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Introduction

Debate is the best educational tool we have for developing empowered learners and critical thinkers. Teaching debate is both a challenge and a privilege. It allows instructors to creatively engage subjects and motivate their students.

The DEBATE-Kansas City Guidebook is designed to assist debate instructors in directing students through the exciting world of policy debate.

- **Flexibility**
  The material is presented in order of difficulty, but it can be altered or supplemented to fit individual teaching needs.

  Debate is best taught in depth and generous amounts of time. However, some teams only meet once a week. To best fit varying needs, you will find tips that highlight the most critical units to cover. Some units can be reserved for later in the year or taught with more brevity.

- **Organization and Development**
  The book is divided into 14 units. The first few units explain the format and feel of policy debate, while covering the fundamentals of argumentation and public speaking. Many following units cover major arguments in debate, such as stock issues, disadvantages and counter-plans. Other units focus on specific components of debate itself – like cross-examination, judge adaptation and research.

- **Content**
  Each unit includes lecture materials, class discussion topics and lesson plans that can be used to generate homework assignments. Many units contain supplemental lesson plans. Freely pick the best lectures, class discussions and lesson plans to suit your teaching style and students.

  Several units also include a “Talking Debate” section to explain and define special debate terminology. These can be used as quizzes at the completion of each unit.
• **Styles, Preferences & Adaptation**

Since the 1980’s the presentational styles of policy debate have changed tremendously. The most notable development in modern debate has been the use of “speed-reading.” This occurs when a debater reads evidence at lightning speed to make as many arguments as possible during the time limit. A slower, more dramatic, oratorical style of debate remains popular in regions of the United States where coaches value persuasion and traditional approach.

The newest development in debate has been the use of form, or the speaking style of debate, to advance arguments and criticize some opponents. This postmodern approach includes the use of poetry, personal narratives, music, rhyming, and satire with new styles emerging each year.

The DKC Guidebook does not favor any one style of policy debate. Styles are explained with equal merit and the aspect of debate valued most is judge adaptation. Debaters cannot control a judge’s preferences, but they can control how they adapt to those preferences. Even debaters who challenge traditional judging standards need to understand preferences. Without a keen understanding of judging preferences a persuasive case for change is problematic.
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Pre-Season Teacher Schedule

Prepare for the Upcoming Season: Summer

*Keep in touch* with students attending debate camp or doing summer research. Ask what they have learned.

- **Gather debate evidence** from various sources.
  1. DEBATE–Kansas City
  2. Debate camps
  3. Original research
  4. Student research
  5. Debate handbooks*
     * Numerous handbooks are available on the internet, developed by college debate programs across the country. However, most of these cost money.

- **Make copies** of novice affirmatives and key negative arguments for all students anticipated to participate in debate. Before school starts you should have copies of the following:
  - ALL DKC Files
    - Community Schools Affirmative
    - Community Schools Negative
    - Spending Disadvantage
    - States Counter Plan
    - Discourse of Poverty Kritik
  - 1 Affirmative Case and extension evidence
  - 3-5 Generic Disadvantages
  - 1 Topicality file
  - 1 Generic Negative Solvency file
  - 10-15 Negative case files on the most popular cases
  - 1 Counter-plan (for more advanced students)
  - 1 Kritik (for more advanced students)

Start the Season: Fall

- Use the DKC Guidebook to teach policy debate.

Begin the New Topic: Spring Semester

- Ask students about signing up for *summer debate camp*.
- If available, use class time or after-school practices to discuss the new policy debate resolution.
- Begin *experimental research* and organize *practice debates* (this only applies if you have a class or continued after-school meetings).
- Brainstorm *summer research assignments*.
- Do *your own reading* on the topic.
- Make sure that students update their contact information (email, phone number, alternate addresses, etc.) through the DEBATE-Kansas City Blog (*http://debatekc.edublogs.org/students/*) so you can keep in touch.
Unit 1: Introduction to Debate Part 1

What is debate?
“…an equitably structured communication event about some topic of interest, with opposing advocates alternating before an opportunity is given for decision.”
(Many Sides, Debate Across the Curriculum, Snider and Schnurer, 2002)

What does that mean?
Basically, a debate has two sides arguing opposite points of view. A clear topic is needed to keep the debate focused and provide a basis for picking the winner. Both sides are given an equal amount of time to speak. Finally a judge or group of judges picks a winner based on the arguments presented.

Class Discussion: What are some topics that could be debated? Have the class brainstorm over topics (any topics, such as what is better peanut butter or jelly) that could be debated.

Why do we need debate?
We have entered the information age. We are constantly confronted by advertisements, propaganda and “expert” opinions on numerous issues. Despite this increased access to information, citizens have become less involved in our democracy, as if information overload has lead to apathy.

Debate encourages critical thinking as we try to make sense of the world. Debate provides its participants with tools to dissect information, express opinions and form sound conclusions. Rather than relying on how or what others tell them to think, debaters can think for themselves.

Class Discussion: What would happen if citizens were not allowed to debate? Can you think of times when you were not allowed to debate? What were the circumstances and how did this make you feel?

Where does debate happen?
Debate happens all around us in our everyday life and throughout society. Debate can occur in a formal setting like Congress or it can occur informally in our homes and communities. Kids might debate with their parents over a bed time or a punishment. Customers may debate store owners if they want to return a faulty product. Students might debate a teacher over a grade. We all engage in some form of debate everyday.

Class Discussion: List something you have debated recently.
Have the students raise their hands and list recent debates where they have been involved.
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Class Exercise 1A
Introduce a Class Member

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1, 2, 4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6.
KS: Communication Arts Listening, Viewing and Speaking.

Objective:
Students will learn to formulate questions, socialize with classmates and give short speeches.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Timer

Time Requirement:
Approximately two 50-minute class periods.

Instructions:

1. Tell your students a little about yourself. This could include personality traits, family life, hobbies, interests, place of residence, etc. You might consider telling a story about an event in your life that reveals aspects of your character, likes, dislikes, etc.

2. Ask the students the following questions, and write their responses on the board.
   - What types of things do you find interesting about people?
   - What questions do you ask someone you are trying to get to know?

3. Add some questions to the discussion, such as:
   - What do you like most about school?
   - What is your biggest fear?
   - What would you do if you won a million dollars?
   - What is your favorite way to spend free time?
When were you the happiest, saddest, angriest, most embarrassed, etc? Explain what happened that made you feel this way.
Class Exercise 1A
Introduce a Class Member

3. Add some questions to the discussion, cont.
   - (add your own questions here)
   - ______________________________________
   - ______________________________________
   - ______________________________________
   - ______________________________________
   - ______________________________________
   - ______________________________________

4. Divide the class into pairs, and ask the students to interview their partner using questions from the board or other questions they create (assuming the questions are appropriate). Optional: Students can write down three (or more) questions and their partners’ answers to be turned in for a grade.

5. Ask all students to create a 1-2 minute speech about the person they interviewed. Their speech should include the following:
   - Begin with an interesting story about the person
   - Tell the person’s name and age
   - Include information from the interview

6. During the next class period, each student will give a speech that introduces the person they interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began with an interesting story about the person</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides the person’s name and age</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included information from the interview</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met time limit</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 25
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Introduction to Debate Part 2

What type of debate will we learn in this class?

High schools and colleges across the nation participate in academic policy debate. This is different from debate that occurs in everyday life. It is even different from debate you see on TV shows like CNN’s “Crossfire” or the Presidential Debates that occur every four years. Academic policy debate has a set of established rules and a common topic that is chosen each year. The winner of the debate is chosen by a judge, or sometimes a panel of judges, who watch the entire debate and vote for the team that debated the best. The word “team” is used because policy debate requires each side to be represented by two individuals who form a debate team.

Three basic principles of policy debate:

I. EQUITY  
II. RULES  
III. TOPIC

I. EQUITY

Both teams have an equal amount of time to make their arguments. A good debate will give both sides an equal chance to win. Equality is needed to make the competition fair.

II. RULES

Debate has been around for a long time. A set of basic rules has been established to establish fairness and create stimulating debates. Debates are predictable, but the rules and the fairness they impart provide challenge. When both sides agree to common rules, they know what to expect and they will be prepared. If the Kansas City Chiefs and the Denver Broncos disagreed on the rules of football, it would be impossible to have a fair game. Similarly, if you debated without basic rules it would be difficult to have a good debate with a clear winner.

The competitive rules followed by all DEBATE–Kansas City participants are governed by the National Forensic League (NFL) and the state activities associations. Kansas schools follow the guidelines for competition from the Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA). Missouri schools abide by the Missouri State High School Activities Association (MSHSAA) rules.

Each tournament host also has the ability to dictate certain competitive requirements to the attending schools. It is important for students to familiarize themselves with the rules of the game of policy debate. It is just as important for debate coaches to know any changes in competitive rules, travel restrictions, and tournament restrictions made by their respective state association. Coaches can obtain copies of state association rulebooks by contacting their school’s activities director or by directly contacting the state activities association.
Contact information for rules organizations:

Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA)
601 SW Commerce Place, PO Box 495, Topeka, KS 66601-0495
Phone: (785) 273-5329
Fax: (785) 271-0236
Email: kshsaa@kshsaa.org
Website: www.kshsaa.org

Missouri State High School Activities Association (MSHSAA)
1 North Keene St., PO Box 1328, Columbia, MO 65205-1328
Phone: (573) 875-4880
Fax: (573) 875-1450 or (573) 875-2379
Email: email@mshsaa.org
Website: www.mshsaa.org

National Forensic League (NFL)
125 Watson Street, PO Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971
Phone: (920) 748-6206
Fax: (920) 748-9478
Email: nfl@centurytel.net
Website: www.nflonline.org

National Catholic Forensic League (NCFL)
Missouri, Rand Pierce, Email: randebrate@aol.com
Kansas, Kenneth King, Email: kennethking@smsd.org

III. TOPIC

Every year, high schools across the nation vote on ONE topic to be debated for a full school year. This topic is known as the resolution. One topic may seem restrictive, but resolutions are usually broad enough to allow for variety. The resolution will always call for a change in policy, usually by the US federal government. One side of the debate, known as the AFFIRMATIVE, has the duty to uphold or support the resolution. The NEGATIVE opposes the resolution.

The resolution for 20098-10 is:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

Class Discussion: What does the topic mean to you?
Have a brief discussion over the resolution and the students’ first impressions.
Switching Sides. One element that makes debate exciting is that everyone must switch sides. You will both support and oppose the resolution. In fact, at most tournaments, you switch sides after each debate. The AFFIRMATIVE is the name of the side that supports the resolution, while the NEGATIVE opposes the resolution. This means debaters will sometimes argue for ideas that they do not support.

Proof. Both sides of the debate will need evidence, or quotes from research, to prove their arguments are supported by facts and experts. Debaters carry crates or tubs that contain volumes of debate evidence into each debate round. Debates can be decided by what team has the best evidence to support their claims, so doing research can lead to success.

Where does academic policy debate take place?
Debate tournaments take place at many high schools across the nation. Usually 15 to 45 schools gather for a weekend to participate in a debate tournament. A schedule is created and every team debates a certain number of rounds, usually four to six. The teams with the best records advance to elimination rounds (such as quarterfinals, semifinals and finals) until a winner emerges. The debates will take place in normal classrooms with debaters and judges using desks and tables to get situated.

Putting it all together
To recap, policy debate is based on a firmly established set of rules, including speech times. In each debate, you will find two teams with two members on each team. Each team is from a different school. They debate a topic, known as the resolution. One side supports the resolution, while the other side negates it. A judge watches the entire debate and picks the winner based on the arguments presented in the debate.
Class Exercise 1B
Watching a Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 4-7
KS: Communication Arts Listening & Viewing

Direct Objective:
Students watch a practice debate to become familiar with the activity.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Varsity debaters or video with TV/VCR

OPTION: This lesson can be accomplished in one of two ways. You can either play the students a video of a practice debate on the new topic or you can have returning varsity debaters put on a practice debate.

Instructions:
1. Describe to your novice students what they are about to see.
   a. Let them know approximately how long the debate will last.
   b. Let them know a little about the structure of the round (speaking times, speaker order, etc.).
   c. Encourage new students to attempt to flow (see definition on page 8). This early in the year you are really just asking them to take notes, but you can use the practice debate to introduce the concept of flowing.
   d. Let the students know that they are likely to be confused, and that is OK! Explain that debate takes time to absorb and understand.

2. If your varsity debaters are demonstrating the debate, they should be told to go very slow and avoid using too much debate terminology.

3. You should stop the debate after each speech to ask and answer questions. Varsity debaters can yield to questions from the audience as well, and you should feel free to clarify answers.

4. Create time to discuss the debate when the demonstration or video is over.
Unit One

Talking Debate

Below are debate terms and definitions that have been used in Unit One, along with terms that will help students understand the practice of debate in Unit Two.

**Academic Policy Debate**—a highly-structured and strictly rule-governed competition that is comprised of a series of arguments between two two-person teams. One team debates in favor of making a policy change and the other team opposes the change.

**Affirmative Team**—the team that says “yes” to change by debating in support of the resolution.

**Constructive Speech**—the first four major speeches delivered by each of the four competitors in which they “construct” their major arguments in the debate.

**Cross Examination**—the questioning each competitor undergoes by a member of the opposing team after delivering a constructive speech.

**Debate**—a series of opposing arguments that take place between individuals (or groups of individuals) to arrive, ideally, at the best possible solution to a problem.

**Flow**—a way of taking notes during a debate that keeps your arguments and your opponents’ counter-arguments together in a visual framework.

**Negative Team**—team that opposes the affirmative team and/or the resolution. This team says making a change is not necessary because things are fine the way they are.

**Proof**—Expert testimony, statistical data, court rulings, or other credible sources of evidence that support the arguments you are making.

**Policy**—a plan of action developed for and adopted by a political or social group. A “policy” can be one rule in a classroom, such as “Raise your hand before talking;” or a “policy” can be many rules and require entire government agencies to implement, such as the United State’s government providing healthcare to disabled individuals.

**Rebuttal**—the final four speeches of a debate delivered by each of the four competitors in which they analyze the arguments constructed at the beginning of the debate and attempt to persuade the judge that their arguments are the best. New evidence or proof may be read during this phase of the debate, but new arguments are prohibited due to fairness.

**Resolution**—firmly committed. Within policy debate, the affirmative team is firmly committed to make a change. (Think about resolutions you made on New Year’s Eve.)

**Status Quo**—current state of things. The way things are right now.
Unit 2: Basics of Debate

Debate in the academic policy form has been around for over 100 years. There are a number of rules and terms that you will need to learn. However, before we study the rules of debate, you need to learn the most basic and fundamental debate skill: how to argue.

**Unit Focus:**

A.R.E.: Argument, Reason, Evidence

Four-Step Refutation

“SpAr” Debates

Flowing/Note-Taking Skills

Speaking Skills
A.R.E.: Argument, Reason, Evidence

Handout

ARE is an acronym used to teach the three parts of a complete argument. Any time you make an argument in debate, you want to think about these three parts.

**Argument:** Also called the *claim*. This is the statement you are declaring to be a truth.

**Reason:** The explanation for why the statement is true. It is also called the *warrant*.

**Evidence:** The supporting material used to establish that the argument is true. It could be facts or statistics from various sources, or it could be an example.

**Example:**

**Assertion:** The Kansas City Chiefs have the best fans in all of football.

**Reason:** Chiefs’ fans are the best because they are extremely loyal and show the most support for their team.

**Evidence:** The Chiefs have set record for selling out home games and Arrowhead Stadium is one of most difficult places for visitors to win because the fans are so loud.

**Put it all together…**
The Kansas City Chiefs have the best fans in football because they are loyal and show clear support for their team. The Chief’s fans have broken records for home attendance and make their stadium louder than any other in the league, giving their team a major home field advantage.
Class Exercise 2A

A.R.E. Mixed Up

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing and Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will learn the difference between an argument, and an argument with a reason.

Supplies:
• Paper
• Pen
• A.R.E. You Making Your Point? (page 12)
• A.R.E. handout (page 10) optional

Instructions:
1. Explain the difference between an argument and an argument with a reason.
2. Provide each student (or group) with “A.R.E. You Making Your Point?”
3. Have each group/individual label the points as an “argument” or an “argument with a reason.”
   (Answer Key: 1, 3, 4, and 10 are arguments. 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are reasons and 7 has a reason, but the reason is so bad it barely counts.)
4. Discuss the list.

   Number 1 makes the argument that Michael Jackson is the “King of Pop,” but it provides no reasons. Even though Michael Jackson is actually called the “King of Pop,” a complete argument would provide reasons. Additionally, while it may seem obvious that Paris Hilton is not the sharpest tool in the shed, you would need justification for why she should be considered unintelligent. The same is true with 4, 7, and 10.

Homework: Have students provide “reasons” for each of the incomplete arguments.

The rest of the numbers include reasons. Number 9 gives two reasons to support its central argument that the US is the most powerful nation on earth: its strong economy and military.
Exercise 2A
A.R.E. You Making Your Point?
Worksheet

Consider the following points and determine if they represent arguments or arguments with reasons:

1. Lebron James is better than Kobe Bryant.

2. My brother has a difficult time focusing on schoolwork because he has ADHD.

3. Flavor Flav is not intelligent.

4. The Kansas City Chiefs are the greatest football team ever.

5. Smoking is unhealthy because studies show it causes cancer and respiratory problems.

6. England would be a depressing place to live because it is dark and rainy.

7. Pink is the best color because I like it the most.

8. My mother is unfair and mean because she gives me a stricter curfew than any of my friends.

9. The United States is the most powerful country in the world because it has a strong military and a strong economy.

10. Iraq is a terrible place to live.
Four-Step Refutation Handout

You have learned the basics of creating and making an argument, so now you need to know how to refute an argument. Below, you will find the four steps needed to most effectively refute an argument.

Step 1. **Identify** the opponent’s arguments that you are answering.

This sounds simple enough. You (the debater) need to tell the judge and the other team which argument you are answering.

For example, let’s say you are supporting an end to drug testing in school, and your opponent argues that drug tests prevent drug use by teens. To answer this argument, you would say to the judge and opponents, “Go to where my opponent claims we need drug testing to decrease harmful drug use.”

Step 2. **Number** and “**Tag**” your response(s).

After you let everyone know how many responses you have, give the “tag” for your argument. The “tag” is a one-sentence summary of your argument.

You might say, “I have three responses. First, drug testing has never proven effective at decreasing drug use in any major study...”

Step 3. **Read your evidence or provide an example for the Reason/Warrant**.

At this point, you have let everyone know what argument you are addressing. You have stated the number of responses and provided the “tag” for your first argument. Now, you must prove your argument is true.

For example, if your argument is, “Drug testing has never proven effective at decreasing drug use in any major study,” you could provide the warrant/reason that proves the argument is true by reading evidence from a qualified source. You might say “*The Cook Daily Reader* reported on May 15 of 2004 that ‘several studies at high schools across the nation indicate that drug testing has never proven to substantially reduce drug use. In one high school, drug testing actually increased drug use as a form of rebellion.’” (Please, note that this quote and cite were only created to serve as examples; there is no such paper as *The Cook Daily Reader*.)

Step 4. **Impact.** Explain what your arguments mean in the debate round.

You are almost done. You informed everyone which argument you will address, you numbered your responses, and made your arguments. Now, you must let everyone know why your arguments matter and how they affect the debate.

To continue with our example on drug testing, you might say, “No major study has ever proven that testing reduces drug use. This means the negative argument about drugs has been proven wrong through empirical research and drug testing should not be continued on the false assumption that it reduces drug use.”
Exercise 2B

“Four Steps to Refute”
Handout

Four-Step-Refutation allows debaters to directly answer an opponent’s attacks and organize their own responses to make them more effective.

1. **Identify** the opponent’s arguments that you are answering.

2. **Number** and **Tag** your response(s).

3. Read your evidence or provide a logical example for the **Reason/Warrant**.

4. Explain how your arguments should **impact** the debate round.
Class Exercise 2B
4 Steps to Refute

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing and Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will identify arguments and learn how to refute them through the 4-step refutation method.

Supplies:
- Pens
- Paper
- Tape
- 4-step handout (page 14)
- Completed blocks with evidence (page 17-18)
- 4-step refutation worksheet (page 19)
  Note: You can also:
  1. Use other the sample blocks/evidence provided in the Guidebook.
  2. Use evidence from packets produced at various summer debate institutes.
  3. Create your own following the format provided.

Instructions:

1. Provide students with a piece of block/evidence paper that has three affirmative arguments (page 17), or use your own. If you are creating your own, make sure that each argument is about a similar subject. The materials provided in the DKC Guidebook focus on an affirmative case for the 2007-08 topic.

2. Have the students read the evidence, and take some time to answer their questions about the content.

3. Give each student one piece of negative evidence that answers one of the claims on the evidence block (page 18).

4. Have each student match the negative evidence with the claim it refutes.

(continued on next page)
Class Exercise 2B

5. After every student has a chance to make a decision, ask for volunteers to explain what evidence they feel is correct and take a vote.

6. Clarify which piece of evidence is the correct match. (The negative evidence provided negates argument 2 of the affirmative.)

7. Now that the class knows which piece of affirmative evidence is answered by the negative evidence, distribute the worksheet on page 19 and ask the students to write a four-step refutation. Students should be encouraged to add arguments beyond the evidence provided, if they can.

8. Once each student writes his/her responses, ask for volunteers to read their responses to the class. You should make sure the students correctly use the 4-step model by providing feedback after each speech. You could require all students to read their responses for a grade or participation points. After several students have volunteered, you could have them turn in their work for a grade.

Follow-On Exercise

1. After the students complete the four-step exercise, ask them to get into groups of 3-5.

2. Ask all groups to discuss and answer on paper the following question about the negative evidence on page 18:

   Why do the following words mean: systemically, rigorously, comparable control group? Why would studies and research proving community schools be important? What arguments can be made to show research on community schools is important? What arguments can be made to show research is not important?

