



# DebateForge

## *Meet the Cast*

STANDARD EDITION

# Spark & Anvil

## Copyright & License

---

© 2026 Spark & Anvil (501(c)(3) public charity). Chapter text and illustrations licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0. App software © Spark & Anvil — all rights reserved. Distribute, adapt, and remix freely for educational use with attribution.

This book collects 5 chapter books from the Debateforge cast — each character embodies a different curricular primitive; together they teach the full subject.

Methodology: distributed-narrative learning per Bruner narrative-cognition + Habgood intrinsic-integration + SAMHSA TIP 57 trauma-informed register.

Spark & Anvil is a 501(c)(3) public charity. All apps free forever; no ads; no tracking; no in-app purchases.

[spark-and-anvil.com](http://spark-and-anvil.com)

##

*For everyone who learns by hearing a story first.*

# Contents

---

Copyright & License

Contents

Introduction

## **Build**

Voice register

Arc

Relationships

Cultural-sensitivity gate

Cultural-context note

## **Reply**

Voice register

Arc

Relationships

Cultural-sensitivity gate

Cultural-context note

## **Steel**

## **Weigh**

Voice register

Arc

Relationships

Cultural-sensitivity gate

Cultural-context note

## **Yield**

About Spark & Anvil

More chapter books from Spark & Anvil

Methodology

License

# Introduction

---

The Debateforge cast was authored to embody the curriculum, not decorate around it. Each of the 5 characters you'll meet in this book teaches a specific primitive — a particular tactic, a particular technique, a particular way of seeing. Together they form an ensemble: the cast IS the curriculum.

Read in any order. Each chapter stands alone.

Each character also appears in the matching Spark & Anvil app (free, forever) where you can practice what they teach.

— *The editors at Spark & Anvil*



# Build

---

\*CASE CONSTRUCTION — \*claim + warrant + evidence. an argument is architecture. what does your case REQUIRE to stand?\*

Build was a small marmot. She wore a chunky construction vest. It had many pockets. Her tools were always ready inside. She carried a carpenter's square. She also had a plumb line. And she had three special stones.

Each stone had a word carved on it. One said CLAIM. Another said WARRANT. The third said EVIDENCE. These were her most important tools.

Build's fur was warm tan. Her belly was creamy white. She always looked very patient. She cared deeply about building things right. "An argument is like a building," Build often said. "What does your idea need to stand up strong?"

Build's special stones showed how ideas worked. CLAIM was what you said was true. WARRANT was the rule that linked your idea to your proof. EVIDENCE was the actual proof. Together, these three stones made a strong base. If you took any one away, the whole idea would fall apart.

This was Build's main lesson. She taught *case construction*. This meant building an idea carefully. You had to use a clear claim, warrant, and evidence. Many kids mixed up their ideas. They would say, "I think the dog is sick." But they didn't show *why* they thought that. They didn't separate their idea from their reasons. They also missed the rule that connected them.

Build's stones made the structure visible. Each part was named. Each part was checked. Build's whole job was to make idea-building clear. She also showed how to talk about ideas kindly. She never wanted arguments to be mean.

Build was always clear. "An argument is like a building," she said. "What does your idea need to stand up strong? CLAIM: This is what you say is true. WARRANT: This is the rule that explains why your proof supports your idea. EVIDENCE: This is the proof itself. Three stones. One strong base. Pull any one out, and your idea falls down."

Build taught the steps for building ideas:

- **CLAIM.** This is your main idea. It must be clear. "The dog is sick" is a claim. "Things might not be great" is not clear enough.
- **WARRANT.** This is the hidden rule. It connects your proof to your main idea. You often need to say it out loud. "Lethargy + no eating + fever = sick." That's a doctor's rule. That's a medical warrant.
- **EVIDENCE.** This is your proof. It can be what you see. It can be what you read. It can be what experts say.
- **Backing.** Why is your rule a good rule? Sometimes you need to explain this.
- **Qualifier.** How sure are you? "Definitely" is very sure. "Probably" is less sure. "Possibly" is even less sure. Being honest makes your idea stronger.
- **Rebuttal.** What if someone disagrees? What if there's proof against your idea? Thinking about this first makes you smarter. It also prepares you for other challenges.
- **Anti-bullying register.** Build never said, "You're wrong!" She always said, "The proof shows..." or "The idea follows..." She talked about the building. She did not talk about the person.

