Policy Debate Glossary

(These terms shall be used in conjunction with the Competitor's Standards for conducting all CCA debate tournaments.)

Addendum: The concluding and typically extra-topical plank of the affirmative team's plan which adds further provisions that may be necessary to complete the plan's implementation. For example, it might provide for the repeal of conflicting legislation, indicate the intent of the plan, and provide other details that could help make the plan comprehensive and understandable.

Ad Hominem: A Latin term that means "attack on the man." This form of argument attacks the person rather than the argument.

Advantages: The benefits or gains that the affirmative team claims will result from adopting its plan. These advantages must be shown to outweigh any disadvantages.

Agency: In this aspect of the plan, the affirmative team specifies who will be responsible for administering its plan. This may include identifying who will enact the plan and/or who will do the work of the plan. The affirmative must provide the essential details of the agency that will put its plan into effect.

Argumentation: Giving a reason that justifies acts, beliefs, attitudes, or values.

Argumentation: (Speaker Criteria) Refutation and rebuttal – challenging opponents' points by showing flaws or weaknesses in their arguments or overcoming opponents' arguments by re-explaining or rebuilding their own arguments. A well-argued presentation includes tearing down a case by refuting evidence with stronger, more credible, and current evidence as well as by challenging the opponents' reasoning with stronger, clearer, more logical reasoning using direct refutation, linking arguments, and showing significance of argument.

Assertion: A claim offered without supporting evidence or reasoning.

Burden of Proof: The obligation of the affirmative, to overcome presumption, to give good and sufficient reasons for affirming the resolution.

Burden of Rebuttal: The obligation of the negative to refute at least one of the stock issues of the affirmative, otherwise the affirmative will prevail provided it has met its burden of proof.

Burden of Rejoinder: The obligation to refute or respond to opposing arguments. It applies to both the affirmative and the negative as far as it challenges the argument of the other.

Communication: (Speaker Criteria) Conversational quality – speaking to sound spontaneous no matter how many times a speech has been rehearsed. One facet of a well-communicated speech is the use of verbal techniques which include changes in a speaker's rate, pitch, and volume that give the voice variety and expressiveness. Effective communication is also characterized by proper pronunciation and enunciation. The second facet of communication is the use of non-verbal techniques. This is communication that occurs because of appearance, posture, gestures, eye contact, facial expressions, and other non-linguistic factors.

Comparative Advantages Analysis Affirmative: A case in which the affirmative team accepts the goals of the status quo and argues that its plan offers a better way to attain these goals and that its plan will produce greater advantages than the status quo. The four essential features of the comparative advantages case are 1) identify the goals of the status quo, 2) integrate the plan with the goals, 3) provide significant advantages linked to the plan, and 4) prove the advantages are comparative.

Cross-examination: The three-minute period following each constructive speech during which opponents may question the constructive speaker.

Cross examination: (Speaker Criteria) an effective cross examination will employ assertive, thoughtful, pertinent questions and responses. The ability to think and respond spontaneously without much preparation time is an important facet of cross-examination and should include questions of fact, value, and policy. Cross-examinations provide the opportunity to investigate, check, inquire, clarify, interrogate, and question.

Definitions: Are critical to policy debate; it is important that all parties involved understand what is meant by a particular word usage. Some criteria to prove a satisfactory definition are: (not all of these will apply in all circumstances)

- Prove your definition is officially stipulated as the correct one for this resolution.
- Prove your definition is grammatically correct.
- Prove your definition is derived from the appropriate field.
- Prove your definition is based on common usage.
- Prove your definition is consistent with policy maker's usage.
- Prove your definition meets the original understanding of the framers of the resolution.
- Prove your definition provides a clear distinction between what is legitimately included and what is legitimately excluded by the definition.
- Prove your definition provides a fair division of ground.

Disadvantage: An off-case position taken by the Negative Team which argues that adoption of the Affirmative Case would have unintended consequences, separate from the planks of the Affirmative Case, which counterbalance the Affirmative Advantages and undermine the Affirmative's claims of Significance.

Division of Labor: Occurs between negative team speakers when the 1NC spends much of its time focusing on some, but not all, of the affirmative arguments using logic, evidence, and reasoning, only briefly addressing all other on-case arguments. The 2NC then spends much of its time focusing on the remaining arguments using logic, evidence, and reasoning, but again, at least briefly addressing all on-case arguments.