3. Ask each group to share their response.
Class Exercise 2B
4 Steps to Refute
Affirmative Evidence

The following pieces of evidence support a case for community schools.
(Only read the bold out-loud)

1. Basic services, like dental care, can be provided through community schools and they make a big difference in a child’s education.

**Martin Blank, staff director of the Coalition for Community Schools & Dan Cady, executive director of the National Center for Community Education,** Academy for Community Schools Development System Change Through Community Schools Website. **July 2008**
http://johnwgardnertestsitelpworks.com/f/S1+Readings+-+Systems+Change+Through+Community+Schoo-Blank.doc

Evidence of new resources in Evansville is hard to miss. **After hearing from site team members that children were coming to school with toothaches, St. Mary’s Medical Center commissioned a gleaming 60-foot dental van to take services directly to students at school. Dentists and hygienists saw 1,600 children last year, many of them for multiple visits. The hospital bills Medicaid but absorbs any uncovered costs so all services are free. Jean Baresic, Evansville’s assistant superintendent for curriculum, says: “When children are in pain, learning suffers. Services like these help us be more effective as teachers.”**

2. Arguments about community schools needing more evidence are based on ignorance; those working in real schools know the real solutions.

**Leo Casey, Vice President of Academic High Schools in United Federation of Teachers in New York City Ed Wize August 8, 2008** http://www.edwize.org/a-will-to-dogma-some-thoughts-on-criticism-of-community-schools

**Disingenuous calls for “evidence” that community schools work require a willful myopia on the effect on life in poverty on education — a blindness made possible by a complete unfamiliarity with the real world of the classroom. It is perhaps inevitable that when one approaches the issue in pride ignorance of that world, the debate quickly degenerates into invective and accusation of lying. When it comes to blind dogma in the world of education, experience in real classrooms and real schools is a welcome cure.**

3. Community schools help create social capital for neighborhoods in need.


**While social capital is a scarce commodity in too many communities, it can be cultivated and replenished in even the lowest-income areas.** The more relationships a community has to draw upon to share information, assist neighbors and solve problems, the more its social capital grows (Putnam, 1993, 1995). **By engaging students and families in the community and its issues, community schools provide opportunities for young people and residents to give back to their schools and neighborhoods and add to their community’s stockpile of social capital.**
Class Exercise 2B

4 Steps to Refute Negative Evidence

The following piece of evidence opposes community schools. Which piece of affirmative evidence does it most DIRECTLY refute? (Only read the bold out-loud)

Not enough data has been collected to prove community schools work.


**Evaluators warn, however, that the available evaluation data need to be regarded cautiously as many of the programs have not been systematically or rigorously examined. Many studies contain inadequate descriptions of program components, use a limited number of outcomes, have few direct measures of collaboration, and do not have comparable control groups** (Knapp, 1995; Wang et.al., 1997). Knapp (1996) argues that useful insights in the understanding of integrated services can be achieved through detailed profiles of individual participation and change. He suggests that such studies can best answer the questions: How does the individual child or family participate in integrated services? What does participation involve? In what ways do these individual participants change? Such investigations could present a picture of integrated services initiatives across the range of people within a community or even multiple communities. This is especially critical when trying to understand and develop policies and practices which are compatible with the cultural norms and values of the school-community population.
Class Exercise 2B
4 Steps to Refute
Worksheet

1. My opponent’s argument

is____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

2. I have ______responses

3. Make your arguments below. One argument should include the evidence provided. Write out the “tag line” for the evidence you will read under one of the numbers. You must make at least 2 arguments. *Ask your teacher what “tag line” means if you don’t know.

1.____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

2.____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

3.____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

4.____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

5. The impact of my argument is...

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________
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Flowing

An essential component of debate is writing down all the arguments in the debate round—this is known as flowing. If you do not write down your opponents’ attacks, you will not know how to respond. Likewise, if you do not write down your own arguments, you may forget them. Flowing is just like taking notes in class, but it is a little more precise.

Flow Sheet
When you flow a debate, you need room on your paper for several speeches so that you can keep track of the arguments as they develop. To do this, you need to divide your paper into seven to eight columns, depending on which speech introduces the argument. Some debaters fold their paper into eight sections; others use a ruler to make lines. Experienced debaters will write down the arguments next to each other and keep track of them without lines.

On page 21, you will find an example of what a “flow” looks like. This example should be familiar because it is from the Demo Debate Materials. This is one part of the exact flow used with Demo Debate.

► Class Discussion:

1. Give students a copy of the “Go With the Flow” handout on page 21.

2. Divide students into 7 groups.

3. Assign each group 1 column from the flow to answer the following questions about your column:

   a. What does each abbreviation stand for?

   b. What argument do you like best from your column?

4. Ask each group to answer these general questions about the entire flow:

   a. Are all of the arguments extended?

   b. What should happen in a debate round when an argument does not get extended?

   c. Why does a flow only have seven to eight columns when there are twelve speeches during a debate round (including cross-examination)?

   e. Why don’t we flow cross-examination?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2AR</th>
<th>2ND/1NR</th>
<th>1AL</th>
<th>1NC</th>
<th>1AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF &gt; 5 MP already Guardian</td>
<td>OF &gt; 5 MP already Guardian</td>
<td>1&gt; Need Infrastucture, only last 30 years Africa &amp; Europe are different</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa is corrupt bec colonization</td>
<td>1&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt; Increase Princesses at Africa Academic 2003</td>
<td>OF &gt; 5 MP already Guardian</td>
<td>5 Reasons MP falls Eng 2005 (1) Expensive (2) Can't keep track (3) Trade unlikely (4) Trade unlikely (5) Can't keep track</td>
<td>1&gt; MP not effective Africa</td>
<td>1&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt; Need Infrastucture, only last 30 years Africa &amp; Europe are different</td>
<td>5 Reasons MP falls Eng 2005 (1) Expensive (2) Can't keep track (3) Trade unlikely (4) Trade unlikely (5) Can't keep track</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>1&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&gt; Can't shoot horn 40 countries and 10,000 tribes.</td>
<td>2&gt; Can't shoot horn 40 countries and 10,000 tribes.</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>1&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>1&gt; Africa needs a MP.</td>
<td>2&gt; WRH Europe = World MP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Go with the Flow**

Handout for Discussion (Example from previous year – see demo kit for update)
Flowing Tips
Handout for Discussion

The tips below will help new and old debaters alike; however, they will probably make more sense to experienced debaters. The tips might be a little confusing to novice debaters who haven’t had enough experience to put flowing into the proper context.

**Abbreviations and Symbols**—To successfully flow, debaters must use a form of short hand. Similar arguments are made every debate. So to improve flowing abilities, students should use the same abbreviation for those common arguments. Often, new debaters struggle with abbreviation. They will attempt to write down every letter of every word spoken. Commonly used symbols and abbreviations include the following:

- ↑ = Increase(s)
- → = Leads to
- ↓ = Decrease(s)
- US = United States
- $ = Money/Cost
- PC = Probable Cause
- 1AC = First Affirmative Constructive

“No vowels, Vanna.”—Try writing words without using any vowels. It is one way to ensure that you abbreviate. For example, “graduation” becomes “grdtn,” and “destruction” becomes “dstrctn.”

**Tags and key words**—Arguments are given taglines in debate, such as “no-link”, and then an explanation of the tag follows. If the round is moving quickly, make sure you at least write down the tag, and then fill in the rest as best you can. Also, pick out the most important words. Don’t worry about fillers like “the.”

**Write small**—Write about half your normal size to make every argument fit on the flow. Be careful to not make the flow smaller than you can read.

**The space between**—Provide plenty of space between each argument. This will be critical as arguments pile up in rebuttals.

**Best paper**—Try various paper types to see what works best for you. Some debaters use legal pads, while others try colored copy paper. You could also experiment with which way you flow on the paper: horizontal or vertical.

**Cross examination**—If you miss an argument or two, use cross-examination to clear up your flow.

**Partner communication**—If you miss an argument, turn to your partner for help. If you work as a team, you will be able to get more arguments. (However, don’t shout or stop your partner from flowing.)

**Skelettons**—If you miss an argument just use a “skeleton shell” to keep its place and move on. You can use cross-examination or your partner to fill in what’s missing. However, keeping your place will prove very useful.

**Opponent’s evidence**—If your opponent is willing to share (most of them do), you can borrow the evidence they read to help you understand their argument.
Class Exercise 2C
Flow the Cards

Standards Met:
MO: Communication Arts 1, 4
KS: Communication Arts Listening

Direct Objective:
Students will improve flowing skills.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Deck of Cards

Description:
You will read playing cards for the students to flow. This exercise will introduce the students to the concept of flowing and can be used again to practice flowing skills. Each playing card represents one argument. Below is what a flow might look like after reading 3 speeches worth of playing cards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. 5 of hearts</strong></td>
<td>Off the 5 of hearts 1. 6 of clubs 2. 3 of hearts</td>
<td>1. Extend the 5 of hearts 2. 6 of diamonds 3. 7 of clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Ace of Clubs</strong></td>
<td>Off the Ace of clubs 1. 3 of diamonds 2. Ace of spades 3. King of hearts</td>
<td>Off the 1 answering the 2 1. King of diamonds 2. 5 of hearts Group the 2&amp;3 1. Extend the Ace Clubs 2. 2 of clubs 3. Jack of spades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. 8 of spades</strong></td>
<td>Off the 8 of spades 1. Queen of diamonds</td>
<td>1. Extend the 8 of spades 2. Jack of diamonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. 2 of diamonds</strong></td>
<td>Off the 2 of diamonds 1. 3 of hearts 2. Ace of diamonds 3. 9 of spades</td>
<td>Off the 1 answering the 4 1. Extend 2 of diamonds 2. 3 of clubs 3. 7 of diamonds Off the 2 answering the 4 1. Extend 2 of diamonds 2. 7 of hearts Off the 3 answering the 4 1. 9 of spades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on page 24)
Class Exercise 2C

Instructions:
1. Turn over a playing card and read it out loud to the class. Keep the cards arranged in columns on your desk (in the same order you would as if you were flowing a debate).

2. Let the students know when you have finished your first “speech,” and prepare them for the second speech. Just as if you were addressing specific arguments, you will need to tell the class which card you will be “answering.” See the example in column two on page 23.

3. When you have completed your second “speech,” let the class know that you are ready to move on to the third speech. Column three gets even more complicated because the “debate” has progressed and there are several more arguments to track. You can make the debate as simple or complicated as you like.

4. OPTIONS:
   - You can shuffle the deck and start over a few times until you are sure that students have the hang of it before adding multiple arguments and grouping arguments.
   - You can speed up your reading in order to let students learn the importance of abbreviation.
   - Have a several students do practice flows on the chalkboard.

5. Go over the flows with group immediately at the conclusion of the exercise.

   Class Discussion: What helped you the most in this exercise?
   What is the best way to space your arguments?
   What kind of abbreviations/symbols did you use?
   Why would you “group” arguments?

6. Have the students turn in their flows for a grade.
Class Exercise 2D

Flow the Music

Standards Met:
MO: Communication Arts 1, 4
KS: Communication Arts Listening

Direct Objective:
Students will improve flowing skills.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Music

Description:
You will play two or more songs and ask students to flow them.

Instructions:

1. Select two or more songs that meet the following qualities:
   a. Easy to understand the lyrics and paced slow enough to follow
   b. Appropriate content
   c. Topical content preferred

2. Create a flow chart. (Each student will need to create a flow chart)
   a. Hold a sheet of paper horizontally
   b. Fold in half based on the number songs or clips you will play
      i. Fold once for two songs, twice for four and so on
      ii. The folds create sections
      iii. Have the students flow each song in one different section, adding sections left to right as songs are played

3. Provide the following flowing tips:
   a. Write small
   b. Abbreviate
   c. Write more vertical – bullet point like

4. Play the songs or clips of the songs and help the students flow.
Class Exercise 2E

Abbreviation Madness

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1, Communication Arts 1, 4, 6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will learn terms in the resolution and begin creating abbreviations.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Blackboard/Whiteboard

Description:
Place key terms of the resolution on the chalkboard or overhead projector and brainstorm with the class for abbreviations. Students may not know what all the terms mean, and that is OK.

Instructions:
1. Write several terms from the list below on a chalkboard or overhead projector.
2. Place students into groups and tell each group to create an abbreviation for the terms on the list. This should only take 5-10 minutes.
3. Ask each group to share their abbreviations, and write the responses on the board.
4. Ask students to discuss which abbreviations made the most sense.

Terms for the board:
- Social Services
- Poverty
- Welfare
- United States Federal Government
- Congress
- Inherency
- Topicality
- Link
- Disadvantage
- Not or Negative (not the team)
- Plan
- Observation
- Increase/Decrease
- Solve
- Rehabilitation
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Class Exercise 2F

Let’s SpAr

(Sequence of Argumentation)

Standards Met:

- MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
- KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing and Speaking

Objective:

To introduce students to public speaking and analytical arguments.

Supplies:

- Pens
- Paper
- A timer
- List of topics/resolutions
- Blackboard/whiteboard

Description:

The SPAR activity will give students their first taste of debating. You will help the students choose topics for debate, and then give everyone in the class a chance to perform in a very short debate. SPAR debates are over simple topics and are done without evidence. There are various time formats, but most SPAR debates last around ten minutes.

Instructions:

1. Select topics for the debates. The class can take ownership of topic choices by brainstorming. You can also provide examples of a few good topics for debate, such as “school uniforms should be required in all public schools” to get the students going. If the class is reluctant to engage, try topics that they can have a lot of fun with—such as: debates over fashion trends, music, videogames, etc.

2. Review one of the topics with the class. Ask them to come up with a few pros and cons.

3. Divide the class into pairs that will debate one other. You can select pairs randomly or have the students pick their partners. (Allowing students to pick their partners may give you an idea of who they will want to have as permanent debate partners).

4. Each pair will select a topic. One student should pick a topic from the board while the other gets to pick the side: affirmative or negative.

(continued on page 27)
Class Exercise 2F

5. Give the students the following instructions before allowing them some preparation time:
   A. Provide numbered reasons to support your side of the debate. For example, if the topic is school uniforms, the side affirming uniforms might make the following points:
      1. School uniforms will reduce violence in school by avoiding fights over expensive clothes.
      2. Uniforms will save everyone money because they are cheaper than other clothes.
      3. Uniforms will improve self-esteem because people that can afford the top clothes will no longer have to worry about being trendy.
      4. Uniforms will make everyone in the school feel united with common “threads.”

   B. Give explanations and examples after each argument.

   C. The negative should attack affirmative points, and add some of their own points if they want. **The negative must address all of the affirmative points rather than only making new points of their own—this is called “clash.”**

   D. Everyone watching the debate should “flow it” (take notes). They can turn in the flows for a grade, and the debate itself could count for a grade.

Time formats:
You can adjust the time formats to fit your needs. A couple of common formats are provided below.

**Option 1:**
- Affirmative speaker—1 Minute
- Negative speaker—1 Minute
- Affirmative speaker questions the negative—1 Minute
- Audience questions and comments—1-3 Minutes

**Option 2:**
- Affirmative Opening Speech—2 Minutes
- Cross Examination by Negative—1 Minute
- 30 Second Prep Time for the Negative Speaker
- Negative Opening Speech—2 Minutes
- Cross Examination by Affirmative—1 Minute
- 30 Second Prep Time for Affirmative
- Affirmative Closing Speech—1 Minute
- 30 Second Prep Time for Negative
- Negative Closing Speech—1 Minute
Speaking Skills
Handout

In debate, persuasion can be very important. Some judges pay more attention to speaking skills and persuasion than specific argumentation. This does not mean the arguments do not matter, it simply means that you will need to add some passion and inflection to your arguments.

Class Discussion: What are the traits of good public speakers? Ask the class what appeals to them when they watch public speakers and list those qualities on the board. Use the list to teach students the skills they will need to be effective public speakers.

Some common traits of effective public speakers:

- **Clarity**—Good speakers enunciate well and avoid mumbling. If people cannot understand you they will not listen for very long.

- **Proper Pace**—Avoid going too fast or too slow. Your audience may get lost if you talk too quickly; or they may be bored if you talk too slowly. Find a happy medium where you speak with a sense of urgency, but avoid going a million miles an hour.

- **Voice Inflection**—When you speak with passion, it shows in the quality of your voice. Your pitch and/or your volume might rise or fall to emphasize key points. This can help you hold audience attention and become more persuasive. However, keep in mind that you are a debater, not a preacher. Become aware of the difference in presentational style.

- **Humor**—Not all of us are funny, but adding an innocent and tasteful joke can lighten the mood and make you more likeable to your judge. Your coach can help you decide what is appropriate.

- **Organization**—Good speakers keep the audience focused by organizing their thoughts and staying on point—just like telling a story or giving someone directions to a party. If you jump all over with your points and arguments, you will lose the judge—and often the round.

- **Proper Posture**—If you slouch or move around too much, the judge may pay more attention to your odd positions than what you say. When you debate for judges who pay attention to speaking skills, face them with your body open and move only to accent key points.

- **Gestures**—When you debate, you have paper and evidence in your hands. However, if possible, keep one hand free to add gestures. Avoid moving your arms all over, but a few subtle motions can add to your overall presentation and accent key points.

- **Facial Expression and Eye Contact**—You often read evidence in a debate, but making eye contact with the judge can really add to your persuasiveness. Facial expressions can also be helpful in demonstrating passion and accenting main points.
Class Exercise 2G

Make It Sound Beautiful

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will use, identify and evaluate proper speaking skills.

Supplies:
- 2-3 pieces of debate evidence
- Paper
- Pen
- Handout over speaking skills (page 28)

Instructions:
1. **Give everyone in the class a sheet of paper with 2-3 pieces of debate evidence that support similar arguments.** The evidence can be a disadvantage shell, an advantage to an affirmative case, solvency evidence against a case, or any other debate argument. Feel free to use the samples provided throughout the DKC Guidebook or create your own evidence.

2. **Tell the students to read the evidence as persuasively as possible.** This means using proper inflection, vocal variety, volume, pausing for impact, lively facial expression, appropriate rate, and avoiding vocalized pauses like “uh” and “um.”

3. **Demonstrate by taking similar evidence and reading it aloud as a model.** Tell the class to **take notes** on your performance as you read. Read the evidence once **without using expression** and once **with expression.** After the first reading, ask the students to give you suggestions for improvement. Add to their critique with your own suggestions if necessary. Read the evidence again incorporating their suggestions. Ask which reading sounded more interesting to the students. Ask which example would hold their attention better.

4. **Divide the class into pairs and have the students take turns reading evidence.** The student who is listening should take notes on the reading to provide accurate feedback. The whole class can do this simultaneously. Be prepared—the class will be loud!

5. **Each student will evaluate his/her partner and provide feedback.** After giving each other feedback, the students should read the evidence again, using the feedback to improve.

6. **Tell the students to turn in their evaluations of each other as participation points.**
Speaking Skills When Reading Evidence

During a round debaters will read research from outside sources to support their arguments. Debaters research their topic in advance to give themselves a knowledge base, and they read the best research to help persuade the judge that their side is right.

Class Discussion: Could a debater simply make-up their own arguments instead of reading ANY evidence? Would you be more persuaded by someone with good arguments and quotes to back them up, or by someone with good arguments, but no quotes?

What Can Evidence Provide?

- **Facts**—Outside evidence can provide key facts. Specific information on history, previous programs, cost estimates and the results of studies can be very useful.
- **Analysis/Opinion**—Experts can be quoted who provide timely and insightful analysis over important issues in debate. If you quote the opinion of a professor who has researched a subject extensively it can add to your credibility as a debater.

How Long is Evidence in Debate?

- Most pieces of evidence are about one paragraph.
- Longer pieces of evidence are underlined or highlighted so that only certain sentences are read out-loud.

What Do I Say When I Evidence?

1. **Signal to the Judge**—Good speakers will let the judge know when they are quoting outside evidence by saying something like, “This argument is supported by…” or “As you can see from…”

2. **Evidence Citation**—After signaling to the judge the debater must read what is known as the cite. This is where the quote came from, or its source. When you read the cite out-loud include the following:
   - Author…the person who wrote the article
   - Qualifications…the background or title of the person being quoted
   - Source or Publication.
   - Date
   * If your evidence comes from a staff writer at a publication, such as a writer at the *New York Times*, you only need to quote the *New York Times*, not the staff writer’s name.

3. **Read the Evidence**—Read the evidence with as much inflection, enthusiasm and persuasion as you can.

4. **Sum it Up & So What**—After the evidence is read summarize it and explain to the judge why you read it. Otherwise you leave the judge wondering, why did they read that and so what? You should sum-up what you read and explain why the evidence helps you win the debate.
Class Exercise 2H

Sum it Up So What

Standards Met:
- MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
- KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will use, identify and evaluate the best method for citing research in a debate.

Supplies:
- 2-3 pieces of debate evidence
- Paper
- Pen
- Handout over speaking skills (page 28)

Instructions:
1. Give everyone in the class a sheet of paper with 2-3 pieces of debate evidence that support similar arguments. The evidence can be a disadvantage shell, an advantage to an affirmative case, solvency evidence against a case, or any other debate argument. Feel free to use the samples provided throughout the DKC Guidebook or create your own evidence.

2. Tell the students to read the evidence as persuasively as possible AND ADD a summary and So What statement. This means using proper inflection, vocal variety, volume, pausing for impact, lively facial expression, appropriate rate, and avoiding vocalized pauses like “uh” and “um.”

3. Demonstrate by taking similar evidence and reading it aloud as a model. Tell the class to take notes on your performance as you read. Read the evidence once without using expression or a summary and a “so what” statement and once with expression, a summary and a “so what” statement. After the first reading, ask the students to give you suggestions for improvement. Add to their critique with your own suggestions if necessary. Read the evidence again incorporating their suggestions. Ask which reading sounded more interesting to the students. Ask which example would hold their attention better.

4. Divide the class into pairs and have the students take turns reading evidence. The student who is listening should take notes on the reading to provide accurate feedback. The whole class can do this simultaneously. Be prepared—the class will be loud!

