Beginner's Practical Guide to Policy Debate

For Middle School and Novice Debaters

Formerly titled as *The Super-Novice File: A Guide to Entry-Level Policy Debate.*

By Ryan Childress

Edited by Molly Bunton

Advised by Tracy Dalton, Missouri State University

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Super-Novice File: A Guide to Entry-Level Policy Debate

By Ryan Childress

This manual identifies persuasive public speaking, professional presentation, and policy debate argumentation skills for entry-level high school policy debaters wanting a better understanding and application of policy debate arguments. Male debaters should wear a suit and tie that is not excessively colorful for debate rounds. Female debaters should also wear a skirt or pant suit, depending on their coach's preference. Debaters need to format their arguments by stating the argument they are attacking, indicating the quantity of responses they have, and then giving their responses. Gestures, such as the indication gesture, should be used to provide emphasis to certain arguments made. Debaters need to speak slowly, clearly, with pauses, and with pitch variation. The posture of a good debater involves standing feet shoulder-width apart with the knees slightly bent and the chin parallel to the ground. Tools for researching using popular search engines are discussed, as well as ways to limit searches to the precise information debaters are looking for. Using syntax operators, such as quotes, AND, OR, and the asterisk (*) symbol help limit the searches performed on internet search engines. Building an affirmative case means deciding what type of case to use (comparative advantage, problem/solution, or goals). Further, debaters need to use a paragraph plan text as opposed to a plan plank format. Negative teams need to develop a coherent strategy that involves solvency attacks, disadvantages, and topicality arguments, if applicable. Topicality arguments must have a definition, violation, standards to prefer the interpretation, and reasons why the argument is a voting issue. Disadvantages include uniqueness, link, and impact evidence.

Keywords: policy debate, affirmative case, disadvantage, topicality.

Acknowledgements

The manual you are about to read is a compilation of seven years of listening. I had the special privilege of being taught by some of the best coaches in the country. The knowledge contained in this manual comes from them. You will notice very few source citations. It is because I honestly cannot remember who taught me which part. All I can say is that I should be given little, if any, credit for these arguments. I am not the creator of them. I am merely the vehicle through which these messages travel.

I would first like to thank Mr. David Watkins, the Director of Forensics at Neosho High School. His constant dedication to debate and overwhelming support for me personally has been one of the biggest influences in my life. If I graduate from college, I will be the first in my entire family to ever attain a Bachelor degree. I do not know what you saw in me Mr. Watkins; but whatever it was, it changed my life forever. You have been one of the greatest influences in my life. I will never forget what you did for me.

I would also like to thank Dr. Eric Morris, Dr. Heather Walters, Director and Assistant Director of Forensics at Missouri State University. Their dedication and sheer strategic genius taught me a level of understanding of debate I never thought possible. Your ability to craft specific strategies into complex arguments impresses even the best debaters. Thank you for all your time and wisdom.

This book would also not exist without the kind donation of Mr. Michael Kearney, former high school and collegiate debater turned Assistant Coach for Missouri State University. He wrote the comparative advantage case located in Appendix B of this manual. His kindness and sheer genius has taken him far and is always much appreciated.

I would also like to thank Mrs. Nancy Wedgeworth, Director of Forensics for Parkview High School. As an esteemed coach in Missouri and at the national level, Mrs. Wedgeworth has put together an impressive group of debaters at Parkview High School. Her love for her debaters extends far beyond the typical coach-debater relationship. She has been a great personal inspiration to me and has graciously allowed me to be her assistant through most of my undergraduate career. This has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life that words scarcely begin to describe.

Finally, I would like to thank the debaters of Parkview High School. I am blown away every time I watch your rounds; you really are one of the best squads in the country. On top of that, each one of you is an excellent person. I look forward to seeing you every time I go to Parkview. You make me happy, even when my days are less than great. Thank you for letting me be a part of your life.

This manual is for all of you. I hope others can add to it and make it better. I just want to thank all of you one more time, for everything.

Love Always,

Ryan

Introduction

Debate is an instrumental skill. In all situations, one must know how to present their ideas and, most importantly, defend them. The ability to present and defend your arguments is a skill necessary in casual conversation as well as job acquisition and advancement.

It strikes me as very strange that in this very complex, life-changing activity there are only two rules: speech times and speech orders. Everything else in any debate is what you can get away with (M. Bostick, personal communication, 30 August 2005). For example, you may be limited in how long and in what sequence you may speak, but nobody in high school debate can stand up during your speech and stop you. You are free to say and do, within legal limits, what is best for your team.

The other fascinating part of this activity is the variety of ways to win a debate round. As a personal example, two of my close friends debated a team our junior year of high school at a debate tournament in Kansas City, Missouri, that had three unrelated ideas in their plan. The problem with this particular **case** was the affirmative team told the judge to pick her favorite idea. My friends ran several **disadvantages**, all based on the theory that one of their ideas would link to the argument.

Later, my partner and I **hit** the same team. Instead of arguing disadvantages, my partner and I argued that their plan was abusive and we were unable to develop a proper strategy given they advocated three completely different ideas. Both my friends and my partner and I won that round. We had completely different approaches, yet we still won. Debate will teach you many things, but most importantly, it teaches you there is more than one way to do something right.

This manual identifies persuasive public speaking, professional presentation, and policy debate argumentation skills for entry-level high school policy debaters wanting a better understanding and application of policy debate arguments.

Unit 1—Public Speaking and Presentation Fundamentals

Before you can step into a debate round, there are several things you need to know. Much of the debating you will do starts long before you walk into the room and ends long after the round is over. General etiquette, coupled with proper dress and demeanor, often say much more in debate rounds than the arguments you deliver.

Dress Etiquette

The specific dress varies from location to location. Further, dress varies between what is acceptable for men as opposed to what is acceptable for women. As general rule, present yourself in the "most conservative and professional manner" (Robert, 2007). In debate rounds, the judges need to be focusing more on what you are saying than the eccentricity of your wardrobe.

Men should always wear a suit. These suits should not attract too much attention, so a color such as black, navy, or gray would be acceptable. Shirts should have a fair amount of starch, but not come directly from the dryer. White shirts should be white as opposed to off-white or yellow (Roberts, 2007). Finally, "Men's ties should be seen and not heard" (Robert, 2007).   Men should strive for dark, neutral colors when preparing for a debate. Exotic suits, shirts, and ties typically distract the judges and make the person wearing them appear immature.

Women are also encouraged to wear a suit. Similar rules of color apply, which means a dark color, such as black, navy, or gray, would be preferred. Women should not wear large, exotic jewelry, but instead should wear jewelry that is small, manageable, and makes one look professional. If choosing a skirt, make sure it is "at knee length" (Roberts, 2007). Finally, women need to wear pantyhose with shoes that have heels (Roberts, 2007).

Another important topic for women is the decision to wear a skirt or a pant suit. Women are increasingly wearing pant suits in the professional world. As a debater, your decision to wear a skirt or a pant suit depends on two factors: your coach and your event. If your coach prefers a skirt, obey the wishes of your coach. If your coaches allow pant suits, consider your activity. For example, extemporaneous speakers would probably not move around very much and a skirt would therefore be appropriate. Actors performing humorous interpretations, on the other hand, may move around more and should therefore consider clothing that is less revealing in certain situations.

Posture

Now that you are appropriately dressed, you are almost ready to begin your speech. A judge usually notices first the way you dress, then how you stand. Whenever you stand up to give a speech, imagine that you are in front of Congress. The individuals in the crowd represent your fellow legislators. How would you address such a prestigious body? By leaning on the podium and bouncing up and down? I hope not.

Appropriate posture first takes into account a comfortable stance. The tendency of most debaters is to lock their knees. Do not do this because you could pass out! Instead, bend your knees slightly so the bulk of your weight rests on your thighs instead of your knees. Make sure your feet are shoulder-width apart. Your back should be straight instead of slouching. Your chin should be parallel to the floor so you maintain strong eye contact. Finally, one hand should be at your side with the other holding the evidence you plan to present to the judges.

Speaking

Debaters will win and lose rounds based on how well they speak. Delivering a debate speech is not easy. There are several tactics one can use which improve not only the quality of the speech, but also one's overall professional demeanor.

The first mistake I notice most in a speech is when someone uses a voice other than their natural voice. I admit that I did the same thing. For some reason, there is an unspoken belief that debaters should use a high-pitched voice when speaking. Using a high-pitched voice significantly erodes the natural qualities of the voice. This high-pitched voice makes all debaters sound the same. Be different. Use your natural voice instead of a high-pitched variation of it.

Another common mistake among debaters is speaking too quickly. Especially in policy debate, many assume that judges are comfortable with a faster pace. This could not be farther from the truth. Most of your judges will know less about debate than you. Given the complexity of not only the style of debate but also the arguments presented in a round, one should exercise caution and speak at a slow-to-moderate pace.

Clarity is also important. Gum is a problem that should be removed before speaking. Further, debaters should try their hardest to say difficult words clearly and at a natural pace. Words like antidisestablishmentarianism, succinctly, utilitarianism, and others should be practiced so they are smoothly delivered.

Pauses are also a very important issue when delivering a speech. Some debaters pause too often. For example, pausing at each—and every—word—makes—the speech—difficult—to—follow. Instead, one should pause at natural locations in text, such as commas, periods used at the end of a sentence, and so forth. Pauses can also be used for emphasis on certain words. An example of this would be pausing at the end of a great piece of evidence to give a dramatic effect. Pauses often emphasize certain words and concepts that, if read normally, would lose their effect.

The final issue concerning voice is pitch variation. Debaters should practice vocal inflection when they read evidence. Inflection accomplishes two goals. First, it prevents debaters from becoming monotone. How many times have you fallen asleep during class because the teacher rambled on in the same voice without ever changing pitch? Assume your judges are like you and want to be entertained. Entertain them by using a variety of pitches.

Inflection also displays a level of interest. If I am judging two teams and one team is inflecting and looks like they want to be there while the other team looks half-asleep, I will be inclined to vote for the excited

team. Remember, your judges are people too. They will take into account factors like excitement, manners, and other cues that may be irrelevant to the topic but important to presentation.

Appropriate Gestures

Proper speaking is an excellent way to deliver a great speech. But speaking only involves your mouth. What about the rest of your body? There are several strategies you can implement to increase the effectiveness of the speech you are delivering by using proper gestures.

The first method a debater can use to improve speaking quality is to emphasize appropriate words with gestures. Several gestures can be used. A common gesture is using your fingers to indicate numbers of something, such as a list. An example of this would be reading a list and correspondingly using your fingers, with your palm facing the judge and your wrist perpendicular to the ground, to indicate a numerical quantity.

Another great gesture to use is what I call the "indication" gesture. Whenever you are giving a speech and you make reference to the judge, the common tendency is to point straight at the judge. Avoid pointing because it is such a direct, harsh gesture. Instead, connect all your fingers and turn your wrist over so that the inside of your hand is facing the ceiling. Then, reach your hand towards the judge with the tips of your fingers pointed at approximately a 45 degree angle with the ground. This is a more polite way of indicating that the argument you are making is to be directed to the person sitting in the back of the room.

A good portion will be devoted to judge adaptation later. However, remember that most of what you do depends on the judge you have. Think about pizza. Pizza comes with many flavors to satisfy different needs. For vegetarians, there are pizza options that exclude meat. For people who love meat, there are options to accommodate them. The point is that people order pizza based on their preferences. Imagine that you are the server waiting on the customers eating at the pizza restaurant. The only catch is that you do not know what they want to order, but instead, must guess based on their reactions to your arguments. We will get into some general suggestions later, but for now, just understand that following the basics will help you get very far.

Unit II–Argument Construction and Development

Every sport has a main weapon that the opponents use in order to win the competition. For tennis, there are rackets. For golf, there are clubs. For debate, there are arguments. The ability to incorporate graphic images into thoroughly analyzed arguments is a skill few master and many wish they knew how to do. Further, the ability to state an argument and then develop it throughout the round is an imperative skill in policy debate.

You may be wondering how to create an argument. To begin with, there are three basic ways to refute an argument: deny, diminish, disbar. The basic strategy behind an argument is to refute, in some way, what the other person is saying. This does not mean you need to argue with everything your opponents are saying. More than likely, you will agree on some points. Debates are about the points on which the two teams disagree.

Deny

The first strategy in refuting an argument is to deny it. This means saying the argument is not true or lacks reasonable proof. A classic example concerns the sky. If your opponents looked at you in the middle of debate round and said, "The sky is not blue, it's pink." What would your reaction be? Obviously, you would immediately retort by saying, "The sky is in fact blue." You could prove this by simply looking out a window. This is an example of a denial. One team claimed the sky was pink and was wrong because the sky is blue, not pink.

Diminish

In some cases, you will be unable to deny an argument. The argument may not be as clear as the example with sky color. In this case, you should not deny something simply to deny it. You should try to diminish the argument. Diminishing an argument means showing that the argument is not as severe or as important as the other team might claim. For example, assume your opponents read a piece of evidence saying national security is in jeopardy because two knives were taken from a passenger boarding an airplane. Does the fact that two knives were seized at one airport in the entire country mean national security is threatened? The answer is probably no. Diminish this argument by saying two knives, both of which were seized by the authorities, do not jeopardize national security.