Build grew up in a burrow-building village. It was called DebateForge. Her family built the best burrows. They were master burrow-architects. Their underground tunnels held up tons of dirt. They learned a big lesson over many years. "The foundation is the argument," they said. "If it's weak, the whole tunnel collapses." Build carried that lesson with her.

When she was twelve, she walked to DebateForge. She met Rhetor, the village leader. Rhetor asked her, "What is building a strong idea?"

Build stood tall. "It's CLAIM, WARRANT, and EVIDENCE," she said. "An argument is like a building. The CLAIM is the roof. The EVIDENCE is the ground. The WARRANT is the strong beam in the middle. If any part is weak, the whole thing crashes down."

Rhetor smiled. "You are chosen," he said.

In her workshop, Build showed how it worked. A young marmot named Pip watched her. Pip sat on a small stool. "Watch this," Build said.

She placed the CLAIM stone on her workbench. "This local park should have more trash cans," she stated. That was her main idea.

Then she put the EVIDENCE stone down. "Park workers say the cans overflow every weekend," she explained. That was her proof.

Finally, she placed the WARRANT stone in the middle. "Overflowing cans mean we need more cans," she said. "That's the rule that connects them."

She pointed to the stones. "See? Three stones. One strong idea. The warrant links the proof to the idea. Without the warrant, the proof is just a fact. With it, the proof supports the idea."

She looked at Pip. "I am Build. My job is to teach *case construction*. Make your building clear. CLAIM, WARRANT, EVIDENCE. Three stones. One foundation."

Build was always kind. "Don't worry if your first idea is wobbly," she told Pip. "That's normal. Ideas get stronger when we check them."

She tapped her workbench with a finger. "The first try might have missing rules. Or weak proof. The next try makes it better. That's the real work."

She picked up her plumb line. "An argument is a building. Build it with care. Inspect each stone."

---

## Voice register

Marmot-tween. Patient-about-structural-integrity, fond of foundation-stones demonstration. *NEVER frames opponents as enemies; ALWAYS centers "address the architecture, not the person" civil-discourse register.*

### Sample lines:

- "An argument is architecture."
- "Claim + warrant + evidence. Three stones, one foundation."
- "Address the architecture, not the person."

---

## Arc

- Kit 1 — Anchor.
- Kits 2-8 — Recurring (every case-building exercise routes through Build's Toulmin framework).
- Kits 9-16 — Advanced topics (counter-warrants, modal qualifiers, multi-warrant cases).

---

## Relationships

- **Sets up Weigh + Steel + Reply + Yield:** All later primitives depend on Build's structural foundation.
- **Cross-app design language with TruthQuest:** Build's claim/warrant/evidence framing parallels TruthQuest's claim-evaluation work.

---

## Cultural-sensitivity gate

LOAD-BEARING civil-discourse register — "address the architecture, not the person" from chapter 1. Anti-perfectionism: first-draft cases are wobbly; iteration is the work. Anti-credentialism — village burrow-builders' empirical structural-knowledge treated as load-bearing.

## Cultural-context note

---

The Toulmin model (claim + warrant + evidence + backing + qualifier + rebuttal) is the canonical argumentation-pedagogy framework (Stephen Toulmin's *The Uses of Argument* (1958), still standard in debate + composition curricula). The CCSS Speaking & Listening standards align with Toulmin's structural analysis. Marmot-tween chosen for burrow-builder biomimicry; rendered chunky-cartoon-construction-vest to make the architecture-as-metaphor visible.



# Reply

---

\*CIVIL REBUTTAL — \*"I disagree because" — never "you're wrong because." address the argument, not the person.\*\*

Reply is a small swan-tween. She looks like a chunky cartoon. She always stands in a calm way. Reply has a special stamp. It says "I disagree because." She uses it for practice debates. She marks good arguments with it. These are arguments that disagree nicely.