5. Each student will evaluate his/her partner and provide feedback. After giving each other feedback, the students should read the evidence again, using the feedback to improve.

6. Tell the students to turn in their evaluations of each other as participation points.
Unit 2
Talking Debate

Claim—An argument.

Clash—What happens when debaters make arguments that directly refute one another.

Cross Examination—The question and answer period after each constructive speech.

Extension—Arguments given in response to an opponent’s attack on your original argument. Extensions are not new arguments, and are therefore allowed in rebuttals.

Impact—The outcome or end result of an argument.

Skeleton Shell—A marker you place on your flow to hold the place of an argument you missed during the round. Its purpose is to remind you to fill in the gap later when you have more time, like cross-examination or prep time.

Signposting—Brief statement that lets everyone know what argument you will be addressing. For instance, “No Link…”

Tag—A summary of your argument (usually one sentence).

Warrant—Reasoning that supports the tag of an argument.
Unit 3: The Affirmative

In policy debate, the affirmative team advocates in favor of change. The affirmative will present a case with structure and evidence that makes the argument for change. Included in their case will be a plan—which is like a bill in Congress. The plan will call for specific action that the federal government should take. The affirmative, however, cannot pick just any subject for their case. They are guided by the resolution, and must develop a plan that fits under that topic area in order to compete fairly.

Unit Focus:

Resolution

Foreign Aid: Help or Hurt?

“Problem, Cause, Solution” and the STOCK ISSUES

Fiat

First Affirmative Constructive (1AC) and Extension Evidence

Stock-Issue Judge vs. Policy-Maker Judge
The Resolution

Each year debate coaches across the country vote to decide what resolution will be debated. The resolution debated in the 2008-09 year was:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase incentives for alternative energy use in the United States.

The Resolution for 2009-10 is:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

Do we need a resolution?
There are two good reasons why we debate one resolution all year.

1. Preparation and Research: By limiting debates to one resolution, everyone has a good idea of what to prepare and research. If debate could be over anything, the research burden would be enormous.

2. National Standard: The entire country debates the same topic. This means you could go anywhere in the United States and debate anyone because you both have prepared for the same resolution. It also helps ensure that everyone can fairly compete at national events.

What does the resolution mean?
The 2009-10 resolution asks the affirmative to support federally funded social services for those living in poverty in the United States.

Class Discussion:
- What are social services?
- Who is “living in poverty”?
- Why should we support social services?
- How much did the Obama’s stimulus spend on social services?
- How much do we spend on social services?
- Who provides most of our current social services – the federal government or the state governments?
- What is welfare?
- Does welfare sound like a negative word?
- What does poverty mean?
- What does society think of poor people?
- Is poverty a choice?
- What are the economic benefits to reducing poverty?
- How does spending money on social services effect the deficit?
Class Exercise 3A
Social Services: Safety Net or Crutch?

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will read, analyze, evaluate and then debate about evidence pertaining to the success of social services.

Supplies:
- Evidence and Guide Sheets (provided on pages 36-39)
- Pen
- Paper
- Timer

Instructions:
1. Groups
   a. Divide students into four groups.
   b. Give two groups a copy of evidence supporting social services, while the other two groups should have evidence opposing social services.
   c. The groups are told that they will be using their evidence in a debate.

2. Evidence and Brainstorming
   a. Ask each group member to read the evidence and then discuss it.
   b. All students should answer the questions on the evidence handout.
   c. The groups should also write down all the reasons given within the evidence to support or oppose social services. (They can write on the evidence in the space provided.)

3. Debate Preparation
   a. Each group must nominate one person to speak in a four speech long debate. Arguments from the handout should guide the speakers.
   b. Assign each group one of the four speeches for the debate.
   c. The first two speeches will offer a general defense of their side. The last two speeches should respond to arguments made in one of the first speeches.

4. The Debate: Rules and Goals
   All students, especially those responding to the first two speeches, should flow.
   - Speech 1 (2 minutes long) Support Social Services. Option: Audience Questions
   - Speech 2 (2 minutes long) Oppose Social Services. Option: Audience Questions
   - Speech 3 (1 minute) Respond to speech 1
   - Speech 4 (1 minute) Respond to speech 2

5. Flows and group notes should be collected for a grade.
Class Exercise 3A

Evidence (A.K.A. Card) Supporting Social Services 1/2

Argument Tag:
We can greatly reduce poverty with government commitment to funding social services.

Evidence Citation (Cite):
Paul Krugman, a professor of economics at Princeton University, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania) February 19, 2008 LOSING THE WAR; WE'VE JUST ABOUT GIVEN UP ON ENDING POVERTY

Poverty rates are much lower in most European countries than in the United States, mainly because of government programs that help the poor and unlucky. And governments that set their minds to it can reduce poverty. In Britain, the Labor government that came into office in 1997 made reducing poverty a priority and its program of income subsidies and other aid has achieved a great deal. Child poverty has been cut in half by the measure that corresponds most closely to the U.S. definition.

Questions to Answer:

• Why are poverty rates lower in Europe than in the U.S. according to the evidence?

• What are subsidies?

• How much did childhood poverty decline in Britain since 1997?

• What does this quote mean, “And governments that set their minds to it can reduce poverty.”?
Class Exercise 3A

Evidence (A.K.A. Card) Supporting Social Services 2/2

- Write down each reason your evidence gives for supporting social services.

- Write down every reason you can think of for supporting social services.
Class Exercise 3A

Evidence (A.K.A. Card) Opposing Social Services 1/2

Argument Tag:

Social services cause the breakdown of the family and increases poverty.

Evidence Citation (Cite):

Peter Ferrara is Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Institute for Policy Innovation The American Spectator August 21, 2008 Poverty and Welfare in America

So does that mean that everything is just fine with poverty and welfare in America? The answer is an emphatic no. The welfare system itself primarily causes the nonwork we see among the poor. It also strongly contributes to family break up, illegitimacy, and single parenthood. Most importantly of all, thorough welfare reforms are possible that would ensure the effective elimination of poverty in America, and eliminate all welfare incentives for non-work, illegitimacy, and single parenthood. Moreover, the new welfare system would cost taxpayers only a fraction of the current system. That will all be discussed in a future column.

Questions to Answer:

- What is the welfare system?
- What is meant by “nonwork”?
- What problems does the author believe welfare causes?
- How does the author believe poverty can best be reduced?
Class Exercise 3A

Evidence (A.K.A. Card) Opposing Social Services 2/2

- Write down each reason your evidence gives for opposing social services.

- Write down every reason you can think of for opposing social services.
Class Exercise 3B

Topic Reading

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will read segments of articles pertaining core topic issues and complete varied handouts.

Supplies:
- Article segment handouts (Provided on pages )
- Pen
- Paper

Instructions:
Simply read through the various handouts below and select your favorite exercises for the class. They can be individual exercises or done in groups. You can be creative!

Keep in mind that almost any exercise can be a Speak-at-Once. Instead of writing answers to the questions in the handout have students give the answers as a speech in a time efficient manner.

What is Speak-At-Once?

During a Speak-At-Once the class the following occurs:

a. The class is divided into partner pairs
b. One partner is asked to stand and deliver their speech to other partner
c. This means half the class talks at once
d. Those standing are told to speak on the teachers command for an assigned period of time
e. The teacher starts, and when time expires, stops the speakers
f. Partners who listened give feedback
g. Partners switch and repeat

Homework:
Ask each student to pick any argument from any article presented and write a half-page essay on why he/she thinks the argument is either true or false.
Class Exercise 3B
Article Segment 1: Poverty vs. Poor

Step 1: Read the article segment below.

Step 2: On a separate sheet of paper: The article describes the difference between being poor and living in poverty. Do you agree with the article's description? Explain in your own words. Also, explain the difference between being poor and living in poverty in your own words.

Business Pundit October 10, 2008
Poverty vs. Poor: What’s Your Attitude?

I visited with our local public school Deputy Superintendent yesterday. Among the many challenges he mentioned facing the K-12 education system was the challenge of teaching children of poverty. When one of our small group asked about the percentage of children who receive free and reduced lunches in our school district, the Deputy Superintendent was quick to point out to us the difference between children who are poor and children of poverty.

So what’s the difference between being poor and living in poverty?

Poor: People who have a low income are poor. This may be due to choice of career, hard times, or other circumstances. They may or may not be able to pull out of their situation. However, they are as likely as those earning higher incomes to strive for the future, to hope for more. They may value education for the future benefits it affords.

Poverty: Living in poverty includes a survivalist attitude. People living in poverty may be extremely mobile because they’ve had to be. They may be able to move everything they own in 24 hours if they can’t make rent. It can be difficult to impress upon children of poverty the value of sacrificing today to get educated for some uncertain tomorrow. The school official went on to explain that because the poverty mentality favors the moment over the long term, things that provide entertainment value are important. It’s hard to imagine why someone struggling to put food on the table would (or could) have a 60 plasma flat screen.

Has America as a whole bought into poverty thinking? Isn’t that really what all this credit mess is about? Who cares about the bill? That’ll come tomorrow. Just give me my toys today. Real poverty is a lot more complicated than that, but I wonder what promotes the attitude among those who have so much. Many of us may indeed become poor (or at least relatively so) in the next year. What worries me more are those of us who are affluent (again, at least relatively) operating with a poverty mentality.
Class Exercise 3B
Article Segment 2: Poverty Challenge

Step 1: Read the article segment below.

Step 2: On a separate sheet of paper answer the following questions: What is a poverty challenge and why did people go through it? Do you think more people should go through a poverty challenge? Do you agree that we should be giving people in poverty more money? Explain your answers.

Step 3: Debate Option: Two volunteers SpAr over the following topic: People in poverty should be given more aid to help with daily needs.

Buffalo News (New York) May 9, 2008
Walking in the shoes of the poor opens a few eyes

County Legislator Maria Whyte couldn't do it. Nor could Common Council Member Michael LoCurto, United Way President Arlene F. Kaukus or the Rev. Ronald P. Sajdak of St. Martin de Porres Catholic Church.

Challenged to spend no more than $9.25 a day, as part of a two-day exercise calling attention to area poverty, they all admitted failing miserably.

"You have to be 100 percent perfect, 100 percent of the time to make that budget," Whyte said.

The "poverty challenge" was put forward by the Homeless Alliance of Western New York, which earlier in the week called on community leaders and lawmakers to join in solidarity with the 30 percent of Buffalo residents who live at or below the federal poverty line of $866 (or $1,466 for a family of three) in income per month.

More than two dozen people, including religious leaders, heads of human service agencies and lawmakers, accepted the unusual invitation.

Sajdak, a Catholic priest, figured he would have less difficulty with the assignment than most people. "I did accept the challenge, and I found myself flunking it terribly," he said.

The alliance arrived at the $9.25 daily allotment by subtracting the cost of fair market rent in Buffalo, including utilities and repairs, as well as clothing costs.

Fair market rent for a one-bedroom apartment in Buffalo is $513, according to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Clothing is $76 per month, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

That leaves $277 for the month or, divided by 30 days, about $9.25 per day.

The alliance also assigned other costs, such as driving a car or using a cell phone, based upon national averages. Driving, for example, costs about $6.81 per day; having medical insurance, another $1.60.

During the challenge, LoCurto gave up cable television and the Internet, saving about $2.48 against his budget. But he continued to use his cell phone, drove to work and maintained his health insurance.

"That left me with a budget for the day of negative 82 cents, before I started eating," said LoCurto, who represents the Delaware District. "I don't function if I don't have three
Class Exercise 3B

Article Segment 2: Poverty Challenge

meals a day, and they weren't elaborate meals . . . What do you do if you have to buy a $4 bottle of Tylenol? You don't have dinner that day?"

Whyte tried to give up driving her car one day, saving $6.81 of the $9.25 allotment. It meant getting up an hour earlier to take her son, Liam, to day care on the bus at an average daily cost of $2.20.

But later in the day, Whyte learned her husband wouldn't be able to pick up Liam at the appropriate time, and the day care center charges $15 extra for late-arriving parents.

Whyte had to make a decision: Take the bus again and risk showing up late at the day care center and incurring the real $15 fee or stick to the challenge and "spend" the $6.81 to use her car and go into debt.

"I broke the rules. I used my car to pick up my son, Liam," she said.

The second day, Whyte drove again, and this time with just 84 cents remaining in her budget, she decided not to feed the parking meter.

"I took my chances, and this is the parking ticket I got," she said, holding up the slip of paper and bright orange envelope that again put her into debt for the day.

But the real victim throughout the challenge, she discovered, was her son, because Whyte was "stressed out" and had less time to spend with him.

After the experience, Kaukus said, she figures that people with poverty-level incomes are more skilled budgeters than those with larger incomes, despite the common perception that poor people simply don't know how to handle money.

She said if ($9.25) is someone's budget, "your entire day would be spent on limiting possibilities and choices for your children," she said.

The alliance developed the challenge to call more attention to poverty in the second-poorest large city in the country, according to U.S. Census Bureau data.

Executive Director Bill O'Connell urged Mayor Byron W. Brown and County Executive Chris Collins to take more of a leadership role in addressing poverty and to create a task force that will develop policies lifting people out of poverty.

"Poverty needs to be the lens through which we create all of our policies," O'Connell said.

Putting more money into the hands of people with low incomes was a better strategy to growing the local economy than searching for "silver-bullet" projects for the city's skyline, he added.

The mayor has a strong commitment to addressing the city's poverty issues, said Peter Cutler, Brown's spokesman.
Class Exercise 3B

Article Segment 3: Poverty by Experience; Poverty by the Numbers

Step 1: Read the article segment below.

Step 2: On a separate sheet of paper answer the following questions: Why does the woman in the story spend so much time waiting. What is meant by the working poor? Why does the woman in the article think she might be better off not working? Explain your answers.

Step 3: Read the article segment on the next page

Washington Post May 18, 2009

Poor? Pay Up. Having Little Money Often Means No Car, No Washing Machine, No Checking Account And No Break From Fees and High Prices

And then there is the particular unpleasantness when you make too much money to fall below the poverty line, but not enough to move up, up and away from it.

For our final guest lecturer on poverty we take you to the Thrift Store on Georgia Avenue and Marie Nicholas, 35, in an orange shirt, purple pants and thick black eyeliner. She is what economists call the working poor.

She is picking through the racks. The store is busy with customers on a Monday afternoon. There is the shrill sound of hangers sliding across racks under fluorescent lights. An old confirmation dress hangs from the ceiling. It has faded to yellow. It's not far from the used silver pumps, size 9 1/2, nearly new, on sale for $9.99.

"People working who don't make a lot of money go to the system for help, and they deny them," Nicholas says. "They say I make too much. It almost helps if you don't work."

She says she makes $15 an hour working as a certified nursing assistant. She pays $850 for rent for a one-bedroom that she shares with her boyfriend and child. She went looking for a two-bedroom unit recently and found it would cost her $1,400. She pays $300 a month for child care for her 11-year-old son, who is developmentally delayed. She tried to put him in a subsidized child-care facility, but was told she makes too much money. "My son was not chosen for Head Start because I wasn't in a shelter or on welfare. People's kids who do go don't do nothing but sit at home."

Money and time. "I ride the bus to get to work," Nicholas says. It takes an hour. "If I could drive, it would take me 10 minutes. I have to catch two buses." She gets to the bus stop at 6:30 a.m. The bus is supposed to come every 10 or 15 minutes. Sometimes, she says, it comes every 30 minutes.

What could you accomplish with the lost 20 minutes standing there in the rain? Waiting. That's another cost of poverty. You wait in lines. You wait at bus stops. You wait on the bus as it makes it way up Georgia Avenue, hitting every stop. No sense in trying to hurry when you are poor. When you are poor, you wait.
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Step 4: Answer the following questions: Why does the author believe poverty is inflated? What statistic do you find most powerful in arguing poverty is inflated and why?

Step 5: Debate Option: Two volunteers SpAr over the following topic: The working poor should be given more aid.

REDUCING THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES LIVING IN POVERTY; COMMITTEE: SENATE JOINT ECONOMIC

For most Americans, the word "poverty" suggests destitution: an inability to provide a family with nutritious food, clothing, and reasonable shelter. For example, the "Poverty Pulse" poll taken by the Catholic Campaign for Human Development in 2002 asked the general public the question: "How would you describe being poor in the U.S.?" The overwhelming majority of responses focused on homelessness, hunger or not being able to eat properly, and not being able to meet basic needs. But if poverty means lacking nutritious food, adequate warm housing, and clothing for a family, relatively few of the 37 million people identified as being "in poverty" by the Census Bureau could be characterized as poor. While material hardship does exist in the United States, it is quite restricted in scope and severity. The average "poor" person, as defined by the government, has a living standard far higher that the public imagines.

The following are facts about persons defined as "poor" by the Census Bureau, taken from various government reports:

-- Forty-three percent of all poor households actually own their own homes. The average home owned by persons classified as poor by the Census Bureau is a three-bedroom house with one-and-a-half baths, a garage, and a porch or patio.

-- Eighty five percent of poor households have air conditioning. By contrast, 35 years ago, only 36 percent of the entire U.S. population enjoyed air conditioning.

-- Only 6 percent of poor households are overcrowded. More than two-thirds have more than two rooms per person.

-- The average poor American has more living space than the average individual living in Paris, London, Vienna, Athens, and other cities throughout Europe. (These comparisons are to the average citizens in foreign countries, not to those classified as poor.)

-- Nearly three-quarters of poor households own a car; 30 percent own two or more cars.

-- Ninety-eight percent of poor households have a color television; two thirds own two or more color televisions

-- Sixty four percent have cable or satellite TV reception.

-- Nearly all have a VCR and a DVD player;

-- Forty seven percent have a personal computer,

-- Eighty two percent own microwave ovens,

-- Sixty percent have a stereo,

-- and a quarter have an automatic dishwasher.
Class Exercise 3B
Article Segment 4: Black Women in Poverty

Step 1: Read the article segment below.

Step 2: On a separate sheet of paper: The article segment below describes the challenges faced by black women. What statistic from the segment below did you find most interesting and why?

Step 3: Read the article segment on the next page.

Cecilia A. Conrad is vice president and dean of faculty (interim) at Scripps College. She is editor of The Review of Black Political Economy and president of the International Association of Feminist Economics

THE COLOR OF OPPORTUNITY; Black Women: The Unfinished Agenda

The American Prospect

October, 2008

We occupy many of the seats on the 5:30 P.M. Metrolink train from downtown Los Angeles to San Bernardino. We are behind the counters at the Department of Motor Vehicles and on both sides of the desks at the Department of Social Services. We push wheelchairs in parks and hospitals and hug children at day-care centers. Black women, who in 2006 constituted 7 percent of the working-age population, represented 14 percent of women workers and 53 percent of black workers, yet we are largely invisible in the policy discourse about both race and gender.

Like black men, black women live in neighborhoods far from employment opportunities and with low-performing schools. Like white women, black women experience occupational segregation, a gender wage gap and the challenge of balancing family and work. We are discriminated against because we are black. We are discriminated against because we are women. We are discriminated against because we are both.

This twin set of vulnerabilities has a big impact on black families and the black community at large because the wages of black women constitute a major component of black family income. Because of the limited economic prospects for black men, black women are likely to be both primary caregivers and primary breadwinners in our families. In nearly 44 percent of black families with children, a woman is the primary breadwinner. This includes both families headed by working single mothers and married-couple families in which the wife works and the husband does not. These female breadwinner families account for over 32 percent of aggregate black family income. In contrast, across all racial and ethnic groups, female breadwinner families represent only 24 percent of all families with children and account for 14 percent of aggregate family income. Hence, the gender wage gap and the lack of labor-market opportunities has a bigger impact on the economic well-being of black families than it does for other groups.
Step 4: On your sheet of paper answer the following question, or have a SpAr debate:

The article segment below argues we need to stop ignoring black women in crafting policy solutions? Do you agree? Should we strive to create policies apply the same to everyone, or should we focus on specific concerns for groups like black women?

Continued…

Black women confront many of the same issues as white women, as black men, and as working people in general, but these issues are compounded by the intersection of race and gender. In addition, black women suffer from not only the burden of their own employment obstacles but also from the lack of economic security among black men, and this third burden, which, as economist and college president Julianne Malveaux recently observed, is "why African American women cannot separate interests of race and issues of gender in analysis of political candidates, economic realities, or social and cultural realities." Black women may share policy agendas with black men and with white women, but it is important that the specific impacts of policies on black women not be ignored as we pursue common goals.
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Article Segment 5: Segregated Living

Step 1: Read the article segment below.

Step 2: On a separate sheet of paper answer & explain: What does the phrase “geography of opportunity” mean? Do you think your city is segregated in ways described by the author? Should Americans be concerned about neighborhoods of concentrated poverty?

Step 3: Read the next article segment on the next page.

JOHN A. POWELL, Gregory H. Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at Moritz College of Law

THE COLOR OF OPPORTUNITY; Race, Place, and Opportunity

The American Prospect October, 2008

We live our lives trying to gain as much opportunity as our circumstances will allow. Space and place have always been important to pathways (and roadblocks) to opportunity, but they became even more important for the distribution of opportunity after World War II, when national policies began to shape the racial dimensions of housing and economic development. Today, we live with the legacies of a deliberately segregated past.

Where you live usually determines the school your children attend, your degree of neighborhood safety, your access to public transportation or highways, the availability and quality of finance and credit, your employment opportunities, and your social network. These spatial arrangements of opportunity are contoured by our past, and if not changed, they will have serious implications for our future. The geography of opportunity has significant influence on the choices available to us as well as on the shape of the culture we inhabit. Unfortunately, in our society these arrangements continue to carry a footprint of race whether currently intended or not. We can tell much about someone's life opportunity by his or her zip code.

These differences play out not only in our neighborhoods but also at the city and state levels. At all levels, places with the weakest support for schools, unemployment insurance, and health benefits tend to be geographically and racially concentrated. There is a strong correlation among location, weak economic opportunity, and race. Blacks are generally segregated from opportunity through use of space. Although the majority of the poor are white, most of those living in concentrated poverty are black.