Disbar

The final strategy against an argument is to disbar it. Disbarring an argument means an argument has no relevance or bearing in the debate round. For example, if your opponents started describing their favorite pizza when the debate was supposed to be about the death penalty, the argument about pizza would be moot. A person's favorite pizza in no way relates to the death penalty. Therefore, you could disbar the argument, claiming it is not relevant. Not all examples are as clear-cut as this one. However, if the argument does not fit into the debate round, disbar it.

These are the three basic ways to attack an argument. However, an argument is only as good as the judge's understanding of it. That is why clear wording of an argument is vital to your ability to persuade your judges.

Clear Wording of Arguments

Experts in the field of communication devote books to this topic. However, for purposes of this discussion, the highlights of the concept will be addressed. Remember, judges are people too. They will notice debaters glancing over arguments they should be focusing on.

The first strategy someone should take when phrasing an argument is to keep it simple. Arguments can become unnecessarily complicated when debaters assume their vocabulary needs to be complex. This is not the case. Just because you understand the words you are using does not mean the judge will. Often, judges are overwhelmed at the idea of judging an activity they know nothing about. This phenomenon is compounded when they know little about the topic and the vocabulary is beyond their comprehension. At this point, judges simply give up. Do not make judges give up; instead, make your wording of arguments simple.

Take into account this example. If you are arguing about the death penalty and your opponents say, "Recidivism rates in American prisons compounded with an exponentially growing population properly leads one to conclude that unnecessary government intervention in an overly hierarchical institution furthers the monolithic power of the federal government." If you know what that means, good for you. I am not convinced I fully understand that sentence. Imagine what a judge unfamiliar with debate would say. This argument could be shortened to say, "The number of persons returning to prisons combined with the structure of the government means the government has too much influence inside prisons." This argument is simpler, and judges appreciate simplicity as opposed to complexity.

Proper Procedure for Attacking Arguments

Despite popular belief, there is a proper procedure for attacking arguments. Whenever you are refuting an argument, you need to follow four steps. First, state your original argument. Then, briefly state the opponent's argument. Third, identify the number of responses you have to the argument. Fourth, give your arguments.

Here is a classic example of an inappropriate way to attack arguments. If a debater says, "Well, umm, they like, said they weren't going to take away the death penalty in one of their speeches. That's just not cool." Not only will judges question your intelligence, they will be thoroughly confused.

Instead, give an argument that sounds more like, "My partner and I originally stated that the death penalty should be removed from America as a form of capital punishment. The negative team stated we should keep the death penalty. To counter this argument, I have two responses. First, the death penalty is an unnecessary form of punishment. Second, the death penalty executes a disproportionate number of minorities, making it a racially bias form of punishment." This example is much clearer and judges will be pleased with your clarity.

Now you should have a grasp on how to state and clearly refute an argument made by your opponent. This is an excellent skill for a debater at any level. However, sometimes, you will need more than just your wits to refute an argument. You may need evidence from experts in the field to answer some of the claims made by your opponents. This is where debaters are separated based on who has the facts and who does not.

Unit III–Research

Debaters need to know how to research. There will come a point in your career when you are in a serious time crunch and need to locate something quickly. Most debate research now takes place online, and, thankfully, there are a few search engines that are overwhelmingly helpful.

Syntax Operators

The internet is much like a double-edged sword for debaters. On one hand, a debater has infinite access to a wealth of knowledge. On the other hand, the amount of information available often creates a needle in a haystack situation where debaters cannot find what they are looking for and give up. Luckily there are ways to eliminate information researchers do not wish to include in their search. These tools have been named syntax operators. Basically, these commands are a series of codes that tell the internet what to look for.

Different search engines vary on whether they accept certain syntax operators. However, there are some universal commands that instruct search engines in similar ways. Figure one shows a generally accepted list of commands that debaters should learn to use in their quest for evidence.

Figure One – Table of Syntax Operator Research Commands

Command	Example	Result
Quote Marks ""	"Death Penalty"	Articles with the exact phrase death penalty
AND	United AND States	Articles with both United and States
OR	Jelly OR Jam	Articles with the either the word jelly or jam
* Asterisk	Eat*	Articles with the word eat, eating, eater, eatery

These command combinations are endless and you do not have to stick to just one. For example, you could type "United States" AND Japan OR Germany OR England AND econom*. This entry would return articles containing the exact phrase United States and possibly Japan, Germany, and/or England, along with the word or words economy, economics, and/or economist. As you can see, there are many ways to limit a search. The best way to research is to practice, so use these commands, Good luck finding what you need.

Google

Debate begins and ends with Google. This search engine has revolutionized the way debaters locate evidence. Within Google, there are a number of functions one can use that are very helpful when locating evidence.

Cached Function

The cached function is a tool offered by Google that highlights the search terms you entered in the article you are about to review. So, for example, let's assume you entered the search term, "death penalty." By clicking the cached button, Google will highlight the phrase "death penalty" every time it appears in the article.

The cached button is located underneath almost all of the links to websites on Google. The cached button is located right after the full address of the website you are about to enter. The following example shows you exactly where the cached button is located on most links.

EXCLUSIVE - Baumgartner Out Of Jail, Judge Reverses Himself On ...

The Supreme Court has ruled that if a defendant is **denied** the right to counsel, **...** A botched waiver does not **diminish** or alter that right, **...**
www.northcountrygazette.org/articles/071706JudgeReverses.html - 27k - Cached - Similar pages

HTML for .pdf Documents

If the document you are working on is a .pdf document (i.e., an Adobe Acrobat document), you will need to click the "View as HTML" link to see the cached function of this document. However, clicking the View as HTML button means the document will no longer be separated based on its original page numbers. Consult your coach for his or her preference on this issue.

Immediately following the file designation is where the View as HTML hyperlink is found. Clicking this will highlight the search terms you entered in the search bar. The following example shows you exactly where it is located.

Supreme Court of Florida

File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML
Board's recommendation and **deny** J.J.T. readmission to the bar at this time. In
1992, J.J.T. was **disbarred** after pleading guilty to charges of unlawful **...**
www.floridasupremecourt.org/decisions/pre2004/ops/sc96477.pdf - Similar pages

To the best of my knowledge, the two previously mentioned research tools are mainly used in Google. Other research engines may utilize different functions, and those known will be addressed later. There is a general function one can use that should work in almost all situations.

Ctrl + F

Assuming you do not like either of the previously discussed methods, or are using a search engine other than Google, there is another way to quickly locate any term: Ctrl + F. This key combination accesses the find function. Holding the control key and pressing the F key will bring up the Find dialog box. Here, you can enter whatever term or numbers you want and the internet browser you are using will locate those terms if they are present.

There may be variations to both the syntax operators and the control + F key combination based on the search engine and the internet browser you are using. For Google, Microsoft Internet Explorer, and Mozilla FireFox, the above research tips are known to be effective.

Last Modified Date Command

These three methods cover the possibilities for locating text within an article. There is another command that can be used that discovers the last time a page was modified. Before you enter this command into every website address bar that lacks a date, be careful. All this command does is show the last time a page was modified `in any way`. As a general rule of thumb, if it is not the exact time of the exact day you entered it, you can trust this command. Consult your coach if there is any concern. The command to be entered into the search bar is javascript:alert(document.lastModified). Type this command into the address bar exactly as it appears here and press enter. You will the notice a dialog box that identifies the last time the page you are currently viewing was modified in any way.

Other Search Engines

Google is not the only search engine on the internet. Despite Google's popularity, some debaters prefer other websites. Another common search engine is Lexis-Nexis. Some high schools have Lexis-Nexis as part of their library research package. Most do not. This is a very powerful search engine that looks at many different publications. Findarticles.com is also popular, but I have found its results very similar to Google. Usa.gov is the government's official website. For anything related to the government, I would examine this website to see what information is available to the public.

Specialized Think Tank Sites

Depending on your political beliefs, you may want to examine a few of the specialized think-tank sites that exist. For conservative ideas, I would strongly encourage the Cato Institute (www.cato.org) and the Heritage Foundation (www.heritage.org). These are two websites that employ Ph.D. level experts in various fields to conduct research and publish that research in the form of scholarly research papers. These papers are very well supported and offer great analysis on public policy topics. Another website that seems to be somewhat neutral is the economist.com. Particularly, this website offers small paragraph statements called backgrounders that are very general and help you get acquainted with your topic. Again, these websites typically publish articles that are written from one vantage point. Consider this whenever you are citing evidence from these sites.

If you are interested in consulting think tank sites, the list below suggests several think tank sites that offer varying views on many prevalent policy debate issues:

- American Enterprise Institute

- Brookings Institution

- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

- Center for Defense Information Center for Strategic and International Studies

- International Center for Economic Growth

- Progressive Policy Institute

- Rand Corporation

- United States Institute of Peace (Library, 2005)

Now that you know how to research, your next question is what you should be researching. This varies from topic to topic and from location to location. I would strongly recommend a general overview of the topic before starting. Just type in some key words from the resolution and read the articles. There are some general tips, and those will be discussed next.

Start Looking for Solvency Evidence

The best research tip available for any debater is to begin with solvency. Generally, experts in the various fields the topic falls under will have researched the problems and will advocate solutions based on that research. This is where your search should begin. Once you find the solution, that evidence will help identify what problems exist and how those problems can be fixed.

Solvency evidence also helps generate ideas for **plan** text. If you know what area of the topic you want your case to focus on but are unaware of a solution, searching for solvency evidence will help you determine a plan that has been researched and is supported by experts in the field.

The final advantage to starting with solvency evidence is that it helps determine plan feasibility. If the plan is a good idea, and there are authors who support it, the plan is still not complete. The plan needs to be workable within current society. If, for some reason, the plan is not workable, then the plan is not the best choice for the current system.

To start looking for solvency evidence, use search terms like eradicate, eliminate, fix, alleviate, change, promote, revamp, and others coupled with the problem area you want to focus on. An example search for the current topic of health in Sub-Saharan Africa could say the following:

> eradicate OR eliminate OR alleviate OR fix OR solve OR change AND "water quality" AND "Sub-Saharan Africa

Research is an important skill for any field. Once you find evidence, it is important that you develop a way to organize the evidence for quick retrieval in rounds. You need to not only know what your evidence

says, but you also need to know where to find it. Organizing your evidence is very important, and this is discussed next.

Unit IV–Identification and Organization of Evidence

Given changing software, this manual includes the ways to organize evidence based on Microsoft Word 2003 and Microsoft Word 2007. Bear in mind that the basic concepts in both will be the same. The only thing changing is the location of the commands used to organize the evidence. Also, please remember that there are many ways to organize evidence. These tips will help you develop a method you are comfortable with.

Before we get into the organization of evidence, you need to understand how to properly cite evidence and create taglines. A tagline is an argumentative, one sentence summary of what the evidence is saying. Taglines are the arguments you state that the evidence supports. We are going to walk through the process of finding a piece of evidence, citing it properly, and then formatting it to get the argument we want out of it.

Source Citations

A safe rule for source citations in debate is the more, the merrier. What this means is you will never get into trouble for getting too much information. The bare minimum for a source citation should be the publication and date (e.g., New York Times, August 18, 2005). However, there is much more information to include than just the publication and the date. The proper format for debate source citations is as follows:

> Author's name, Author's qualifications. Publication. Page # (if applicable). Date. Website (if found online). Access date (if found online).

The evidence used below would have the following source citation:

> Death Penalty Information Center, a non-profit research organization that supplies the media with information about capital punishment. "Public opinion: Poll reveals Marylanders prefer life without parole over death penalty." 2007. Accessed online at www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/article.php?did=2496&scid=64 on October 30, 2007.

In debate rounds, it has become vogue to read the "last name" and "date" during rounds. For certain judges, this is very appropriate. However, for judges unfamiliar with debate, read the evidence as last name, qualifications, date. The following is an example of how you would read the source citation:

> As stated by the Death Penalty Information Center, , a non-profit research organization that supplies the media with information about capital punishment 2007.

Notice that only the year was read under date. This is very common, and I would encourage you to do so, unless the evidence was acquired within the last two weeks. In that case, read the full date.

Taglines

The ability to create effective taglines goes back to argument clarity. Remember, a clear argument is a good argument. Assume the topic you are debating is "Resolved: The United States should abolish the death penalty." Further, assume you are trying to find a piece of evidence that people prefer life without parole as opposed to the death penalty. The following is a piece of unformatted evidence. Let us begin by looking at the evidence.

> A recent Washington Post opinion poll found that Marylanders prefer the sentence of life in prison over the death penalty. In the October 2007 poll of 1,103 Maryland adults, respondents were asked to choose between the sentence of life in prison without parole or the death penalty for the crime of murder: 52% said they favored life without parole and 43% supported capital punishment. Among black respondents, support for life without parole was even stronger, with 65% responding that they preferred the sentence of life in prison and only 29% choosing the death penalty.

> According to the Washington Post, support for capital punishment in theory stands at 60%, but Marylanders hold nuanced views on the issue and are shifting away from the death penalty. Carla Hosford of Chevy Chase noted, "If we kill and they kill, who has learned anything?" In the coming year, Maryland Governor Martin O'Malley and others who oppose capital punishment are expected to continue efforts to abolish the death penalty in the state.

> Last year, a national Washington Post-ABC News poll revealed a similar shift nationally. The poll found that Americans are almost evenly split when given the two sentencing options, with 50% favoring the death penalty and 46% preferring life without parole.