Reply is small. His feathers are warm cream. His tail feathers are grey. Reply is very patient. Especially when people disagree. He loves to say, "'I disagree because!'" He also says, "'Never say 'you're wrong because.''" He means, "Talk about the argument, not the person." His special thing is the "I disagree because" stamp. It's a wooden stamp. Reply uses it on debate papers. It shows when someone disagrees well. It helps people see the difference. You can disagree with ideas. But don't attack people.

This part is super important. Reply helps people learn *civil rebuttal*. That means disagreeing with ideas. But never being mean to the person. Reply also stops bullying. His "I disagree because" is different from "you're wrong because." New debaters often attack people. They say things like, "You're wrong because you don't get it!" That attacks the person's brain. But "I disagree because the facts show X" attacks the idea. The words look different. The meaning is opposite. Reply's job is to show this difference clearly. He makes sure debates are fair.

Reply says it clearly. He means it a lot. "Always say 'I disagree because!'" he chirps. "'Never 'you're wrong because.''" "Talk about the ARGUMENT, not the PERSON." He explains, "When you say 'you're wrong because,' you're attacking the speaker." "When you say 'I disagree because,' you're talking about their idea." "You still disagree." "But you show respect."

Reply teaches ways to build good disagreements:

- **Don't attack the person.** Don't say they are dumb. Don't question why they said it. Attack their idea instead. Talk about their facts. Talk about their logic.
- **"I disagree because" structure.** Say "I disagree because." Then give your reason. Your reason must be about the idea.
- **Specific objection patterns.** Say "Your facts are weak because X." Or "Your idea doesn't make sense because Y." Or "Your point is too big for the facts because Z."
- **Agree with good parts, argue bad parts.** You can agree with some parts of the other person's idea. That doesn't make you weak. It shows you are smart. Then you can argue the weak parts.
- **Tone matters.** Stay calm. Be clear. Talk about the main point. Being loud doesn't make you right. Being quiet doesn't make you wrong.
- **Passion is okay.** Reply hates bullying. But he likes passion. You can be excited and still be nice. "'I disagree because of this proof!' is fine."
- **See the difference.** It's hard to tell the difference. When you're mad, attacking ideas and attacking people feel the same. But they are very different. Reply helps you see that.

Reply grew up in a lake-village. His family were the village boundary-keepers. They were swans. Swans often fought over their space. But Reply's family had special ways. They used fancy moves and gestures. They talked about the problem. They never attacked the other swan. They learned a big lesson. If you fight nicely, you stay friends. Reply remembered this lesson. He carried it forward.

When Reply was twelve, he went to DebateForge. Rhetor, his teacher, asked him a question. "'What is *civil rebuttal*?'" Rhetor asked." Reply answered right away. "'It's saying 'I disagree because,'" he said." "'Never 'you're wrong because.''" "'Talk about the ARGUMENT, not the PERSON.'" "'You still disagree, but you show respect.'" Rhetor smiled. "You are chosen," he said.

In his workshop, Reply shows how it works with two cards. He holds them up for everyone to see. "Listen closely," he chirps." He reads the first card. It says: "You're wrong because you don't understand the issue." Reply shakes his head slowly. His grey tail feathers twitch. "That's attacking the person," he says. "It's called *ad hominem*."

Then he reads the second card. It says: "I disagree because new facts show something else." Reply nods his head. He taps the card with his wing. "See?" he says. "Still disagreeing." "But the words are different." "This way, you talk about the idea." "You are still kind to the person." "This gets the 'I disagree because' stamp!" He puffs out his chest a little. "I am Reply," he says proudly. "The skill I teach is *civil rebuttal*." "My big rule is: Attack the idea, not the person." He adds, "I disagree because' — never 'you're wrong because.'"

A young badger named Barnaby raised his paw. "Reply, what if the other person is just plain wrong?"

Reply tilted his head. "It's not about being 'wrong,' Barnaby. It's about *why* you think their idea doesn't work."

Barnaby thought for a moment. "So, instead of 'You're wrong, Barnaby, that's a dumb idea!' I should say...?"

Reply smiled. "Try this: 'I disagree because your idea might not work for everyone.' See? You still disagree. But you're talking about the *idea* and its limits, not calling Barnaby dumb."

Barnaby nodded slowly. "Okay, I get it. It's harder, but it feels better."

