DG2: Rugged Individualism or Brother’s Keeper Redux: Debate on the The Financial Crisis 20007-2009

Date of Discussion: Wednesday, November 9, 1:10-2:30pm (first 80 minutes of class)

Resolution Under Debate: Be it resolved that, without the extraordinary actions undertaken by the U.S. Government and Federal Reserve Bank since 2007, the U.S. financial crisis would have been far worse.

Debate Position 1: Affirmative – For the Resolution (Mishkin [1])

Debate Team 1: Long Su (tedsu) and Nick Pates (njpates)

Debate Position 2: Negative – Opposed to the Resolution (Vincent Reinhart [2])

Debate Team 2: Kodjo Drofenou (drofenou) and Katie Lacy (kmlacy11)

Required Readings:


Specific Responsibilities of the Members of Debate Teams 1 and 2:

Each debate team 1 and 2 should prepare a clear concise hand-out for distribution to the class in hard-copy form on the discussion date November 9. The hand-out should provide as persuasive a case as possible for the team’s position, either in favor of the resolution (team 1) or in opposition to the resolution (team 2), using references [1] and [2] as key sources. These hand-outs should also be distributed to the class using the class email list macro502@iastate.edu at least one day prior to November 9th.

The four debate team members should meet prior to November 9th to decide on the protocol for the debate, using (for example) reference [3] for guidelines. However, the selected debate protocol should involve general class participation. One possible approach might be for the debate team members to carry out the following steps:
• Designate the instructor as the debate timekeeper.

• Divide all students in attendance (other than the debate team members) into two groups of roughly equal size, an affirmative support group asked to sit on the left side of the classroom and a negative support group asked to sit on the right side of the classroom.

• The affirmative debate team 1 then has one of its members, referred to as the first speaker for the affirmative, give a short speech (max 8 minutes) presenting as persuasive an argument as possible for its affirmative position.

• The negative debate team 2 then has one of its members, referred to as the first speaker for the negative, give a short speech (max 8 minutes) presenting as persuasive an argument as possible for its negative position.

• For a designated amount of time (e.g., 20 minutes), the members of the negative debate team 2 and the negative support group are called upon by debate team 1 members to pose questions to them regarding the arguments for the affirmative laid out in the initial speech by the first speaker for the affirmative.

• For a designated amount of time (e.g., 20 minutes), the members of the affirmative debate team 1 and the affirmative support group are called upon by debate team 2 members to pose questions to them regarding the arguments for the negative laid out in the initial speech by the first speaker for the negative.

• For a designated amount of time (e.g., 5 minutes), the designated second speaker for the affirmative presents a closing rebuttal speech in response to all of the arguments presented against the affirmative position.

• For a designated amount of time (e.g., 5 minutes), the designated second speaker for the negative presents a closing rebuttal speech in response to all of the arguments presented against the negative position.

• Students (other than the debate team members) are then allowed to get up and “vote with their feet” with regard to which support group they now want to join, either affirmative or negative.

• The side (affirmative or negative) with the largest support group at the end of this DG2 session is judged to have won the debate.
Evaluation of Discussion Group Moderators: I will evaluate the performance of each of the debate teams 1 and 2 (as a group) on the basis of their hand-out and in-class debate performance.

Evaluation of Other Class Participants: I will evaluate the performance of each class participant other than the debate team members on the basis of the quality of their contributions to the in-class discussion. The points earned by each of these other class participants will be either 0 (not present), 1 (poor), 2 (satisfactory), 3 (good), or 4 (excellent). The points earned by each of these other class participants (up to a maximum of four) will be included in the determination of their overall course score.