> (Washington Post, October 26, 2007). See Public Opinion and Life Without Parole. (DPIC, 2007)

This is the entire article. Clearly, you are not going to read the entire article in a debate round. After careful consideration about the argument I was trying to develop, here is what I decided to use as evidence:

> According to the Washington Post, support for capital punishment in theory stands at 60%, but Marylanders hold nuanced views on the issue and are shifting away from the death penalty. Carla Hosford of Chevy Chase noted, "If we kill and they kill, who has learned anything?" In the coming year, Maryland Governor Martin O'Malley and others who oppose capital punishment are expected to continue efforts to abolish the death penalty in the state. (DPIC, 2007)

This was the second paragraph from the evidence. Now that we have the above piece of evidence, we need to create a tagline. Again, remember that we are trying to prove that people prefer life without parole over the death penalty. Our argument should therefore be based on this idea. Here is the tagline I recommend for this evidence:

Maryland proves people prefer life without parole over the death penalty

This tagline is simple and it sums up the paragraph. There are more ways to do this, some are better than the argument I just created. What tagline would you use? Remember, there often is not a right or wrong way to do something in debate. Do your best and consult your coach for more help.

Highlighting and Sizing Evidence

Every piece of evidence you find will not be gold. You need to learn what to pick out of a piece of evidence so you can make a well-developed point while not reading unnecessary pieces of information. This is a skill that develops with practice. The next portion of this manual will be a step-by-step process of formatting the evidence from above.

Creating Appropriate Font Styles

The most important suggestion in using fonts is making sure they are professional and distinguishable. Evidence that looks professional is important for many reasons. The most important being that judges sometimes want to look at the evidence you used. If a judge looks at a piece of evidence hand-written on a napkin, they may think you did not adequately prepare for the debate. However, if the evidence is typed and everything is spelled correctly, the judge will likely think you care about the event in which you are participating.

Evidence that is distinguishable has two parts to it. The first aspect to distinguishable evidence is that you can recognize your evidence when compared to other schools. Attached to the end of this document is Appendix A which is an example evidence template. This is what the school I currently work for uses as an evidence template. If our evidence was ever lost, or stolen, we could identify it based on the template we use. Keep your templates simple and professional, but use them for your squad's evidence.

The other aspect to distinguishable evidence is that you can easily distinguish between the different parts of the evidence you are using. For example, the font styles I use has the text that will be read from the evidence set at Times New Roman, 12 point, bold, underlined, and highlighted. The text that is not read from the evidence is set at Times New Roman, 10 point, no bolding, no underlining, and no highlighting. Using the paragraph above, here is what the evidence would look like when formatted properly:

> **According to the Washington Post, support for capital punishment in theory stands at 60%, but Marylanders hold nuanced views on the issue and are shifting away from the death penalty.** Carla Hosford of Chevy Chase noted, **"If we kill and they kill, who has learned anything?"** In the coming year, Maryland Governor Martin O'Malley and others who oppose capital punishment are expected to continue efforts to abolish the death penalty in the state (DPIC, 2007).

In a round, when time is very precious, this evidence could be easily read given the varying font styles used. This should be your goal when organizing your evidence.

Microsoft Word 2003

Word 2003 offers a feature known as "Styles and Formatting." To begin with this feature, go to the Format menu, then select Styles and Formatting. This tool applies a selected set of fonts and styles to text in the document. The number of styles you can apply is almost limitless. As a suggestion, I would

have at least four styles: taglines, source citations, text from the evidence you will read, and text from the evidence you will not read. Again, you can have as many or as few styles as you feel appropriate.

Shortcut Keys

Once you have established your font styles, you can create shortcut keys that will allow the font style to be changed at the touch of a button. To do this, follow these steps:

1. Click the Format button and choose Styles and Formatting.

2. Select the font style you wish to modify, left click on the style, and choose modify.

3. At the Modify Styles dialog box, click the format button in the bottom left-hand corner and choose shortcut key.

4. In the box that says press for new shortcut key, enter the key you wish to be your shortcut key. I recommend using one of the F keys (aside from F1), such as F4, because they are otherwise rarely used in word processing.

5. Select ok.

Once your shortcut key is assigned, you can easily change evidence to look how you want it to look.

Inserting a Table of Contents

A table of contents is necessary for most files. If the file exceeds a page, it should have a table of contents attached to it. Some people prefer to create tables of contents that have headings, all their subheadings, and the taglines of evidence in them. Others choose only headings. The level of detail you wish to include in your table of contents is up to you. To insert a table of contents, follow these steps:

1. Make sure your text has been formatted by using the styles and formatting task pane. If this has not occurred, the table of contents function will not work.

2. Place your insertion point on a blank page at the beginning of the document.

3. Select insert, reference, indexes and tables.

4. At the indexes and tables dialog box, select the appropriate number of headings you wish to appear in your table of contents.

5. Make any desired formatting changes to the style you wish.

6. Click ok. The table of contents should now be inserted.

Microsoft Word 2007

For those of you who have not yet used Word 2007, it has eliminated the idea of a drop-down box. Instead, Word 2007 uses a ribbon at the top of the screen with varying groups under general tabs. Despite this significant change, I have found it very user-friendly for debate purposes.

Shortcut Keys

To apply shortcut keys in Word 2007, follow these steps:

1. Click on the Home tab and select the appropriate style in the styles group that you want to add a shortcut key to.

2. Right click on the style and select modify.

3. At the Modify Styles dialog box, click the format button in the bottom left-hand corner and choose shortcut key.

4. In the box that says press for new shortcut key, enter one the key you wish to be your shortcut key. I recommend using one of the F keys (aside from F1), such as F4, because they are otherwise rarely used in word processing.

5. Select ok.

Inserting a Table of Contents

Inserting a table of Contents is much easier in Word 2007 as compared to Word 2003. To insert the table of contents, perform the following steps:

1. Make sure your text has been formatted by using the styles and formatting task pane. If this has not occurred, the table of contents function will not work.

2. Place your insertion point on a blank page at the beginning of the document.

3. Click on the References tab and select Table of Contents.

4. Decide which reference style you want and click on it.

5. Select the number of headings you wish to include in the table of contents.

6. Make any desired formatting changes to the style you wish.

7. Click ok and the table of contents should be inserted.

If there is a problem with the table of contents in either Word 2003 or Word 2007, it probably has to do with your application of the appropriate styles. Make sure you applied the font styles to all the text you wish to appear in the table of contents.

Unit V–Time Limits and Speech Orders in Policy Debate

Before this manual identifies the detailed elements of policy debate, it is important to understand the time limits and speech orders. Figure two identifies the times and speech orders in policy debate.

Figure Two: Table of Speech Order and Speech Time Limits

Speech/Cross-Examination Period	Speaker/Speakers Involved	Time Limit (in minutes)
First affirmative constructive	First Affirmative Speaker	8
Cross-examination #1	Second negative speaker asks first affirmative questions	3
First negative constructive	First negative speaker	8
Cross-examination #2	First affirmative speakers asks first negative speaker questions	3
Second affirmative constructive	Second affirmative speaker	8
Cross-examination #3	First negative speaker asks second affirmative speaker questions	3
Second negative constructive	Second negative speaker	8
Cross-examination #4	Second affirmative speaker asks second negative speaker questions	3
First negative rebuttal	First negative speaker	4
First affirmative rebuttal	First affirmative speaker	4
Second negative rebuttal	Second negative speaker	4
Second affirmative rebuttal	Second affirmative speaker	4

As you can see, each person in a debate round gives a constructive speech, a rebuttal, asks questions to a speaker, and is questioned by a speaker. Remember the format of debate. This is necessary to proper participation.

Unit VI—The Buffet of Judges

The judge evaluating the round is a very important factor to consider in any debate. In every state, you have a unique and wide variety of judges, given the dynamics of the activity. The judges range from people who have never watched a debate round to coaches who have been around for over thirty years. Remember that every person is different and it is impossible to identify a person based solely on certain factors. Instead, take the following information as generalizations of judges instead of absolutes.

All judges like good rounds. The tricky part of that statement is that there are varying perceptions of what a good round is based on the type of judge you have. A good round to a college debater is probably in stark contrast to a good round for a lay judge. Understanding these varying expectations will help you be successful.

Remember the pizza topping analogy from earlier? You are the server waiting on the table, but you do not know what they want. Most of figuring out what a judge wants is a guessing game. You should pay close attention to the way they react and then go from there in terms of developing a strategy. There are many types of judges, but the most common types of judges in Missouri are lay judges, current varsity debaters/recently graduated high school debaters, former debaters, coaches, and college judges.

Lay Judges

The most common type of judge you will have in Missouri debate is a lay judge. Lay judges are unique in that they vary significantly. Everything from a successful businessperson to a doctor to a blue-collared worker could be a lay judge. Lay judges have one thing in common: no debate experience. The reason they are deemed lay is they lack general knowledge about debate. These types of judges tend to judge based on their perceptions of what a debate should look like, although they have never seen one.

Manners

For lay judges, there are several tactics you can use to ensure success. The first is manners. Lay judges love it when debaters are polite. Cross-examination should not be a reenactment of the Judge Judy episode you watched the night before a debate tournament. Cross-examination is a friendly exchange of beneficial information. You are well within your rights to make your opponents look bad, and are encouraged to do so. However, be polite when doing so.

Rate of Speaking

Lay judges like people who speak slow. Often, lay judges know little in terms of what you are talking about. You should therefore speak slowly without insulting their intelligence. Speaking too quickly often confuses lay judges and they stop paying attention. This is devastating and should not happen. Therefore, speak at a reasonable rate.

Simple Arguments

You may be familiar with the phrase, "Keep it Simple, Stupid" or KISS. Following the guidelines of this phrase will win you many rounds in front of lay judges. Complex counterplans, reverse voting issues, and **link turn** strategies often confuse lay judges. They do not know what these words mean and more than

likely do not care. Instead, make your arguments so that a person who has never seen a debate round would know exactly what you are talking about. With arguments, remain simple and you will always be safe.

Identification

The lay judge is a unique judge. Some lay judges are very intelligent and you would never be able to tell they have never seen a debate round. To distinguish between lay judges and other types, you should look for some key factors. First, if they tell you they have never seen a debate round before they are a lay judge. Also, if he or she looks very confused, then he or she is probably a lay judge. If he or she is not writing during appropriate times, like when you are reading your case, he or she is more than likely a lay judge.

The above mentioned paragraph identifies stereotypes of lay judges. There are exceptions. The best advice to follow is to be careful and never assume. If you assume, you run the risk of being wrong. Instead, try your best to stick to the basics. Also, you could ask if the judge has any argument preferences. This will often tell you what to look for.

Current Varsity Debaters/Recently Graduated High School Debaters

The current varsity debater/recently graduated high school debater is another common type of judge in Missouri, especially at the novice level. These debaters are typically well-versed on current trends in debate and will expect you to both know and follow them. Whenever you have this type of judge, try to take into account what debaters expect rounds to be like and then go from there.

Answer All Arguments

This type of judge will know how to flow. Therefore, you should answer every argument made in the round. If you are accustomed to simply glossing over arguments and leaving out important details, now would be a good time to change that strategy. Debaters will be paying attention to whether or not you addressed key issues.

Make Smart Arguments

Debaters are experts at making up stuff. However, as judges, they typically do not like it whenever they are watching people make up arguments that are not logical. You should make smart, simple, logical arguments in front of this type of judge. Remember, they are debaters too and will know all the tricks.

Moderate Speaking Rate

Most debaters have a slightly-faster threshold for speed. They do not like you to speed in the college debate sense, but prefer that you talk faster than you would in front of a lay judge. You should speak a little faster and focus on speaking clarity as well as thorough argument construction.

Identification

To figure out whether or not you have a current varsity debater/recently graduated high school debater, look for one factor: youth. If they look like they are in high school, they are more than likely this type of judge. Be careful with age because some people look younger or older than they are. Also, going just on looks could confuse this type of judge with a college judge, which often has a different set of

expectations. If it looks like they are **flowing** or are going to flow, you can ask them before the round if they have any argument preferences. If their answer contains debate-specific answers, and they are in the right age range, they are probably a high school debater.

Former Debaters

The term former debaters means debaters from an earlier generation. Debaters that are your parent's age would fall under this category. This type of judge often has expectations based upon what debate was like when he or she was debating. This can be tricky, given most debaters are unfamiliar with the standards of the past. Try your best to focus on the following tips.

Slow-to-Moderate Speaking Rate

Most of these judges will have been out of the debate realm for sometime. Instead of speaking very quickly, or too slowly, try to find a middle ground between the two. These judges will often know what you are talking about in terms of your arguments, but may need a little time to catch up. Give them that time by not speaking as fast.

Manners

Manners are important with almost any judge, but for most middle-aged parents and coaches, they are of the utmost importance. You will win rounds based on your attitude (trust me, I have). If a person is rude to you in cross-examination, ignore it. Just ask the questions you need to ask or answer the questions the other speaker asks and then sit down.

Moderately Complex Arguments

Given that these debaters will often remember the types of arguments, you can read them at your leisure. However, remember that debate has changed since they were debating. Some of the arguments today, such as kritiks, are not viewed as favorably by the previous generation of debaters. Read arguments that are good, but make sure you explain your position well. Explanation as opposed to complexity is preferred by these judges.