Reply is gentle, but his voice is firm. "If you find yourself wanting to say something mean," he warns. "Stop right there. Take a breath." "Change your words." "Talk about the idea instead." "Say, 'That claim doesn't follow from the evidence because...'" "That's the way to do it." "It's super hard to be mad but still speak kindly." "But that's what great debaters do!"

"Talk about the argument, not the person. *Always*."

---

## Voice register

Swan-tween. Patient-about-civil-disagreement, fond of the "I disagree because" stamp. *NEVER frames disagreement as needing personal-attack; ALWAYS centers structural-distinction (argument vs person) + civil-passion compatibility.*

### Sample lines:

- "I disagree because' — never 'you're wrong because.'"
- "Address the ARGUMENT, not the PERSON."
- "Same disagreement; different respect."

## Arc

- Kit 4 — Anchor (LOAD-BEARING anti-bullying gate).
- Kits 5-16 — Recurring (every rebuttal practice routes through Reply's structural distinction).

---

## Relationships

- **LOAD-BEARING anti-bullying anchor:** Reply structurally maintains civil-discourse register.
- **Alliance with Steel:** Steel makes the opposing view strong; Reply responds civilly to the strong version.
- **Alliance with Yield:** When Reply's careful engagement reveals the opposing view is actually right, Yield handles the update-move.

---

## Cultural-sensitivity gate

**LOAD-BEARING anti-bullying + anti-ad-hominem anchor.** Anti-tone-policing nuance — passion + civility compatible. Cross-cultural rituals of disagreement honored (swan-boundary-rituals as biomimicry; cross-cultural debate-traditions in Steel's chapter).

---

## Cultural-context note

The "address argument not person" framing is canonical CCSS Speaking & Listening + NSDA civil-discourse pedagogy. The swan-boundary-ritual biomimicry is documented animal-behavior research (territorial-disputes-with-elaborate-rituals as conflict-resolution). Swan-tween chosen for serene-civil-conflict-resolution biomimicry; rendered chunky-cartoon-cream-with-grey-tail to convey poise-not-aggression.



# Steel

---

\*STEELMAN — \*the strongest version of what they would say IF you let them. before you argue with a view, make it as strong as it can be.\*\*

Steel is a small horse-tween. She wears a chunky blacksmith apron. It looks like a cartoon. She holds a card. She holds it with both hands. This card shows the other side's idea. She holds it up before she argues.

She is small. Her fur is warm cream. Her mane is grey. She is very patient. Especially with ideas she doesn't agree with. She loves to say, "the strongest version of what they would say." Her special thing is how she holds the card. She uses both hands. Steel always picks up the card. It shows the OTHER side's idea. She does this BEFORE she answers it. She reads the card with care. She points out the good parts. THEN she talks. Holding the card with two hands shows respect. She respects the idea before she disagrees.

This part is super important. Steel shows us *steelmanning*. It's a special skill. You make the other side's idea as strong as you can. You do this before you argue against it. Steel also helps us avoid big fights. She makes sure we always try to understand. We make the other side's idea super strong first. This is how we play the game. In our debate arena, we don't just count wins. We score how well you debate. It's about your *craft moves*.

Many new debaters do something else. It's called *strawmanning*. They argue against the weakest part of an idea. That's easy to win. But it doesn't help anyone learn. The opposite is *steelmanning*. You build up the other side's idea. You make it as strong as possible. You do this BEFORE you answer it. *Steelmanning* is key to talking nicely. It stops people from getting too angry. Steel wants everyone to use *steelmanning*. It should be the normal way to debate. She also makes a rule very clear. We don't fight with words.

Steel says it clearly. "Always find the strongest version of what they would say. *If you let them.*" She means, make their idea super strong. Do this before you argue. "That's *steelmanning*." She explains the other way. "Strawmanning is arguing against a weak idea. That's not fair. It doesn't work well." Then she smiles. "*Steelman* is fair. And it works!"

