

Atlanta Urban Debate League
Argumentative Speech Bowl – Resource Packet
Spring 2022 - Preliminary Round

Submissions for the **preliminary round** of the Spring 2022 Argumentative Speech Bowl are due **Thursday, February 3, 2022**.

Preliminary Round - Submission Guidelines

- **Any student** attending an AUDL member **middle school** or **high school** is eligible to participate.
- Participants are required to submit an affirmative AND negative speech in response to the topic. Speeches should be 2-3 minutes in length and should be persuasive or argumentative speeches as opposed to policy debate speeches.
- **Time Penalty:** To ensure equity in the evaluative process, judges will be instructed not to evaluate speeches in excess of the specified time limit.
- **Deadline:** To ensure equity in the evaluation process, speeches submitted after the specified deadline will not be evaluated.
- Speeches should be submitted using the [submission entry form](https://forms.gle/dpTEMNwPmbT1JWr2A).
(<https://forms.gle/dpTEMNwPmbT1JWr2A>)
 - The submission entry form can be completed by coach educators OR students. One (1) entry form needs to be completed for each student participating in the competition.
 - To ensure timely speech evaluation and fairness, submissions received via means other than the submission entry form will not be evaluated.
 - Coaches and participants should communicate errors on the submission entry forms via email to candice.marie.williams@emory.edu.
- Speeches should be uploaded as **two separate, unlisted videos** to **YouTube**. The link to each unlisted video should be provided, where requested, on the entry submission form.
 - Unlisted YouTube videos should have the following title format: “[School] – [Student's name] – [Aff/Neg] Speech.”
 - Participants are welcome to delete unlisted videos from YouTube following the start of each subsequent round of competition.

Rubric – A copy of the rubric provided to judges for speech evaluation will be shared with all competitors.

Feedback and Suggestions

Based on feedback from judges from previous iterations of this competition, students are encouraged to be mindful of the following:

- Students should remember that argumentative or persuasive speeches are somewhat different than speeches given in a policy debate round in terms of pace and presentation. Students should not assume that their audience has any familiarity with formal policy debate.
- Students are encouraged to focus on presentation as well as content, making sure to occasionally look up at the audience as they are speaking.
- Students should assume that the audience has a minimal understanding of the problem their plan seeks to address and the policy/plan they are proposing. Students are responsible for persuading the judges and audience that their plan is a good idea.
- Students should use the introduction of their speeches to draw in the audience and to preview the outline of their speech. While students are welcome to order their speech in any manner, they deem appropriate, a sample structure is:
 - Introduction
 - Opening Line – Includes a hook or information that encourages the audience to keep listening.
 - Explanation of the problem or reason the plan is necessary.
 - Plan
 - Articulation of the plan – It should be easy for the judges and audience to discern the text of the plan. An example would be, “I _____ would propose that the United States federal government should...”
 - Explain benefits or advantages to doing the plan
 - Benefit 1
 - Benefit 2
 - Benefit 3
 - Conclusion – Should adequately conclude the speech. Strong conclusions usually make some reference to the themes introduced at the beginning of the speech.
- Students should make sure to explicitly refer to sources when using them to support their speech. An example is, “In (article name), (name of author) suggests that...”

Topic

For the Spring 2022 semester of the AUDL Argumentative Speech Bowl, the preliminary round topic is:

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

The AUDL Argumentative Speech Bowl is an **open-evidence** event and competitors are encouraged to conduct their own research in the development of their speeches. The AUDL staff suggest the following sources as starting points for research and speech development:

Affirming

1. <https://www.businessinsider.com/compulsory-voting-what-if-americans-have-to-vote-2016-11>
 - a. Explains how compulsory voting improves voter turnout.
 - b. Provides examples.
 - c. Studies supporting data.

2. <https://blogs.iadb.org/ideas-matter/en/can-mandatory-voting-improve-democracy/>
 - a. Voter education
 - b. Study and examples.
 - c. Statistics on voter turnout.
3. <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-08-20/2020-election-mandatory-voting-australia>
 - a. Voter suppression
 - b. Voting patterns by demographics.
4. <https://www.futurity.org/mandatory-voting-pros-cons-1922322-2/>
 - a. Representation
 - b. What is compulsory voting?
 - c. Example
5. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2020/07/24/why-shouldnt-voting-be-mandatory/>
 - a. The electoral process and voting efficiencies.
 - b. Voter penalties
 - c. Voter turnout statistics.

Negating

1. <https://ethics.org.au/why-compulsory-voting-undermines-democracy/>
 - a. Effect of mandatory voting on democracy.
2. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/03/19/president-obama-endorses-mandatory-voting/>
 - a. Compulsory voting and uninformed voting.
 - b. Freedom of choice.
 - c. Examples.
3. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2015/04/01/compulsory-voting-can-actually-weaken-support-for-democracy/>
 - a. Compulsory voting and weakening democracy.
 - b. Election outcomes
4. <https://www.cato.org/commentary/mandatory-voting-guarantees-ignorant-votes>
 - a. Unconstitutional
 - b. Compulsory voting and uninformed voting.
 - c. “Donkey voting” and an example.
5. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-23810381>
 - a. Spoiled ballots.
 - b. Voter turnout.
 - c. Disengaged electorate.