Identification

Identifying this type of judge is tough. Typically, they will flow on a legal pad, are middle-aged, and are not coaches. Although it is tough to identify a person based on the above factors, these are the best tips available. A safe tip would be to ask for argument preferences. Most former debaters understand what this means and will give you a brief background of their experience.

Coaches

Coaches are a great judge to have in a debate round. Not only have they likely done specific research on the topic, they are very well-versed on all the present trends and argumentation styles. Understanding the types of arguments to use in front of coaches will be extremely helpful.

Manners

If you are not polite, many coaches will not vote for you on the spot. You are unwise to think that pulling aggressive stunts will win rounds in front of high school coaches. Instead, be polite, and act as though

your coach is watching the round. Keep in mind that coaches talk to one another and it is embarrassing when a coach hears about how poor their students behave. Coaches remember this and expect much out of you in a debate round.

Argument Style

Coaches like smart arguments. There is a trend that some varsity debaters will give novice debaters arguments they do not even understand just to confuse the other team. Some coaches become activists in these situations and make it their personal mission to vote against you. Do not incite such feelings. Stick to arguments you understand and can explain. Coaches appreciate this and will not make it their mission to vote against you.

Speaking Rate and Clarity

Most coaches have a personal pet peeve about debaters speaking too quickly. Further, coaches appreciate great speaking clarity. To ensure you are doing both, make sure you are speaking at a slow pace and are explaining everything very well.

Identification

Coaches are probably the easiest type of judge to identify. They are usually middle-aged persons in suits. They will likely be flowing and will usually be very attentive. Again, if unsure, you may ask what argument preferences they have. Usually, you can tell a coach based on their attire.

College Judges

Rarely will entry-level debaters have college judges evaluating their rounds. College debaters typically try to judge championship varsity rounds and rarely deviate. However, you may see this type of judge at a district or open tournament. To prepare, keep in mind a few major differences about this type of judge.

Argumentation Preference

College debaters often vary significantly from other types of judges in their argument preferences. College debaters enjoy very in-depth analysis. The difference is they have a very high threshold for the depth of analysis they prefer. Remember, most of these debaters have been debating for several years and are used to very in-depth rounds. Picking one or two positions and analyzing them very well as opposed to five or six surface-level arguments will help win rounds in front of these judges.

Speaking Rate

A major difference I have found between high school debaters and college debaters are the rate at which they prefer debaters to speak. College debaters enjoy fast rounds. If you have never seen a college debater speed, and have not practiced it thoroughly, do not attempt to do so. Speeding is very difficult and takes much practice. Instead, just keep in mind that you do not have to talk slow, and this type of judge will keep up.

Cross-Examination

Most college debaters practice what is known as open cross-examination. All this means is that all four people engage in cross-examination as opposed to just two. This is very different from the high school

standard of one person asks and the other answers. Do not let this bother you. Just do your best to adapt to this style if it happens.

Speaking Stance

Many college debaters remain seated when speaking. Very few will hold points against you for speaking standing up. However, they may allow one person to remain seated while speaking if they so choose. Just keep in mind that college debaters have different styles of debate and do your best to not let it affect you. Just present your arguments. Trust me, they understand how different their style of debate is from yours.

Identification

Identifying college judges is somewhat tricky. They are younger, probably in their early 20's. Some of them flow on laptops. Although this is not universal, it is an easy way to identify some of them. Again, to be safe, just ask. These types of judges will answer your questions very thoroughly.   Most likely, they will identify that they are or have been a college debater to help you understand their preferences.

The analysis provided on judges is mainly based on personal experience. There are many exceptions and no absolutes when it comes to judges. The best advice available is to ask questions and stick to the basics. If you know the type of judge you have, do your best to adapt to his or her personal preferences.

Unit VII–Assembling the Affirmative Case & Delivering Affirmative Speeches

The most important element of any debate is the foundation. With policy debate, the foundation for the affirmative team is the affirmative case. If debating on the affirmative side, you must have a strong, well-developed case with evidence to support your claims. We will focus on the negative side later. For now, it is imperative to understand the elements of building a good affirmative case.

The Five Stock Issues

Every debate round is judged on a set of criteria. The criteria used by each judge may vary, and common variations will be addressed later. In Missouri, especially at the novice level, most debate rounds are judged on the five stock issues of debate. The affirmative team must win all five stock issues in order to win the round. The negative team needs to win only one. Do not let this intimidate you. More often, you know much more about your case than the negative team, this is why you must win all five issues. To commit these issues to memory, just remember the acronym THISS: Topicality, Harms, Inherency, Significance, and Solvency.

Topicality

Topicality is a procedural argument that tests whether or not the affirmative team falls within the boundaries of the resolution. Take the policy topic for the 2001-2002 year, which was resolved: that the United States federal government should establish a foreign policy significantly limiting the use of weapons of mass destruction. A case that distributed Tylenol to the Middle East would probably not fall within the boundaries of this resolution and would therefore not be topical.

Topicality is important for many reasons, among those reasons being jurisdiction. In theory, a judge can only vote on cases that fall under the topic. This theory is much like the theory used in legal court. If the court lacks proper jurisdiction for the case, the judges will simply state they do not have proper jurisdiction and will refer the case to the appropriate court. Debate rounds work in the same way, only there is no deferral. If the affirmative case is not topical, the negative team wins the round.

Harms

Harms are the problems in the current system that your plan would solve. Assume you are debating the topic just mentioned about weapons of mass destruction. If your case dealt with terrorist groups attaining such weapons, you could cite terrorist attacks as the harms. The harms are the bad things your case will fix.

Another example is under the 2007-2008 topic, which is resolved: that the United States federal government should substantially increase its public health assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa. Many cases focus on water sanitation problems in certain parts of Africa. Their cases cite specific examples of water-borne illnesses and pathogens that claim the lives of innocent Africans. Then, their plans focus on a way to fix those problems. You want harms to get the attention of your judge so he or she knows something is wrong with the current system.

Inherency

Inherency is the part of the current system that is blocking your plan from going into effect. Inherency can be compared to a roadblock. If there is a block in the road, vehicles cannot get around it and instead are stuck in traffic. Every affirmative must have something that is blocking their plan from going into effect. Often, it is a dilemma in congress or an attitudinal viewpoint of the current administration. For example, under the topic about weapons of mass destruction, there were many issues with what President George W. Bush perceived as a threat to national security. His emphasis was on maintaining homeland security. Therefore, some affirmative teams cited his policy viewpoint of protecting the homeland as a barrier to support preventative measures in other countries deemed less hostile by the President.

Significance

Significance and harms are often considered two peas in the same pod. While harms is the problem, significance is the magnitude, or severity, of that problem. Refer to the topic about health in Sub-Saharan Africa. A severe problem is the quality of water on that continent. Most people suffer daily from unhealthy drinking water filled with bacteria. This would be an example of a significant harm.

Some debaters claim there are quantitative and qualitative harms. Quantitative harms are like the example just described: many people suffer. Qualitative harms claim that the fact that people are suffering is enough to warrant a significant problem. Both claims have merit. Remember, there are no rules in debate. Find a case that has arguments you feel you can defend and go from there.

Solvency

I consider **solvency** the most important issue. Solvency is whether or not your case fixes the harms you claim. If there is a case that falls within the boundaries of the topic, is being blocked by Congress or the President, and has a significant problem, but lacks a means to fix it, the case is useless. When finding evidence for a case, you should begin searching for solvency evidence.

Debaters often refer to the way solvency evidence works in terms of a **solvency mechanism**. This is merely how your case solves. For example, under the Sub-Saharan Africa topic, if your plan transports fresh bottled water to Africa, your solvency mechanism would be the bottled water. Much like there is more than one way to skin a cat, there is often more than one way to solve a problem. Try to find a solvency mechanism that is reasonable and lacks severe problems.

Now that we have discussed the elements of a case, it is time to put those elements together into a case format you like. Many formats exist, but for novice debaters in Missouri, I would encourage sticking to an easily understood format that is common and easy to defend.

Picking Your Case Type

You are probably familiar with the phrase, "it's not what you say, but how you say it." In the same fashion, debate arguments need to be arranged in a way that conforms to a judge's preference. While there are many ways to organize a case, three ways have been used predominantly in Missouri to show the most success: problem/solution, goals, and comparative/advantage.

Contentions and Observations

Before we begin analyzing these three types of cases, there are some organizational terms you need to be familiar with. The terms are called "**contentions**" or "**observations**". In policy debate, these terms are used similarly. Both contentions and observations are overall headings, typically followed by subpoints, which establish a major element in the case. For example, a team might read their case and say

> Please note observation one: current United States foreign policy hurts our national security. In order to show you this, we have broken this down into three subpoints. Please note subpoint A: the United States military presence in Iraq ignites Middle East terrorists to attack the U.S. According to...

Think of observations and contentions like chapters in a book. Each chapter highlights a major element in the book that is broken down and explained in each paragraph. The affirmative case functions the same way. Observations and contentions highlight major elements that are explained further by each subpoint.

The glossary at the end of this manual contains a detailed description of the terms just explained. If confused, please reference observation and contention in the glossary.

The organizational framework is important to understand because it indicates a great deal about the team's strategy. It is important to note that there are other types of cases and other ways to write the different types of cases here. The analysis ahead focuses on the most common formats and the use of those formats.

Problem/Solution Case Format

A problem solution case is a very simple format. Typically, the case consists of three observations or contentions and a plan. The plan will be discussed later, so for now, we will focus on the observations and contentions.

Observation or contention one is typically an analysis of the inherency. This contention will analyze why the plan is not going into effect based on some flaw in the current system. The next portion of the case is typically the **plan text**. Observation or contention two is typically the harms, also called the problem. Teams usually focus on the problems in the current system in each area that their plan effects. Finally, observation or contention three is usually solvency. The team ends their analysis with how their plan fixes the identified problems.

Teams who read this type of case are strategically focusing on stock issues. A problem/solution case is a very typical case of a team that wants to focus on the five above-referenced stock issues and how their case satisfies that criteria.

Goals

Although not as common as it once was, the goals case is still an effective weapon under certain resolutions. The goals case can take a number of organizational appearances, but it still maintains the same thesis: one absolute end to strive toward. The goals case highlights the ultimate end, or goal, the world should seek when addressing the problems of the resolution. For example, under the current policy

topic of health in Sub-Saharan Africa, a team could cite the goal as improving the health of people living in Sub-Saharan Africa.

It is difficult to identify the strategy of a team using a goals case. The best advice available is that this team will emphasize their goal in comparison to the negative team as a general thesis behind every argument. Much past that, the goals case often varies substantially from team to team.

Comparative Advantage Case

The comparative advantage case is the most popular form of affirmative case in Missouri. For good reason, this manual strongly advocates you use a comparative advantage case. The comparative advantage case typically has two observations or contentions, a plan, and two advantages.

The first observation or contention is almost always inherency. The team identifies the problems in the current system and ways to fix it. This is usually followed by a reading of the plan text. The second observation or contention is typically solvency, showing how the plan fixes the problems of the current system. The unique part about a comparative advantage case is the next two portions: the advantages. Typically, teams try to find two advantages that their plan creates and then identify those with supporting evidence. These advantages are used by the affirmative in a cost/benefit analysis to persuade the judge why the benefits of voting affirmative outweigh the disadvantages.

Attached in Appendix B is an example of a comparative advantage case. This case was written by Mr. Michael Kearney, a successful high school and collegiate debater in Missouri and now an Assistant Coach at Missouri State University. Refer to this case as an example of how to write an effective comparative advantage case.

Writing Plan Text

Debaters spend their entire careers mastering the art of writing a good plan text. The goal of a plan text is to specifically state what your plan does. Imagine that your plan is a law. If enacted, Congress and other appropriate officials would look at exactly what your plan says to clearly identify how the law should be enforced. With this in mind, there are some general tips that can be given for writing a solid plan.

Administration

The plan needs to have an entity that will administer, or carry out, the plan. More often than not, this is identified in the solvency evidence that you found. If confused, ask your coach for his or her preference on the subject. As a general rule, the United States federal government, or a branch within, is the entity that administrates most policy debate plans.

Mandate Action

The plan needs to mandate, or demand, the change of the current system to something else. The mandate section is the part of the plan where you say how your plan changes the current system from doing X to now doing Y. For example, if your plan changes the order of the days of the week, you would want to specifically state in what order the days of the week are now organized.

Funding

Funding is important in any plan. People want to know where you are getting the money for your plan. Some debaters simply say "normal means" for their funding. This just means however Congress would normally fund a piece of legislation is how your plan will be funded. I would discourage this argument. Instead, find an actual source of funding for your plan that has the quantity of money you need.

Some plans are budget neutral, which means they do not cost anything. If your plan does not cost anything, make a funding section of your plan that says something to the effect of, "Our plan is budget neutral. We require no funding."

Enforcement

Much like administration, there needs to be an entity that will enforce your plan. Some solvency authors say that specific organizations should serve as watchdogs for the plan. You are very lucky if you find evidence like this. As a general rule, debaters should use something similar to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice enforces laws. Given that your plan would be a law if passed, the Department of Justice would be the entity to enforce that law.