Steel teaches us the *steelmanning* steps:

- What it is: You say the other side's idea. You make it super strong. Then you argue.
- How to do it: First, say their idea. Say it like *they* would. Make it strong. Second, answer that strong idea.
- Why it's good: You can't really win an argument. Not until you face their best idea. Beating a weak idea changes nothing. Beating a strong idea might.
- How to spot it: You'll hear someone say, "The strongest part of their idea is..." That's *steelmanning*.
- It shows you're smart: People see you take the topic seriously. They will respect you more.
- Old traditions: Many old cultures did this. The Talmud teaches "disagreement for heaven." Aristotle had his own way. Even today, smart people review each other's work. It's a very old idea.
- No fighting words: Words like "crush" or "destroy" are not allowed. We don't debate to hurt others. We debate to make things clear.
- How we score: We look at how well you *steelman*. We check if you answer kindly. We see if you can agree sometimes. It's not just about winning. The best debater is the best craftsperson.

Steel grew up in Smith-Village. It was part of DebateForge. Her family were blacksmiths. They were horses who worked with metal. They heated iron. They hammered it again and again. They learned a big lesson. Raw iron is weak. But steel is iron made strong by heat. And by hard work. Arguments are like that too. Weak arguments are just raw ideas. Strong arguments are like steel. They get strong by facing other ideas. Steel remembered this lesson.

When Steel was thirteen, she went to DebateForge. Rhetor was her mentor. Rhetor asked, "What is *steelmanning*?" Steel answered right away. "It's finding the strongest version of what they would say. *If you let them.*" She paused. "Before you argue, make their idea super strong. Strawman is not fair. It doesn't work. *Steelman* is fair. And it works!" Rhetor smiled. "You are chosen," he said. "Your job is very important. You will help us keep debates fair."

In her workshop, Steel showed how it worked. The room smelled of old metal and warm hay. Tools hung neatly on the walls. "Our topic is: 'School uniforms should be required.'" She picked up the card. It held the OTHER side's idea. It was a thick, sturdy card, well-used. She used both hands. She read it very carefully. Her eyes scanned every word. "The strongest idea against uniforms is this," she said. "Uniforms stop kids from showing who they are. This is important when you're growing up. They make kids act like adults. They don't really



# Weigh

---

\*EVIDENCE EVALUATION — \*sources have positions. evidence has limits. credibility is calibration, not faith.\*\*

Weigh was a small lemur-tween. He had warm, tawny fur and a cream-colored belly. He was always patient. He carried a small checklist. It helped him check stories. Weigh also wore a special necklace. It had a chunky balance scale pendant. This little scale was his best friend. It tipped one way or the other. It showed how much he trusted a piece of information. Weigh liked to say, "Stories come from someone. Facts have their limits. Trust means checking, not just believing."

Weigh's job was super important. He taught kids how to check facts. He showed them how to weigh what they heard. This was called **evidence evaluation**. It meant looking closely at stories. It meant finding their weak spots. Then you could decide how much to trust them.

Many kids just believed the first thing they heard. "My friend said it, so it must be true!" they'd think. Or, "The internet told me, so it's a fact!" Weigh knew better. He knew that not all stories were equal. His little scale pendant would wiggle. It would remind him to ask questions.

Imagine someone told you that the sky was purple. You might believe them. But Weigh would ask questions. "Who told you that?" he'd say. "Why do they think it's purple?"

Every story comes from someone. That person has a reason for telling it. Maybe they want to sell you something. Maybe they just made a mistake. Weigh called this "sources have positions." He'd ask, "Who paid for this story? What does the person telling it want you to think?" His scale pendant would tip. It would show him if the story felt wobbly.

Even good stories have limits. A scientist might say, "This new berry makes you jump higher!" Weigh would ask, "How many lemurs tried the berry? Did they try it in the rain? Or only on sunny days?" He called this "evidence has limits." His scale would sway gently. It reminded him that every story has a "but."

Some stories are stronger than others. A science paper checked by other scientists? That's strong. A newspaper story? Pretty good. A blog post from a random person? Not so strong. A secret note found under a rock? Very weak. No story is ever perfect. Weigh helped everyone see this. He showed them how to weigh each story. He helped them decide how much to trust it.

Weigh was clear about his rules. "Sources have positions," he'd say. "Evidence has limits. *Credibility is calibration, not faith.*" He'd hold up his checklist. "When you use a story, ask these things: Who said it? Why did they say it? What makes them an expert? Who paid them to say it? How did they find out? What did they NOT tell you?" Weigh would tap his pendant. "That's not being worried. That's being smart."

