

THE DEBATE KIT
ROUND 2
SPEECH 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

PROPOSITION:

That the Federal government should abolish animal experimentation.

ROUND 1 RE-CAP, AS IT RELATES TO THIS PARTICULAR SPEECH:

In the 1st Affirmative Constructive: Introduction

- The Affirmative Team argued that animal experimentation results are misleading. They proved this by using the example that over the span of 50 years, mice were used to test the effects of smoking on the lungs. The results appeared to indicate that smoking does not cause cancer, but obviously, this is not the case. Scientists went on later to confirm that smoking does, indeed, cause cancer, so many people died due to the mistakes of animal experimentation. In essence, animals aren't a reliable source for human problems.

In the 1st Negative Cross-Examination:

- The Negative Team came back with the following research to indicate that animal testing has been very effective in helping cure human ailments: Jonas Salk used Rhesus monkeys to isolate the polio virus and use the isolates to create the Salk vaccine, which markedly reduced the incidence of polio in the U.S. Later, Albert Sabin made a live vaccine by infecting animal hosts to "grow" the virus. By 1965, polio had been virtually eradicated in the U.S.

In the 1st Negative Constructive:

- The Negative Team went on to develop the above counter-argument further by indicating the following:
 - In the 1920s, experiments in dogs allowed Frederick Banting to determine the functions of the pancreas in producing insulin. Prior to this discovery, a diagnosis of diabetes was more or less a death sentence.
 - Primates have been used extensively for AIDS research, with anti-viral and prophylactic treatments evaluated in several types of monkeys.
- Then they continued on with the speech, providing other evidence as to why the current system, which uses animal experimentation, works just fine as is and that no change is necessary.

In the 1st Affirmative Cross-Examination:

- The Affirmative counter-argued the Negative team's point about primates being used extensively for AIDS research by stating the following evidence to refute:
 - Based on scientific research, monkeys are systematically incapable of contracting the HIV virus.

ROUND 2 BEGINS...

2nd Affirmative Constructive, Sample Speech Layout:

My name is __ and I am speaking on behalf of the Affirmative team, where we believe that animal experimentation should be abolished because it is an immoral and ineffective means of seeking medical knowledge. During the course of this speech, I intend to share with you our plan for overhauling the current system that allows this type of experimentation to take place, and I will also share the advantages of adopting this change.

Before I begin, however, I would like to take a brief moment to redress one of the points my opponent raised in Round 1. When we mentioned that current animal experimentation often leads to misleading results, our opponent struck back by saying that this current system has led to medical breakthroughs such as finding a vaccine for polio in the 1920s. However, this “medical triumph” is not entirely true. If anything, it was animal experimentation itself that led to a delay in the development of a vaccine, which ultimately exposed millions of Americans to potentially dangerous monkey viruses.

Prior to the use of animal testing, scientists were on the cusp of a cure for the polio virus; they found that the gastrointestinal system was where the virus attacked first, which was correct. However, the animal testing that took place shortly after indicated otherwise; animal testers concluded that the virus mainly infects the nervous system, but this conclusion was erroneous because using animal testing for human cures simply doesn't work. The whole ordeal led to misdirected preventative measures, which then led to a delay in the development of the much— needed vaccine. And while monkeys were used to create the polio vaccine in the long-run, this is actually a lot worse than it sounds. It exposed millions of people to the harmful viruses monkeys can carry. (Recall that it was the monkey that spawned the Ebola virus...!!). Now do you think the risk is worth the result?

Now that I've reestablished the fact that harm in the current system does, indeed, exist, I would like to move on to our Plan for changing this harmful system. The Affirmative team has compose several workable alternatives to pursue as a replacement for animal experimentation in the medical field. My partner previewed two of these in Round 1, which I will take the time to discuss in depth now.

First, we believe that **in vitro testing**, which isolates cells for the purposes of research, will change the playing field for medical breakthroughs if it is pursued instead. Whereas we would be using human cells to conduct research regarding proper medical treatment for humans, animal testing will never have this benefit. Animal cells will always be animal cells. And since in vitro testing is proven to be as effective, if not more effective, than animal experimentation, there is virtually no harm in pursuing it instead. If you are worried about cost, sure, it might sound more expensive, but in reality, there is virtually no cost at all; much of the current in vitro testing is already funded by the government so this would be no different. Since the cost is low, and the results do not cause harm to anyone, there will be little controversy to arise amongst the American public, so enforcement should be relatively easy.

The advantages of this plan are that modern medicine can continue to prevail, but animals will cease to be harmed. It will continue to promote humanitarian efforts to preserve life on earth as an American ideal, and this in turn, will set an example for the rest of the world to follow, just as we set the example for balanced democracy on the political stage.

Another central plan option we came up with to replace animal experimentation concerns the use of autopsies and biopsies from humans as the alternative. Most of you would agree that the best way to find cures for humans would be to conduct research on humans. 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). While our opponent might argue that autopsies can be expensive, ranging from \$1,000 to \$3,000 per autopsy, government subsidies can easily reduce this cost. Since 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.

Therefore, the advantages of this plan are that it will cater to economic stimulation because it will create jobs and help hospitals nationwide expand, not to mention the obvious benefits of more accurate research results.

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? Clearly, it is time for a **change in the current system**, and our team has just to the **solution** to this ongoing problem.

RESEARCH FOR COUNTER:

During the 1920s and 1930s, studies on monkeys led to gross misconceptions that delayed the fight against poliomyelitis. These experiments indicated that the poliovirus infects mainly the nervous system; scientists later learned this was because the viral strains they had administered through the nose had artificially developed an affinity for brain tissue. The erroneous conclusion, which contradicted previous human studies demonstrating that the gastrointestinal system was the primary route of infection, resulted in misdirected preventive measures and delayed the development of a vaccine. Research with human cell cultures in 1949 first showed that the virus could be cultivated on non-neural tissues taken from the intestine and limbs. Yet in the early 1950s, cell cultures from monkeys rather than humans were used for vaccine production; as a result, millions of people were exposed to potentially harmful monkey viruses.

<http://mipwww.life.uiuc.edu/404%20Docs/SciAm%20articles/AnmResrchProCon.pdf>

ADDITIONAL AFFIRMATIVE CLAIMS FROM ROUND 1 AND APPLICABLE COUNTERS:

- In the 1920s, experiments in dogs allowed Frederick Banting to determine the functions of the pancreas in producing insulin. Prior to this discovery, a diagnosis of diabetes was more or less a death sentence.
- Primates have been used extensively for AIDS research, with anti-viral and prophylactic treatments evaluated in several types of monkeys.
 - **COUNTER:** Based on scientific research, monkeys are systematically incapable of contracting the HIV virus.
- Human beings share about 99% of their genes with chimpanzees and only slightly fewer with other monkeys. As a result, the reactions of these creatures are a very good guide to possible reactions of human patients. Even lower down the scale, other animals share the same basic physiology with humans. Furthermore, it would be immoral to risk the life of a human being when a medicine or procedure could instead be tested on a non-human animal.
 - **COUNTER:** In fact, most animal experiments are done on animals that are nothing like human beings - rats and mice - which undermines the argument that these experiments are a reliable guide to human reactions. Scientifically, as well as morally, most animal experimentation is to be rejected - the reaction of a mouse to a substance is no guide to human reactions. Each species has its own unique physiology. And the more similar an animal is to a human being - e.g. a chimpanzee - the more intelligent and sentient it is, and so the more immoral it is to treat it as a disposable and worthless biological object.