In the U.S., to live in a neighborhood of high-concentrated poverty (defined as the percent of the residents below the poverty level) means that life chances for you and your family will be greatly constrained—even if you yourself are not poor. Conversely, to live in a neighborhood or a state with a solid tax base and good amenities produces a favorable opportunity structure; the life chances of you and your family will be enhanced—even if you are low-income. But if you are black or Latino—even if working- or middle-class—you are much more likely to live in a neighborhood or state with a weak opportunity structure than you would be if you were white.

A myriad of public policies and private practices create these spatial opportunity structures and sort people into them. Where blacks live in large numbers, whether in a particular state or region, or a rural or urban area within a region, those places tend to be underfunded and with weak institutions. Even if someone from one of these stressed areas can get to a job site, there is growing evidence that he or she will face discrimination not just based on race but also based on places or zip codes where blacks are most likely to live.
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Class Exercise 3B
Article Segment 5: Segregated Living

Step 4: The article says that universal, race-neutral policies often fail and it says we need to think about poverty differently. The author says we need targeted policies aimed at stopping spatial racism. Provide three reasons this is a good idea and three reasons it is not.

...article continues

POLICIES THAT ARE designed to be universal too often fail to acknowledge that different people are situated differently. For racially marginalized populations, particularly those who live in concentrated-poverty neighborhoods, there are multiple reinforcing constraints. Although whites may have equally high poverty rates, they are more likely to experience sporadic or temporary poverty by comparison to racially marginalized populations, and they are not as spatially isolated as low-income blacks and Latinos are.

For any given issue—whether it is employment rates, housing, incarceration, or health care—the challenge is to appreciate how these issues interact and accumulate over time, with place as the linchpin holding these arrangements together. Universal policies that are nominally race-neutral and that focus on specific issues such as school reform will rarely be effective because of the cumulative cascade of issues that encompass these neighborhoods.

What is required is a strategy of "targeted universalism." This approach recognizes that the needs of marginalized groups must be addressed in a coordinated and effective manner. To improve opportunities and living conditions for all residents in a region, we need policies to proactively connect people to jobs, stable housing, and good schools. Targeted universalism recognizes that life is lived in a web of opportunity. Only if we address all of the mutually reinforcing constraints on opportunity can we expect real progress in any one factor.

My research suggests targeted efforts—ones that target both racial and spatial arrangements—to break this cycle of the racial dimension of the geography of opportunity. Cardinal Francis George more succinctly refers to these practices as spatial racism. While these practices may be less dependant on deliberate racialized policies today than earlier in America's history, only deliberate policy interventions that are sensitive to the structural dynamics of opportunity are likely to be effective in ending this cycle of opportunity segregation.
The Affirmative Basics

Burden of Proof
Many of debate’s rules and formats are based on principles used in the legal system. The affirmative team, like a prosecution in a court case, has the “burden of proof.” In a court case, the prosecution has the burden to prove the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. In debate, the affirmative is said to be placing the status quo or the current system, on trial.

The Stock Issues
In order to make their case, the affirmative must include certain parts/components called the “stock issues.” The stock issues are the major points the affirmative must win to successfully fulfill their burden of proof. The stock issues can be broken down into three parts:

1. **Problem**—What is happening to raise concern? Are people dying? Is there war? Are people being hurt? What is the problem?

2. **Cause**—What is causing the problem? Why hasn’t someone already fixed/improved the situation?

3. **Solution**—What can be done to fix the problem?

**Example:**

Let’s say you need to build a case to get a better grade from your debate coach. First, you need to identify the **problem**. If you get bad grades, then you will be grounded and possibly banned from the debate team. That would hurt your debate partner and the whole squad.

Now, you need to identify the **cause**. Conflicting after-school activities could be the cause of the problem. Maybe your basketball practices and games have conflicted with required debate practices.

Last, the **solution**. Your solution could be to persuade your debate coach to allow you to do extra-credit work after school to raise your grade. You have now presented a complete case to your coach.
“Problem, Cause, Solution” & The Stock Issues

In debate, “Problem” is also called:

Significance and Harms—These are labeled as separate issues, but they are very similar. Harms are the same as the problem in the current system. Significance is supposed to be how big/significant those harms are. Look at the difference between Significance and Harms in the example below.

Example:
- Pollution from smoke stacks could be harmful.
- However, if the pollution only hurt 5 people a year, those harms may not be significant.
- If the pollution killed thousands it would be considered a significant harm.

“Cause” is also called:

Inherency—This means that affirmative’s plan is not being done now and the harms of the current system will continue if no action is taken. Inherency can be taken a step further by requiring the affirmative to prove why their plan is not being done, including specifics on what prevents the plan from becoming law. This is called the inherent barrier (the barrier, either attitudinal or structural, that is preventing the affirmative plan from being passed). If pollution is your harm, then your cause/inherency needs to state what is causing the pollution.

Example:
- By using coal as a source of electricity, the US is relying on dirty energy sources instead of developing new and clean technology.
- To draw out an inherent barrier you could argue that the coal industry, which produces the dirty energy, has a lot of political power and are forcing Congress to avoid looking for new energy sources.
- Therefore, the powerful coal industry is your inherent barrier.

“Solution” is also called:

Solvency—This is how the affirmative reduces the harms they have presented. This means that their proposed plan will work and make the problem go away—or at least get smaller.

Example:
- If the harm/problem identified was pollution, and the pollution was produced by dirty energy sources, the affirmative plan may use clean energy sources to reduce pollution.
An Additional Stock Issue…

**Topicality**

*Stay on Topic:*

Topicality is a stock issue that ensures the affirmative plan stays within the framework of the resolution.

It is said by many that if the affirmative’s case does not fall under the guise of the resolution, they should lose. The structure of such an attack is called a topicality argument. If affirmative cases were allowed to fall outside the resolution, it would be very hard for the negative to prepare. The topic limits what can be debated to allow for better preparation and targeted research.

**Example:**

What is this year’s resolution? (Ask class). The resolution for 2009-10 is: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for people living in poverty in the United States. Now let’s say a team, which was affirming or supporting this resolution, called for a tax cut for the rich. Would this increase social services? Of course not. If an affirmative case in no way relates to the resolution, like tax cut, it is un-topical. The negative could claim that since the affirmative is not on topic, they should lose the debate.

Most debates, however, are not as completely off-topic as the example above. Many affirmative cases border between topical and non-topical.

Imagine the resolution is in the center of a circle. The closer you are to the center of the circle, the more topical you are. The further away you get from the center, the less topical you are. Most negative teams will be prepared for affirmative cases in the center of the circle. As you get further away from the center of the circle, you might have reached some topic areas that are not as obvious. This will make it more difficult for the negative to have prepared adequately against your case, which might make it easier to win.

*Topicality arguments are most appropriate when a topic is near the border between topical and non-topical or when the affirmative team is clearly off-topic.*
Stock-Issue Judge vs. Policy-Maker Judge

You have just learned the stock issues. Most people in the policy debate community agree that an affirmative case should uphold the standards set by the stock issues. But there is disagreement over how these issues are interpreted when deciding the winner of a debate round. Examining two basic theories will give you insight into the complications of the decision-making process.

**Stock Issues Theory:**
This type of thinker/judge believes an affirmative must *absolutely* win all of the stock issues to win the debate round.

**Example:**
- If the negative argued that affirmative harm was very small, and they won that argument, a stock issue judge would vote for the negative team based on that single stock issue—Harms. The same goes with Solvency and all of the other stock issues.
- Stock issue judges believe that the affirmative needs to strongly prove their case, meeting the requirements of *every* stock issue. One or two poorly answered or dropped arguments over a stock issue could cause the affirmative to lose the round.

**Policy Maker Theory:**
Policy makers believe the affirmative must simply be better than the status quo or, the present system. If the affirmative has a very small harm, or poor solvency, they could still win if their plan is better than the present system. One way the negative could prove the plan is not better than the status quo is to bring up a *disadvantage*, or negative effect to doing the affirmative plan. If the affirmative plan does not solve a very large harm and it has a disadvantage, the policy judge would reject it.

These are the two most fundamental theories. However, as you learn more about debate and its complexity, you will find more disagreement over *style* and *substance*.

**Class Discussion:** Should the affirmative be required to absolutely prove every stock issue or can the case simply be a little better than the status quo? Have the class discuss this for a few minutes. Encourage students to think of the arguments for each side.

**Example:**
- If an affirmative argued that lake pollution needed to be cleaned because it was dangerous, the negative might question how the big problem is. They might question how many humans or other creatures are harmed by the pollution.
- If the affirmative says hundreds of fish and 3 humans have died from the pollution, would it be enough to justify a major program cleaning the lake?
- What if the lake clean-up cost one million bucks, and the money spent traded off with money for education programs?
Class Exercise 3C

Cafeteria Food Case

Standards Met:
   MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1-6
   KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
   Students will analyze a sample resolution and develop a simple affirmative case.

Supplies:
   - Pen
   - Paper
   - Chalk/White Board

Instructions:
   1. Have students get into groups of 2 or more and provide them with a mock resolution.

   Example: Resolved: that our school should improve the lunches served.

   2. Have each group make a mock case with their own thoughts and words that uses problem/cause/solution organization. The case does not need to be more than a sentence or two for each point. They could use the following format:

   Example: Point 1—Problem: State a problem with cafeteria food.
   “Cafeteria food tastes terrible so students do not eat their lunch. When students fail to eat lunch they get malnourished and are unable to learn in school.”

   Point 2—Cause: State a cause in their own words.
   “The food is bad because the school budget for cafeteria is too low to buy quality food.”

   Point 3—Solution: State a solution in their own words.
   “To improve the quality of cafeteria food the school budget for food should be increased.”

   You may need to provide more examples to get the students started.

   3. Once each group has developed their case, hold a class discussion over each group’s results. Use the discussion as an opportunity to correct any misunderstandings.

   4. All of the cases should be collected and KEPT by the teacher. They will be used in the next Unit.
Fiat

Fiat is a funny sounding term. It means the affirmative team’s plan will pass through the necessary branch of government. The resolution says, “should” instead of could. This means we are not debating if the affirmative plan would ever pass, but whether or not it should.

**Example:** Let’s say you ask your friend if you should ask a boy named Dave to a school dance. Your friend says that you can’t because you always chicken out and that girls are not suppose to ask boys anyway…they are suppose to be asked. Your friend has NOT answered your question. You asked if you should ask Dave. You want to know if he is cute enough to be asked or if he would say yes. Your friend is addressing whether or not you could ask him. They are two different questions.

By allowing affirmative teams to have the “power of fiat,” we avoid debates about whether or not the government would or could ever adopt a particular plan. Instead, we debate about whether or not we should adopt a plan.

**Class Discussion:** Which would be more interesting: debates about whether or not the government could adopt cases, or debates about whether or the government should adopt cases?
Class Exercise 3D

Report the Story

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3, 4, 5, 6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will create a story to be delivered in a speech based on a newspaper article.

Supplies:
- Newspaper article (one is provided)
- Pen
- Paper
- Timing device

Instructions:
1. Give each student a short newspaper article about a political issue. It could be local or national.

2. All students should be told to read the article and highlight or underline key parts.

3. Preparation Requirements:
   a. Ask the student’s to prepare an oral summary of the article.
   b. The summary should sound like a news report and it will only last 30 seconds to one minute. The story will not be written down, but delivered extemporaneously to a partner.

4. Delivery:
   a. Put the entire class into pairs.
   b. Ask half the class to speak at once, delivering their thirty second to one minute speech to their partner. After one person has gone, they should switch roles.
   c. Each student will write a review of the partner’s speech for a grade. This should include 2 positive comments and 2 things that need improvement. They should also deliver these comments out loud to their partner.

   OPTIONAL-Students could re-do the speeches after the reviews.
“PHOENIX — Battered by the recession and the deepest and most widespread budget deficits in several decades, a large majority of states are slicing into their social safety nets — often crippling preventive efforts that officials say would save money over time.

President Obama’s $787 billion stimulus package is helping to alleviate some of the pain, providing large amounts of money to pay for education and unemployment insurance, bolster food stamp programs and expand tax credits for low earners. But the money will offset only 40 percent of the losses in state revenues, and programs for vulnerable groups have been cut in at least 34 states, according to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, a private research group in Washington.

Perhaps nowhere have the cuts been more disruptive than in Arizona, where more than 1,000 frail elderly people are struggling without home-care aides to help with bathing, housekeeping and trips to the doctor. Officials acknowledge that some are apt to become sicker or fall, ending up in nursing homes at a far higher cost. Ohio and other states face large cutbacks in child welfare investigations, which may mean more injured children and more taken into foster care. Despite tax increases, California has ended dental coverage for adults on Medicaid, all but guaranteeing future medical problems.

“There’s no question that we’re getting short-term savings that will result in greater long-term human and financial costs,” said Linda J. Blessing, interim chief of the Arizona Department of Economic Security, expressing the concerns of officials and community agencies around the country. “There are no good options, just less bad options.” ”
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Class Exercise 3E

Understanding the 1AC

Day One

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will receive the 1AC and practice reading it to increase understanding of the case and to gain speaking experience.

Supplies:
• Copy of topic novice 1AC for each person in the class
• Each student will need a timer or a clock with a second hand

Instructions:
1. Make copies of the 1AC for the entire class or require them to create their own affirmative case (but that is difficult for beginners).
2. Give a brief overview of the cases(s) so students will have an idea of what they are receiving.

Homework Assignment: Practice reading the 1AC and identify its key components.
1. Read the 1AC three times and record the time it took to complete it each time.
2. Select at least five words you did not understand, look their meaning up in a dictionary and provide the definition.
3. Label the affirmative evidence in terms of three major stock issues: Significance/Harms, Inherency and Solvency.

Evaluation:
• 3 points for each recorded time.
• 2 points for each definition. One bonus point per extra definitions (up to 5).
• 1 point for each correctly labeled piece of evidence.

(continued on next page)
Class Exercise 3E

Understanding the 1AC

Day Two

Reflections:
The 1AC homework assignment can be used to generate class discussion and brainstorming on the day it is due. Students should have several questions, and there are plenty of follow-up lessons that can stem from students’ first interaction with a debate case.

• Ask for the words students did not understand and make a list of them on the board. This could even include the definitions the students have looked up. Notice if certain words are on many students’ lists.

• Ask if there are any words or sections of the 1AC the students still do not understand.

• Ask the class how long it took to read the 1AC and if they felt more comfortable during the third reading than they did the first. (Use this point to emphasize practice.)

• Ask for opinions on the 1AC and ways they might improve it. This can also include arguments they think could/should be made against the case.
Class Exercise 3F

2AC Blocks

A block (also called a brief) is a single page of a file that includes a heading, tag, citation, and evidence. There is often more than one tag, cite, and piece of evidence under a single heading. The headings can be “Answers to Courts Counter-plans,” “Solvency,” or sub-headings to major points in an affirmative case (among many others). This is called a “block” because it blocks the opponents’ arguments.

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will increase their understanding of evidence, organization, debate blocks and their case.

Supplies:
• 2AC/Back-up evidence for novice affirmative case (examples pg 61-62)
• Pens
• Tape
• Scissors

Description:
Assist students in creating their “2AC,” or affirmative back-up blocks. Students will be given the evidence, but it will not be organized or placed on labeled blocks. Students are going to be given the task of putting the correct evidence on the correct debate blocks. These labels will match-up with the affirmative cases 3 observations: problem, cause and solution.

Instructions:
Preparation:
1. Use the DKC Affirmative case file to create scrambled back up evidence.
   a. Make copies of affirmative case back-up evidence in the DKC evidence files, or cut and paste with the electronic version.
   b. Remove all block tags. The evidence should not be labeled other than the tag for specific argument. (Example on page 61)

2. Create a master set of blocks with the appropriate organization. This will be what each students back up evidence blocks should like when they are done. (Example on page 62) If you work with all the 3 cases you will need 3 separate master sets.
Class Exercise 3F
2AC Blocks

Student Instructions:
1. Ask all students to take out their 1AC.
2. Explain to the students that they are going to receive evidence used to back up and support their 1AC. However, they are going to need to organize it.
3. Clearly state how that scrambled evidence backs up one of the 3 parts of the affirmative case: problem, cause or solution. Students need to put all the problem evidence on one set of blocks, and the same with cause and solution.
3. Use the board or an overhead to demonstrate what a “block” should look like.
4. Guide the class in placing a piece of evidence or two under the appropriate headings.

Execution:
Creating evidence blocks is not an easy task. It will take an entire class period and maybe more. The teacher must actively go around the room and assist students.
Class Exercise 3F

2AC Blocks

Scrambled Affirmative Evidence Example

Normally this area would include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name and/or File Author</th>
<th>Block Title</th>
<th>Argument Title Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Community schools work by fostering meaningful relationships between the student and the community.


As Don Davies writes in the book School-Community Connections: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice (1995), children’s lives are not compartmentalized but are made up of a series of interactive relationships and supports that create an experience. Therefore, a narrow focus on standardized tests misses the complexity of what it takes to educate the whole child and aid in that child's future success. Community schools provide a compelling solution by fostering collaboration and relationships among different community stakeholders that create holistic learning opportunities for students (Dryfoos, Quinn, and Barkin, 2005). As we continue our NCLB Reauthorization debate, we need to consider community schools as one model that could help educate the whole child.

The current school system is not equipped to deal with the problems of poverty.

Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy Spring, 2005

A Helping Hand: Full-Service Community Schools as a Model for Educating Low-Income Children

The United States must invest in the education of its poorest children and provide an education system that enables meaningful and successful academic achievement. However, success is only possible where students can overcome the obstacles imposed by poverty in order to achieve success. It is not enough to demand that schools reach certain testing standards or threaten under-performing schools with funding cuts and closures; there is a systemic failure when schools simply are not equipped to deal with the full range of social problems that undermine a student's ability to succeed.

Childhood poverty will cost the U.S. economy 1.7 trillion dollars if action is not taken.

U.S. Newswire December 16, 2008

Recession-Induced Child Poverty to Cost U.S. $1.7 Trillion in Economic Loss

WASHINGTON, Dec. 16 /U.S. Newswire/~ A new report has found that the United States will suffer a future economic loss of over $1.7 trillion if the current recession drives an additional 3 million children into poverty, as has been predicted. That amounts to a yearly loss of about $35 billion dollars per year over the lifetime these children.
Class Exercise 3F

2AC Blocks

Completed Evidence Block Example

Cause: Community Schools Lack Support

Several barriers have prevented community schools from becoming the norm in low income neighborhoods.

**Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy Spring, 2005**
A Helping Hand: Full-Service Community Schools as a Model for Educating Low-Income Children

Full-service community schools have not become the norm in the low-income localities that need them the most because of a variety of political, organizational, financial and regulatory barriers. p.64 By and large, they have not taken hold as a viable education delivery model that is mainstream and deserving of political and financial support. p.65 One criticism concerns the difficulty of successfully building full-service schools. p.66 There is not a single, authoritative implementation plan; schools cater to children who live in vastly different communities and bring diverse backgrounds and needs, and schools also have different resources available. p.67

Federal legislation for community schools has not moved beyond the committee stage.

**Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy Spring, 2005**
A Helping Hand: Full-Service Community Schools as a Model for Educating Low-Income Children

Federal legislators know that school-service integration holds promise. p.69 At the federal government level there have been a few major pieces of proposed legislation to promote full-service community schools, most notably the Full-Service Schools Act of 1993, p.70 and the Child Opportunity Zone Family Center Act of 2001. p.71 However, neither of those bills has made it past the committee consideration stage. In terms of obtaining legislative success, it is important to attract bipartisan support; gaining political support from state governments is a necessary parallel effort.
**Talking Debate**

**Affirmative Case**—Everything that is read during the entire first affirmative constructive, it usually includes the five stock issues.

**Affirmative Plan**—The sentence (or two) within the first affirmative speech says exactly what you are doing to solve the problem. The rest of what you read in your case is centered around this statement(s).

**Advantage**—the benefits your plan will create

**Block**—is a single page of a file that includes a heading, tag, citation, and evidence. There is often more than one tag, cite and piece of evidence under a single heading. This is called a “block” because it blocks the opponents’ arguments.

**Card**—a piece of evidence. This name comes from the “old debate days” when evidence was painstakingly written down on 3x5 note cards.

**Concession or Concede**—to yield (agree) to your opponents’ argument, sometimes without intending to do so.

**Disadvantage**—(also called a “disad” or DA) The problems the affirmative plan will create.

**Dropped argument**—an argument that is not addressed by the opposing team. In debate, if you do not challenge your opponent’s argument, then you are conceding (agreeing) to that argument—even if you just didn’t have time to get to it. Debate rounds can be lost if you drop too many arguments.

**File**—contains all of the evidence/blocks that support/defend a particular area of the debate. If you have more than one affirmative case, you will have a separate file for each case. Additionally, you will have separate files for different disadvantages, advantages, etc.

**Harms**—the problems in the status quo that your plan is trying to fix.

**Inherency**—the reason why your plan does not already exist.

**Inherent Barrier**—the barrier, either attitudinal or structural, that is preventing the affirmative plan from being passed.

**Significance**—how big the harms are. This usually deals with numbers/statistical data, or it places weight on issues of morality.

**Solvency**—Stock issue that requires the affirmative plan solves the harms identified.

**Topicality**—a stock issue that requires the affirmative team to stay within the realm of the resolution.
The Negative

We now know that the affirmative must prove that their case has all the stock issues and that it is better than status quo. The negative’s job is to prove that the affirmative plan is a bad idea. The negative has many options for proving the affirmative case is a bad idea, but the most basic option (the one that every debater needs to learn first) is to simply attack each element of the affirmative case.

Unit Focus:

Answering the Affirmative Case

Attacking Evidence

Debating Against an Affirmative Case
Negating

The negative side is charged with opposing the affirmative idea. They, however, do not need their own case with a problem, cause or solution. Instead, the negative needs to win that one or all parts of the affirmative idea are wrong. If the negative can win that some element of the affirmative is untrue, they can win the debate.