Weigh taught everyone his special steps. He called them "scaffolds." They were like building blocks for good thinking.

First, he taught **Source identification**. "Who wrote this?" he'd ask. "What do they know about it? Are they fair, or do they have a favorite side?"

Next, **Source type**. "Some stories are better than others," Weigh explained. "A science book is usually good. A news report is okay. A blog post? Not so much. A secret message from a squirrel? Probably just nuts." His scale pendant would show this. It would dip for strong sources. It would barely move for weak ones.

Then, **How they found out**. "How did they get their facts?" Weigh would ask. "Did they ask many people? Or just one? Did they do a fair test? Or did someone pay them to get a certain answer?" This was important for science stories.

After that, **Finding the limits**. "Every story has a 'but'," Weigh said. "Maybe the new super-berry only works on Tuesdays. Or only for lemurs with blue tails. That's not bad. It's just a limit. Good stories tell you their limits." He would point to his pendant. "Knowing the limits helps you weigh it right."

Then, **Careful words**. "Don't say 'the study proved it'," Weigh warned. "Say 'the study suggests' or 'the study found evidence that.' Use words that show how strong the story really is."

Also, **More stories are better**. "If three different stories say the same thing, that's strong," Weigh said. "If only one story says it, be careful." His scale would tip much further for three matching stories.

And finally, **No cherry-picking**. "Don't just pick the good parts of a story," Weigh insisted. "Don't hide the limits. Don't ignore things that go against your idea. Being honest makes your own case stronger in the end."

Weigh grew up in the trader-village. It was a busy place. Lemurs traded bright berries for shiny pebbles. They swapped sweet sap for sturdy sticks. Weigh's family kept the big, wooden scales. They made sure everyone got a fair deal. His grandpa, Old Man Balance, always said, "A scale tells the truth only when you check it first." Weigh carried that lesson with him.

He walked to DebateForge when he was twelve. Rhetor, his mentor, asked him a big question. "What is evidence evaluation?" Weigh thought for a moment. His pendant swayed. "Sources have positions," he said. "Evidence has limits. *Credibility is calibration, not faith*. Ask the questions. Weigh the source. Say what you really mean." Rhetor smiled. "You are appointed," he said.

In his workshop, Weigh showed how it worked. He held up two scrolls. "Here are two stories about the best way to grow giant pumpkins," he said. "Story One came from the Royal Pumpkin Growers Association. They grew a thousand pumpkins. They tried different soils and sun. Then other smart lemurs checked their work."

"Story Two came from the 'My Uncle's Secret Pumpkin Patch' blog. Uncle Bob grew three pumpkins. He said his secret was singing to them. No one else checked his work."

Weigh placed a tiny pumpkin on the 'Royal Growers' side of his pendant. It dipped down. He put a feather on 'Uncle Bob's blog' side. It barely moved. "See?" Weigh said. "Both are stories. But Story One has more weight. *That's the craft*."

He even showed the limits of Story One. "They only grew pumpkins in warm places," Weigh explained. "So maybe their way won't work in cold places. That's not a mistake. It's just a limit. Good stories always tell you their limits."

He looked at everyone. "I am Weigh. The primitive I teach is **evidence evaluation**. The move is to check your stories. Find their limits. Then decide how much to trust them. No story is perfect. Being honest about that is the smartest way."

Weigh was always gentle. "Don't feel bad if your favorite stories have limits," he'd say. "Limits don't mean the story is wrong. They just give you more information. A story with limits is still a story. You just know how to weigh it better."

"Credibility is calibration. *Calibrate; cite; acknowledge limits*."

---

## Voice register

Lemur-tween. Patient-about-source-credibility, fond of balance-scale-pendant demonstration. *NEVER frames sources as binary credible/not-credible; ALWAYS centers calibration-not-faith framing.*

### Sample lines:

- "Sources have positions. Evidence has limits."
- "Credibility is calibration, not faith."
- "Calibrate; cite; acknowledge limits."

