

THE DEBATE KIT DEBATE OUTLINE SAMPLE



Yo, I'm Jill!

I live on macha green tea lattes + nerdy lesson planning sessions.

I'm on a mission to flip the script on how we teach today's writers, so...

I provide secondary ELA teachers with the **resources + mindset** they need to make the **writing process** more **relevant + applicable** for today's learners and tomorrow's leaders.

© 2021 edPioneer Consulting, LLC

This is solely considered a work of JillPavich.com edPioneer Consulting, LLC. The thoughts + ideas expressed in this resource are those of the author; the points expressed here are her own. The information shared here is for education + learning; the author is not responsible or nor does she guarantee any set of academic outcomes as a direct result of using this resource. For classroom use only.

By accessing/downloading this resource, you give Jill Pavich consent to contact you hereafter regarding matters directly related to its content. You also agree to the JillPavich.com Terms of Use.



jill@jillpavich.com



facebook.com/jillbpavich



@jillpavich



© 2022 edPioneer Consulting, LLC All Rights Reserved

Troy ---
Pavich/5th period
Debate Brief
15 April 20__

Animal Experimentation: Affirmative Position

TEAMS:

Affirmative = Troy ---, Zara ---, Carson ---

Negative = Scott ---, Mary Kate ---

PROPOSITION:

Resolved that the Federal Government should abolish animal experimentation.

LIMITS OF DEBATE:

- My team and my opponents have agreed to limit “animal experimentation” to just medical experimentation. Therefore, we will NOT discuss other experimental concerns such as cosmetic.
- We define “abolish” as - to end the observance or effect of *entirely*. In abolishing animal experimentation for medical purposes, this practice would cease to exist altogether, including both public and privately funded ventures; in essence, it would be illegal to pursue.
- We consider “medical purposes” to fulfill the following criteria:
 - to develop new drugs
 - to develop new treatments
 - any other advancements to aid in the physical and mental well being of humans

AFFIRMATIVE CASE

I. INTRODUCTION

- Attention-Getter
 - Monkeys must inhale poisonous gases. Dogs receive surgery while partially conscious. Cats are lowered into tanks of water. Live guinea pigs are doused in corrosive chemicals to deteriorate flesh and organs. Mice are forced to inhale gasoline fumes. As a result, millions of animals are killed each year. And for what? There have been no significant advancements linked to animal experimentation in research to date.
- Thesis Statement
 - Therefore, the Affirmative team agrees that animal experimentation should be abolished because it is inhumane and ineffective.



FYI: Thesis statement should include 2-4 “big picture” ideas that your entire debate research will rally around in order to sway the audience.

For every FACT mentioned in the entire brief, list the SOURCE!
Either use the article website, title, the group, or the author as your source indicator.

II. RELEVANT HISTORY

- The use of animal testing has a surprisingly long history, dating back to the 4th century B.C. Well-known Greek philosopher Aristotle is one of the first individuals to perform experiments on live animals (www.brighthub.com/science/medical/articles), though this definitely does not endorse it as right. Currently in the United States, millions of new animals are experimented upon each year. After experimentation, if they have not already been killed, most are euthanized. Around 1.2 million animals are used in experimentation each year in the United States, although this does not even begin to account for rats and mice, which make up about 75% of the testing body. This means the number is closer to 4.8 million animals yearly (“Alternatives to Animal Research”).
- Luckily, most advancements in medicine are not resulting from animal experiments. They actually come from human autopsies and biopsies (“Today in Breakthroughs”). These current, more medically logical experiments are used to develop drugs and new procedures regarding various human problems including cancer, AIDS, heart disease, surgeries, and more (“Alternatives to Animal Research”). Given this information, though some may argue that animal experimentation is beneficial for our society, the facts actually reveal the opposite.

III. HARMS OF CURRENT SYSTEM/SIGNIFICANCE OF HARMS

The harms caused by the current system of animal experimentation exist and are significant. Millions have died either due to errors in data leading to faulty drugs, or errors in obtaining data that proves problems in humans. If millions of people are unnecessarily dying, it is a HUGE problem.