This is similar to the role of a defense attorney. A defense attorney simply needs to find one key flaw in prosecutor’s case and they can win a trial. In a similar sense, if negative debaters can prove one element of the affirmative idea untrue, then they can win the debate.

Refute Each Element of the Case

Ask the Class: What are the stock issues that the affirmative must win?
Answer: Problem (Significance and Harms) Cause (Inherency) Solution (Solvency)

The negative can attack each one of the stock issues to win the debate. When you are negative you should think of ways to oppose each affirmative point. Below you will find some arguments to make against the affirmative case.

Basic Negative Arguments

- The **problems** are caused by other factors
- The **problem** is being made bigger than it really is
- There are too many **causes** of the **problem**
- The **cause** or the **problem** is impossible to ever fix
- The **solution** is unproven and risky
- The **solution** will cause more harm than good
- The **solution** does not solve enough of the problem
Class Exercise 4A
Cafeteria Food Case Part 2: The Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4, 5 & 6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will develop negative arguments to debate against affirmative cases.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Chalk/White Board
- Previous Cafeteria Food Cases (The ones written by the students)

Instructions:
1. Review the sample affirmative case from the previous section and then begin a
discussion over possible negative arguments. On the next page is a handout
detailing how a negative debater could phrase arguments against the sample
affirmative.
2. Ask the students to pick a partner to debate against. Students will need the
following materials: Paper, Pen and their Affirmative Cafeteria Cases.
3. Turn Pairs Into Groups:
   Once the class has formed into pairs, the pairs need to become groups of 4.
   a. Each partner set should get in a group with one other partner set.
   b. The group is going to facilitate four debates. Partner sets will
debate each other on both sides. This means each student will
debate affirmative once and negative once.
   c. The partner set not debating will serve as judges.
   d. Each group will move to a different area of the room and several
debates will occur at the same time. Each group will hold one
debate at a time while the instructor times all groups at once.
4. Rules for Debate
   a. Every student must take notes in every debate. They will turn in these
      notes for a grade. The notes are especially important during debates
      where students are the participants.
   b. - Time Limit and Speech Order
       - The affirmative will speak for up to 1 minute
       - The negative has 1 minute
       - The affirmative has 30 seconds
       - The negative has 30 seconds
   c. At the conclusion of each debate judges should say one thing that went
      well and one thing that could be improved for each debater.
   d. All students should turn in their notes and the instructor should answer any
      questions generate from the debates.
**Exercise 4A**  
*Cafeteria Food Case*

**Negative Example**

*Affirmative Point 1—Problem:* Cafeteria food tastes terrible so students do not eat their lunch. When students fail to eat lunch they get malnourished and are unable to learn in school."

**THE NEGATIVE HAS 2 RESPONSES:**

1. The problem can be avoided. Students can bring lunches to school from home if they do not like the cafeteria food.
2. The problem is over-stated. Many people like cafeteria food. My friends like the school food and most of the people in our cafeteria clean their plate. This means that the problem is over-stated and we do not need a new school lunch plan.

---

*Point 2—Cause:* The food is bad because the school budget for the cafeteria is too low to buy quality food.

**THE NEGATIVE HAS 1 RESPONSE:**

1. The cause is false. The poor quality of cooks, not the quality of food is the real cause of the bad food. If the affirmative is not targeting the right causes, their solution will fail.

---

*Point 3—Solution:* To improve the quality of cafeteria food the school budget for food should be increased.

**THE NEGATIVE HAS 2 RESPONSES:**

1. The solution would cause more harm than good. If we spend more money on food then we will spend less money on something else. The food we eat in school is good enough; we need to spend our money on computers and new technology, not cafeteria food. Voting affirmative would actually make the school worse.

2. Money will not fix all problems. The affirmative is proposing that we spend more money on food, but they do not say what type of food they will buy, or who will cook it. Everyone has paid too much for bad food at some restaurant, and if you vote affirmative you would be just be paying too much for bad food.
Detailed Ways to Answer the Affirmative Case

Affirmative cases often sound intimidating and difficult to answer. However, most affirmative cases have numerous flaws the negative can easily exploit. To effectively answer the case, a negative should go through a few steps outlined below.

Attacking the Problem (Significance and Harms)

Affirmative cases often make big claims about harms and problems in the status quo. They will present these harms in advantages or harms contentions in their 1AC. The negative should look for ways to defend the current system and refute the problems claimed by the affirmative.

- **Don’t Buy the Hype**
  Affirmatives love to make the problems of the current system sound much worse than they really are. Listen to their claims, consider them, and then create reasons why the harms, or problems, are over-hyped.
  
  Example: We all know people, and this is especially true with small children, who cannot take pain very well. They will cry over a scrapped knee or small bump on the head. The negative needs to make the affirmative case sound like children screaming about a small scrape or little bump.

- **Examples from History**
  Debaters can use general knowledge of history to disprove the affirmative harms.

- **Specific Research**
  Most arguments affirmative teams make have been directly refuted by someone somewhere. If you do the research you can find evidence that will refute the affirmatives. (Your DKC files already have a ton† of specific research).

† DKC files may not actually weigh a ton.
Attacking the Cause (Inherency)

The cause of the problem, or the Inherency, is usually one of the least argued points of the case. However, negative teams can still make plenty of good arguments against the cause.

- **Too Many Causes**
  The problems explained by most affirmative teams have more than one cause. The negative should think of as many other causes as they can.

- **Cause Goes Unfixed**
  Negative teams can argue that the affirmative case does too little to fix the cause. Most causes relate to a failure by our government to fix some problem. Negatives can argue that current system is so broken that affirmative cannot possibly fix it with one change.

- **The Current System Rocks Your Face Off**
  The negative should look for reasons to support the status quo. Maybe things are the way they are for a good reason. The affirmative team could disrupt the good thing we have going in the status quo.

  Example: Let’s say an affirmative team argued that our current government is not supporting social services enough. The negative could argue that nonprofit organizations will provide aid where it is needed. Why waste taxpayer money on something that can done better by charity?

Solvency Attacks

Solvency is often the most difficult aspect of the affirmative case to defend. Most affirmatives claim to solve for big harms such as war, rights, sexism, racism and more. These are huge problems that have not been solved as of yet because they are historically challenging. This leaves the negative with many ways to challenge affirmative solvency.

- **Problems and Causes the Affirmative Cannot Fix (Alternate Causality)**
  Affirmative cases claim that they will fix all the problems they identified. However, many of the problems they try to fix have numerous causes.

  Example: Let’s say we were debating a pollution topic. The affirmative is going to clean up a polluted lake. They claim that the lake is being polluted by a nearby car factory. The negative could argue that another factory, one that spews sewage, is the real problem. This *alternate cause* of the pollution would prevent the affirmative case from solving the problem.
• **Solvency Research**
  Against many affirmatives, you will find evidence claiming that plans like theirs have been tried before—but failed. These are some of the best arguments because they directly refute the affirmative solvency claim. The more specific your evidence is, the better it will be. (Once again, DKC files are a great starting place).

• **“Show-Me” Some Specifics**
  Negative teams should look for how the affirmative case will actually work. Negatives should ask plenty of questions and look for holes in the specifics of the affirmative solvency.

• **It’s Not Enough**
  No affirmative can claim to solve 100% of the problems they identify. If it were that easy to solve societal problems the government would have a much better reputation for efficiency. Negative teams should question how much of the problem is actually solved by the affirmative case.

• **Flip It or Turn the Case**
  The negative can argue that the affirmative will make the harms they identify worse. With evidence or logic the negative can look for ways the affirmative will not only fail to solve the harms, they will actually make the harms worse!

  Example: If an affirmative team claimed social services reduce poverty, the negative could argue the opposite is true. With evidence the negative could claim that government social services make people more dependent on the government. In turn, government dependency reduces motivation, self esteem, etc. and prevents people from reaching their potential. Over time this dependency increases poverty, thus turning the case.

**Class Discussion:** Think back to the cafeteria case exercise. Now that you have seen some ways for the negative to attack the affirmative, what are new arguments you can think of about the Problems, Causes and Solutions of the affirmative cases?
Evidence

Using Yours and Attacking the Opponents

Debate is a clash of ideas, and the best ideas are those supported by examples, experience and evidence. Statements are not enough, and arguing something is true “just because” is not very impressive. For example, most children dislike it when their parents say, “Because I said so”. To win debates you need to support your arguments with evidence and logic.

Evidence

Evidence can come in many forms, but its basic function in debate is to support an argument. Forms of evidences include:

- **Examples** based on the topic of debate
- **Personal Experience** that can be direct or in relation to a debate topic
- **Research**: quotes from books, magazines, statistics, newspapers, journals, songs, poetry or Internet publications

- **Examples**
  Providing an example that shows the validity of your argument can be a very effective tool for winning a debate. Examples should be on topic, reasonable and something other people can relate to.

If you were debating about drug testing for student athletes and you were supporting testing student’s athletes for drugs, you might provide the following example about a girl named Sarah who used drug testing to avoid peer pressure:

Drug testing can help kids avoid peer pressure. Let’s say there is a girl named Sarah who wants to be on the basketball team at her school. She has been a star basketball player her whole life and she loves the sport. Now, because she is a star athlete she often hangs out with the so-called “popular” crowd. Sometimes she is offered drugs at parties and she feels pressure to do drugs so that she can look cool. If her school tests all student athletes for drugs, then she would have an excuse to not do drugs. Sarah will not look un-cool, because she just wants to stay on the team, and it is not her fault that the school has a drug testing policy. This example proves that drug testing gives students a way out of peer pressure and can prevent dangerous drug use.

The example is not about a real person, but it sounds like situation that easily could happen. This type of hypothetical example can provide something real for your audience, judge and opponents to think about. It contextualizes the argument.

*Class Discussion: Can you think of a counter example, or can you find flaws in the example above?*
• **Personal Experience**
  Some topics for debate will be familiar to you. You make have *direct* experience in the topic. For example, school uniforms are an issue that all students can understand. Even if your school does not have uniforms, your school experience will be useful.

  Additionally, even if you lack direct experience on an issue you can still *relate* to it. Many fundamental issues within a particular debate are found in other debates. For example, drug testing is claimed by some to violate an individual’s privacy. Privacy is a fundamental issue that comes up in many debates and many areas of life. If your parents were to read your diary it might violate your sense of privacy. The feelings that come from losing your privacy would be similar in both cases. Thus, even if you did not have direct experience with drug testing, you could relate to it through a similar loss of privacy.

  *Class Discussion:* What personal experience could be used in relationship to the poverty topic?

• **Research**
  In debate people argue about many different issues. For many of these issues, people lack direct experience on the subject they are arguing about. This means that good debaters will research their topics to become informed and prepared. The research gives debaters knowledge and materials to quote.

  Good evidence is very useful in debate because it can help prove one argument to be superior to another. When given a topic to debate one of the first things that should be done is to collect research that can be used as evidence. The evidence will help the debaters become informed on the topic and it will help build arguments for the debate.

  *Class Discussion:* If one side of a debate has up-to-date statistics and quotes from an expert, to prove their argument true, while the other side only has only personal examples, who do you think will win the argument?
Explaining Your Evidence
Debaters must explain how the evidence they present in the debate supports their argument. Debaters must tie things together so that the judge and audience know why the evidence supports their claim.

Attacking Evidence
Debaters should look for ways they can attack their opponent’s evidence. When you debate someone listen to their evidence closely and try to figure out ways that it does not support their arguments. Sometimes you can find ways that your opponent’s evidence actually benefits your side more.

- **Context**
  Make sure the evidence was taken from the proper context. If someone uses out-of-context evidence, then it is not credible.

*Class Discussion: Have your words ever been taken out of context?*

- **Sources Qualifications and Bias**
  Make sure the evidence is from a qualified and unbiased source.

- **Quality of Argument**
  Evidence often contains arguments and opinions. You should analyze the arguments made in the evidence and question any claims that may be untrue.

- **What is Missing?**
  Sometimes evidence will ignore certain facts. Examples can be misleading if you are not given all the information, so debaters should always think about what could be missing.

- **Dates**
  The date of evidence can be important. Many issues require up-to-date facts and statistics. For example, if we were debating about how to improve the war in Iraq, evidence from 2003 would be outdated.

- **Parts Not Read and Portions that Help You**
  Sometimes your opponent’s evidence can actually help your side. Many teams will only read some parts of their evidence. The parts they don’t read aloud, but are still on the evidence sheet can be used against them. Also, sometimes teams will read evidence that you can spin for your side.
Class Exercise 4B

Attack the Card Drill

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective: Students will find flaws in debate evidence.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- 1-5 cards (pieces of debate evidence)

Description:
Students will be given the opportunity to write out attacks against pieces of debate evidence.

Instructions:
1. Give the students 1-5 pieces of debate evidence and ask them to write at least three arguments against each piece of evidence. An example is provided below. Make sure they provide reasons why the evidence does not effectively prove the argument provided in the tag.

2. Demonstrate what to do with one piece of evidence to get them started. You can read this evidence aloud and ask the class to look for flaws. On the next page you will find example arguments against this evidence.

Example:

The “poor” live very well compared to past generations.

Robert Rector, Senior Research Fellow in Domestic Policy Studies for the Heritage Foundation, CQ Congressional Testimony, September 25, 2008

Point #2 Most "poor" Americans are not "poor" in any normally understood sense of the word. For most Americans, the word "poverty" suggests destitution: an inability to provide a family with nutritious food, clothing, and reasonable shelter. But only a small number of the 37 million persons classified as "poor" by the Census Bureau fit that description. While real material hardship certainly does occur, it is limited in scope and severity. Most of America's "poor" live in material conditions that would be judged as comfortable or well-off just a few generations ago.

Today, the expenditures per person of the lowest-income one-fifth (or quintile) of households equal those of the median American household in the early 1970s, after adjusting for inflation. For example, according to the government's own data, nearly two thirds of households defined by Census as "poor" have cable or satellite television. Eighty five percent have air conditioning. Overall, the typical American defined as poor by the government has a car, air conditioning, a refrigerator, a stove, a clothes washer and dryer, and a microwave. He has two color televisions, and cable or satellite TV reception. He has a VCR, a DVD player, and a stereo. He is able to obtain medical care. His home is in good repair and is not overcrowded. By his own report, his family is not hungry and he had sufficient funds in the past year to meet his family's essential needs. While this individual's life is not opulent, it is equally far from the popular images of dire poverty conveyed by the press, liberal activists, and politicians.
Possible Answers:

1. The evidence says 37 million people living in poverty is an inflated number, but it does not provide any sort of real number of its own. Poverty is a real problem regardless of statistics, and even if you cut the 37 million number in half, that would be over 16 million.

2. The evidence defines poverty based on material possessions like air conditioning and cable T.V., but you can have cable T.V. and be still be poor. Not to generalize, but part of the problem with poverty is that people make impulsive choices rather than planning for the long term.

3. The evidence uses sexist language by using the generic “he”. The author, out of respect for the power of words, should have used “he or she” or some other phrasing.

4. The evidence is focused on shallow details rather than core problems. Poverty is a complicated issue with intersections of race, sex and class. To divert attention on how many T.V.’s people have, rather than discussing root causes and real problems, borders on unethical. It makes poverty, a very serious problem for millions, trite.
Class Exercise 4C

Class Case Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will prepare arguments and attack a negative case, gaining experience creating arguments and speaking.

Supplies:
• Pen
• Paper
• DKC Affirmative Case File
• DKC Negative Case Evidence

Instructions:
1. Prepare the case:
   a. Select one of the 3 DKC affirmative cases to read to the class.
   b. Read the case very slow and ask all students to flow.
   c. You can modify the case by adding obvious errors if you wish.

2. Provide class instructions:
   a. Explain to the class they are going to hear you read a sample affirmative case, and they will be giving a 5-minute speech refuting the case.
   b. Before you begin reading, give ask the students to take out their “DKC Case Negative File”.
   c. Tell the students that they will use the evidence to help refute the affirmative case.
   d. Instruct the students to flow the case and carefully listen to the evidence. Tell them they will be preparing attacks against the case, so if they hear flaws in the evidence they should write them down as they are flowing.

3. Preparing for speeches at once
   a. Once all the students have prepared attacks against the case, they should be put into pairs.
   b. Each student will read his/her attacks against the case to the partner—each speech should last about five minutes.
   c. The entire class should speak at once. It will sound loud, but partners should be able to hear.
   d. Once the first student has finished a speech, the second should do the same.
   e. Partner should provide feedback to each other and they should flow each other speeches.

4. After each student has read a case attack, you should discuss with the class what the best arguments were.
Unit 5: Disadvantages

A disadvantage (also called a “disad” or “DA”) is a bad circumstance that only results from the adoption of the affirmative plan.

Unit Focus:

Components of a Disadvantage

Uniqueness

Link

Impact

Answering Disadvantages
Disadvantages & Negative Strategy

The affirmative plan has proposed benefits. When the affirmative solves a problem, they can claim an advantage. A disadvantage is the bad consequence of the plan. No change comes without a cost: and the disadvantage is that cost.

Disadvantages are critical to negative strategy. If the negative team does not present a harmful effect of the plan the affirmative team can claim that we are better off adopting the affirmative plan because it can only make things better. The negative needs to convince the judge that the affirmative plan will not only fail, but that it will actually do more harm than good.

Example: Let’s say you have an old car. It breaks down a lot and so you want to buy a new car. The advantages to a new car are many. It should be safer, the engine is new and the car should run smoothly and you get that great new car smell! However, there are also disadvantages. One is the cost. New cars are expensive. You may have to get a loan and pay extra money in interest. The money you spend on the car may trade off with other items you want to purchase, like clothes or even food. Another disadvantage may be that the car is more likely to get stolen.

What are the Components of a DA?

A disadvantage has three basic parts. It also contains many subparts but you must understand the most basic components to grasp the other specifics.

1. Uniqueness.
   This means that DA is NOT happening now. Uniqueness states that the present system prevents a certain harmful side effect from occurring, or simply that such a bad effect will not happen in the status quo. This element of a disadvantage is vital: if the affirmative can prove certain bad consequences will occur anyway, it is irrelevant if their plan actually causes them to occur or not.

   Example: Let’s you say have a disad (disadvantage) about the economy. You claim that the affirmative will hurt the economy for whatever reason. For your economy disad to be unique, you need evidence proving the economy is in good shape now, or at least proving the economy has not collapsed. If the economy were already in terrible shape, then making it a little worse would not cause a unique disadvantage.

2. Link.
   The link is simply how the plan causes the negative effect, or impact, explained in the disadvantage.
What is the Deficit?  
The U.S. government collects tax money each year and then spends that money on various programs. When the government spends more than it takes in, it’s called a deficit.

Example: Let’s go back to the economy. You are claiming that affirmative plan would somehow hurt the economy. The link is how the plan would hurt the economy. We can use cost as an example. Some plans need to spend money to be implemented. You could argue that to fund the plan the affirmative would be forced to deficit spend, meaning that, since the budget is already spent, Congress would be forced to increase the deficit to fund their plan. Adding to the deficit, according to some economists, hurts the economy for a variety of reasons. So your link argument becomes two fold. You show that the plan spends money and spending money hurts the economy.

2a. Internal Link (A sub category of link).  
The internal link can be thought of as a second step of the link, or a more detailed link.

Example: In our previous example, we saw that spending money and increasing the deficit was our link. However, that may not be enough detail. An internal link goes a step further. We know the plan spends money, and thus, increases the deficit. That is our first and basic link argument. However, we may need to show exactly how increasing the deficit hurts the economy. One internal link may be that increasing the deficit would increase interest rates. The next internal link would be that high interest rates hurt the economy. You could have several internal links for the same disad.

3. Impact.  
The impact is the effect of the link and the ultimate effect of the disad. If the plan causes the economy to worsen, why is that bad? The “impact” of economic downturn can be many things. One impact could be a loss of jobs. Another may be a little bigger and scarier, like war. (It is said that the Great Depression in the 1930s triggered World War II.) The negative tries to make their disad a big reason not to vote affirmative. The bigger the impact of the disad, the better. Many disads end with war or nuclear war as the ultimate impact. It may seem a little ridiculous to say that an affirmative case will cause a nuclear war, but you need to keep in mind that a disadvantage is based on risk. You are not contending it is absolutely certain the plan will cause nuclear war, but that there is a definite risk that it could cause war in a worst case scenario.

Example: Sticking with the economy disad, we know that the economy is OK in the present system. The plan spends money, which sky-rocket the deficit, increasing interest rates, and the economy is massively hurt. What happens next? We can look for evidence that explains what would happen if the economy was damaged. Several authors have stated that if the US were to take a big economic hit, it could cause global war, similar to the 1930s.
Other Disadvantage Issues

Brink/Threshold:

The brink or “threshold” is similar to uniqueness; except that it claims the present system is very close to the point of danger (the danger point is the impact). The negative may argue the status quo has created a situation where we are on the brink of disaster, and one more plan like the affirmative’s would push the present system over the brink—causing a negative side-effect, or impact, to happen.

Example: Person “A” is standing near a cliff. Force “B” pushes A. If the force is great enough, A will fall off the cliff. How close to the cliff person A is standing is known as the brink. Force B is the link, and falling off the cliff is the impact, which we could call C.

Linear Disadvantages:

Basically, a linear disadvantage is the opposite of the threshold or brink DA’s. Uniqueness does not matter much. Linear DAs claim that the affirmative plan would make an existing problem worse. This DA form can be easier for novice debaters to understand.

Example: Let’s say you wanted to run the spending DA as a linear DA. You would not worry about how good or bad the economy is in the status quo, you would simply argue that spending money would increase deficits and hurt the economy. The impact would not be global war or something huge, but something simpler. You might argue that when the economy gets worse people lose their jobs and have less money to buy essentials.

