted disadvantages to be produced from the resolution/motion. The Negative team must accept the 1AC's interpretation/definition as long as it is reasonable and fair. If the speaker objects to 1AC's interpretation of the resolution/motion, he/she should voice this objection at the beginning of 1NC. The objection should be stated and explained. 1NC should then proceed with the round, leaving the matter for the judge to decide.

**Second Affirmative Constructive (2AC):** As the Second Speaker of the Affirmative (Member of the Government), the 2AC speaker should introduce any remaining new arguments for the Affirmative team, respond to the 1NC independent arguments, and reconstruct the Affirmative team's case in part by responding to the 1NC's (Leader of Opposition's) arguments.

**Second Negative Constructive (2NC):** As the Second Speaker of the Negative (Member of the Opposition), the 2NC speech should introduce any remaining new arguments for the Negative team and respond to the Member of Government's arguments. It is advised that 2NC and 1NR should divide the coverage of arguments so that any overlap may be avoided. For example, 1NC may want to extend the Negative team's independent arguments in 1NC and 1NR may want to extend the 1NC's refutation against the Affirmative case.

**First Negative Rebuttal (1NR):** The First Negative Speaker (Leader of Opposition) should continue to respond to the Affirmative arguments and/or reconstruct the Negative case in light of the 2AC responses. Major new arguments may not be introduced in the 1NR speech or any other rebuttal speech, and new argumentation should take the form of extensions or developments of arguments already made in earlier speeches.

**First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR):** The First Affirmative Speaker (Leader of Government) should continue to defend the Affirmative case by responding to any major new arguments made in the 2NC and reconstructing the case from attacks made in the 1NR. As a rebuttal speech, major new arguments may not be introduced in the 1AR speech, and new argumentation should take the form of extensions or developments of arguments already made in earlier speeches.

**Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR):** The Second Negative Speaker (Member of Opposition) must summarize the round in order to frame the debate from the Negative's point of view. The 2NR should explain each of the reasons why the Negative has won the round and why these reasons outweigh the arguments the affirmative/government has made. This would also be the last opportunity to remind the judge briefly of any objections the 1NC raised about the case or the case statement. If the Affirmative has dealt with an issue vaguely, a 2NR might point out to the judge that the Affirmative has not made its position clear before the 2AR and that the Affirmative's exact position has not had to bare the brunt of the Negative's attack. A 2NR might point out any arguments that the Affirmative team failed to address, and explain why that failing helps the Negative team win the round. Because the 2NR is a rebuttal speech, no new arguments are allowed except for the responses to the 1AR arguments. New examples (evidence) are permitted.

**Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR):** The 2AR (Member of Government) must summarize the debate from the Affirmative/Proposition's point of view. Like the 2NR, the 2AR will spend time arguing the key arguments which might win the Affirmative the round. A good 2AR will not simply restate the arguments, but demonstrate why the Affirmative case outweighs the Negative's. A 2AR might also point out arguments the Negative team missed or ignored and explain their impact on the round. Like the 2NR, new arguments are not allowed except for the responses to the 1AR arguments. New examples (evidence) are permitted.