Dropped Argument: Any argument that is not addressed in the subsequent speech.

Ellipsing of Evidence: Ellipsing is to leave out with ellipses or to strike out unnecessary verbiage. This is permitted so long as it does not change the original meaning of the quotation. Students should be able to verify the context of ellipsed evidence in the event of a challenge at the discretion of the Tournament Director. At a minimum, students are expected to be able to provide a full citation to the original source.

Enforcement: The aspect of the affirmative case which specifies a means of making people behave the way intended by the developers of the plan. The affirmative case may include fines, prison terms, or other forms of coercion or incentives to encourage people to act in the way necessary for their plan to work. In some circumstances, the affirmative may be able to demonstrate that, under the new conditions created by its plan, people will act in the desired way because it is now in their self-interest to do so. Enforcement can be described as "through normal means," which is to say that is not specified by the plan, but simply uses the existing law enforcement mechanisms of the status quo.

Ethics: The principles of right and wrong that govern conduct.

Evidence: Consists of facts and opinions used to generate proof.

Extra Topicality: The Affirmative Team may have some provisions in its plan that are not specifically enumerated in the resolution but provide for a reasonable implementation of its proposal. These provisions are typically described as "extra topical." Affirmative advantages may not be drawn from extra topical mandates. Advantages drawn from extra topical mandates are not a result of adopting the resolution, not likely to be unique to the resolution, and therefore should be rejected as a reason for adopting the affirmative plan.

Fiat Power: The affirmative's authority, as defined by the resolution, to implement its plan.

Funding and Staffing: The aspect of the affirmative case that provides the necessary finances to implement the plan.

Goals: An element of the Comparative Advantages Analysis Affirmative Case Structure that refers to the goals of the policy defined by the resolution that is being debated. In this case structure, there must be an identifiable relationship between the goals accepted by the Affirmative Team and the resolution as justified by the planks in the plan that

implement the resolution. The Affirmative Team must select goals that are from the specific policy being reformed. Goals that identify broad ideological ideals that are not associated with the specific policy being reformed are not significant and are prohibited.

Harm: The evil or important problem that the affirmative team claims to exist in the status quo and that requires remedy. (Often referred to as "need")

Inherency: One of four stock issues in policy debate. It argues the relationship between the status quo and the probability of future harm or inability of the status quo to fully meet a specific goal. The affirmative team must prove that each significant harm or unachieved goal that it identifies is built into the essential nature of the status quo such as through legal structures or societal attitudes, and that the needs identified by the affirmative can only be met by adopting the affirmative case.

Interventionist Judging: The aspect of the judging paradigm that allows a judge to use his personal knowledge, wisdom, and experience to evaluate matters of ethics in the round regardless of the students' arguments.

Justification: (Speaker Criteria) The basic issue in the speech which deals with the questions of policy: "Is there a genuine problem or need that requires a change from current policy? Is this problem widespread and is it significant enough to require change?" It is also the aspect of a speech designed to change or reinforce the audience's beliefs or actions. A well-justified speech will present evidence and reasoning in a winsome manner by using Aristotle's *Available Means of Persuasion:* Logos [logical appeal], Pathos [emotional appeal], and Ethos [speaker's character or likeability].

Kritic: A popular form of argument usually initiated by the negative team in a debate. It is an argument that challenges the philosophical foundations or applies ethical constructs to the opponent's advocacy and its implications. This type of argument is typically structured like a disadvantage, is argued as an absolute voting issue, and falls outside the scope of the four stock issues. Kritics may be based on attacks on some aspect of the opposing advocates' performance, such as language use or on the underlying presuppositions of the resolution or their proposal. For example, a negative might notice the affirmative's use of the generic "he" and suggest that the judge reject the affirmative for furthering the sexist thinking of those present in the debate. Another form of kritic argument questions the premises upon which the resolution, and therefore the affirmative plan, is based. For example, the negative might argue that the resolution (and the affirmative) relies on governmental solutions to social problems. It could then argue that it is governments that cause most of the world's problems and that reliance on the state to solve social problems is philosophically wrong. It then follows that the affirmative should be rejected, because it relies on the state for reform. (Note: This technique is prohibited in this league.)

Logic: The use of evidence and reasoning in one of many forms with the objective of persuading.

Mandates: Those elements of the affirmative team's plan that will be implemented through fiat power to solve the harms presented and accrue the advantages.