- Products are harmful despite animal testing.
 - **Harm:** Many of the drugs produced using animal experimentation are actually harmful to humans, including many prescription drugs and cosmetics. These drugs, when tested on animals, usually have mild or even no side effects. But when they reach the market, around 80% of drugs are withdrawn eventually due to harmful side effects--12,000 out of 15,000 yearly (Thomas).
 - **Harm:** Out of 198 drugs safely tested on animals and introduced into the market, 51.5% caused harmful side effects in humans and were immediately withdrawn from the market (Hurley 2). As noted above, eventually 80% would be withdrawn at some point in the future.
 - **Significance:** Over 1.5 million Americans were hospitalized in 1978 due to prescribed pharmaceutical drugs. This is directly accredited to the unreliability of animal models used for drug development (Center for Medical Research). This also coincides with the deaths of millions of lab animals, but that goes without saying.
- Experimentation results are misleading.
 - **Harm:** Attempts to create lung cancer in mice from cigarette smoke for the sponsored tobacco industry to produce results. This falsely convinced society that cigarettes do not create lung cancer. Finally it was revealed that smoking in humans DOES produce lung cancer. Over the span of 50 years though, millions of people across the world died because of the misleading effects of animal experimentation (Santa Monica College).
 - **Significance:** Though many people know it is harmful to them, people all around the world continue to smoke today. If people had known this 50 years ago, perhaps most people would not smoke by now because the information would have been put to use faster. Ultimately, the blame for lung cancer goes on the failure of animal experimentation to produce results.

Remember, if it is LOGIC generated from your OWN BRAIN there is no need to add source...

- Animal testing increases the likelihood of spreading disease.
 - **Harm:** Outbreaks in Marburg and Ebola viruses occurred in monkey colonies used for experimentation in the United States. The reason the infected monkeys had these viruses were because they were shipped in from Africa. If animal experimentation was abolished, there would not be any importing of diseases in lab animals, reducing the risk of outbreaks (Preston 122).
 - **Significance:** Marburg and Ebola are among the deadliest viruses known to man, and an epidemic could have been possible and deadly.
 - **Significance:** The emergence of Marburg and Ebola in the United States is a very big deal. This virus kills many people yearly in rural Africa. The consequences of an outbreak in the United States would be devastating, due to closely concentrated urban centers and travel. Eventually it would be a worldwide pandemic. This proves animal experimentation not only unreliable in data, but risky for the well being of mankind on the whole planet (Preston 167).

Plan/Advantages Overview: The problem of putting animals through harm to create advancements in science is completely unnecessary. Although many accomplishments are made using live experimentation, the same results are obtainable using in vitro methods (Howard 2). But these advancements made using the current system are immoral and inhumane in many cases. Our plan solves the problem of killing animals to obtain information, because the same information can be obtained using humane methods.

There are several advantages present using the suggested plan as opposed to keeping the current system including a concerted effort to acquire quantitative over qualitative data as a more valuable means of precision; it will yield economic benefits to society at large; and it will set a good example for other societies who look to the United States as a model for good form.

Wrap-Up: Nobody wants for thousands of people to die unnecessarily, but animal experimentation directly or indirectly DOES cause this, so why do we continue to use it?

IV. AFFIRMATIVE PLAN FOR CHANGE/ADVANTAGES

Animal experimentation is an immoral way of accomplishing goals in the vast field of medicine. Our aim is to complete these same goals of increasing human longevity and curing illnesses without the loss of animal life to do it.

- To solve this issue, we have a few plans.
 - In vitro testing
 - **Cost:** Virtually none. Most branches of this are funded by the government.
 - **Workability:** In vitro testing is the isolation of cells to do research on (Center for Medical Research). We will use human cells, since the drugs we develop are made for humans. After all, in vitro testing has proven to be as effective as live testing on animals (Center for Medical Ethics and Health Policy). Human cells obviously contain the genome of a human, so effects of chemicals on human cells would be able to be identified, whereas is may be distorted when tested on, say, a dog (Center for Medical Research).
 - **Enforcement:** This plan will be popular among the general public because it steers away from the moral issue of bringing harm to innocent creatures.
 - The way to accomplish this would be to simply transfer funds being used in animal experimentation to more humane ones like in vitro testing. If companies aren't so worried about lawsuits regarding animal experimentation requirements, the money could be used for in vitro testing (Animal Rights Movement).
 - Advantages: Obtaining additional information in the areas of cancer (Thomas 2), drug development (Howard 1), chemistry, biology, and execution of surgery (Thomas 1) lets everybody win...science prevails while animals remain unharmed.

