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| C:\Users\jordan.hart\Pictures\Jay Debate.png | **Speaking Order**  **\*\*\*\*Each Team receives 5 minutes of Prep Time\*\*\*\***  **1AC** First Affirmative Constructive **8 minutes**  **1st Affirmative is cross examined by the 2nd Negative 3 minutes**  **1NC** First Negative Constructive **8 minutes**  **1st Negative is cross examined by the 1st Affirnmative 3 minutes**  **2AC** Second Affirmative Constructive **8 minutes**  **2nd Affirmative is cross examined by the 1st Negative 3 minutes**  **2NC** Second Negative Constructive **8 minutes**  **2nd Negative is cross examined by the 2nd Affirmative 3 minutes**  **1NR** First Negative Rebuttal **5 minutes**  **1AR** First Affirmative Rebuttal  **5 minutes**  **2NR** Second Negative Rebuttal **5 minutes**  **2AR** Second Affirmative Rebuttal **5 minutes** |
| **2015-2016 Policy Debate Resolution:**  Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially curtail its domestic surveillance  **A Resolution is:** A debate topic that is phrased so that two sides, The affirmative and the negative, can support or argue against it.  **Proposition:** A statement that asserts that a course of action should be taken. | **Stock Issues!**  **Topicality-** The Affirmative team must run a plan that fits within the guidelines set by the Resolution. If they do not they are untopical and you can run a topicality argument on the Negative.  **Inherency-** The Affirmative case must have a barrier that is keeping the current system from adopting their plan. If they do not they are lacking an inherent barrier or inherency.  **Harms-** The Affirmative must present huge problems that are in the status quo now that are not being solved for. DEAD BODIES!  **Significance-** This stock issue goes hand in hand with harms. The problems that the Affirmative talks of; must be big enough to warrant change.  **Solvency-** The Affirmative must prove that they solve for the problems they present. They do not have to solve for 100% of the problems, just be better than the current system. |
| **Inherency**  **Structural Inherency-** There is an actual barrier to the plan passing. A rule, a law, a system, etc.  **Attitudinal Inherency-** The plan is unpopular. Could be political or public attitudes.  **Gap Inherency-** All other solutions have been flawed up until the proposal of the affirmative plan. Could also refer to the situation where a solution has been implemented, but only on a very small scale.  **Existential Inherency-** The Affirmative doesn’t really know what is blocking their plan, but there is something. Maybe no one thought of it before, or it just hasn’t been brought to light. **This is the weakest and most abusive type of inherency.**  **\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*This is also called an Inherent Barrier.\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*** | **Solvency**  **There are 2 types of solvency:**   1. **Empirical-** historically the plan has worked, or is working somewhere. 2. **Solvency Advocate-** There is a person with solid qualifications that says your plan will work.   In cross-x, you can be really sneaky as a Negative and ask the Affirmative Who is your solvency advocate?  **Terms Related to Solvency:**  **1. Solvency Deficit:** term used to imply that the affirmative team does not fully solve for every harm they claim (important for the negative team to exploit) |
| **HARMS**  Problems and Harms ARE NOT equal!  Problems only become harms when the problem carries IMPACT.  If an argument carries no impact….THERE IS NOT REASON TO FIX IT!  **Quantitative Harm:** deals with frequency (How many?)  **Qualitative Harm:** deals with severity (How bad?) | **Terms to Know**   1. **Fiat-** The affirmative will reserve this right. It basically means that they do not have to prove that congress will actually pass their plan. We don’t debate those mechanics, we assume that plan will pass and debate the issues. 2. **A Priori-** Latin phrase that means, “Before all else”. It usually is referenced when dealing with Topicality. Topicality is a procedural issue that deals with the rules of debate, A priori asks the judge to consider Topicality before they consider the merits of the case. 3. **Prima Facie-** Latin phrase that means, “At first face”. Affirmatives have the burden of prima facie. That simply means, after the 1AC, all stock issues should have been presented. |