Be careful not to use the same entity to administer and enforce your plan. Using the same entity for both creates a conflict of interest. It is difficult for an organization to practice internal oversight on its own actions. Instead, assign administration and enforcement to separate entities.

At the end of this manual you will find Appendix B: Example of a Comparative Advantage Case. This is an example of a comparative advantage case from the 2006-2007 topic. Pay close attention to the construction of the advantages and the transitions in the case.

In terms of the source citations for the case, they do not follow proper APA or MLA source citations. Instead, they follow the prototypical debate format of citations that was mentioned earlier.

Intent

Intent is the final part of the plan text. Intent is a quick section about the affirmative team. Here, you should include two things. First, state that the purpose of the affirmative is to clarify the intent of the plan. This creates the perception that your plan is your thesis and subsequent speeches are only to ensure that thesis is well-explained and supported.

Second, state that your team claims the power of `fiat`. The term fiat means that the affirmative team assumes the plan is passed by Congress. This means the power the affirmative team has is to assume that Congress would not object to the law, but would pass it through. This creates the ability of the affirmative to not have to argue whether or not Congress would find the idea acceptable.

Organizational Style: Paragraphs vs. Planks

The issue of how to organize your plan text is very important. When making this choice, consult your coach. Some prefer planks, others prefer paragraphs. As a general rule, always ask your coach.

A plank plan is typically divided into five planks which are just means of organization (much like observations and contentions). Planks of most plans typically include administration, mandates, funding, enforcement, and intent.

Figure three is an example of a plan plank organization style. This is a case my partner and I ran under the topic my senior year of high school, which was resolved: that the United States Federal Government should substantially increase its support for United Nations peacekeeping operations.

<u>Figure Three: Example of Plan Plank Organizational Style</u>

Plank 1: Administration
> Administration shall be the United States Federal Government.

Plank 2: Mandates
> A. The United States federal government shall use Private Military Companies (PMC's) instead of United States military troops for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.
> B. The United States Federal Government shall amend the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act to cover Private Military Companies operating in foreign countries.

Plank 3: Funding
> Funding shall come from reallocating wasteful pork barrel spending.

Plank 4: Enforcement
> Enforcement shall be through the Department of Justice.

Plank 5: Intent
> The affirmative team serves to clarify the intent of the plan. We also claim the power of fiat.

A paragraph plan includes all the elements of a plank plan but is instead written in paragraph form. There are no fancy headings; the plan is read as if it were a paragraph. Figure four is a transformation of the plan text above into paragraph form.

<u>Figure Four: Example of a Paragraph Plan Organizational Style</u>

Plan

The United States Federal Government shall use Private Military Companies instead of United States troops in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. The United States Federal Government shall also amend the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act to cover Private Military Companies operating in foreign countries. Administration shall be through the United States Federal Government. Funding shall come from reallocating wasteful pork barrel spending. Enforcement shall come from the Department of Justice. The affirmative team serves to clarify the intent of the plan and also claims the power of fiat.

Creating Advantages

Creating advantages is very important. Often, these advantages are used by the affirmative to create the argument that the benefits of voting affirmative outweigh the disadvantages of voting affirmative. Advantages should be written like a story. The first point should explain the magnitude, or severity, of the problem as it stands. The second point needs to identify specific harms. Common uses of the second

point include evidence about what will happen if no action is taken, how much worse the problem will become, and how the problem will spread to other places. The final point needs to be a clear piece of evidence referencing how the plan text for your affirmative case fixes the problems just referenced to create the advantage.

Attached to the end of this document is Appendix B: Comparative Advantage Case. This is a case that came from the Missouri State Debate Institute Camp in 2006. Please refer to it for an explanation of how a proper advantage should be formatted.

Advantages tell a story of the problem in the current system and how the affirmative plan fixes that problem. Briefly, the role of the second affirmative speaker needs to be mentioned before the elements of the negative strategy can be discussed.

The Second Affirmative Constructive (2AC)

The 2AC has a very unique job in the debate round. While the first affirmative (1A) speaker reads the case in the first affirmative constructive (1AC), the second affirmative (2A) speaker has one mission: answer all the arguments posed by the negative team. While this may seem simple, it is quite difficult. Answering all the arguments made by the negative team is time consuming. Nevertheless, the 2A needs to answer every argument made.

An easy way to save time in rounds is to create what are called **frontlines**. A frontline is a pre-written answer to common arguments. If you know a team is going to argue something, and you will likely hear this argument again, write it down and then make a frontline. Frontlines help with argument clarity because the responses are made before the round. Further, frontlines help save time because you can just grab them from your file and you are ready to go.

The 2A needs to use the evidence from the case as a weapon. This is a growing problem with many of the rounds I have observed. Instead of just reading the case and forgetting about it, the 2A should use the case to his or her advantage to answer negative arguments. Do not just let the case idly sit because the negative team did not respond; use it as a weapon.

The affirmative has an important duty to persuade the judge to change the current system. The negative team, on the other hand, must explain why the affirmative plan is a bad idea. The strategy developed by the negative team is the next area of discussion.

Unit VIII–Developing the Negative Strategy

The affirmative team presents a case, is cross-examined by a member of the negative team, and then sits down. Now it is time to hear from the other side. The negative team has many options. They can argue that the current system is working and there is no need for the plan. They can propose an alternative option, known as a **counterplan**. There are a seemingly limitless number of choices. However, you must tailor your strategy to the round you are presently debating.

It is impossible to tell you how to develop your strategy because each round is completely different. Varying judge preferences, combined with different debate arguments, make blanket strategies impossible. There are, however, general tips to follow that will help you develop a sound negative strategy.

The First Negative Constructive (1NC)

The 1NC is the first opportunity the judge has to hear from the negative team. As a general rule, especially for Missouri, the 1NC should read the basic arguments. The 1NC should merely make the general position of the negative team known. For example, assume that your strategy is to **run** two disadvantages and some solvency arguments. In this case, the 1NC would read both disadvantages and some of the main solvency arguments. The second negative (2N) speaker in the second negative constructive (2NC) would handle the in-depth analysis of the arguments.

The Second Negative Constructive (2NC)

The 2NC is the point where the debate really becomes interesting. The affirmative team has read their case, the negative team has made their arguments known, and the affirmative team has had a chance to respond to those attacks. Now, most people wonder where the round goes. It is at this point that the negative team must strategically decide which arguments to divide between which speaker. Keep in mind that the negative team has an eight minute constructive, the 2NC, and a four minute rebuttal, the first negative rebuttal (1NR), until the affirmative team is allowed to give a speech. This section of time is known as the **negative block**. This means you have twelve (or thirteen, depending on the tournament) minutes to really make life difficult for the affirmative team. I recommend the following strategies.

The 2N Should Take the Winners

When dividing arguments in the negative block, the 2N should take the arguments the negative team feels they are winning and will advocate in the end. This is subject to change and often times teams change their minds. Do not put pressure on yourself to make an unnecessary decision. If you cannot decide, just pick which arguments you like and give your partner the rest. The point is that the negative team should divide the arguments so that you are not covering the same arguments twice.

Two Goals of the Negative Block

Negative teams should have two goals in their block of time just described. The first is to answer all the arguments made by the affirmative. You can group similar arguments, just make sure that you specifically address every claim made by the affirmative team.

The second goal of the negative block is to further develop your team's strategy. Remember, you need to have a vision in the round that identifies what the judge will get if they vote negative. The thesis of the negative team should not be to just deny, diminish, and/or disbar the claims made by the affirmative. You need to have an option that clearly identifies what the world will look like if the judge votes negative.

Up to this point, we have walked through the constructives in a debate round. Try to hold back your frustration that this manual is not addressing specific arguments. That would be very confusing and might bias your perception of a round. Instead, focus on the general tips and make those fit into every round.

Now it is time for the rebuttals. The constructives are often a give-and-take situation. The affirmative team will more than likely recognize the legitimacy of certain claims, but will focus on others. The negative will likely do the same. It is in the rebuttals where the debate "boils down" to a few key issues. This is where most judges make their decision, making these speeches very important.

Unit IX–The Rebuttals

The rebuttals are the point in the debate round where murky water should become crystal clear. All issues need to be clearly addressed. The ultimate goal of any round is for the judge to write the explanation the teams gave in their rebuttals as his or her reason for the decision.

The First Negative Rebuttal (1NR)

The 1NR is the exception to general rebuttal suggestions. This speech is still part of the negative block. As such, the goal of this speech is still make the first affirmative rebuttal (1AR) as difficult as possible. Debate is often a time war, and this war is most prevalent during the negative block and the 1AR. The 1NR should take the arguments his partner did not argue, answer the claims made by the affirmative, and then provide analysis to further develop the positions.

The First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)

The first affirmative rebuttal is the hardest speech to deliver. You have 4 (or 5, depending on the tournament) minutes to cover 12 (or 13) minutes of speech. Basically, your only option is to give blanket arguments without explanation and let your partner clean up the rest. You should be giving the arguments you will go for on each position. Make sure that your arguments cover all the arguments made by the negative team.

The Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR)

The 2NR is undeniably important. This is the last opportunity the negative team has to tell the judge why the negative team should win the round. Given the importance of this speech, you should include a general summary of the round and important reasons why the judge should vote for you. This summary is called an overview.

The Overview

There are no set rules or standards for an overview. As a personal preference, overviews should include the **paradigm** you advocate and the reasons why you should win the debate round. An example 2NR overview could look like this:

> The affirmative team has presented you a case that is worse than the current system and does not fix the problem. As a judge, you should weigh the advantages versus the disadvantages to see which policy has the best options. The negative team has shown you that the affirmative team results in an economic disadvantage, harms relations with China, and does not solve the problem. For these reasons, we should win the round. Now let us analyze the specific arguments, beginning with the economy disadvantage.

The Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)

The 2AR is the last speech in a debate round. This is the last chance by the affirmative team has to explain why the current system needs to change. The 2AR needs to be a very persuasive speech that clearly identifies why the judge should vote affirmative.

The Overview

An overview is essential in the 2AR. Judges evaluating the speech need to know exactly what to look for and need an overview to help them understand the key arguments behind the affirmative case. Theoretically, a judge should be able to compare the overview given in the 2NR to the overview given in the 2AR to decide how they are going to vote. The goal of the 2AR is to get the judge to use your overview as his or her reasons for decision. An example 2AR overview could look like this:

> The debate should be evaluated by comparing the advantages versus the disadvantages of voting affirmative. Please remember that the affirmative team not only saves lives, as proven in advantage one, we also save money, as proven in advantage two. Savings lives and money outweighs any argument brought up by the negative team and warrants an affirmative ballot.

Unit X–Topicality

The Negative Shell

Topicality is a procedural argument in debate. As previously described, this argument is a stock issue and asks whether or not the affirmative team is within the boundaries of the resolution. To setup a topicality argument, you need to have a definition of the word or phrase, how the affirmative team violates the definition, standards for why your definition is superior, and why topicality is a voting issue.

Subpoint A - Definition

A topicality argument usually begins with a statement like, "The affirmative team is not topical because they violate _____." The blank is the word or phrase they violate. You need a definition of the word or phrase the team has violated to give your topicality argument credibility.

For example, a common word that is usually argued under topicality is the word establish. Assume that the case we are running is the private military companies case used as an example of plan text. There was much literature going both ways saying that private military companies were being used and that private military companies were not being used in U.N. peacekeeping operations. A topicality argument with this example could begin like the following:

> The affirmative team is not within the boundaries of this resolution because they have violated the word establish. According to Merriam-Webster's online dictionary, 2007, establish means "to bring into existence" (Merriam-Webster, 2006-2007).

Subpoint B – Violation

The next part of a topicality argument is the violation. The violation is the interpretation given by the negative team for why the affirmative team does not meet the definition. For example, the negative team could say

> The affirmative team is not topical because they do not bring something into existence. Instead, they merely expand something that already exists by using PMC's instead of U.S. troops.

Subpoint C – Standards

Standards are the reasons to prefer the negative team's definition and interpretation. There are many standards one could use, and in no way is it guaranteed that this manual contains a comprehensive list. A standard is just a warrant why a definition and interpretation should be preferred. This means many arguments serve as standards. Please see Appendix B in the back for a list of standards to use in a debate round.

For the example above, the following standards could be used to justify why the negative team's definition and interpretation are good:

1. **Layman's Definition.** Dictionaries contain universally accepted definitions for terms. We should look to universal norms of definitions before we vary into field-specific examples.

2. **Slippery Slope.** Allowing definitions and interpretations like the affirmative team create a slippery slope. If we allow cases like the affirmative, then anything that expands an existing program would be topical, exploding the ground the negative team would have to cover.

3. **Limits.** Topicality is a tool used by the negative team to check abusive affirmative cases. The purpose of the argument is to prevent affirmative teams from running cases that are outside the boundaries of the resolution. Keep the topic from exploding unnecessarily and vote negative.

Subpoint D – Voting Issue

The final element in a topicality argument is that topicality is a voting issue. This is the part of the argument where you articulate specific reasons why topicality should be voted on. It has become vogue to give a one sentence statement of why topicality is a voting issue. Do not do this. Instead, give well-supported reasons why topicality is a voting issue. For the above example, you could use the following examples.

Topicality is a voting issue for the following reasons:

1. **Education.** Topicality is a procedural argument that in no way provides topic-specific education. Instead, we are forced to focus on procedural issues that provides no education to an educational activity.

