

Debate Reflection Assignment 2

Purpose:

The overall purpose of the debates in class is to enhance all students' learning. This will happen in a different way if you are a debate participant or not. But preparing for the debate, presenting (or listening), and reflecting on what happened will reinforce both the particular material being covered during the debate as well as the methodology of philosophical argumentation and progress.

Our second debate will focus on Medical Nihilism. The particular debate resolution for the first debate is this:

Resolved: We ought to have low confidence in the overall benefits of most novel medical interventions.

Below are the assignments for the debate participants and the debate listeners respectively.

A. For Debate Participants

Task:

Write a roughly 2 page reflection that addresses the following:

1. (If PRO) Do you think your team did a good job in presenting a clear view of what medical nihilism is (of what the resolution means?)

(If CON) Do you think your team did a good job in helping to clarify what medical nihilism means?

2. Identify the strongest argument your team prepared and evaluate how well it was communicated.
 3. Discuss the most challenging argument made by the opposing team and how persuasive you found it.
 4. Reflect on your team's division of roles and debate strategy. What worked? What would you change?
 5. Explain whether participating in the debate shifted your view of medical nihilism and why.
 6. Conclude with your own philosophical position: Is medical nihilism persuasive? Why or why not?
-

B. For Debate Observers

Task:

Write a roughly 3 page reflection that addresses the following:

1. Summarize what each team's position is.
2. Summarize the strongest argument presented by each team.
3. Evaluate which team made the more effective case and explain why.
4. Identify one issue or objection you wish had been addressed more fully.
5. State your own philosophical position: Do you find medical nihilism persuasive? Why or why not?
6. Reflect on how watching the debate differed from only reading the texts—did it help clarify or complicate the issues?