

be rewarded for arguing some resolution other than the one that has been announced in the tournament invitation as the focus of debate.

VALUE STRUCTURE

Lincoln-Douglas debate centers on a value structure or framework. This value structure serves the function of providing a central focus for the resolution and offering the judge a method for determining or evaluating this central focus. The Lincoln-Douglas framework includes the following elements: a statement of the resolution, definitions of key terms, a value premise (or core value), and a value criterion (or standard).

The affirmative should offer contextual or dictionary definitions that offer reasonable ground for debate. Contextual definition means an implied definition based on the actual usage of the terms. A contextual definition of domestic violence might be a form of child discipline involving verbal abuse. The negative has the option to challenge the affirmative definitions of terms and to offer counter-definitions.

A *value premise* or *core value* is an ideal held by individuals, societies, governments, and so on that serves as the highest goal to be protected, respected, maximized, advanced, or achieved. This means that debaters choose a value that, in their opinions, best captures the essence of the resolution and provide a focus for argumentation.

The value criterion or value standard provides one or more of the following:

1. It explains how the value should be protected, respected, maximized, advanced, or achieved.
2. It measures whether a given side or argument protects, respects, maximizes, advances, or achieves the value.
3. It evaluates the relevance and importance of an argument in the context of the round. Each debater should clearly show the relationship between the value premise (core value) and the criterion (standard for evaluation).

In some debates there are competing value structures, with each side presenting its own value premise and standard. In other instances the negative might agree on the affirmative's value premise but offer a competing standard for evaluation. In still other instances, the negative might accept both the value premise and the standard but show that the negative interpretation of the resolution best meets the standard.

Consider how this framework might apply to the following Lincoln-Douglas resolution: "Resolved: Colleges have a moral obligation to prohibit hate speech on their campuses." The statement of the resolution simply means that the affirmative debater will state the resolution to be debated somewhere early in the first speech. The affirmative might present a definition of hate speech from the *American Heritage*