- The “Three R’s”—Replacement, Reduction, and Refinement
 - **Cost:** Once again, virtually none. We can easily apply for grants and other government funded finance sources just as other medical programs have successfully done in the past. Although my opponent might say that money must be put in for a grant, the money saved in the long run will actually outweigh the cost (Preston 202).
 - Foundation for Juvenile Diabetes is one example that effectively uses grants to fund research.
 - **Workability:** The “Three R’s”, or Replacement, Reduction, and Refinement are another viable solution. Replacement refers to replacing animals with computer models and “dummies” for testing. Reduction just means limiting the number of animals used in harmful experimentations, not abolishing it altogether. Refinement refers to perfecting current techniques of animal experiment to limit distress and discomfort (“Animal Ethics”).
 - **Enforcement:** Like many other medical programs seek to do, we would pursue workshops to reach the medical public in order to educate them on this option and train them. Using the “Three R’s” will then reduce harm inflicted on animals.
 - **Advantages:** Promotes advancements in humanitarian efforts to preserve life on earth. Also, it helps to set an example for the rest of the world to follow (ie: nuclear non-proliferation).
- Autopsies, Biopsies on Humans
 - **Cost:** Extensive autopsies range from \$1,000 to \$3,000 per person; however government subsidies can reduce the cost. As the hospital does not have to pay for its autopsies when they are used for science and medicine, the hospital can employ more workers and further drive the medical industry.
 - **Workability:** One would think that the best way to conduct research on the human is to... conduct research on the human. Similar to how people can be listed as an organ donor on their driver’s licenses, they can also donate their bodies to science. Conducting autopsies has given us critical information on how the human body works, why it doesn’t work when put under stress, and what we can do to prevent the shutdown of the body and death. Biopsies are just samples of living human tissues used to conduct research, similar to in vitro (Center for Medical Research).
 - **Enforcement:** The government takes responsibility for paying and supervising autopsies, all information goes towards preventing death and developing drugs. As noted above, this comes, in the end, to no cost as the hospital can strengthen and “pay” the government back with its taxes.
 - **Advantages:** It will cater to economic interests in hospitals expanding economically.
- Quantum Mechanics
 - **Cost:** we already do it!
 - **Workability:** Quantum mechanics allows us to break down substances (including toxins, enzymes, carcinogens, and other substances) down to their molecular levels in order to learn more about chemical interactions with said substances. Conducting these studies will help us make advancements in our understanding in chemistry, which will in turn lead us on the way to developing medicines (“Alternatives to Medical Research”).
 - **Enforcement:** We already do quantum mechanics studies. To limit and cut down on animal experimentation would save money that could be used for quantum mechanics research. Therefore the cost is near zero, so not many can really object. Grants could be used if more money is needed.
 - **Advantages:** It will help stop the spread of foreign pathogens/disease in our own country (Preston 167). Also, obtaining quantitative data (exact numbers) is more reliable as opposed to qualitative data, which is often appearance based, judgmental and inconsistent.

V. CONCLUSION

- Summary of Affirmative Case:
 - In summation, the current system we use today may be functional, but it is impractical, unreliable, erratic, inhumane, costly, and sluggish. Our proposed system would speed up research to a whole new level, would reduce costs in many cases, and would take humanity in the direction of being more benevolent towards life on earth, a huge step for mankind.
- Memorable Ending:
 - As George Orwell pointed out in his politically charged novelette, *Animal Farm*: “Man is a creature who consumes without producing. He does not give milk, he does not lay eggs, he is too weak to pull the plow...yet he is lord of all animals.” As humans, we are not superior to our animal race, thus we have no right to press suffering upon them any more than whites had the right to press suffering upon blacks during segregation (Alice Walker). Therefore, the question I leave you with is not, “can they reason” or “can they talk,” but rather, “can they suffer?” If you can answer “yes” to this final question, I believe you know where you stand when it comes to animal experimentation.
- Alternative Endings:
 - *Why should man expect his prayer for mercy to be heard by What is above him when he shows no mercy to what is under him? ~Pierre Troubetzkoy*