2. **Fairness.** It is unfair for the negative to be expected to research cases that both expand existing programs and establish new ones. This is an unfair research burden on the negative.

3. **Jurisdiction.** As the judge of this round, you only have the jurisdictional authority to vote on cases within the topic. It is outside your jurisdiction, as a judge, to vote on cases that are not relevant to the topic.

The Affirmative Answers to Topicality

Affirmative teams need to have frontlines to topicality. This argument is too important to create arguments during rounds. Debaters need to know exactly what they are going to say to these arguments.

Subpoint A – Counter-definition

You need to have a definition from a credible source that supports your interpretation of the resolution. If your definition would be the same as the negatives, you can just say that your definition is the same. However, I would caution you in doing so. It is best to read a definition, even if the definition is similar to the negative team's.

An example, based on the above example, would look something like the following:

The affirmative team establishes a new foreign policy to increase support for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. As stated by Merriam-Webster's online dictionary, establish means "to institute (as a law) permanently by enactment or agreement" (Merriam-Webster, 2006-2007).

With counter definitions, you always need to argue how your team meets the definition of the negative team and the affirmative team. This is done to show how both teams advocate a similar interpretation, and to prove that your affirmative case is indeed topical.

Subpoint B – Counter-Interpretation

The counter-interpretation is the point where you identify the position of the affirmative team in the debate round. Here, you use your definition to both argue the negative team's interpretation and provide your own. The continued example would look like the following:

> The affirmative team institutes as a law the use of private military companies in U.N. peacekeeping operations. It is reasonable to interpret "establish" as something that creates something permanently.

Subpoint C – Counter-Standards

Counter standards are the reasons why the affirmative team's definition and interpretation should be preferred in the round. Please see Appendix C for a complete list of counter-standards. Continuing the example, one could use the following counter-standards:

1. **Bright Line.** The affirmative team's definition creates a bright line on what is topical and what is not. A case that creates something permanently is topical. The negative team's definition could be met by bringing into existence a new part of an already existing program, violating their interpretation.

2. **Literature Checks Abuse.** The negative team read evidence against our case. Clearly, they thought our case was topical. Otherwise, they never would have taken the time to research it.

3. **Reasonability.** The affirmative team's definition is reasonable. Creating harsh and stringent limitations on definitions of words used in the resolution over limits the topic to little to no cases.

Subpoint D – Voting Issue

There are many choices an affirmative team has at this point. Some choose to claim topicality is not a voting issue. You would be wise to avoid this argument. Topicality is a stock issue and is a voting issue. Instead, you should do one of two things. First, say topicality is a voting issue, but say how you win the issue. Secondly, you could say topicality is a voting issue, but if the negative team drops it, the argument becomes a **reverse voting issue** and you should vote against them because they merely used this argument as an argument to waste our time.

Based on the continuing example from above, options one and two for subpoint D could resemble the following:

1. Topicality is a voting issue. However, the affirmative team has clearly shown how using Private Military Companies instead of U.S. troops as a permanent foreign policy satisfies the definition of the term establish.

OR

2.   Topicality is a voting issue. However, the affirmative team has clearly shown how using Private Military Companies instead of U.S. troops as a permanent foreign policy satisfies the definition of the term establish. If the negative team drops this argument, topicality should become a reverse voting issue. If **dropped**, the only purpose for running the argument was to waste the affirmative team's time. The negative team should therefore be punished for doing this.

Topicality is a tricky argument which is often mishandled by affirmatives. You should answer every point in the negative team's shell and counter it, if applicable.

Topicality is just one of the arguments that a negative team can run. Another popular type of argument is a disadvantage. The analysis and importance of disadvantages will be covered next.

Unit XI—Disadvantages

Disadvantages are an important part of a negative team's strategy. Also referred to as disad's or DA's, a disadvantage is an argument stating that the affirmative team causes something bad to happen that otherwise would not occur. A common disadvantage from year to year is the spending, or economy, disadvantage. This disadvantage says that the economy is doing fine now, the affirmative team spends money, spending money causes the economy to collapse, and if the economy collapses, extinction occurs.

The Negative Team's Disadvantage

In order to properly argue a disadvantage, one must understand the argument's structure. A disadvantage is organized into **uniqueness**, links, and **impact** arguments.

Subpoint A – Uniqueness

Subpoint A of a disadvantage is typically the uniqueness. This argument says why the disadvantage is not happening now. A common example of uniqueness for the economy disadvantage is the economy is doing fine now. Another way of stating uniqueness is stating that we are on the brink right now. This means, in terms of the economy disadvantage, that the economy is on the brink of having severe problems.

Subpoint B – Link

The **link** is what connects the affirmative plan and the disadvantage together. Something their plan does must somehow cause the disadvantage. Focusing on the economy disadvantage, a common link to this argument is that the affirmative team spends money. Sometimes, the link will go one step further and claim the impacts of the plan's action. For example, some evidence might say that spending this much money will cause problem X and problem Y. It all depends on the evidence you use.

Subpoint C – Internal Link

An **internal link** is not a required part of a disadvantage. However, anymore, teams are creating disadvantages with more developed stories about how the plan links to the disadvantage. An internal link is simply another step in the process from point A to point B. An example of an internal link for the economy disadvantage could say something like, "spending money causes economic collapse."

Subpoint D – Impact

The impact is the problem that results from passing the affirmative plan. The impact is the real meat of the disadvantage. It is a problem so catastrophic that it should be prevented at all costs. Finding a good impact takes time, but, if found, it can be an effective weapon. In terms of the economy disadvantage, a common impact is that economic collapse causes extinction.

One should use caution when reading this argument. The most common author of the "economic collapse causes extinction" argument is a gentleman by the name of Walter Russell Mead. His evidence is empirically denied. What this means is that based on the past and evidence analysis, Mead is incorrect about his statements. Many lay judges frown at this argument and one should use caution when reading it.

Please see Appendix D for an example of a disadvantage. This is an economy disadvantage that came from the Missouri State Debate Institute Camp in 2006. Note the structure of the disadvantage that creates the story of spending from the affirmative team causes a major problem.

Affirmative Answers to a Disadvantage

Affirmative teams can make any number of arguments to a disadvantage. As a general rule, one should always have offense against a disadvantage. Keep in mind that disadvantages are the key offensive weapon of a negative team. Therefore, as the affirmative team, you need to have an offensive answer to their offensive argument.

Appendix E is a reference of nine universal arguments you can make to disadvantages. Assuming the affirmative case sends water bottles to Africa, here are some arguments you could make based on the economy disadvantage:

1. **Non-unique.** Bush recently called for $480 billion for Iraq. That would have caused the disadvantage.

2. **No brink.** We do not know how much money the affirmative team must spend to cause the disadvantage.

3. **Turn: We help the global economy.** By sending clean water to Africa, people do not get as sick and therefore can return to work, boosting their economy, helping the global economy.

4. **No magnitude.** We do not know how long or severe the impact would be.

5. **No timeframe.** How long does it take after the affirmative plan passes for the disadvantage to occur?

6. **Empirically denied.** Walter Mead has been empirically denied several times.

7. **Case outweighs.** The benefits of voting affirmative outweigh this disadvantage.

Topicality and disadvantages are great strategic arguments for the negative. Now that you are aware of the arguments, you need to be aware of how to use them. Judging paradigms are our next topic of analysis.

Unit XII–Judging Paradigms

Now that you understand all the arguments you can make, it is time to decide which arguments you should make in front of which type of judge. There is no easy way to classify a judge. There are college debaters who are policy makers and high school debaters who are policy makers. There are coaches who are stocks issues judges and former high school debaters who are stock issues judges. Asking preferences before a round is very helpful. Often, their answers will sound something like the following.

Stock Issues Judge

A stock issues judge is very prevalent in Missouri. These judges think that stock issues are the most important thing in a round and will judge each team accordingly. As the affirmative team, this judge will expect you to win all five stock issues. As the negative, you only need to win one issue to win the entire round. Pay close attention to stock issues and procedural arguments with this type of judge. If you have multiple versions of your affirmative case available, use the problem/solution case with this type of judge.

Tabula Rasa

This type of judge is not as popular recently but is still present. If a judge tells you they are tabula rasa, it basically means they have no argument preferences. Tabula rasa is a Latin phrase meaning, "the mind in its hypothetical primary blank or empty state before receiving outside impressions" (Merriam-Webster, 2006-2007). I have yet to find a judge that has absolutely no preferences in a debate round, especially if they have debate experience. For this type of judge, stick to your normal strategy and watch for any nonverbal confirmations or hesitations.

Policy Maker

The policy maker judge is a very popular type of judge. He or she will evaluate the round based upon benefits of the plan versus the disadvantages resulting from the plan. For this type of judge, use the comparative advantage or goals case. As the negative, make sure you run disadvantages with this judge. The last two rebuttal speeches given in front of this judge should be a direct comparison of the costs and benefits of voting affirmative or negative.

Unit XIII—Conclusion

This manual has hopefully given you a start to some complex topics in debate. I understand that it is not comprehensive or complete on some issues. The goal of this manual is to provide a start. The best way to learn about all these arguments is to listen whenever you receive criticism. Do not let your pride get in the way of getting better. Listening to others is the best way to get better. That is how this manual was written, by listening. Good luck to all of you. I know debate is a life-changing activity, and I wish you the very best.

References

Death Penalty Information Center (2007). Public opinion: Poll reveals Marylanders prefer life without
 parole over death penalty. Retrieved October 30, 2007, from
 http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/article.php?did=2496&scid=64.

Library Documents Center (2005). University of Michigan. *Political Science Resources Think Tanks.*
 Retrieved November 13, 2007, from http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/psthink.html

Merriam-Webster (2006-2007). Definition of tabula rasa. Retrieved November 8, 2007, from
 http://merriamwebster.com/dictionary/tabula%20rasa.

Robert J. Trulaske, Sr. College of Business (2007). University of Missouri – Columbia. *Guidelines for attire at
 receptions, presentations, and information sessions.* Retrieved October 22, 2007, from
 http://www.business.missouri.edu/340/default.aspx.

Glossary

Card – slang term for a piece of evidence.

Case – term meaning the organized, formatted idea the affirmative team argues.

Contention – see observation.

Counterplan – argument ran by the negative team stating a non-topical, competitive alternative to the affirmative plan.

Disadvantage (aka "Disad" or "DA") – argument read by the negative team stating if the affirmative plan passes, something bad happens.

Dropped – slang term meaning a speaker did not respond to an argument.

Fiat – power given to the affirmative team; allows affirmative to assume Congress would pass their plan if the judge voted affirmative.

Flowing – process of shorthand note-taking debater use to summarize the arguments made in a debate round.

Frontline – set of pre-written responses to an argument.

Harms – stock issue; problems within the current system that the affirmative plan solve.

Hit – slang term for who we competed against/who we debated.

Impact – part of a disadvantage; states the problem that happens if the affirmative plan is passed.

Inherency – stock issue; reason why the affirmative plan is not going into effect right now.

Internal Link – part of a disadvantage; extra step that connects the plan to the disadvantage.

Link – part of a disadvantage; what connects the affirmative plan to the disadvantage.

Link Turn – specific type of turn argument that says, "we do not link to this, but instead are the opposite." A common example is on spending disadvantages. Affirmative teams often argue that they do not spend money, but somehow save money.

Mutual Exclusivity – means two things cannot happen at the same time (i.e., you cannot walk to the left and walk to the right at the same time).

Negative Block – Period of time extending from the 2NC to the 1NR where the negative team has back-to-back speeches and can divide the arguments read in the 1NC.

Net-Benefit – part of a counterplan; advantage of the negative counterplan over the affirmative plan.

Observation – organizational term similar to chapters in a book that makes a general argument and is generally further supported by subpoints.

Open Cross-Examination – All participants are engaged in the cross-examination and can both ask and answer questions as opposed to the one person asks, one person answers tradition.

Open Tournament – A tournament that lacks the regular and championship varsity distinctions.

Paradigm—a judge's preferred argumentation and communication style for debaters.

Plan – specific part of affirmative case that identifies specific action(s) to be taken and how those action(s) will be administered, enforced, and funded.

Plan Text – the exact wording of the plan.

Reverse Voting Issue (RVI) – popular argument used on topicality that believes arguments should not be voted on, but instead, the other team should be voted against for having made the argument.

Run – slang term meaning the arguments we read.

Shells – slang term meaning the initial argument (for example, the "shell" of a disadvantage would be the uniqueness, link, internal link, and impact).

Significance – stock issue; quantity and/or quality of harms.

Solvency – stock issue; ability of plan to fix the problems claimed.

Solvency Mechanism – means by which the affirmative plan solves.

Topicality – stock issue; argument questioning whether or not the affirmative team falls within the boundaries of the resolution.

Turn – argument saying, "we do not do this, but instead do the opposite."

Uniqueness – part of a disadvantage; states why the disadvantage is not happening now.

Voters – slang term for voting issues.

Appendix A: Evidence Template

☺ \<Your Last Name\> ☺   \<File Name\>   ☺ \<Your Last Name\> ☺

     The template shown here had the information you see distracted from the header and footer. In your template, I would suggest putting the information I have on this page in the header and footer of your document so all the pages look the same.

