

*Newton v. Leibniz, Part 2*

By now you know the role your team is to play in this classic debate. It's time to put some work into building those roles!

Between now and Friday, March 27th, your team will be asked to spend your time reading up on the history of the debate: who made what claims? Who said what, and to whom? Who was where, and when? What mathematics was involved, and does the math help shed light on just who it was who made the respective discoveries?

Meanwhile, I expect that each team will focus on issues of particular importance to the role you've been asked to play. What issues might your team consider? Below are some examples. (This is *not* meant to be an exhaustive list: be inventive, feel free to deepen and broaden your study as you feel suitable!)

- **The litigants and their legal teams.** These teams should focus on evidence that will build their case: ideas that were published or clearly expressed, letters to colleagues, presentations (if any), historical evidence suggesting discovery. Be sure to understand the mathematical basis of your respective scientist's system carefully. Whoever it is that your team picks to play the role of the litigant should be ready to *be* that person during the trial.
- **The sets of colleagues.** These teams should focus their attention on learning about the people making up the sets of colleagues: who are these people? What relationship did they share with the litigants? What ideas did they share? What evidence can they offer in support of their respective friends?
- **The team of experts.** Each of these teams should focus on particular type of evidence they've been asked to evaluate, learning both sides of the issue whenever possible. The historical experts might wish to concentrate on details like correspondences, visits, timelines: who said what to whom, and when and where? The mathematical experts might wish to more fully understand the mathematical systems developed by the litigating parties: how does Leibniz's system differ from Newton's, and how is it the same? What evidence is there that there was "theft" or "borrowing," or is there really any such evidence? Remember that you might be called to the stand, so you should be ready for that eventuality.
- **The jury.** The two teams making up the jury have the obligation to develop as well-rounded a viewpoint as possible: learn all that you can about the debate and the issues surrounding it. You will not be allowed to "object" during the trial, so the information you learn may not come up immediately when we take this action to court, but your knowledge about the issue will help you render a well-thought-out verdict after the trial has ended.

## What I need from you.

At the end of this step, the last before the trial occurs on Monday, March 30th, your team will be asked to submit a **single, 3-4 page** document, as indicated below.

- **The litigants and their legal teams.** These teams must submit briefs clearly indicating
  - the arguments the team intends to use in trial,
  - evidence it will use in order to bolster its claim, and
  - witnesses it will call to the stand in order to make their case more strongly.

This information should appear in narrative form, with justification given where necessary: how do you feel the evidence you're bringing into play is relevant? Why should such a person be called to the stand?

- **The sets of colleagues.** Each team of colleagues should submit a letter of support for their respective colleague, indicating any evidence they feel is relevant to the case at hand. The letter should take the form of a co-authored persuasive narrative in which each party to the letter offers his support for his friend.
- **The team of experts.** Your team should produce a report summarizing the historical and mathematical findings arrived at after extensive research has been completed. These reports should include a careful scrutiny of the historical and mathematical evidence at hand. If the team desires, it may wish to render an opinion as to which litigants has greatest claim to discovering calculus, but this is not necessary, and is neither encouraged or discouraged.
- **The jury.** Each team of jurors should submit a report indicating their initial inclination: do you favor one side or the other? Or perhaps you feel both sides have made equally strong arguments? Your report should indicate any relevant evidence, describing carefully how you analyzed the evidence and what weight you gave to it.

**All** of the teams' documents should include **clear, correctly formatted** citations. Any accepted style is appropriate (for instance, MLA or APA); see me for more information on these. Also, **any internet sources** must be approved by me before you make use of them: the quality of information contained on the internet is often highly suspect. I reserve the right to disallow sources I deem disreputable.

For now, have at it! Remember: have fun, be creative! As long as you don't rewrite history, I hope that you'll take every step that you need to to make the history an engaging and exciting one, and to use your own voice in telling this tale.

Please come to me with any and all questions about this step: don't put them off if you've got 'em! Remember that the second document, described above, is due at 5:00 p.m. on *Friday, March 27th*. Sometime well before then I will handout a description of the way the trial will be organized, so that you may adequately prepare for it.