

4. Introduce your final argument, the last piece of the puzzle. With this argument you should show the adjudicator that your side is not merely presenting a collection of interesting commentaries on the issue but a clear perspective that is more valid than your opponent's about what will or will not work in the real world. Consequently, you should take pains to make clear how this final argument relates to the others to present a comprehensible package.

Let's see how the second speeches would work using the example of the legalization of prostitution debate from the last chapter. First Affirmative has defined the motion (Prostitution should be legal nationwide within registered brothels and nowhere else) and has demonstrated the health and personal safety benefits to prostitutes, a frequently victimized group. She supported this well using a study from Europe that included clear statistical evidence. However, First Negative has attacked the proposal as giving legitimacy to prostitution, which he has argued undermines the family and encourages an objectified view of women in wider society.

Second Affirmative then engages with what First Negative has said. She may point out that he has missed the point; Affirmative fully accepts that prostitution has social harms but is trying to mitigate the worst or most immediate of these. She points out that Negative has failed to address the public health and personal safety issues Affirmative raised and settled instead for the "cheap shot" of blaming the prostitutes for undermining the family rather than the men who solicit their services. Negative isn't required to provide a solution, but they do need to demonstrate that the solution put forward by Affirmative will either make the situation worse or will simply not work; in this instance, Negative has tried—and probably failed—to rely on moral outrage to make his point for him. Second Affirmative then turns her attention to the public health benefits for those people not directly involved, especially the reduction in the transmission of STDs to the wives of the men who use prostitutes. By so doing, she demonstrates a wider social good. Finally, she sketches an even wider benefit to society by introducing another study, from a different city. She highlights the effect that removing prostitution and the associated criminality from the streets of particular neighborhoods had on that city's ability to revitalize those neighborhoods, thus providing a boost to the local economy. Notice that Affirmative doesn't need to demonstrate that everything is now fine and everybody is happy, just that regulated brothels are better for the life of all concerned than are unregulated streetwalkers.

With that final piece of the picture, she has demonstrated how Affirmative's policy benefits not only those immediately involved (the prostitutes) but also improves the situation for a group that was victimized through no fault of their own (the wives). Finally, she demonstrates a benefit to the population at large through increased legal commerce in the city. At this point, the adjudicator has a sense of how the policy can be seen as positive,