Minor Repair: A non-resolutional minor change in existing programs to solve the problem, which is advocated by the negative. Should not require structural change and should not be within the philosophy of the present system, a form of Counter Plan. (Note: This technique is prohibited in this league.)

Need: *See* definition of "Harm."

Needs Analysis Affirmative: An affirmative case wherein a significant inherent need (or harm) in the status quo exists that can best be solved by adopting the affirmative team's plan. This plan will solve the need and, thus, provide significant advantages.

Negative Block: The back-to-back negative speeches (2NC and 1NR). These speeches are to be treated as separate speeches and have the same responsibilities as every other speech in the debate round.

Novice Team: A team consisting of two students who are both in their first year of debate.

Off-case Arguments: Negative arguments that, while not directly responding to the affirmative's case point by point, are offered as significant reasons for rejecting the case or plan. Disadvantages are an example of off-case arguments.

On-case Arguments: Arguments that directly respond to the affirmative team's case, point-by-point, using either the affirmative team's case organization sequence or in a sequence selected by the appropriate speaker.

Oral Critique: A ten-minute period at the end of the debate round where the judge may review the debate, give examples of effective argumentation from the round, and offer suggestions for improvement. The judge does not reveal the outcome of the round in the oral critique.

Organization: (Speaker Criteria) Strategic and methodical structuring of the speech – arranging a speech in such a way as to achieve a certain result with a particular audience. A well-organized speech has an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. It uses main points, transitions, signposts, internal previews, and internal summaries which the listener can follow.

Plan: That portion of the affirmative case that attempts to solve the harms and to accrue the advantages. It is comprised of mandates, funding, agency, and enforcement.

Prep Time: A total of five minutes allotted to each team in the round. It can be used at the team's discretion, except that it may not be used prior to cross-examination.

Presumption: The perspective that the essential feature of the status quo should continue until good and sufficient reason is given to justify a change.

Prima Facie: A Latin term which means "on its face" or "at first glance." In debate, this term refers to the fact that the affirmative case, as presented in the first affirmative constructive speech, must present a complete case – a case that, in and of itself, provides good and sufficient reason for adopting the proposition. Each case must provide effective issue statements to answer all four stock issue questions.

Rebuttal: Argumentation meant to overcome opposing evidence and reasoning by introducing other evidence and reasoning that will destroy its effect. The second speech by each advocate in the debate.

Refutation: Argumentation meant to overcome opposing evidence and reasoning by proving that it is false or erroneou**s.**

Resolution: A statement of policy that identifies the central issue(s) in a debate (also known as a proposition).

Resolutional Analysis: A resolutional analysis is analogous to an opening quotation; it may be illustrative, but it is not one of the arguments in the flow of the round. As a statement of analysis by the affirmative team that is not required in any CCA debate case structure, it does not require a response from the negative team or confer any advantage to the affirmative team.

Rhetoric: As defined by Plato, "A universal art of winning the mind by argument."

Significance: One of four stock issues in policy debate. It argues the degree of importance or impact attached to an issue. The affirmative team must prove that the essential elements of the case are quantitatively and/or qualitatively important. As a concept, significance can also refer to affirmative case advantages and negative case (or status quo) disadvantages, as each must prove the value of the advantage or disadvantage.

Solvency: One of four stock issues in policy debate. It argues the ability of a plan to work and to solve or significantly reduce the harm(s) identified by the affirmative.

Speed and Spread: A debate technique where a speaker uses a rapid mode of speaking, typically speaking faster than 160 words per minute to overwhelm the opposition. (Note: This technique is prohibited in this league.)

Splitting the Negative: A debate technique where the first negative speaker (1NC) fails to address the entire affirmative case, usually only addressing half (definitions and harms) of the case. The second negative speaker (2NC) then addresses only the

arguments omitted by the first speaker (plan and advantages). (Note: This technique is prohibited in this league.)

Status Quo: The existing state of things: the present system.

Stock Issues: Issues common to most decision-making situations. In policy debate, they refer to topicality, significance, inherency, and solvency.

Tag-teaming: Receiving hints, clues, or answers from a team member or the audience while speaking or during cross-examination.

Topicality: One of four stock issues in policy debate. It argues a state of conformity between the affirmative case and the intent of the debate resolution.

Varsity Team: A team consisting of two students where at least one of the students has debated for at least one year.

Voting Issues: The stock issues of topicality, significance, inherency, and solvency. *See* "Stock Issues."