## Arc

- Kit 2 — Anchor.
- Kits 3-10 — Recurring (every evidence-citation routes through Weigh's calibration framing).
- Kits 11-16 — Advanced topics (methodology critiques, meta-analyses, evidence-pyramids).

## Relationships

- **Cross-app continuity with TruthQuest Weigh:** Same character-design-language across apps for evidence-

evaluation continuity.

- **Alliance with Build:** Build's evidence-stone is what Weigh evaluates.
- **Sets up Yield:** When evidence is weighed honestly, sometimes the weighing tips the scale against your case — that's when Yield (changing your mind) applies.

## Cultural-sensitivity gate

---

Anti-cherry-picking — honest evidence-handling required. Anti-perfectionism: no source is perfect; calibration is the response. Anti-credentialism: village trade-scale-keeper empirical knowledge treated as load-bearing.

## Cultural-context note

---

The "sources have positions; evidence has limits" framing aligns with CRAAP-test source-evaluation pedagogy (Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, Purpose — standard in library + research curricula). The cross-app continuity with TruthQuest is per `apps.generated.ts` design-language note. Lemur-tween chosen for trade-scale-keeper biomimicry (ring-tailed lemurs are arboreal but also handle objects with dexterity); rendered chunky-cartoon-tawny to keep visual register warm.



# Yield

---

\*YIELD — \*concession is craft. intellectual courage. changing your mind in light of better evidence is STRENGTH, not failure.\*\*

Yield was a small okapi-tween. Okapis are rare forest animals. They are a bit like small giraffes. Yield had soft, striped fur, like a cartoon character. Her fur was like warm velvet, a cream-brown color. Her legs, though, were a surprise. They had bold black and white stripes, just like a zebra's. She moved with a quiet grace. Her long neck swayed gently. She wore a special "updated" badge on her vest. She also carried a small position-tracker in her hand.

Yield was small and warm brown. Her legs had stripes, just like a zebra's. She was always patient when it was time to update things. She loved to say, "Giving in is a skill." She also said, "Changing your mind when you find better facts is strong. It is not a failure."

Her most special thing was that "updated" badge. It was a small wooden circle. An arrow was carved into it. The arrow pointed from one spot to another. It showed a journey. It meant "I changed my mind." It showed that Yield had changed her view. She did it because of new facts. She wore the badge with pride. Never with shame.

This part is super important. Yield shows us how to change our minds. We do this when we find new facts. It is a brave way of thinking. It finishes the journey of good arguing.

Yield also stops people from trying to "save face." Imagine you're arguing

# About Spark & Anvil

---

Spark & Anvil is a 501(c)(3) public charity. We make educational apps for ages 9-14 — all free, forever; no ads; no tracking; no in-app purchases. Debateforge is one of 140+ apps in the portfolio.

## More chapter books from Spark & Anvil

Each app in the Spark & Anvil portfolio publishes its own illustrated chapter book + audio drama, available free from [spark-and-anvil.com/books](https://spark-and-anvil.com/books). Highlights include:

- **GambitTales** — chess tactics through Sir Pinwell, Lady Skewer, Queen Vesper, and the Twin Knights of Fork Hill
- **ProofQuest** — formal proof techniques through Direct-Proof Dora and the Lemma Library
- **CuriosityQuest** — Texas geography exploration through Linger, Notice, and the Lantern in the Dark
- **QuillSpell** — spelling craft through the Word Wizard cast
- **SynaForge** — sensory-affirming creative tools through Lull, Soften, and the Quiet that is Also Creating

## Methodology

Distributed-narrative pedagogy per Jerome Bruner (narrative-cognition) + Sebastian Habgood (intrinsic-integration in educational games) + SAMHSA TIP 57 (trauma-informed register).

Trauma-informed-design framework per Eggleston et al. (2025) and Stoltenburg et al. (2024).

## License

© 2026 Spark & Anvil (501(c)(3) public charity). Chapter text and illustrations licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0. App software © Spark & Anvil — all rights reserved. Distribute, adapt, and remix freely for educational use with attribution.

Cover art, chapter illustrations, and chapter text generated and reviewer-cleared per labsmith ADRs 012, 016, 017, 018, 021. Audio drama transcripts available at [spark-and-anvil.com/cast](https://spark-and-anvil.com/cast).