

You could imagine the process as a pyramid with a solid basis of evidence at the bottom supporting a more general statement about social activity (the warrant) and finally a claim about this particular situation sitting on the top.



CASES

If you think of your own experience, you rarely believe or do something for one reason. Usually we are convinced only when several lines of reasoning justify that decision. Take the decision to buy an ice cream cone. Chances are that several factors would need to coincide for you to buy one:

- The weather is hot.
- A stand nearby is selling them.
- The price of the ice cream is affordable.

If any one of these factors is missing, you probably skip the cone.

The same principle applies in a debate. Rarely will a single argument persuade an adjudicator—just as it would be unlikely to persuade an audience, who the adjudicator represents. As a result, debaters will put forward several arguments to support their case. For their case to be effective, the arguments need to point in the same direction without contradicting one another. So, if the Affirmative were to support the decision to commission