Worksheet for Lesson 12: Spotlight Cases

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Read the four Spotlight Cases provided in the August Addendum. In the following spaces, write a brief summary of the case that explains the position of the author.

1. “Personal Safety Social Contract” — Affirmative Case by Mark Csoros

2. “Human Dignity” — Negative Case by Joshua Johnson

3. “We Love Taxes (Value of General Welfare)” — Affirmative Case by Thomas Keith

4. “Human Rights” — Negative Case by Mark Csoros

Answers for Lesson 12: Spotlight Cases

1. “Personal Safety Social Contract” — Affirmative Case by Mark Csoros

*Basically, the Social Contract states that citizens sacrifice some freedoms for more protection. It also works the other way, stating that society can remove protection from an individual who isn’t playing by the rules. That idea of an implicit agreement between people and their government is the crux of this case.*

2. “Human Dignity” — Negative Case by Joshua Johnson

*The purpose of this Negative case is to provide a simple response to the resolution that both you and your audience can easily understand. The opening quote by Ayn Rand succinctly summarizes the Negative position: private property rights are an inseparable part of your humanity. The loss of private property rights is the loss of a very part of your being.*

3. “We Love Taxes (Value of General Welfare)” — Affirmative Case by Thomas Keith

*All this case says is that the resolution gives us taxes and that leads to general welfare. The first contention is designed to adopt a holistic approach to the kinds of things taxes are necessary for, and the second contention is designed to paint a taxless society as an incredibly stupid suggestion. The broad buffer value combined with a simple narrative is intended to focus the debate on giving Aff as many impacts as possible to outweigh the Negative with.*

4. “Human Rights” — Negative Case by Mark Csoros

*Most affirmatives want to give judges a pragmatic view of the resolution. They want to run arguments like “There’s no such thing as a free lunch” or “the public has needs and we have to get them somehow.” The point of this case is to flip that rhetoric on its head by combining the three powerful points of argumentation explained in the case.*