You will be assigned one of the scenarios below. With your group, brainstorm possible arguments to be used by each side and use what you come up with to create a script of the ensuing conversation. In order to get what you want, each party needs to understand the other’s position well so that you can use it to strengthen your own position.

* Scenario 1: Two friends outside a movie theater. Each wants to see a different movie. (Feel free to come up with the selections!)
* Scenario 2: A parent and a child. The child wants a later curfew to attend a party with friends.
* Scenario 3: A student and a teacher. The student wants an extension on a paper.
* Scenario 4: Two friends. One wants the other to let him or her copy his or her homework.
* Scenario 5: A parent and a child. The family has planned a trip during school vacation. The child wants to do something with friends instead.
* Scenario 6: A parent and a child. The child wants a smartphone. The parents feel he or she isn’t old enough.
* Scenario 7: A parent and a child. The parent wants the child to attend college close to home; the child wants to go across the country.

Your Scenario #\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Side 1: | Side 2: |
| Arguments: | Arguments: |

Script of your scenario:

Look at these excerpts from two of last year’s [Student Editorial Contest Winners](http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/tag/editorial-winner/): [Stop ‘I Spy’ Game With Allies](http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/24/editorial-contest-winner-stop-i-spy-game-with-allies/) and [The War on Drugs](http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/23/editorial-contest-winner-the-war-on-drugs/):

**Excerpt 1: Editorial Contest Winner | Stop ‘I Spy’ Game With Allies**

The N.S.A. is overreaching its duties. While President Obama and officials assured Americans that the N.S.A.’s only purpose for surveillance is to prevent another terrorist attack (despite a panel commissioned by Obama himself that flatly noted surveillance was not essential for the N.S.A.’s purpose), the N.S.A. also eavesdrops on diplomatic communications of friends for an advantage in negotiations and policy making which does not contribute to their dubious claims of protecting national security.

R. James Woolsey, a former director of the C.I.A., writes in his Wall Street Journal article, “Why We Spy on Allies,” that we wouldn’t need to spy on Europeans if they would reform their economic policies and stop bribing. Sure, it’d be nice for someone to police their unethical behavior to save themselves and possibly even out the competition for ourselves. But at a time when Americans are largely opposed to foreign interference (look at how people responded to military action in Syria), these actions taken by the N.S.A. are unwarranted and do not represent our interests.

Finally, the N.S.A.’s shrug-off excuse, “Everybody else does it, why can’t we?”, relies on the reasoning of Hammurabi’s Code of an “eye for an eye.” They’re spying on us, so we’re spying on them. However, an eye for an eye only ends up making the whole world blind. In this case, this constant back and forth spying is meaningless, derailing the N.S.A. from the primary goal to fight terrorism at the expense of resources and tax dollars.

**Excerpt 2: Editorial Contest Winner | The War on Drugs**

The drug war is failing for the same reason that prohibition did in the 1920s. Supply for alcohol was cut, while the demand still existed. This gave power to criminals who were willing to break the law to supply alcohol and make quick money. This is more true now than it was in the 1920s. Because of a more globalized economy, better-established and more easily accessible trade routes, smuggling drugs into the country is easier than ever for cartels. The flawed logic here is that the drug war is something that can be won: If enough shipments are confiscated, or enough dealers are busted, the supply will end and drug abuse will cease to exist. Even if tomorrow, the head of the largest cartel was taken into custody, it wouldn’t make any difference. As long as demand exists from the United States for illegal drugs, there will always be someone willing to supply it.

Adapted from: <http://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/02/12/i-dont-think-so-writing-effective-counterarguments/>

How do these two utilize counterarguments?

How will you address the arguments for the other book?