Page number/Number of Pages   <u>Parkview High School</u>   **Page number/Number of pages**

Appendix B: Example of a Comparative-Advantage Case

Written by Mr. Michael Kearney

The United States has an opportunity it cannot pass up. For years, America has chosen to

maintain international relations by using its military might. Those who were once our allies have

now turned a blind eye to our nation. The United States has a choice. It can either change its

ideology or further erode the few relationships it has left. Unfortunately, the U.S. is making the

wrong decision. It is for this reason and many more that _____ and I stand firmly

Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially

increasing the number of persons serving in one or more of the following national service

programs: AmeriCorps, Citizen Corps, Senior Corps, Peace Corps, Learn and Serve

America, Armed Forces. Support for the resolution is seen in the following case. Please note:

Observation One – Current United States civil service policies are inadequate.
According to Marc Magee, Director of the Center for Civic Enterprise at the Progressive Policy

Institute, stated on May 23, 2003

[Marc, director of the Center for Civic Enterprise at the Progressive Policy Institute, "National Service shrinking on Bush's watch", Progressive Policy Institute, 5/23/03, http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=115&subsecID=145&contentID=251716>]

The Bush Administration conceded this week that enrollment in AmeriCorps, the full-time national service program, will fall by 50 percent this year -- despite the president's promise last year to increase it by 50 percent. Additionally, Les Lenkowsky, Bush's choice to head the Corporation for National and Community Service, announced his intention to step down. But the news on national service this week wasn't all bad: Sen. John Kerry (D-MA) unveiled a campaign proposal May 19 calling for a dramatic, 10-fold expansion of AmeriCorps. It's good to see the future of national service injected into the presidential debate. For now, however, **a** Republican White House and Congress have thrown the AmeriCorps program into disarray. On May 21 the Corporation's board made official what PPI had predicted back in February: the combination of restrictions, caps, and cuts **included** in the 2003 appropriations bill signed by President Bush **will result in a dramatic decline in the number of AmeriCorps members in the coming year.**1 This is a major political embarrassment for the president, who made expansion of national service a central component of his "USA Freedom Corps" proposal in last year's State of the Union address. The coming contraction of AmeriCorps is the result of two main factors: a lack of presidential leadership and Congressional Republicans' abiding ideological disdain for what many of them view as Bill Clinton's pet program.

The United States is in dire need of change. A solution exists in the current system, yet it is not being pursued. My partner and I therefore offer the following five-plank plan to fix the problems in the current system. Please note:

Plank 1 – Administration:

Our administration comes through Americorps.

Plank 2 – Mandates:

A. The United States federal government will substantially increase the number of persons serving in Americorps through passage of William Marshall & Marc Magee's 5 point "Voluntary Path to Universal Service". This will include replacing selective service with National Service, expanding Americorps citizen soldier recruiting, replacing work study with serve study, and linking federal student aid to national service.

Plank 3 – Funding:

Funding for this plan will come from redirecting wasteful projects in Congress entitled "Pork Barrel" projects.

Plank 4 – Enforcement:

Enforcement will come through the Department of Justice.

Plank 5 – Intent:

All affirmative speeches shall serve to clarify the intent of the plan. The affirmative team also claims the power of fiat.

The affirmative plan will meet civil service needs. This is shown in:

Advantage One – We will stop a war with China.

In order to show you this, we've broken this down into three subpoints. Please note:

<u>Subpoint A</u> – China is sustaining their economy and moving ahead of the United

States by investing in education.

As stated by Bob Brown, Senior Fellow at the Center for Rocky Mountain West, June 16th, 2006,

[Bob, Senior Fellow at the Center for Rocky Mountain West, "Guest Opinion: U.S. must retain educational, economic edge over China", June 16th 2006, http://www.billingsgazette.net/articles/2006/06/19/opinion/guest/50-guestop.txt, accessed June 20, 2006]

<u>The Chinese have</u> not embraced freedom, yet they have certainly **wrapped their arms around free enterprise. Their economy is booming, and they are** betting on the profit motive to maintain momentum, but they are <u>investing in education to sustain the boom in the long term.</u> These are important lessons I learned while in China recently. The Chinese are pouring public resources into education. Science and math are emphasized, and **Already almost twice as many engineers and computer scientists are graduating in China as in the** <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates. **Perhaps Of even greater significance** to us **is that English is a requirement throughout their educational system. The Chinese are thinking globally, and English is the commercial language of the world.**

China is investing in the future by putting money into the minds of ambitious students. If and

when China's economy surpasses the economy of the United States, the results will be

catastrophic. This is shown in:

<u>Subpoint B</u> – A Chinese economic eclipse of the United States threatens a world war worse than any war to date.

As told by Tony Phyrillas, two-time Pulitzer Prize Winning Political Analyst, June 14th,

2006,

[Tony, 2 Time Pulitzer Prize Winning Political Analyst, "China, US heading for a military showdown", June 14th 2006, http://www.webcommentary.com/asp/ShowArticle.asp?id=phyrillast&date=060614, accessed June 20, 2006]

<u>We read a lot these days about the growing economic rivalry between the U**nited** S**tates** and China.</u> Every time gas prices go up, the experts say the main culprit is the insatiable demand for oil in China. **The U.S. trade deficit has reached historic highs as Americans pour hundreds of billions of dollars into the Chinese economy. China is now the largest creditor for the U.S.,** keeping our economy going by loaning our government money to run up those huge deficits. The headlines talk about "China's Century," the "China Challenge" and the "Awakening Giant." U.S. News & World Report magazine predicts China's economy will surpass Japan's by 2020, becoming second largest in the world, behind the U.S. What is China doing with all its new-found wealth? While the United States has been preoccupied with the War on Terror since Sept. 11, 2001, <u>China has embarked on a massive military buildup **that can have only one objective —** to challenge the United States as a world superpower.</u> That's the conclusion of a chilling new book, "Showdown: Why China Wants War with the United States," by Jed Babbin and Edward Timperlake, released by Regnery Publishing. It appears that Islamic fanaticism may not pose the only threat to our way of life. The defeat of the Soviet Union in the Cold War was only a partial victory, the authors

argue. A Pacific Cold War awaits the United States and its dwindling Western allies, according to Babbin and Timperlake. "If war does become reality, it will be because China has chosen, clearly and decisively, to make war on America, its allies and its interests," the authors argue. "It will not be an accident, the result of an economic clash or a misunderstanding — and our diplomatic efforts need to bear that in mind. We believe **China has already decided in favor of war."** Beyond the facade of free markets and Western-style capitalism, the Chinese communists continue to rule with an iron fist over the largest captive nation on Earth and preside over the largest military buildup in decades. China has the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world, behind the U.S. and Russia. China has the largest standing army in the world — 1.6 million men (compared to 502,000 men and women who serve in the all-volunteer U.S. Army, half of whom are tied up in Iraq and Afghanistan). China has another 255,000 conscripts in its navy and 400,000 in its air force. There's also 800,000 Chinese in the nation's military reserves and an unlimited supply of fresh recruits from China's 1.3 billion (and rising) population. Since none of its neighbors pose a military threat, why is China building such a massive naval force, including attack submarines? The last time an Asian nation had such a large navy was Japan in the early 1940s. We all remember what happened on Dec. 7, 1941, when the Japanese navy steamed thousands of miles from its home ports to destroy the U.S. Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. **China has a history of aggressive behavior.** Chinese soldiers attacked U.S. forces during the Korea War, leading to a stalemate that left the Korean peninsula divided to this day. China also invaded and continues to occupy Tibet. China's support of North Vietnam was a major reason the United States lost the Vietnam War. And China continues to threaten invasion of the island-nation of Taiwan, which China considers a breakaway state that should be reunited with the mainland. China also poses a threat to Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia and even Australia and New Zealand. The authors of "Showdown" point out that China is not going to wait **until the current War on Terror is over**. "The war will begin when China decides the time has come," Babbin and Timperlake write. **"And unless we are** very lucky, very **smart**, and very resolute in our preparations, **it will be as massive in loss of life and economic damage to** America and **the world as either of the two world wars of the last century."**

As China continues to pour money into education, a war between China and the U.S. grows

closer. The affirmative plan will stop this, as shown in:

Subpoint C – Expanding Americorps through the "Voluntary Path to Universal Service" will stop a war with China by investing our capital in education.
As indicated by William Marshall and Marc Magee, as cited earlier,

[Will and Marc, July 23rd, 2005, "The Voluntary Path to Universal Service", Book Excerpt:" The AmeriCorps Experiment and the Future of National Service, DLC, Blueprint Magazine, <http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=115&subsecID=145&contentID=253462>]

A second **reason to expand national service lies in its unique character as a dual public investment in America's human capital.** First, **national service volunteers do work** that helps **to improve the lives of tens of thousands of needy Americans each day.** Second, **volunteers earn education awards that encourage them to attend college and defray** at least **some of** its costs. Imagine how much a vastly bigger service enterprise, with a more generous education award, could magnify these social and economic returns. There's a third reason to enlarge AmeriCorps: to give more Americans a chance to serve their country. The demand for service positions far outstrips the **supply.** Many of the best-known **service programs**, such as Teach for America and City Year, have large waiting lists. Scaling up **AmeriCorps** would transform national service from an exceptional to a fairly common experience for young Americans. And, like the draft of old, it would be one of the few institutions in our increasingly stratified and segmented society **that throw together Americans from different** social and economic backgrounds. The experience of **working together across racial, ethnic, and class lines to solve common problems hones the basic skills of democratic citizenship -- the ability to see past stereotypes**, to empathize with others, to negotiate and compromise, and to transcend our group identities. In political scientist

Robert Putnam's term, it creates the "bridging" social capital essential to making a multiethnic **democracy work.**

Passing the affirmative plan will not only stop a war with China, but will also significantly

reduce a threat the United States has been battling since 2001: Terrorism. This is seen in:

Advantage Two – We will reduce terrorism.
In order to show you this, we've broken this down into three subpoints. Please note:

Subpoint A – Terrorism exists because injustices cause people to have little hope.
As stated by BBC Monitoring International, July 6, 2006

[BBC Monitoring International Reports. Global News Wire. "Pakistan PM Urges World to Address 'Root Causes' of Terrorism". July 6, 2006. http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=ae4ea273c501d8ba8541cdd945cdb23f&_docnum=7&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkVb&_md5=ef88f3b984759ecd4041cde53546d5ec]

[Newsreader] Prime Minister Shaukat Aziz has said terrorism has no frontiers and Pakistan condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations throughout the world. He was talking to the media after the ECOSOC [UN Economic and Social Council] conference in Geneva. The prime minister said we shall have to address the basic reasons which lead to terrorism.
[Aziz - recording] Terrorism is a challenge facing the whole world. It respects, knows no borders. And if you look around the world and delve into history you will see that terrorism has impacted every part of the world. It is not linked to any region, any faith, it is a universal phenomenon. We must examine the root causes of terrorism. We must also join together to fight terrorism because terrorism is no friend on anybody. And, today the world is doing that.
The root causes [of terrorism], in our view, stem from a feeling of deprivation - denial of a voice, denial of rights, denial of economic empowerment, denial of anything which humanity needs to progress and develop, so the two are linked in a way. **If you create economic opportunity and you reduce the sense of deprivation, you give people the right to express their views,** you give people the right to their own sovereignty then you will see the root causes will be **addressed and terrorism** will gradually reduced. So, there is a two-track approach. One is a security approach the other is identifying the reasons and addressing them and the world is moving in this direction and we are all committed to pursuing this.

Terrorist organizations exist. A terrorist attack from one of these organizations would

have catastrophic effects, as demonstrated in:

Subpoint B – A terrorist attack threatens extinction and the destruction of democracy.
As explained by Yonah Alexander, Senior Fellow and Director at the Center for Terrorism Studies, February 28th, 2002,

[Yonah, Senior Fellow and Director at the Center for Terrorism Studies, Federal Document Clearing House Congressional Testimony February 28, 2002] LP

The Threat of Modern Terrorism Scores of countries have experienced sporadic and relentless subnational and government-sponsored terrorism in the post-World War II period. Epitomizing the state of anarchy of contemporary life and increasingly becoming a universal nightmare, terrorism includes: kidnapping of businesspeople, assassination of political leaders, bombing of embassies, and hijacking of aircraft. **Modern** terrorism**,** in contrast to its older features, **has introduced a new breed of warfare** in terms of threats, technology, victimization, and responses. Perhaps the most significant dangers **that evolve** from **modern day** terrorism are those relating to the safety**,** welfare, and rights **of ordinary people;** stability of the state system; health of economic development; expansion of democracy; and possibly survival of civilization itself. And yet, on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned to witness the unprecedented drama of terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Thus, despite the end of the Cold War and the evolving era of the New World Order, terrorism

remains as threatening as ever. Undoubtedly, conflicts emerging from ideological, religious, and national animosities will continue to make terrorism a global problem well into the twenty-first century.

Terrorism is real. In the 21ˢᵗ Century, the United States faces a real threat from those who oppose it. Using the affirmative plan to increase civil service will significantly reduce this threat. This is indicated in:

Subpoint C – Expanding Americorps through the "Voluntary Path to Universal Service" significantly reduces the threat of terrorism by meeting America's needs.