| **Topicality**   1. **Definition or Interpretation-** Read a definition of the word the Affirmative team is violating. 2. **Violation-** A statement in your own words of why the Affirmative team is not falling within the bounds of the resolution. 3. **Standards-** Why your definition is superior and should be considered the best. 4. **Voters-** Why topicality matters in Debate. It is a rule of the game!!   **Extra Topicality-** The plan does more than what the resolution calls for. The team does not lose, they just sever the extra topical segment of their plan and any advantages that they get from that portion of plan.  **Effects Topicality-** The plan is not immediately topical. It takes several steps before the plan actually deals with the resolution. Teams can lose the round if they are effects topical. | **IMPORTANT REMINDERS ABOUT**  **ASKING QUESTIONS IN CROSS-EXAMINATION**  **1. Work hard to be an expert!** Ensures confidence in the arguments. Be assertive and if you don’t understand something…ask!  **2. Think Strategically!** What is the goal you seek in asking the question? Do you want to prove the plan is vague? Do you want to show how the harms are insignificant? Do you want to set up a disadvantage by showing how the plan links to the DA? Do you want to show that the team has a solvency deficit? WHAT?!  **3. Ask questions about evidence.** If something sounds too good to be true, it probably is. Ask questions about the credentials of the author (especially solvency evidence). Ask questions about the actual body of the evidence? Does it say what it is supposed to say?  **4. POLITELY interrupt.** If you ask a question and fail to receive the answer you desire, politely interrupt and say, “I’m sorry, but you are not answering the question, the question was…” WHEN? If they’re overly wordy; if you need to move on; if your judge is sending visual cues that that you should interrupt.  **5. Don’t be afraid to move on!** There is rarely a time in CX when you need to spend the entire time on one question. Ask, then move on...and if you aren’t satisfied with the answer, ask it again. BUT, if you still aren’t satisfied…move on and make a point in your speech about it. |
| **Disadvantages**  **DA’s may include the following:**   1. **Uniqueness-** The DA is not happening now in the current system. 2. **Link-** All DA’s must have this. The link explains how the disad applies to the affirmative case. 3. **Brink-** We are at a key time in the current system, things could get better or they could get worse. It is like a seesaw. 4. **Internal Link-** Any additional steps to get from the Link to the Impacts 5. **Impact-** Really Big Bad things are going to occur when we pass the Affirmative plan   **\*\*\*Make sure that you include Timing, Magnitude and Location. How big, how bad, how soon this DA will happen\*\*\***  **A basic DA Shell Has: Uniqueness, Link, and Impact** | **IMPORTANT REMINDERS ABOUT**  **ANSWERING QUESTIONS IN CROSS-EXAMINATION**  **1. Exploit open-ended questions.** Less is more. If your opponents ask you an open-ended question (who, what, when, where, why, how), they are inviting you to showcase your intellect and your evidence. Take them up on the offer—why? Because the more time you can “waste” answering the question, the less time they’ll have left to ask you truly threatening questions.  **2. Don’t be afraid to have them repeat the question.** If you need to buy yourself some time OR if you genuinely don’t understand the question, politely ask them to repeat or rephrase the question.  **3. You have a partner for a reason.** Don’t be afraid to say: “My partner will address that in the next speech?” This is an effective way in really saying, “I don’t know the answer” but is not framed negatively.  **4. You don’t know every answer.** One of the biggest mistakes people make is trying to give an answer to a question they don’t know the answer to. It usually turn out POORLY. If someone asks: “Who is Mr. Blah Blah”, it is okay to say, “I’m not sure who Mr. Blah Blah is, but the warrants in the evidence are…” |
| **Cross- X Questions for Negative**   1. What is your inherent barrier? 2. What is the barrier in the current system that is allowing your harm to occur? 3. Please explain your what your plan is doing in your own words. 4. Who is responsible for implementation of your plan? 5. How will your plan be enforced? 6. **If funding is through normal means:** What is normal means? 7. What is the penalty for noncompliance? 8. How much will your plan cost? 9. Where is the money for your plan coming from? 10. Will there be a trade off with other areas in order to come up with the money for your case? 11. What is the duration of your plan? 12. How long before we see any solvency? When we will see the positive effects of the plan? 13. Who is your solvency advocate? 14. How is your plan topical? 15. How are your harms significant? | **ANSWERING QUESTIONS IN CROSS-EXAMINATION**  **1. Exploit open-ended questions.** Less is more. If your opponents ask you an open-ended question (who, what, when, where, why, how), they are inviting you to showcase your intellect and your evidence. Take them up on the offer—why? Because the more time you can “waste” answering the question, the less time they’ll have left to ask you truly threatening questions.  **2. Don’t be afraid to have them repeat the question.** If you need to buy yourself some time OR if you genuinely don’t understand the question, politely ask them to repeat or rephrase the question.  **3. You have a partner for a reason.** Don’t be afraid to say: “My partner will address that in the next speech?” This is an effective way in really saying, “I don’t know the answer” but is not framed negatively.  **4. You don’t know every answer.** One of the biggest mistakes people make is trying to give an answer to a question they don’t know the answer to. It usually turn out POORLY. If someone asks: “Who is Mr. Blah Blah”, it is okay to say, “I’m not sure who Mr. Blah Blah is, but the warrants in the evidence are…” |
| **Cross- X Questions Continued…**   1. Has there been any positive outcome as a result of the policy which allows surveillance? If so, why should we risk our security and reduce the level of surveillance occurring? 2. What current law within the US are you curtailing? 3. How does your plan substantially curtail surveillance? 4. How can your plan guarantee that our national security will not be put into jeopardy as a result of reducing the surveillance your plan proposes? 5. How do you guarantee that the advantages you claim will be net-beneficial to the status quo? 6. How does the plan you propose solve for corruption and individuals who ignore laws? | **ATTACKING OTHER TEAM’S EVIDENCE**  **1. Anecdotal Evidence:** if you hear the affirmative only talk about one isolated example, you should point it out  **2. Assertions:** if the affirmative merely states a claim without support, you need to say that the argument has no evidence and therefore should not stand.  **3. Conclusionary Evidence:** if the evidence merely states a conclusion without properly explaining why the conclusion is true, then point it out to the judge by saying, “There is no warrant to the conclusion, and must therefore not be considered as valid.” |
| **ATTACKING OTHER TEAM’S EVIDENCE**  **4. Biased Sources:** look at authors. Bias can be revealed in their job, their affiliations, the manner in which they state their views. Evidence should be unbiased. If it is not, then point it out as invalid  **5. Dates:** policy concerns itself with rapidly changing issues. If the evidence is old, then provide say, “their evidence is old and our claims post-date their evidence.”  **6. No Causality:** if the affirmative makes a claim and says that one event or idea led to another, but has no specific link that connects them, point out to the judge saying, “their evidence and their claims do not correlate.”  **7. The “Does it make sense?” test:** attack the logic of the evidence when evidence seems unclear. Or provide counter-examples and/or your own knowledge to attack the evidence that is unclear. | **JUDGE ADAPTATION:**  1. **Talk to your judge**. Before the debate, it's fine to ask the judge what they think you should do or shouldn't or do in-round. Most judges will be happy to answer you: you're demonstrating that you respect their time, and that you want to debate in a way they'll enjoy.  2. **Watch your judge.** Some judges will smile, frown, nod or shake their head, look bored or engaged, or give you other non-verbal signals that they like or don't like the argument you're making. If it seems like they like your argument – remember to watch the judge and have your partner watch the judge to see what they like and dislike. Focus on that argument in later speeches, and you'll have a good chance to win the debate  3. **Work on your argument skills and your speaking skills.** All judges appreciate a good, logical argument, and all judges appreciate polished speaking skills.  4. **Be respectful to your opponents.** Again, all judges want this, but some might care so much about it that they'll decide the debate on that alone. |
| **REBUTTALS**  **Rebuttals- The purpose is to summarize and weigh all the important arguments in the round.**  **\*KEY REMINDER:** Spend the majority of your time on the arguments you are winning, and tell the judge why those arguments warrant a ballot for your side  **THREE WAYS TO WEIGH IMPACTFUL ARGUMENTS**  **1. Timeframe:** – in how long will the impact occur? Impacts that happen farther into the future may be less likely to occur, since it's often more difficult to make predictions over the long term.  **2. Magnitude:** – how big is an impact? This includes both how many people an impact affects and the way in which it affects them.  **3. Probability:** how likely is the impact to occur? Do we know that the impact is going to happen (maybe because it's already happening), or is a hypothetical future problem? | **FLOWING SHORTHANDS:** |