Time Frame:

The time frame is how long before the disadvantage impact happens. If there is an especially short time frame, then the disadvantage created by the plan could happen before whatever good the plan creates. When that happens, the disadvantage is more credible and a greater reason to reject the plan. If there were a long time frame before the disadvantage impact happens, then the good created by the plan might happen before the disadvantage. If this is the case, the disadvantage is less of a reason to reject the plan.

Magnitude:

The magnitude is how big the impact actually is. If the impact to a DA is war, you could increase the magnitude of the impact by arguing that the war would be nuclear. The bigger the magnitude, the better.
Class Exercise 5A

The Missing Link

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will identify a link to a disadvantage to learn the basics of disadvantages.

Supplies:
• Handouts on the following two pages
• Pen

Instructions:

*Students can work in groups or individually.*

1. Provide each student or group with the handouts below. The first handout is a corruption disadvantage without a link. The second page has three pieces of evidence and only number 3 is the correct link.

2. Instruct the students to pick the proper link for the disadvantage. Each person/group could vote for the link they believe to be correct.

3. After they identify the correct link, ask the students to label the other two pieces of evidence as uniqueness, link or impact. Students should also notice if any evidence does not match with the corruption disadvantage.

4. OPTIONAL: Ask for volunteers to give 30 second speeches defending their choices.

5. Allow for class discussion.

7. Explain which link is correct and why. You could also discuss the other links and talk about the disadvantage they actually match up with.
Class Exercise 5A

The Missing Link Handout

Economy Disadvantage...missing a link

A. Uniqueness: The U.S. temporarily increased spending to avoid a depression, but now economic growth is expected to return and we must begin reducing the debt.

Chattanooga Times Free Press (Tennessee) June 4, 2009 Bernanke says mounting deficits menace to future

Record federal spending to avoid a deeper economic downturn is necessary in the short term, but the U.S. government soon must present a credible plan to reduce the massive debt burden that's being run up, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned Wednesday. In congressional testimony, Bernanke also expressed confidence that economic growth would resume later this year, that threats of inflation and deflation appear contained and that the global financial system is stabilizing. He said that the Fed would produce a list next week of banks deemed healthy enough to give back bailout money to taxpayers.

B. Missing Link Here

C. Economic decline undermines solutions to ecology, diseases, famine and oppression.

Leonard Silk Winter (prof. of economics @ Pace U.), Foreign Affairs, 1993 Dangers of Slow Growth

Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all of these problems by itself. But economic growth – and growth alone – creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.
Class Exercise 5A
*The Missing Link* Handout

**Find the Correct Link**

1. U.S. economic collapse will cause a global collapse.


This year, eight economies will be in recession, two in depression. But all should be growing again in the second half of next year, he predicts. Asia is moving toward the beginnings of recovery and is no longer in crisis, in Mr. Sinai’s view. South Korea has turned around, from depression to modest growth. Japan seems past the worst, judging by its stock market revival. However, if the U.S. economy falters seriously, so will the fledgling recoveries, Mr. Sinai warns. Asian growth would be stymied. China might devalue, causing new problems for the region. Europe could go into recession. Canada’s growth, heavily dependent on exports to the U.S., would disappear. Latin America would fall into depression. All this could lead to financial market collapse, and perhaps a world depression. 'The odds on this are not zero,' Mr. Sinai says.

2. New social program spending, like the affirmative is proposing, will destroy the American economy.

*Just Politics June 30, 2009* Is Americas Debt Party Coming to an End?

What is clear is the grandiose social spending programs Obama and the Democrats want cannot be allowed to come to pass as it will mean disaster for the U.S. economy and, in turn, the rest of the world. America went to the debt bank too much and now has worn out its welcome.

3. Congress is now operating under pay as you go rules, which will reduce the deficit.

*REP. JOHN M. SPRATT JR.FNS June 26, 2009* COMMITTEE HEARING

Republicans were in the majority in 2002 when the BEA expired, and they chose not to reinstate PAYGO, knowing that it would impede passage of their tax cut agenda. Without the process rules, the budget plunged from a surplus of $236 billion in the year 2000 to a deficit of $413 billion in the year 2004. When Democrats took back the House, the reinstatement of PAYGO was on the top of our agenda. We made PAYGO a rule of the House the first day we convened the 110th Congress. Two weeks ago, the president proposed a bill to make PAYGO statutory, and last week that bill was introduced, with over 150 co-sponsors, as a starting point toward making statutory PAYGO part of our budget process.
Class Exercise 5B

Assembling the DA

Standards Met:
- MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
- KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will label and assemble the main components of a disadvantage.

Supplies/Preparation
- Chose one generic and simple disadvantage, such as the economy, and make enough copies for each student or for groups of students. You can use the 2008-09 DEBATE-Kansas City evidence, evidence from another summer debate institute, or evidence from previous years.

- Have your varsity students cut apart the disadvantage and put it in envelopes. Make sure that each envelope contains the link, uniqueness, and impact—but the labels must be cut off (camp evidence packets will have all DAs labeled).

Instructions:
1. Review the parts of a disadvantage with the class.

2. Give each student or group an envelope containing the “scrambled” disadvantage.

3. Tell the students to assemble the cards in the correct order and label the uniqueness, link and impact.

4. Check on the students to make sure they have properly assembled their DA and discuss the answers.

OPTION: Add to the Exercise:
You could do the same thing with disadvantage answer evidence. Instruct the students to label the answers non-unique, link takeouts, link turns, impact take-outs and impact turns. You will want to give a lecture over how to answer a DA before you try this modification.
Homework

Overview

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will read a disadvantage file and then write an overview.

Supplies:
- DKC negative disadvantage file
- Pen
- Paper

Instructions:
1. Each student needs a full copy of one DKC disadvantage.
2. Explain the disadvantage to the class.
3. Tell the students to take home the file and read through it.
4. Once the students read the file they should write at least a ½ page summary of the disadvantage. This is called an overview.
5. The following day students will read the overview to a neighbor using “the speak at once and then trade off” method.
Affirmative Responses to Disads

It is important that you know how to answer a disadvantage when you are on the affirmative. Additionally, understanding how the other team will answer your disadvantage will help you prepare.

Common Disadvantage Answers:

1. Non-Unique
We have learned what it means for a DA to be unique. It means that the DA is not happening now. When we call a DA non-unique, that means parts of the DA, or all of it, are happening now. If the DA is already happening, then it is not a unique reason to reject the affirmative.

   Example: We will stick with the economy. If the negative claims the plan will hurt the economy, the affirmative can argue the economy is already in bad shape, thus rendering the DA non-unique. Another example is a little more detailed. Let’s say the negative’s link argument to the Economy Disadvantage is based on spending money and increasing the deficit. The affirmative could make a non-unique argument by claiming that Congress has already increased the deficit by spending a bunch of new money.

   “The economy is already bad already and our plan had nothing to do with it!”

2. No Link
This argument is pretty simple. The affirmative simply claims that they do not link to the negative’s DA. You can read evidence to prove this point or you can find common sense reasons as to why your plan would not link to the DA.

   Example: Once again we stay with the Economy DA. The negative may claim that affirmative plan spends new money, raising the deficit. The affirmative may respond by reading evidence that their plan is very cheap or that it will save money in the long term. Another “no link” argument may be that the plan does not spend enough money to hurt the economy.

   “Our plan doesn’t hurt the economy!”
3. Empirically Denied (Looking at History for Support)
This is an argument that says the DA should have already happened. It means affirmative is claiming history proves the negative DA is nonsense.

*Example:* If the negative says spending money will hurt the economy, and a reduction of the US economy will cause war, the affirmative could point to many examples that prove the negative argument is empirically denied. After stock market crashes in the 80s and 90s, the US avoided a global war. Further, the government spends money all the time. The deficit is already very high, and yet we have not seen the impacts referenced by the negative.

“History shows us that a bad US economy does not always lead to war!”

4. Link Turn
This argument takes the DA and tries to turn into an advantage for the affirmative. The affirmative is claiming that they do not cause the DA, but instead they prevent it.

*Example:* Link turns are easier to understand in context. If the negative says the plan will hurt the economy a link turn would say the opposite: the plan helps the economy. Link turns are simply the opposite of the link.

“Actually, our plan does the opposite of what you are saying!”

5. Impact Take-Out
This argument seeks to explain why the impact either will not happen, or will not be as bad as what the affirmative is claiming.

*Example:* If the impact is about how hurting the economy leads to a nuclear war, the affirmative could make a number of arguments that would be labeled *impact take-outs.* They could read evidence that proves economic downturn does not cause war. They might have evidence that says the economy will quickly bounce back from any decrease.

“History shows us that a bad US economy does not always lead to war!”

and/or

“The economy will bounce back from spending!”
6. Impact Turn
This is similar to a link turn, but for the impact. The affirmative is arguing the impact of the DA is actually a good thing.

Example: The negative could claim that hurting the economy increases the risk of war. If the affirmative wanted to turn this impact they would need evidence to prove that hurting the economy is a good thing. They might read evidence that says hurting the economy will actually decrease the risk of war (yes, this evidence does exist).

“In our current climate, spending more is a GOOD thing!”

7. No Threshold/No Brink.
The affirmative could claim that the negative cannot prove their plan would be enough to cross the threshold and get to the impacts of the DA. They may also claim that negative does not know how close we are to the brink or threshold now.

Example: The negative may claim that the economy is good now, but the affirmative plan will hurt the economy. They may also claim that hurting the economy will cause the impact of war. The affirmative could argue that hurting the economy just a little will not send the economy over the brink. They may also ask the negative how much the economy would need to be hurt or damaged to send it over the edge and cause some kind of war. If the negative does not have a good answer for how close the economy is to spiraling out of control, the affirmative can claim that the DA has no brink or threshold.

“Our plan does not threaten the economy enough to lead to war!”

8. Case Outweighs
This argument is that the benefits of the affirmative plan are greater than the impacts of the DA. You could explain that DA is a little silly sounding, with a bunch of links and steps before the impact, whereas your affirmative is specific and strong.

“The benefits of our plan are greater than the impacts of the DA!”
Class Exercise 5C

DA Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will learn how to debate a disadvantage in depth, practice flowing and improve speaking and critical thinking skills.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Economy Disadvantage and answers provided by DEBATE-Kansas City evidence packet.

Description:
You will have at least 2 students debate only a disadvantage. Those not debating will flow and vote for a winner.

Instructions:
1. Select two students to debate each other over one disadvantage (DA). You can set a class schedule so that everyone must debate once.

2. Give one student the DA and its extension evidence. Give the other student evidence to answer to the DA.

3. Use the following speech times:

   Reading of DA: 2 minutes (Speaker 1)
   Cross x: 1 minute (Speaker 2 asks Speaker 1 questions)
   Answer the DA: 3 minutes (Speaker 2)
   Cross x: 1 minute (Speaker 1 asks Speaker 2 questions)
   Extend the DA: 4 minutes (Speaker 1)
   Answer the extension: 3 minutes (Speaker 2)

4. Instruct the other students in the class to flow and evaluate the debate.

5. After the debate is over, provide instruction on how to better explain and argue the DA and ask for class input. You can have the class vote on the winner.

Tips/Notes:
- Make sure you tell the debaters what type of judge they have: lay, college, etc.
- Tell the debaters ahead of time what DA they will be debating and make sure they understand the exercise beforehand.
How to Kick-Out of a Disadvantage

The negative’s job is to negate the affirmative plan. This means that the negative does not have to keep and extend every argument they make early in the debate. If the negative reads a disadvantage they are not stuck with it. However, there is a certain process to follow when “kicking” a DA that is explained below.

Why Kick the DA?

The negative should attack the affirmative from many angles. However, not every argument made will be a round-winner. Sometimes, the affirmative will make really good arguments to answer certain positions; it is then wiser for the negative to spend their time developing arguments that the affirmative mishandled. The negative should “kick” a DA when they are either not winning the DA or when they have better arguments to fill their time.

Steps to Kicking a DA

1. Tell the judge and the affirmative team you are kicking the disadvantage. Just say, “Go to the DA, we are not going for it.”

2. Concede and extend affirmative takeouts. This does not mean you concede any affirmative argument, but rather the TAKEOUTS. A takeout can be any of the following:
   - No link
   - No impact
   - Empirically denied
   - DA evidence is horrible
   - Uniqueness overwhelms the link (depends on context)

   If you conceded any of these affirmative arguments you have effectively made the DA go away.

   Example: Let’s say that the negative has run a spending DA with an economy impact and one of the affirmative answers was “the DA is empirically denied because the economy has slumped in the past without major impacts.” The negative, if they wanted to kick the DA, could simply concede this argument and the DA would effectively go away. The impact had been proven untrue.

3. Danger! Danger! Answer the TURN. Sometimes affirmative teams will TURN the DA. This means they claim to make the DA a benefit for them.

   Example: Let’s say you have run a spending DA. The affirmative could turn the DA by claiming that they save money, thus avoiding the problems of spending. This is only dangerous if the affirmative did not make a takeout argument. If they did not make any takeout arguments for you to concede then you MUST answer the turn.
Class Exercise 5D
Kick the Disad

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective: Students will learn how to effectively “kick” a disadvantage.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Disadvantage and answers

Description: The students are going to practice kicking out of a disadvantage. To do this, the students will need to understand the basics of one disadvantage. Give the students affirmative answers to a disadvantage. Tell them to kick the DA by making the proper concessions and answers to the disadvantage answers.

Instructions:
1. Break the class into several groups of 4-6 students each.
2. Have the groups pretend they are in a debate. An affirmative case and a disadvantage have already been read. Provide as many details about the pretend affirmative and disadvantage as necessary. Use a common case and disadvantage for the exercise.
3. Read answers to the disadvantage, and have the students to flow those answers.
4. Have the groups discuss how they could “kick” out of the disadvantage.
5. Once they decide on the necessary arguments to kick the DA, they should elect one person from the group to give a short speech to actually “kick” the DA.
6. Carefully listen to how each group leader kicks the DA and make any necessary corrections.
7. OPTION: Combine this lesson with the DA debate by having the students take their old flows from the DA. Instead of debating the affirmative answers, they could kick the DA.

Grading:
Students could be given participation points for the exercise. They could be asked to flow each group leader’s speech and turn in the flows for a grade. Group leaders could be given bonus points for their speeches.
Unit 5

Talking Debate

**Affirmative Takeout**—A challenge to the negative’s link, impact, or empirical evidence related to a disadvantage.

**Brink**—Claims the present system is very close to the point of danger and one more plan like the affirmative’s would push the present system over the brink, causing a the negative side effect, or *impact*, to happen.

**Disadvantage** (Also called a “disad” or “DA”)—A bad circumstance that only results from the adoption of the affirmative plan.

**Flow Judge**—A person with lots of debate experience who takes extensive notes during the round.

**Impact**—The effect of the link and the ultimate effect of the disad.

**Kick-Out**—Negative concedes to a takeout argument made by the affirmative in order to abandon the DA debate.

**Lay Judge**—A person with little debate experience. This judge might prefer a more oratorical style of delivery.

**Link**—How the plan causes the negative action of the DA.

**Uniqueness**—Part of a disadvantage that states the DA is not happening now. Uniqueness states that the present system prevents a certain harmful side effect from occurring, or simply that such a bad effect will not happen in the status quo.
Unit 6: Practice Debates

Students can listen to an infinite number of lectures on debate, but the best way to learn debate is by doing it. At this point, the class should be comfortable with the basics of debate, and every student should have already performed at least one short speech/mini debate. The last step before the class is ready to debate is an explanation of what is expected in each speech.

Unit Focus:

- Speaker Duties
- Time Restrictions
Speaker Duties

Each individual in a debate round plays a unique role in advancing the arguments and winning the debate. The speaker duties are necessities for the completion of two basic objectives:

1. Advancing and developing arguments.
2. Following rules to create fair and equitable debates.

Basic Duties for Every Debater:

Flowing:
The primary duty in every speech is to respond to the arguments made by the preceding speaker. A good flow provides the necessary information to comprehensively cover the arguments in the round.

NO NEW ARGUMENTS IN REBUTTALS!!!
This does not mean no new evidence is read in rebuttals; this means that new ideas cannot be advanced. The rebuttals are time for crystallizing and explaining existing arguments. The constructive speeches are open season for new arguments.

The First Affirmative Constructive (1AC)
The big opening to every debate is the 1AC. The first affirmative speaker has the responsibility of introducing the case and laying the ground for the debate. As mentioned in Unit Three, the 1AC should contain the following elements to comprise the affirmative case:

- Inherency
- Harms/Significance
- Plan
- Solvency

The affirmative has an infinite amount of time to completely prepare this speech, so it should be good. It needs to be compelling and thorough. After the 1AC, everyone in the room should think that the case is the greatest idea in the world. The 1AC should be very clear, and it should flow nicely with one point leading to another.

You will eventually want several versions of the 1AC so it can be tailored to the style of debate your judge prefers.

PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE. This is the only speech in debate that is totally prepared. The 1A should know this speech inside and out, forward and backward. In fact, the 1A should be reciting the 1AC while asleep! The more practiced it is, the better it will sound.

At the end of the 1AC, the judge should think, “Why hasn’t the government already implanted this amazing affirmative plan?”
First Negative Constructive (1NC)

The 1NC needs to immediately cast doubt on the affirmative with a forceful attack. Like a heavy-weight fighter, the negative must come out swinging. It can include any argument the negative wants to make, and it should include a diversity of succinct attacks. Avoid long stories, and get to the meat of your attacks.

The 1NC should have arguments that are “on-case” (directly attacking the affirmative’s case). These arguments will address the affirmative’s Solvency, Inherency, and Harms/Significance.

This is also when the negative introduces “off-case” arguments. Off-case arguments are new arguments (like Topicality, Counter-plans, Disadvantages, or Critiques) that do not directly clash with the affirmative’s case. While we already have an understanding of disadvantages, other types of off-case arguments will be discussed later in the Guidebook.

Not all of the arguments made in the 1NC will “stick” because the affirmative will have some good answers. This makes it even more important to attack the 1AC from various angles. The 1NC will have less depth and less explanation, and it will use “shells” for arguments. This means the 1NC lays out the basics of several arguments that will be further developed later in the debate round.

After the 1NC you want the judge to say, “Wow, this case may not be a good idea. The affirmative sure does have a lot of good attacks to answer.”

Second Affirmative Constructive (2AC)

If we continue the boxing analogy, the 2AC needs to be a flurry of sharp and pointed jabs at EVERYTHING the negative said. The 2AC should already be prepared for the negative by knowing common negative attacks and the weakest points of their case. The 2AC needs to extend 1AC evidence as often as possible to answer negative attacks. Again, to extend an argument means that you are responding to an opponent’s attack on one of your arguments. Extensions are not considered to be new arguments.

Coverage is the key. The negative just made a bunch of arguments, so time management is critical. The 2AC needs to think about how much time to devote to each attack. The affirmative can still make new arguments in this speech, and they should read evidence to address major negative positions, such as disadvantages or compelling case attacks. The 2AC also needs to lay the groundwork for the story they will tell in the 2AR. This means providing a very brief overview of the most critical points in the case.

At the end of a good 2AC the judge will think, “The case sounds like a good idea after all. Besides, many of those negative attacks were pretty weak.”
The NEGATIVE BLOCK

After the 2AC, the negative will have two speeches in a row (13 minutes of speech time) to attack the affirmative and respond to the 2AC. Here, the negative needs throw some big punches and cast serious doubt on the affirmative.

Second Negative Constructive (2NC)

There is some question in the debate world over what new arguments the 2NC should provide. Some people believe that the 2NC should be mostly or all new attacks. However, newer debate theory suggests that the 2NC should largely consist of explanation and extension of major negative attacks form the 1NC, such as a disadvantage. If this approach is taken, the 2NC needs to answer every argument on the positions developed. He/she should tell the story of their previous arguments and read evidence to extend and strengthen the negative arguments. A good 2NC will overwhelm the 2AC arguments with depth and explanation.

First Negative Rebuttal (1NR)

The 1NR can be lethal because of the enormous amount of preparation time that 1NR will have. There are 2 speeches and 2 cross examinations in between the 1NC and the 1NR. With all that time the 1NR can carefully craft arguments to answer the 2AC and rebuild negative positions. The 1NR can show depth and poke some serious holes in the case.

Most 1NRs spend time attacking the affirmative case. However, this is the first speech where the negative CANNOT MAKE NEW ARGUMENTS. Rebuttals are for extending arguments already made. Again, to extend an argument means that you are responding to an opponent’s attack on one of your arguments. Extensions are not new arguments.

An additional duty of the 1NR may be to make an argument or two that 2NC ran out of time to make. This requires the negative team to communicate with each other.

At the end of the 1NR, concluding the negative block, the judge should think, “How in the world is the 1AR going to answer all these attacks?”

The First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)

Before the 1AR, take a deep breath and organize your thoughts. The 1AR must cover 13 minutes of negative attacks in 4-5 minutes. This is a challenge, but not impossible. If we continue with the boxing analogy, the 1AR needs to throw several strong and quick punches after taking several big hits from the negative. Since it is a rebuttal, no new arguments are allowed.
The 1AR needs to work off 2AC arguments. On each major position in the debate the **BEST 2AC arguments** should be **extended** and **explained**. You do not need to extend every 2AC argument. The 1AR will only have time to read a couple pieces of evidence and should use most of the time explaining how affirmative evidence already introduced answers the negative arguments. Time management is essential. The 1AR needs to identify the most critical arguments in the round and invest their time on those points.

*After the 1AR the judge should think, “Hey, they actually covered everything and the affirmative still sounds like a good idea.”*

**The Second Negative Rebuttal (2NR)**

While many believe that the 1AR is the most difficult speech, experience has proven that the 2NR is the most challenging. It sounds easy. The 1AR just spent 5 minutes covering 13 minutes of negative arguments, so it is logical to believe that the affirmative would have covered something. This is almost always true, so the 2NR should look for 1AR shortcomings to exploit. However, the affirmative will have the last speech. No matter how good the 2NR seemed, the 2AR can always come up with something that sounds compelling.

