

There are many different ways to write a good public forum debate case. This is a sample case and follows the form that you should follow. I have commented in red and underlined what the different parts of the case are. **The actual case is in bold print.**

Public Forum Con Case

The public forum case speech starts with an introduction.

Intro- Government under a democracy is only as strong as each individual citizen. There is a need for everyone to answer the call for help and not rely on the government too much to be the responsible party

After the introduction, you state the resolution and whether you agree with it (if the case is pro) or disagree with the resolution (if the case is written on the con side.)

It is for this reason that my partner and I must uphold the con side in this debate on the resolution...

Resolved: That the US federal government should fund Hurricane Katrina relief and rebuilding by ending Bush's tax cuts.

Terms can be defined here if you wish. It depends on whether you have key terms that need to be defined to make your arguments clearer or stronger. I chose not to define any terms in this case.

This is a transitions sentence/paragraph. Transitions help you get from one part of the case to the next smoothly. This transition also introduces my foreshadow.

It's important to note that the government does have a role to play in Katrina relief, and there is federal disaster relief being applied. Unfortunately, FEMA has proven ineffective in distributing disaster money, regardless of its' source. But, there are important reasons why eliminating Bush's tax cuts should not be the source.

Next comes a foreshadow. This lists the main arguments of your case. You will go into detailed explanations and evidence later in the case. Here, you list the major arguments off.

The 3 main arguments we believe force the rejection of this resolution are:

- 1. Over reliance on federal govt. disaster funding risks fraud and abuse.**
- 2. Citizenship requires responsibility and America is responding generously.**
- 3. Bush's tax cuts are necessary for the economic health needed to deal with Katrina as a nation.**

Next, each argument is dealt with one at a time. The main argument point is stated and then supported. Notice that there is evidence, examples and explanations to persuade the judge to accept the argument and vote for it at the end of the round.

The first argument is over reliance on federal govt. disaster funding risks fraud and abuse.

Indeed the government should respond to disasters, but the country should not over rely on government money to solve all of these problems. Such a flood of money promotes abuse of the disaster relief system. Geoffrey Colvin reported in Fortune Magazine that "Aid requests are already coming in from people whose only qualification is a Southern accent...Dozens of states, including North Dakota, are using Katrina to ask for federal money, and Washington has found an opportunity to ladle out billions to friends and family." [Oct. 17, 2005; page 5]

Canceling Bush's tax cuts is looking to systematize billions of dollars into a disaster relief system already seeing a rise in fraud and abuse. Dealing with disaster money needs to occur slowly, offering only the money necessary to deal with the problems. Eliminating Bush's tax cuts would offer too much money, too fast, and on too permanent a basis.

Such an approach to disaster relief has historically hurt the process. Time Magazine in Sept. 26, 2005 reminds us that "FEMA's track record before Katrina isn't too encouraging: during last year's \$2 billion cleanup of Hurricane Frances, millions of relief dollars ended up in the hands of residents in the largely unaffected area around Miami. [Staff writer; page 17]

[The same process is followed for my second major argument.](#)

The second argument against canceling the Bush tax cuts for Katrina relief is that citizenship requires responsibility, and America is responding generously.

President Kennedy once said "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." Kennedy was asking Americans not to look to the government to solve all of the countries problems. He recognized that living in a democracy requires the responsibility of each member to help in times of need. Indeed, the government should help respond to hurricane disasters but looking to permanently eliminate Bush's tax cuts is assuming too much of a government role. This is not necessary.

The American people need to practice generosity and responsibility for the well being of the country, and they are responding. Professional aid groups, like the American Red Cross and Habitat for Humanity, are reporting record donations and are responding to the needs of hurricane victims; and doing so better than federal agencies like FEMA.

Private efforts by corporations, like Microsoft and the National Football league, are donating millions of dollars. Even local efforts, like those done by local churches and schools, are giving individuals the opportunity to be responsible members of society. Efforts at Huron High School alone raised over \$10,000. The lessons learned about individual sacrifice, responsibility, and not relying on government action have been great. Canceling Bush's tax cuts and relying too much on government aid should not be the answer.

[The same process is followed for my final major argument.](#)

The final argument justifying rejection of this resolution is Bush's tax cuts are necessary for the economic health needed to deal with Katrina as a nation.

The purpose behind Bush's tax cuts is to stimulate economic activity that will benefit the whole economy. Putting money back into the hands of people has a ripple effect that strengthens America's economy. People with money can buy goods and services. This means more people will be hired to provide those goods and services. When these people get a paycheck, they go out and spend that money on other goods and services. That is how the 'ripple' effect in the economy works.

And Bush's tax cuts are having a positive effect on the economy. UPI NEWSTRACK reported in July 31, 2004 that "Across the board tax cuts and the work ethic of Americans are responsible for rejuvenating the economy...[N]ew reports show a 2-year high in consumer growth following the challenges of recession and economic burdens resulting from the war against terror. These

gains in our economy have come at a time when Americans are benefiting from the full effects of tax relief..." [Staff writer; UPINWSTACK.com; DD: 8-6-07]

The after affects of Hurricane Katrina has resulted in one of the largest mass migrations of population this country has ever seen. A strong economy country-wide will be necessary to deal with this tragedy.

Increased employment potential, for example, is needed now more than ever. As people relocate away from the disaster zone, some permanently, this country needs Bush's tax cuts to maintain economic health and job growth. THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY reported in April 5, 2005 that "...tax cuts [are] key to stimulating the economy. "What we're focusing on is the kind of growth that all Americans want to see, which is job growth," he said. "We had 2.4 million new jobs in the last 12 months. There is no better anti-poverty program than a good economy." [staff writers, page 23.]

To keep the economy strong for every American, and to make long term disaster recovery possible, Bush's tax cuts should not be eliminated.

The case ends with a strong conclusion. The conclusion professionally ends the speech and includes an appeal for the judge to vote for your side.

In conclusion, those on the con side of the resolution believe in disaster relief. We believe these people should be helped and that the federal government should be a part of that solution. But the elimination of Bush's tax cuts should not be the answer to the Hurricane Katrina relief effort. Instead, we need to look at a broader range of solutions that has a long term vision for recovery. We, therefore, urge rejection of the resolution: That the US federal government should fund Hurricane Katrina relief and rebuilding by ending Bush's tax cuts.