Willam Marshall and Marc Magee, as cited earlier, explain in 2005 that,

[http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?knlgAreaID=115&subsecID=145&contentID=253340 The Americorps Experiment and the Future of National Serivce Will Marshall and Marc porter Magee Editors Progressive Policy Institute Washington, D.C. Has AmeriCorps Lived Up to Its Promise? | By March Porter Magee and William Marshall]
Marc Porter Magee is research director of the Partnership for Public Service, a nonprofit organization dedicated to revitalizing public service by inspiring a new generation to serve, and to transforming the way government works. Will Marshall is president and founder of the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI), a center for policy innovation in Washington, D.C. Established in 1989, PPI's mission is to modernize progressive politics and government for the Information Age. Marshall is editor of Building the Bridge: 10 Big Ideas to Transform America (Roman & Littlefield, 1997), co-editor of Mandate for Change (Berkley Books, 1992) and author of the 1988 DLC book Citizenship and National Service, which helped lay the groundwork for the AmeriCorps national service system created by President Clinton. Marshall was present at the creation of the Democratic Leadership Council, serving as its first policy director. P.111-112

Why is bigger better? The first and most compelling reason for expansion **is to match** the scale of America's unmet needs**.** Our country's "social deficit" is as daunting as our fiscal deficit. Compared with other rich countries, **the United States has very high rates of poverty** (especially among children), out-of-wedlock births, and youth violence, **as well as a wide** racial and ethnic gap in educational achievement. Add to these enduring social problems the new challenges presented by the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the baby boom's retirement, and you have a "to do" list that overwhelms government's current capacities. **We need to** mobilize the nation's civic resources more broadly to tackle such urgent **priorities as:**
 • **Tutoring and mentoring disadvantaged children**, especially those from broken families and those with parents in prison.
 • **Providing** long-term **care** and other help **for the elderly** to help America age successfully as the baby boomers retire.
 • **Protecting our homeland against terrorist attacks.**
 • Sharing the burden of military service to our country.
AmeriCorps' New Democrat **architects envisioned it** in the late 1980s as a way to mobilize citizen volunteers **to tackle national problems** that neither government agencies nor private markets could solve by themselves. Since then, Americans have become more attuned to the possibility of tackling public problems through new partnerships between the formal public sector and the informal realm of civic and voluntary groups (including faith-based organizations). National service is a prime example of this new, hybrid form of **public activism—a** decentralized, non-bureaucratic way to grapple with a wide array of **national challenges.**

The United States is at a crossroads. Taking the path it is currently on will lead to a war with China worse than has ever been seen. Moreover, it will lead to terrorist attacks of an unimaginable magnitude. Taking the other path institutes the affirmative plan, stopping a war with China and reducing terrorism attacks, making America a safer place. That fate now lies in your hands. Please weigh the options and vote accordingly.

Appendix C: Standards for Topicality

1. **5 Case Test.** The other team needs to provide fives cases that fall underneath this definition. If they cannot do so, the definition is over-limiting and should not be used.

2. **Best definition.** The team with the best definition should win the round.

3. **Bright Line.** This definition draws a clear line between what is topical and what is not.

4. **Field contextual definitions are best.** Definitions coming from experts in the field are best because they come from sources with first-hand knowledge about the topic.

5. **Layman definitions are best.** Definitions that come from dictionaries are best because they are universally accepted.

6. **Limits.** This definition appropriately limits the topic by providing restrictions on what can and cannot be done.

7. **Over-limits.** This definition over limits the topic to little to no cases by being too stringent.

8. **Reasonability.** The definition provided is reasonable, and should be accepted. Unreasonable definitions limit the topic to little to no cases.

9. **Slippery slope.** Voting for this argument creates unreasonable interpretations of terms, such as _____(explain).

Appendix D: Example of a Disadvantage

Produced by the Missouri State Debate Institute Camp in 2006

Uniqueness-Further rate hikes dangerous – the FRB could easily overshoot and trigger a recession – the threshold is near yet invisible

Isidore 6-14-06

New fear: A Fed gone too far OK, another rate hike is baked in. The worry now is whether the Fed will overshoot and cripple the economy. By Chris Isidore, CNNMoney.com senior writer June 14, 2006: 9:10 PM EDT NEW YORK (CNNMoney.com) - The debate about the Fed and rates is over. Long live the new debate.

http://money.cnn.com/2006/06/14/news/economy/fed_too_far/index.htm

Any remaining question about whether the Federal Reserve would raise interest rates again later this month appeared to end at 8:30 a.m. ET Wednesday, when the government's Consumer Price Index again showed more inflation pressures than forecast. Inflation and the Fed Getting the price(s) right With all eyes on inflation, there's a debate brewing about the best way to measure price pressures in the world's biggest economy. (more) No thanks to the Fed Everyone's been waiting to see what the central bank will do next. The minutes from the last meeting aren't much help. (more) The Bernanke panic Rate hikes by the Fed and other central banks have spooked investors around the world. Has the selling been overdone? (more) Quick Vote Will the Fed overshoot and raise interest rates too high? Definitely   Maybe   No way   Too early to say or View results A 17th straight quarter-percentage point increase in the fed funds rate, the Fed's key short-term rate target, to 5.25 percent, is now seen as all but certain by investors and economists alike. The debate has now quickly shifted to how high the Fed will go before ending its rate-hiking campaign, which turns two years old this month. The obvious next question then becomes whether the central bank will "overshoot" and hobble economic growth as it tries to keep a lid on price pressures - or even possibly cause a recession. At least one economist, Rich Yamarone, director of economic research at Argus Research, said he could see the fed funds rate as high as 6 percent by the end of the year if inflation doesn't cool off soon. That would suggest four more quarter-percentage point rate hikes at the Fed's five remaining meetings this year. "I've been thinking since October that the Fed was going to 5.5 percent," said Yamarone, who added he isn't yet ready to forecast a 6 percent rate, only that he sees an increased likelihood of rates that high. "If we continue to see these hot monthly inflation reports, the Fed definitely will have to go longer and stronger," he said. And the possibility of significantly higher rates was what was worrying some on Wall Street Wednesday. "We don't really fear inflation, we fear the medicine," said Art Hogan, chief market analyst at Jefferies & Co. "The real fear is that the Fed goes too far and really slows the economy down more than we would like to see. The medicine, if you take too much of it, can cause a recession." Already higher than neutral? Some economists argue that the Fed may have already gone past "neutral" in setting short-term rates; a so-called neutral fed funds rate would neither spur nor slow the economy. Jeoff Hall, chief U.S. economist at Thomson Financial, said he would put the neutral rate at about 2 percentage points above the core rate of inflation, which strips out volatile food and energy prices. Even with the core CPI rising to 2.4 percent in Wednesday's report, that suggests the Fed passed neutral two or three rate hikes ago. But even Hall said the Fed isn't wrong to be raising rates in an effort to reign inflation, even if it means a slowdown in the economy. "It's just that inflation is so in your face right now, the Fed can't run from it," said Hall. "The alternative is definitely worse. The ignition of inflation is something the Fed wants to avoid at all cost. A 5.25 percent rate is the right medicine, even if it's tough to take resulting slowdown." Hall said he believed a 5.25 percent rate would increase the odds of a recession and further hikes will increase that risk, but neither he nor most other economists are ready to predict one. Yamarone said he believed the economy is strong enough to continue growing even with a 6 percent fed funds rate. "We've been there before in recent history. I don't think that (6 percent fed funds rate) is something to alarm us," he said. "Of course trying to get the market to believe that might be a different story." But some economists say Ben Bernanke and fellow Fed policy-makers will do everything they can to pause from

<u>raising rates,</u> even if future inflation numbers keep showing some price pressure. They say they central bankers are aware that inflation generally doesn't peak until several months after the Fed stops raising rates, at least. "This Fed knows fairly well that there are lag effects. They know what they've done already has yet to be reflected in the economy," said Stuart Hoffman, chief economist, PNC Financial. **"If they get to 6 percent or higher, that is too high. They won't take rates that high unless inflation is much worse than anyone expects." But even Hoffman conceded the Fed has a history of raising rates too far in its past efforts to put on the brakes. "The problem is you never know if you've gone too far until you get there," he said**.

Link-Expanding National Service pulls youth out of the private sector labor market

Tucker 93
http://www.heritage.org/Research/Education/IB178.cfm Six Reasons Why Bill Clinton's National Service Program Is a Bad Idea by Tucker, Allyson M. Issue Bulletin #178 June 23, 1993 178 June23,1993

As already indicated, the NST legislation is expensive both in terms of actual costs as well as opportunity costs such as the work experience and education students must forgo while they perform their service. Although the Administration's legislation does not con- tain specifics about the cost of the NST, President **Clinton predicts that the program will cost $7.4 billion** from 1994 through 1997, with federal spending increases in future years. The President himself says that if there is more student interest than slots avail- able, he will "go back to the Congress and ask for more money."21 Furthermore, **the proposed $7.4 billion plan does not include the "opportunity" costs, or the costs inherent in taking qualified students out of the private sector job market and placing them in government "make-work projects**."

Brink-Tightening labor market triggers inflation & FRB rate hikes

Dr. Kellner, Weller professor of Economics at Hofstra University in 06
(Irwin, chief economist North Fork Bank, chief economist Market Watch, May 30, 2006, "You're Hired: Wages are finally about to start rising", website: Market Watch, website title:Tight Job Market Means Wages are about to Rise, http://www.marketwatch.com/News/Story/Story.aspx?guid=cda3e22d-1124-492f-83eb-93b4aea4d963&siteid=wsj&dist=morenews , accessed June 11, 2006)

Now that jobs are less difficult to come by, employees are itching to get back some of the buying power they lost to their bosses when the shoe was on the other foot.

Don't get me wrong, overall job growth is still puny. The nation's payrolls in May most likely expanded by around 170,000, if the consensus is right -- well below average. See our Economic Forecast page. This means that after 4-1/2 years of economic growth, the number of jobs in our economy has grown by only three percent -- one-fourth of the average gain during the previous seven expansions. It's also less than the pace of the expansion that followed the 1990-91 recession, which became known as the "jobless recovery." Not surprisingly, income growth is also off track. So far in this expansion, personal incomes have risen only about half as fast as they have done at this point in the past. In particular, average hourly earnings have failed to keep pace with the rate of inflation throughout most of

the current upswing. But although job creation is well below average, the fact remains that, even after 4-1/2 years of sub par growth, **the labor market is starting to tighten and a number of jobs are going begging.** Besides health care and technology, there are more jobs than potential employees in a number of other fields in many parts of the country. They range all over the pay scale and skill set, from blue collar workers to corporate executives. You'll see this ever-so-slight shift in the balance of power between employers and employees when May's data on average hourly earnings come out this Friday. If average hourly earnings did no more than advance by 0.3 percent in May, this will lift the year-over-year increase in wages to 3.9 percent -- the fastest pace in almost five years. And since the average worker has a long way to go to catch up with overall inflation -- not to mention the jump in prices of such critical items as health care, energy and shelter -- **you can rest assured that labor will press management for even bigger pay hikes every opportunity.** As you might imagine, this is good news and bad news. The good news is that bigger pay packets will boost household buying power just as the softening in the housing market is making it tougher for people to supplement their incomes by taking out home equity loans. This will help consumers keep spending, and thus the economy growing. The bad news is that **wages are the biggest cost for most firms, so if they can pass these costs along, it will boost inflation. This, of course, is sure to trigger more rate hikes by the Federal Reserve.** But there is always the possibility that business will have to eat these increases. That being the case, corporate profits will suffer, and so will the stock market.

Impact-US Recession risks global depression, killing more than regional wars
Lopez 98
BusinessWorld January 8, 1998, Thursday   SECTION: Pg. 5 LENGTH: 976 words HEADLINE: Upshot; Towards global recession BYLINE: Bernardo V. Lopez   BODY:

China and the US are actually the potential messiahs in global recession.   A global recession will make the 1929 depression in the US look like a sari-sari **store closing** down. **Global recession will lay off millions** across the planet, **and trigger a stoppage** of production **in all types of industries.** Industry-based nations with little or no agrarian economy, such as Singapore, will be the first to feel the pinch.   Moving out of recession takes time and while the crisis continues**, despair will** negate further efforts towards growth and induce **more crimes and war.** In other words, **a protracted recession will make it harder to get out of it and may cause a depression. A global depression can kill more people at a shorter time than a protracted regional war**. The IMF-World Bank bailout of beleaguered Asian economies, especially South Korea, is urgent since the ongoing regional recession may indeed spread out to affect even the more stable American economy. **An American recession will surely trigger a global recession**.

Appendix E: Answers to a Disadvantage

1. **Non-unique.** The disadvantage should have already happened because (explain).

2. **No Link.** The affirmative plan does not link to this disadvantage because (explain).

3. **No brink.** We do not know how much the affirmative plan must do to cause this disadvantage (explain).

4. **Turn.** We not cause the disadvantage, but instead prevent it or it is an advantage to us because (explain).

5. **No impact.** The disadvantage lacks a substantial impact because (explain).

6. **No magnitude.** We do not know how long the impact will last (explain).

7. **No timeframe.** How long does it take once the affirmative plan has passed for the disadvantage to occur? (explain).

8. **Empirically denied.** The analysis contained in the disadvantage is flawed and is proven by history and evidence not to happen because (explain).

9. **Case outweighs.** The benefits of voting affirmative outweigh the disadvantage because (explain).

Index