In this speech, the negative needs to deliver the knock out blow. The 2NR needs to have a very clear idea of why they should win the debate.

The speech should **begin with an overview** that provides about three key reasons they will win. It should be part of a **comprehensive story** explaining why the affirmative plan would be a disaster and why the negative positions have overwhelmed the affirmative. The rest of the speech should be devoted to developing those reasons for winning. At the same time, the 2NR needs to predict what the affirmative will say in their last speech and pre-empt the affirmative claims.

*At the end of a good 2NR, the judge will think, “I don’t see how I could possibly vote for this terrible case.”*

**The Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)**

The affirmative has now taken the negative’s best shot, and needs to come back with one more, big hit. A good 2AR will **start with an overview** just like the 2NR. The debater can also **respond to the 2NR overview**. The affirmative must truly sell their case story at the beginning of the 2AR. It should sound like the world will end if we fail to adopt the affirmative plan.

The 2AR should look for arguments the 2NR failed to effectively address and exploit them. Since it is a rebuttal, new arguments are not allowed. However, much to the dismay of many 2NRs, the 2AR often makes a slew of brand new arguments. All negative arguments must be covered and addressed thoroughly.

Last, the 2AR should weigh and compare all the issues in the debate. Examine major negative arguments, such as disadvantages, and compare them to the benefits of the affirmative plan showing why the affirmative is more important.

*At the end of a good 2AR the judge will think, “I must vote affirmative. This sounds like the greatest idea ever!”*
# Speaker Duty Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1AC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Pre-written to be persuasive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Requires practice to master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Have different versions for different judges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Be very compelling and grab the judge’s attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1NC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Negative team should consult each other, develop a strategy, and pick arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Needs a diversity of arguments (Harms, Solvency, DAs, Topicality etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Must be very clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Needs to be succinct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Must avoid long stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Must be a forceful first attack (Paint the plan as risky and unneeded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2AC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Must answer EVERY negative argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Rebuild the 1AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Use and extend 1AC evidence to answer negative attacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Begin storytelling/persuasion to lay the groundwork for the 2AR (but keep it brief)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2NC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Pick part of the 1NC to extend/develop (DAs, case attacks, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Can make new arguments, such as solvency attacks (not too many, depth is better)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Needs to be persuasive and tell the stories behind major negative positions...i.e. a DA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1NR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Extend any arguments your partner did not during the 2NC (consult with your partner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Attempt to cover many issues to put pressure on the 1AR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No new arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1AR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Cover all negative arguments (a major challenge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No new arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Extend the best arguments made by the 2AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Know what arguments require the least and most time (you will need to make choices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2NR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Give an overview with the key reasons you should win</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Tell a good story/be persuasive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No new arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Extend the best negative arguments and get in-depth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Take advantage of any 1AR mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Anticipate affirmative arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2AR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Give an overview with the key reasons you should win</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Tell a good story and be persuasive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Look for negative mistakes and take advantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Cover all negative arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Weigh out and compare the big issues in the debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speech Times

Handout

Debates have a pre-set speaking order and pre-set times for speech in the debate. Below you will find the order and times for every speech in a policy debate. The total time for a debate round is about 1 hour and 30 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1AC First Affirmative Constructive</td>
<td>8 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A Cross examined by 2N</td>
<td>3 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NC First Negative Constructive</td>
<td>8 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N Cross Examined by 1A</td>
<td>3 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AC Second Affirmative Constructive</td>
<td>8 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Cross examined by 1N</td>
<td>3 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NC Second Negative Constructive</td>
<td>8 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N cross examined by the 2A</td>
<td>3 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NR First Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>4/5 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AR First Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>4/5 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2NR Second Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>4/5 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AR Second Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>4/5 MINUTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Exercise 6A

Practice Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will participate in a full practice debate where they use argumentation, speaking, critical thinking and other skills.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Debate evidence for affirmative and negative
- Timer
- Video Camera and tape (optional)

Preparation:
Consider the following:
- **Who will be partners?** Some coaches assign teammates while others allow students to choose their partners. You may want to experiment with combinations to see who works best together.
- **When will instructions be given?** After the round, after each speech, or during speeches? This is something you need to think about and develop your own style. Some coaches will interrupt students many times during a debate, requiring them to do things over. Others will never jump in, allowing the students to sink or swim on their own.
- **How will class time be divided?** Forty-five minute classes will need two class periods for 1 debate.
- **Who are the students debating for?** A lay judge? A college judge? A large audience?
- **Are both sides equally prepared and given advanced notice?**
- **How can a positive environment be encouraged?** Some students will struggle and they need positive re-enforcement, not taunting from their peers.

Instructions:
1. Have the entire class flow the debate.
2. Videotape the round for participants to view.
3. Make sure everyone has at least one practice debate before the first tournament.
4. Take time to discuss the round afterwards.
Setting-Up Policy Debates
Handout

Practice debates are the best way to improve debate skills in the classroom and after school. However, since it is only practice, students treat the practice informally. Use this guide to make your practice debates meaningful, on-time and productive.

- **Advanced Notice & Student Sign Up**—Most debates should be set in advance. Tell students at least one day on prior that they will be debating and what side. Get as specific as possible in signing students up for the debate and include:
  - Assigned team members
  - Assigned sides…affirmative and negative
  - Speaker positions…1N, 2N, 1A & 2A
  - Beginning time for the debate
  - Judge…this can be the coach, another student or outside helper.
    - You should also define the kind of judge. For example, the coach may judge the debate from the perspective of a community judge, or a college flow judge.

- **Set Goals**—Ask teams or each student to set goals for the debate. This may include trying out a new argument, improving their clarity, increasing their ability to explain a certain concept, time management in rebuttals and many more.

- **Prevent Excuses with Squad Files**—All coaches should keep a master squad file with a variety of cases and negative arguments. With the presence of this file the “I forgot my case” excuse can never work.

- **Arrange the Room for Debate.**— Debates should be set up as follows:
  - Set-up team seating
    - Two desks or one table with two chairs on each side of the room
    - Seats should face the audience/judge
  - Evidence platform in between team seating
    - Could be a chair, desk or podium.
  - Make a timer visible/ready for use

- **Start on Time**— Students will typically delay the start of any debate. You should begin timing the 1AC once the start time is reached.

- **Keep it Serious**— Students should practice like it is a real debate. Don’t allow goofing off in between speeches or unusual interruptions. In most cases (except with novices) keep strict rules on preparation time as well.

- **Reward Practice**— Students who make an honest effort during practice debates should be rewarded, whether through attendance to special tournaments, snacks after school or something else devised by the coach.
Unit 6

Talking Debate

Shells—Basic version of off-case arguments that can be further developed in later speeches.

On-Case—Arguments that address the specifics of the affirmative’s case (Inherency, Significance/Harms, Solvency)

Off-Case—Arguments made by the negative that do not directly attack the affirmative’s case (Counter-plans, Disads, Critiques, Topicality)
Unit 7: Topicality

One of the most critical aspects of academic debate is the topic. A common resolution is selected to create boundaries for research and arguments. This allows everyone to be prepared for fair debates.

However, resolutions give the affirmative teams flexibility in their choice of a case. Sometimes affirmative teams will pick an affirmative that stretches the boundaries of the resolution. When this happens, the negative can claim that they cannot be prepared to adequately debate an affirmative if it is outside the resolution.

Many people in the debate world feel that if the affirmative does not present a topical case, then they have failed to meet a **prima-facie** burden and should therefore lose.

*Unit Focus:*

Four elements of Topicality
Understanding Topicality

A topicality argument claims an affirmative case does not fall within the bounds of the resolution, and thus they should lose the debate. The negative team will define terms in the resolution to explain and prove why the affirmative plan is not a representation of the resolution.

Example:
Let’s say you have been out with your friends on Friday night and arrive back home at midnight. However, when you walk in the door, your parents accuse you of being late. You claim that you are on time. Your parents respond by explaining that they told you to be home at a reasonable time, which they felt meant 10:00 PM at the latest. However, you tell them that your friends did not need to go home until 2:00 AM, so 12:00 AM was actually early and a very reasonable time to be home.

The argument you are having is very similar to a topicality argument in debate. Both agree that you were supposed to be home at a reasonable time; however, you disagree on the definition of “reasonable time.” If the argument continued, both sides would give reasons why their definition was better. You have already explained that your friends can stay out later, which is a reason why your definition is most fair. Your parents might claim that being out after 10:00 PM is unsafe. This everyday spat with your parents closely mirrors how a topicality debate goes down.

Why Do We Need Topicality?
If debaters did not agree on one topic to debate, and instead debated anything anybody wanted, it would be difficult for any debater to be prepared. Debating one topic, which is worded through a resolution, prevents the affirmative from running an unlimited number cases. If the affirmative were allowed to run an unlimited number of cases, the negative would not be prepared to debate all of them.

Parts of Topicality
Topicality has four basic parts: Interpretation, Violation, Reasons to Prefer, and the Impact (or Voter).

1. Interpretation
Identify and define the word or phrase of the resolution you think the affirmative fails to meet. You can use a dictionary or field specific evidence to provide the definition.

2. Violation
The explanation of how the affirmative plan fails to meet your interpretation. This is usually accomplished with a one or two sentence explanation in the debater’s own words.
3. Reasons to Prefer/Standards

The reasons to prefer your interpretation of the resolution over the affirmative’s. Topicality arguments are based on how the negative team views the topic. The reasons to prefer provide an argumentative justification for how the negative views the topic.

Example: Think back to the parental argument example. You and your parents have a different interpretation of what it means to be home at a reasonable time. When you explain why 2:00 AM is reasonable, you will need reasons to prefer that definition over your parent’s definition of 10:00 PM. You could argue that most of your friends can stay out later and you are missing out on fun. You could also say that you are old enough to have more freedom.

Here are some common reasons to prefer, also known as Standards.

- **Debatability/Fairness**
The negative is claiming the interpretation is the most fair, and would allow for the best debates.

- **Education**
The negative may say that since the affirmative is not part of the topic, researching it would not increase topic education.

- **Better Definition**
Here is where you claim that the source of your definition makes it best. Common examples of definitional claims include:
  - **Common Person**—This means the definition is better because it is what the common person would use. Common person’s definitions are good because they could be used by the highest number of people.
  - **Legal definition**—A definition from a legal source is claimed to be superior because we are participating in policy debate and legal definitions are used in the implementation of policies.
  - **Field Contextual**—If you have cited someone who works within a field that is strongly connected to the topic and/or affirmative case, you can explain that your author is close to topic and would have the most specific and genuine knowledge.

- **Breadth vs. Depth**
Most negatives limit affirmative cases, which makes the topic smaller. The negative can claim that if there are fewer cases both sides would have more time to do in-depth research, which is better than only getting to the surface on a broader number of cases.

- **Research Burden**
If too many affirmatives are allowed to be in the topic, then the negative will have too high a research burden.
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- **In Round Abuse**
  As the negative you can point out specific arguments the affirmative has been able to make because of their non-topical affirmative. You then explain how these arguments have hurt your ability to win the debate.

- **Potential Abuse**
  Similar to in-round abuse, however, you use a hypothetical example of how the affirmative could abuse the negative, instead of something that actually happened in the debate.

4. **Impact/Voting Issue**
   Explain why this issue should decide the round and why the affirmative should lose.
   There are two common components:

   1. **Ground/Education**
      Explain why you have lost key ground in the debate round and why the affirmative case would make debate less educational.

   2. **Jurisdiction/Rule of the Game**
      The negative can claim that being topical is a basic affirmative obligation; if they are not topical they should always lose.
Class Exercise 7A

Topical Treatment

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will use critical thinking skills and create their own concept for a topical plan by analyzing a mock resolution.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Mock resolution (provided below)

Instructions:
1. Give the students a mock resolution.

   Example Resolution: Our school should create a policy that will improve teacher performance.

2. Put the students in teams and have them create a simple plan that could fall under the resolution. Tell them they can be creative; some cases could be borderline topical if they chose. However, if they chose a case that is borderline topical, they should come up with some reasons why it could be topical.

   Example Plan: Our school will start testing teachers over their subjects. If they fail the tests new teachers will be hired.

3. Have each group/pair read their plan to the class and write each one on the board. Discuss whether or not any of the plans do not seem topical, and have the teams defend their case to the class if someone claims they are not topical. Explain that if a plan is on the borderline, it is not incorrect per se. Any case can be seen as non-topical, especially if the negative excels at arguing topicality. This should be an informal discussion.

4. Have the class pick a case to write a topicality violation against. Direct the class through the four-point structure.

   Four-Point Topicality
   1. Interpretation
   2. Violation
   3. Reasons to Prefer
   4. Impact/Voter
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Class Exercise 7B

T-Time

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4, 6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will analyze a resolution and use critical thinking skills to create a topicality argument.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Sample resolution (provided below)
- Sample cases (provided below)

Instructions:
1. Places students into groups of 3-5 and provide the students with the following mock resolution:
   
   Example Resolution: Our school should establish a policy that would provide the debate team more debate resources.

2. Ask the class to discuss the resolution, what is means, the key terms and possible definitions. (Example: What is the definition of a debate resource?)

3. Read the list of sample cases below and have each group label which ones are not topical.

   Example Cases:
   1. A plan to purchase more debate tubs
   2. A plan to hire more coaches
   3. A plan to give the students free food at tournaments
   4. A plan to buy a photocopier
   5. A plan to pay the debate coach more money
   6. A plan to buy a debate team van
   7. A plan to pay the students for debating

Answer Key: 3, 5, 7 are not topical

4. Have each group share which case they consider topical. Write the results on a board for purposes of comparison and larger class discussion.

5. After the class has come to some sort of consensus on what cases are not topical, have the groups write a topicality argument against a non-topical case following the four-point structure. One person from each group will read their topicality.

   Four-Point Topicality
   1. Interpretation
   2. Violation
   3. Reasons to Prefer
   4. Impact/Voter
Class Exercise 7C

About a T

Standards Met:
   MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4, 6
   KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
   Students will research and debate topicality.

Supplies:
   • Pen
   • Paper
   • Access to the Internet
   • Handout (provided below on page 109)

Instructions:
   1. This exercise is for ADVANCED debaters only.
   2. Ask the students to complete the handout provided on the next page.
**Class Exercise 7C**

*About a T*

**Handout**

**Directions:** Follow each step of the numbered directions below.

1. What is the best type of debate?
   
   a. Describe what a really good debate includes. Does one team beat the other badly, or is it close? Does one team argue about something the other is not ready to debate?
   
   b. Is the goal of debate to promote education? If so, what type of education? What should the education help prepare debaters to do later in life?
   
   c. Is the goal of debate to provide a fair and fun game? Have you found to be fair? Why or why not?
   
   d. Should debate be about local problems and solutions? Why or why not?

2. Review the following definitions of substantial from thefreedictionary.com:

   1. Of, relating to, or having substance; material.
   2. True or real; not imaginary.
   3. Solidly built; strong.
   5. Considerable in importance, value, degree, amount, or extent: won by a substantial margin.
   6. Possessing wealth or property; well-to-do.

3. Rank the definitions based on how they would frame the resolution: resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for people living in poverty in the United States.

   **WHAT MAKES THE BEST DEFINITION?**
   
   - The best definition will create the best debate.
   - Use your answers above to frame your choices.
Unit 7

Talking Debate

**Interpretation**—Where you identify and define the word or phrase of the resolution you think the affirmative fails to meet. You can use a dictionary or field specific evidence to provide the definition.

**Prima Fascia**—The requirement of the affirmative to present a case that is acceptable upon its first hearing.

**Reasons to Prefer/Standards**—Part of a topicality where the negative explains why their interpretation of the resolution is better than the affirmatives.

**Topicality**—A stock issue that claims an affirmative case does not fall within the bounds of the resolution, and thus they should lose the debate.

**Violation**—Part of a topicality argument that explains how the affirmative plan fails to meet the negative interpretation.
Unit 8: Judge Adaptation

No two debate judges are exactly the same. Each person brings unique perspectives to a debate round. For debaters, understanding these perspectives is critical. The more you know about your judge the better. Some judges will have years of debate experience with clear opinions on just about everything. Others will be judging for the first time, with very little debate knowledge. It is up to you to select the presentation that will be most appealing to your judge—whoever that person may be.

Unit Focus:

Adapting is Key to Winning

Debating for Lay Judges

Other Factors Influencing Your Judge
Blame the Judge? No…Debate Better!

The MOST critical skill a debater can have, once the basics are understood, is the ability to adapt to a judge. A debater can make the greatest arguments in the world, but if the judge does not like them, they mean exactly squat! Many debaters blame losses on the judge, claiming that they should have won, saying, “The judge was stupid and cost us the round.” This type of blame shifting and lack of personal responsibility will lead to more losses in debate and failure in other aspects of life. Rather than fault the judge’s opinions for losses, debaters should look for opportunities to get an edge by adapting to each judge. This puts the responsibility squarely in the hands of the debater, where it belongs.

**DISCLAIMER:** In rare cases where judges treat debaters without respect, they should be reported. Inappropriate behavior by judges, such as offensive, sexist or racist language or clear displays of bias for one side should not be tolerated. If a judge makes offensive remarks debaters should immediately notify their coach.

What Types of Judges Are Out There?

There are two very basic types of judges:

1. **Lay Judge:**
   A person who has little to no knowledge of debate and its general rules.

2. **Experienced Judge**
   Someone who is familiar with debate has the ability to flow, and to follow all the arguments in a debate.

There will always be a big difference between a judge who has experience and one who has none. However, as with most aspects of debate, there are giant gray areas in between these two types of judges.

How Do I Know What Type of Judge I Have?

Finding out the type of judge you have is relatively easy. If the person is not prepared to flow, or at least take notes, you probably have a lay judge. If the judge has a flow pad, pens and a timer, you probably have a judge with some debate experience. If you are unsure, you can simply ask the judge if he/she has ever judged a debate before, and how much judging experience. Answers to these questions should immediately tell you if you have a lay judge or someone with experience.

If it appears that the judge has some debate experience, you can ask more detailed questions, such as what type of judge they are and what arguments they prefer. For example, you could ask for their feelings about counter-plans, or if they judge based on the stock issues. On the following page, you will see more detailed explanations about different types of judges. This background will provide the basis for more questions.
Debating for Lay Judges

True lay judges will walk into a debate only knowing what they have been told about debate—if they have been told anything. This means they don’t know the rules. They don’t know that new arguments are not allowed in rebuttals, nor do they really know how much evidence matters.

- **Appearance**
  If you were going to buy a car, would you want to buy it from a guy in sneakers and a T-shirt or a woman in a nice business suit? Most of us would pick the woman in the suit. When lay judges watch debates, they are more likely to trust someone dressed nice than someone dressed casually. Nice clothes show you care about how you look and that you care about the activity. Like it or not, appearance does matter—not just in debate, but in the real world as well. For young men, a shirt, tie, slacks and nice shoes would constitute a professional appearance. For young women, dresses, skirts or pants with a nice blouse and nice shoes would be good options.

  *Class Discussion:* Should appearance matter in debate? (There is not a right or wrong answer to this one.)

- **Persuasion**
  The lack of debate knowledge makes persuasion more important for lay judges. Lay judges often vote for who sounded better, both in terms of speaking ability and logical arguments.

- **Explanation**
  Since lay judges know little about debate, first you need to explain what an argument is, then make the argument. For example, if you were going to read a disadvantage you could not jump in with “sub point A…” First, you must explain what a disadvantage is and how it applies to the plan. This is necessary for the judge to follow your arguments.

- **In Control Without Being Rude**
  With lay judges, you walk a fine line with attitude. You want to appear confident and show respect, and still avoid being pushed around by your opponent. However, if you are too aggressive, you can turn the judge off. Just be self-aware, and if it looks like you might have gone overboard, apologize.

- **Passion**
  Debaters need to believe their arguments during the debate round. They need to show a little emotion and get a little excited. This does not mean they should sound like a televangelist, but rather, someone who cares enough to add excitement to their voice.

If debaters follow these tips, they will appeal to just about any lay judge. However, if you want to go deeper in your adaptation, you can analyze other factors that may influence a judge’s opinion and preferences.
Other Factors Influencing Your Judge

DISCLAIMER: Analyzing physical characteristics only provides a window into how someone will judge. Many of the categories and tips below are based on appearance and yes, stereotypes. These stereotypes are by no means always true, and they are not seen as good or bad by the author, but rather, something to consider when attempting to adapt for a judge.

- **Tournament Judging Sheet/Training**
  Many tournaments provide limited training and information sheets for their lay judges. This training and information sheet may be all the judges know, so they may regard it as the only definite truth they use to make a decision in the debate round.

  At the beginning of each tournament, you should **find this sheet** or ask about the training. Once you know what the lay judge has been taught, make sure you follow the rules and guidelines the tournament provided.

- **Location, Location, Location**
  Lay judges are usually from the surrounding area of the tournament location. Knowing this, you can get some kind of idea about the type beliefs the judging pool might have. A suburban person will have a different mindset than an urban person. Suburbanites are usually in a higher socio-economic class. Class can have a large affect on outlook. Someone from a rural area will have a different attitude as well. Consider how divided the country was in the 2004 election with red and blue states. Those on the coast and in the cities were considerably more liberal than those in rural and even some suburban areas.

  **Class Discussion:** How would views change from the city, to the suburbs, to rural areas?

- **Gender**
  Men and women view the world differently. Women are stereotyped as being more emotional than men. This COULD make them more likely to support helping others even in the face of arguments like economic disadvantages. Men are seen as more practical, cost-conscious and conservative. These stereotypes are by no means always true, but are something to consider when evaluating your judge.

- **Clothing/Look**
  Notice if your judge is more conservative and tidy in appearance, versus wearing looser and more progressive clothes. A conservative dresser may be more conservative politically; a looser or even sloppier dresser may be more liberal. You can also look for clues into their philosophies by noticing any buttons or key chains that make political statements.

- **Age**
  Typically, youth are more liberal than older folks. Once again, this is not always true. What is true, however, is that studies have shown that age is the MOST important factor when analyzing an audience. Make sure you thoroughly explore the opinions and interests of different age groups in order to best adapt to a lay judge.

These are all factors to consider when you analyze your judge. Do not go overboard and make huge style changes. Just attempt to subtly adapt, based on a few obvious factors that will influence how your judge thinks.
Class Exercise 8A

Homework: Change the Message

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will modify complicated debate evidence into a simpler version that would be more persuasive for lay judges.

Supplies:
- A topic disadvantage that uses lots of debate jargon and has nuclear war impacts (enough copies for the whole class). The disadvantage should have big impacts, several cards, and look like something that is normally read in front of a college judge. You can use debate evidence from any summer debate institute for this exercise.

Instructions:
1. Pass out copies of a disadvantage to each student.
2. Explain the disadvantage to the class and answer any questions.
3. Remind the students what lay judges know about debate and how they might react to the language in the disadvantage.

Assignment:
1. Students must take the disadvantage home. They should make modifications to tag lines to make them more believable and easier for lay judges to understand.
2. Students will write a one-paragraph summary of the disadvantage that they could use to explain the disadvantage in a debate round.

Following Day:
1. When students return with the homework place them into pairs. Once in pairs each student will read his/her re-tagged DA and summary to the other. This will happen all at once and the class will be loud.
2. Once each pair is done, have the students turn in their re-tagged DAs and summaries.

Homework Evaluation:

Re-Tagged DA
Each tag re-written into a format with less debate jargon 10 points

Summary
At least three sentences that explain the entirety of the argument 10 points

Participatory reading
Full participation in the paired debate 10 points

Total 30 points
Class Exercise 8B

Pick a Judge—Any Judge

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will practice adapting for judges.

Supplies: Pen, Paper, Debate evidence

Description:
Prepare two teams for a practice debate. Each student will debate for a different type of judge in each of two speeches. It will follow the same format and times as a normal policy debate round; however, the assumed judge is going to change throughout the debate. In one speech, students will debate for a lay judge, and in another speech, they will debate for a flow judge. This can be a little tough to conceptualize, so please refer to the example below.

Example: Let’s say Johnny is the 2A. He will need to decide in which speech he wants to debate for the lay judge and which speech he will debate for the flow judge. He might debate for a flow judge in the 2AC and then a lay judge in the 2AR. This means that in the debate, Johnny’s 2AC could be delivered at a quicker rate with more debate jargon. His 2AR would sound completely different. He might need to add explanations and he would certainly speak more slowly. He would not emphasize big nuclear impacts. Instead, he would focus on more “common sense” arguments.

The goal is not for one team to beat the other, but to practice adapting. By changing the assumed judges within the same debate round, students can directly see the stark differences in style and substance when the judge changes.

Instructions:
1. This practice debate should be done with the class watching, flowing and taking notes.
2. Ask the watchers to write a 1-page paper after the debate explaining what they saw and how the debaters changed styles when the assumed judges changed. They could also include changes that were needed, but not made.

Evaluation: Students can earn up to 100 points for the judge adaptation debate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Outcome Needed for Full Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student changed his/her style substantially in each speech. Arguments explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rate of speech changed and evidence used was different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Speaking: the speech was clear and used elements of persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Argumentation: Demonstrated general knowledge of the issues in the debate and made arguments with warrants that were strategically sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evidence was used properly and explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Courteous to opponent at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Full participation in the debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rebuttals included an overview with clear impact analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student was organized and had everything needed to properly debate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 9
Cross Examination

For the audience, the most exciting part of debate is often cross-examination. It is fun to watch two competitors match wits through direct interaction. Cross-examination in debate is similar to lawyers cross-examining witnesses during a trial. However, cross-examination in debate does not work like a Hollywood courtroom drama. People do not break down and concede that everything they have said is a lie. People rarely cry, and nobody screams, “You can’t handle the truth!” Good debaters use cross-examination strategically. The following pages will show you how.

Unit Focus:
The Purpose of Cross-Ex
The Dos and Don’ts of Cross-Ex
The Purpose of Cross-Examination

During cross-examination, one person asks the questions while the other answers. Each person will be the questioner once and will be questioned once. Cross-examination is more about clarification than argument. At high levels, cross-examination becomes a cat-and-mouse game where the person questioned avoids providing too much information. You see, in debate, vagueness can be an asset because you can’t refute something if you do not know what it is. Keeping this in mind, there are a few basic objectives of cross-examination.

Basic Objectives of Cross-Examination

- **Create Preparation Time:** Cross-examination time can be used as preparation time for the debaters not involved in the cross-examination. If you are speaking next and your partner is conducting a cross-examination, you want every second of time to be used because it gives you more time to prepare for your upcoming speech.

  *The person conducting cross-examination should always use the entire time!*

- **Clarification:** When conducting cross-examination, the first task of the questioner is to seek clarification for any argument made by the opposition that is unclear. The gritty details of oppositional positions can be very important, and it is critical for debaters to know exactly what their opponents are arguing.

- **Point Out Obvious Flaws:** If the opposition has made claims that are obviously bogus, or blatant lies, cross-examination can be used to point out the flaw and undermine the opponent’s credibility. For example, if the opposition completely mis-tagged a piece of evidence, it can be useful to point out such a flaw in cross-examination.

- **Set-Up Arguments:** Good questioners will avoid being obvious and clumsy with their questions. Subtlety is far more effective than blatant attacks. The questioner should use cross-examination to set-up arguments they plan on making later in the debate.

  *Example:* Let’s say you wanted your opponents to admit that their plan spends a significant amount of money, so that you could get a link to a spending disadvantage. Most teams will not simply say, “Yes we spend a bunch of money and we will wreck the budget.” *However,* a solid series of questions could go a long way in getting them admit that they spend money. The questioner could ask. “Isn’t the status quo already doing something like your plan, and aren’t we already spending a ton of money on plans like yours?” To avoid looking un-inherent, the opponent will probably respond by saying, “No, the status quo has not done nearly enough and spending is far too low.” The questioner could follow by asking, “So your plan will need to spend a significant amount of money to overcome the budgetary shortfalls of the status quo, right?” Now the questioned will either have to retract what was said about costs in the status quo or admit that their plan spends a good amount of money. *Gotcha!*
The Do’s and Don’ts of Cross-Examination
Handout

When Questioning

• **Be Nice**: In debate you should always be polite. This is especially true during direct questioning.

• **Ask Questions—Don’t Make Arguments**: Speech time is for making arguments; cross-x is for questions. Many debaters will try to get around this rule by turning an argument into a question. They will start a question with “Isn’t it true that….” or they will ask “Isn’t it a fact that…..” You should never ask such questions because they are arguments, and your opponent will never respond with “Yes, you are so right.”

• **Keep Cool**: Cross-x can get heated but don’t lose your cool.

• **Keep It Simple**: Don’t go for too much. A long series of complicated questions will often get you nowhere.

• **Stay in Control of the Questions**: Sometimes, the questioned will answer a question with a question, attempting to put the questioner on the defensive. Don’t let this happen to you. If you must, remind the questioned that it is your role to ask the questions and his or her job to answer.

When Answering

• **Be Nice**: Always.

• **Consider Intentions to Avoid Traps**: When your opponent asks a question you should always consider the intentions. Ask yourself, “What do they want me to say?” Once you know what they want, you can better avoid traps. The opposition may want you to admit a point that is very debatable and you should avoid such admissions.

• **Don’t Ask Questions**: Nobody likes cross-examining someone who avoids answers and instead asks questions—so don’t be that person.

• **Respond Truthfully**: Never lie. Honesty is a value that should be upheld in any setting. However, this does not mean you have to spill your guts with information. Also, you can say, “I don’t know,” if you do not know the answer.

• **Don’t Be Bullied**: You need to hold your own in cross-x. Often the questioner will try to cut you off. If you are rambling on, cutting you off may be justified. But if the questioner will not let you give a full and fair answer, you need to stand up for yourself. Also, don’t give in to questions like, “Isn’t it a fact that…..”
Class Exercise 9A

Good-Question Bad-Question

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will identify the differences between good and bad cross examination questions.

Supplies:
• Pen/Paper
• Questions
• Generic DA or outline

Description:
Students will be given a circumstance and a set of questions. They will identify whether the questions are good or bad.

Instructions:
1. Provide or read a generic disadvantage, or its outline.
2. Provide or read a list of questions and have students identify whether the questions are good or bad. Bad questions should be re-phrased. The activity could be done with groups, class discussion or as individual homework.

Example DA Shell:
A. Uniqueness: The U.S. temporarily increased spending to avoid a depression, but now economic growth is expected to return and we must begin reducing the debt.
B. The Link: New social program spending, like the affirmative is proposing, will destroy the American economy.
C. Economic decline undermines solutions to ecology, diseases, famine and oppression.

Questions:
1. Is the growth of the U.S. economy closely solely related to social services spending?
2. Do you think Congress is smart enough to control the U.S. economy?
3. Isn’t the economy already in really bad shape?
4. Don’t you know the debt already really high?
5. How does the affirmative plan specifically hurt the economy?
6. Why did you read old and horrible evidence?
7. Is your evidence specific to the affirmative case?
8. Do you even understand this disadvantage?
9. How much will the affirmative plan actually hurt the economy?
10. How does your argument come close to relating to the affirmative plan?

Key: Questions 2, 4, 6, 8 & 10 should be re-phrased.
Unit 10: Counter-plans

It is the affirmative’s job to present a case that identifies a set of problems in the current system and then to provide a plan to solve those problems. The negative is supposed to prove that the affirmative plan is a bad idea. One way to prove that the affirmative plan should not be accepted is by offering a counter-plan, or a better way to solve the problem.

Unit Focus:

Reasons to Run Counter-plans

Parts of a Counter-plan

Net Benefits

Counter-plan Theory

Affirmative Theory Arguments
Counter-plans

A counter-plan is a negative policy proposal. The negative wants the judge to vote for their counter-plan instead of the affirmative proposal. Rather than attack each element of the affirmative case, the negative makes the debate about competing policies. The tricky part for the negative is proving that counter-plan is better is than the affirmative plan, OR any combination of the counter-plan and the affirmative plan. This sounds more complicated than it really is; if the judge could support both the negative and affirmative idea at the same time, then he or she would be supporting the affirmative plan. To vote negative the judge must reject the affirmative plan in favor of the negative counter-plan.

Example: You and your friends are planning what to do one evening. One person says, “Let’s go to a movie!” You say no, “How about we go out to eat”. You have just offered a counter-plan.

Text Me

A counter-plan begins and ends with the plan text. Counter-plans take the affirmative plan and alter some part of the actual text. This means that ANY time you run a counter-plan you must use the affirmative plan to write your counter-plan text (aside from a couple extreme cases).

Focusing on the Agent

Most counter-plans focus on the agent of the affirmative plan. The agent is the actor or organization who should implement the plan. The agent is usually some government body.

The affirmative agent for this year’s debate topic is the United States federal government (USFG for short). The USFG consists of three branches: Legislative (Congress), Executive (President) and Judicial (Supreme Court).

The negative can propose that instead of the USFG some other agent implements the affirmative plan. The negative is supporting some part of the plan, but they offer a different organization to carry out the plan.

Class Discussion: (This may need to be written on a board)

What is the agent in the following plan?

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

(Answer in bold)

Follow Up: What other organization could be used as the agent? Possible answers: States, non-profit organizations, & individuals.
Why Run a Counter-plan?

- **The Current System is Difficult to Defend**
  Sometimes the status quo really is a bad system, and it is difficult for the negative to defend it. Problems such as pollution, crime, racism and violence exist in many elements of society. When an affirmative team points out legitimate problems, the negative might be better served to make the debate about the possible solution. If they can offer a better solution, they deserve to win.

  *Example:* An older brother has just finished his diner, but he is still hungry. His family ordered pizza, but 3 slices did not fill him up. For the older brother, this is a problem and his hunger cannot be denied. His younger brother still has one slice of pizza left. The older brother could just take the pizza from his younger brother as the solution to his hunger problem. However, a better solution might be to politely ask his brother if he is going to finish his slice. Or the older brother could find some other food in the kitchen to fix his hunger problem. Both of these counter-plans, or alternate solutions, fix the older brother’s problem. They don’t defend making the older brother go hungry, but they do find a better solution.

  *Agent Based Example:* If we had a debate during the 1940’s about segregation, before the racist practice was ended, defending the current system would have been very hard. If an affirmative case called for the federal government to pass a law banning segregation, a negative would have been hard pressed to defend segregation. However, the negative could concede that the segregation was a problem, and then run a counter-plan to focus on the solution. The negative could argue that each state government should pass laws banning segregation instead of the federal government.

- **You Lack Evidence Against a Particular Case**
  Sometimes, you will find that you do not have any specific evidence on an affirmative case. If you have never heard an affirmative case before, you could run a counter-plan to remain competitive.

  Every affirmative case will use the federal government. While you may not have evidence against every case, you can find other *agents* who could act instead of the federal government.
• **Bigger Benefits (Net Benefits)**

To win a debate while running a counter-plan the negative must prove that their counter-plan is better, or more beneficial, than the affirmative plan.

*Net Benefits* are the elements of a counter-plan that make it better than the affirmative plan.

**Example:** A child asks her parents to take her to the local movie theater. The child has wanted to see a movie for some time and she really enjoys going to the movies. However, the movie she wants to see is R-rated, and her parents do not think the child is mature enough to see it. While the parents would like for their child go to the movies and have a good time, they do not want her see an R-rated movie that could cause her mental harm. The child becomes angry and throws a giant fit. She wanted to go to the movies, and now she can’t. The parents could offer a counter-plan by allowing the child to see a PG movie. This counter-plan would lessen her anger by still letting her go to the movies, and it would avoid the harms created by the R-rated movie.

**Class Discussion:** In the example above, what net benefit is created by the parents counter plan?

*Answer:* The counter-plan creates the following net benefit: avoids the harms of R-rated movies while allowing the child to still see a movie. The counter-plan and the child’s plan both give her joy from the movie experience, but only the counter-plan prevents the harm of the R-rated movie.

**Example 2:** Let’s say two brothers are playing in their front yard. A mutual friend asks the brothers if they want to go to the park to shoot hoops. The younger brother wants to go immediately, but the older brother suggests that they ask their mother first. The older brother explains that by asking their mother, they will make her happier with them and avoid getting in trouble for not telling her where they were. The older brother has offered a counter-plan with a unique net-benefit. Going to the park immediately is the plan offered by the younger brother, but the older brother’s counter-plan of first asking for their mother’s permission would improve their relationship with their mother and prevent her from becoming angry.
What are the Parts of a Counter-plan?

- **Text**
  Just like the affirmative, a counter-plan will need a specific plan text. Often, the affirmative plan text is used with a few changes.

- **Contention of Non-Topicality**
  Many believe that if counter-plans were allowed to be topical, then the negative would be supporting the resolution. Thus, the counter-plan needs to be non-topical to serve as a reason the resolution is a bad idea. Some counter-plans are actually topical and obviously do not include a non-topicality contention. Whether or not a counter-plan can be topical is still debatable.

- **Contention of Competition**
  This means that the counter-plan by itself must be a better option than the affirmative. Affirmative teams’ can make an argument against the counter-plan known as a *Permutation*. This will be explained in more detail later, but a permutation is an argument that says we should combine the counter-plan and the affirmative. In proving that the counter-plan is competitive, the negative must show that a permutation would not be better than the counter-plan by itself.

  Competition—can be broken 3 parts.

  1. **Mutually Exclusive**—The counter-plan and the affirmative cannot coexist. If both could happen at the same time, the affirmative might be able to prove that a permutation is superior to the counter-plan alone.

  2. **Net Benefits**—As explained before, the net benefit is a unique benefit that only the counter-plan can capture. Here the negative is explaining that even if you could do the affirmative plan and the counter-plan, you would not want to.

  **Net Benefit and Mutual Exclusivity Example:** Think back to the child-parent movie example. The child wanted to see an R-rated movie, while the parents offered a counter-plan for a PG movie. If the movies occurred at the same time, the parent’s counter-plan would be mutually exclusive because the child could not go to both movies at the same time.

  If the movies occurred at different times it would be possible for the child to see both movies. This would be a permutation, or combination, of the two plans. The two plans would not be mutually exclusive. However, net benefits are now an important issue. If the child saw both movies the cost would double and the child would still be exposed to the potentially harmful R-rated movie. Thus, the parent’s counter-plan has reduced cost and reduced mental harm as net benefits.
3. Philosophical Competition—The philosophies behind the counter-plan and the affirmative are contradictory. Contradictory thoughts, of course, have never been a problem for some people, especially policymakers, so this standard is of little real use, unless a Kritik is involved (see next chapter).

- **Solvency**
  Like the affirmative, a counter-plan must be able to solve the problems identified in the debate. This is best accomplished by reading solvency evidence.

- **Net Benefits**
  The benefit(s) are mentioned briefly in the competition section as already discussed, but sometime specific evidence and structured net benefit arguments are read at the end of the counter-plan.

Net benefits can be broken into 2 types:

1. Benefits **CREATED** by the counter-plan
2. Harm **AVOITED** by the counter-plan

**CREATED**
Net benefits read after the counter-plan solvency sections are *created* by counter-plan action.

*Example:* Going back to the movie example. Let’s say the parents have agreed to let the child see a PG movie. The mother is prepared to buy the movie ticket with cash. However, the father offers a counter-plan to pay for the movie with a credit card. The father argues that they should use the credit card because it will collect airline miles. This would be a net benefit **CREATED** by the counter-plan.

**AVOITED**
A disadvantage read before or after the counter-plan could also be a net benefit, but is created by *avoiding* the harm that the affirmative plan will cause.

*Example:* Sticking with the movie example. The parents have agreed to pay for the child to see a movie. The mother wants to use cash, while the father has proposed a counter-plan of using the credit card. The father could argue that after the movie the family will need cash to get ice cream. The local ice cream shop does not accept credit cards, so using the family’s cash on a movie ticket would prevent them from getting ice cream. The counter-plan of using the credit card avoids the harm of not having enough money for ice cream.

*Class Discussion:* What is the difference between a net benefit created though counter-plan action and a net benefit created by AVOIDING the affirmative plan action?
What Does a Counter-plan Look Like?

Below is an example of a “states counter-plan” format. This counter-plan would argue that the States should do the plan instead of the US federal government.

Counter-plan Text:

Affirmative Text:

The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for those living in poverty in the United States by providing full funding to all qualified school applicants under the Full-Service Community Schools program established by Department of Education. Funding will continue based on demand from schools. Enforcement will be through normal means.

The counter-plan changes the text to read:

Counter-plan Text:

The fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase social services for those living in poverty in the United States by providing full funding to all qualified school applicants wishing to create community schools. Each state will build guidelines based on the Full-Service Community Schools program established by Department of Education. Funding will continue based on demand from schools. Enforcement will be through normal means.
What Does a Counter-plan Look Like? ...continued

Observation 1: The Counter-plan is not Topical.
(The non-topical observation is optional—some counter-plans are actually topical.)

Our counter-plan is not topical because we use the States instead of the federal government. This proves we are negating, not supporting, the resolution.

Observation 2: Competition.

A. The Counter-plan is Mutually Exclusive: It would not make sense for the federal government and the states to adopt the same plan. That would be inefficient and redundant.

B. Net Beneficial. We will prove that the counter-plan is better than the affirmative plan. The counter-plan will avoid the ______________ disadvantage(s) and it will create its own net benefit as seen below.

Observation 3: Solvency

States are the best at providing social services.

Observation 4: Net Benefit—Federalism

A. States are making the fight against poverty central to their governing mission.

B. Increased federal funding and control in social services hurts the balance of federalism.

C. Strong federalism is needed to promote democracy in the U.S. and abroad.
Class Exercise 10A

Write a Counter-plan

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will learn how to develop a counter-plan

Supplies:
Sample resolution (as provided below or create your own)

Instructions:
1. Put students into groups or pairs.
2. Read a very short sample case based on a sample resolution. No evidence is needed. It could look something like this:

   **Sample Resolution**
   Resolved: That our debate coach should substantially improve our debate team by adding new requirements.
   Observation 1: The debate team does not work hard enough.
   A. Students are not required to come in after school.
   B. Students have not done enough research.
   Plan: Debaters will be required to come in after school three days a week, and they will also be required to turn in 20 pages of quality research.
   Advantage 1: Debate successes.
   A. Without more work, our debate team will not win very much.
   B. Losing debates makes the coach very angry.
   C. An angry coach will make life unhappy for the whole debate team.
   D. New work requirements will make the team successful and increase happiness.

3. Have students write a counter-plan that would solve the case harms of an unhappy coach. The structure of the counter-plan will depend upon how much has been taught. The counter-plan could be as simple as an idea written down without structure, or if students have been taught counter-plan structure, it could be more complicated.

   **Examples:**
   - A counter-plan that has students make new requirements; not the teacher.
   - Counter-plan to have fewer requirements, because requirements are the real cause of bad debate.
   - Counter-plan to fire the coach!

4. Have each group read their counter-plan. Make corrections if needed and answer questions.

Note: You could decide to do the exercise through class discussion. You could ask for ideas and create a counter-plan on the chalkboard or overhead projector.
Class Exercise 10B

Net Benefit or Not?

Standards Met:
  MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
  KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will apply knowledge of counter-plans to label counter-plan net benefits.

Supplies:
  • Pen
  • Paper
  • Counter-plan example provided on page 132

Description:
Students will be given a debate situation that includes an affirmative case, a counter-plan and other hypothetical negative arguments. They will be asked to label what arguments are net benefits are what arguments are not.

Instructions:
1. Lead a discussion about differences between net benefits using the information on page 126 as a guide.

2. Place the students into groups. Ask them to take out a pen and paper; and explain the exercise. Students must flow all of your arguments to do the exercise.

3. Read a short description of an affirmative case.

4. Read a counter-plan outline against the affirmative case.

5. Read a list of other arguments that the negative could run with their counter-plan.

6. Give the students 10 minutes to label negative arguments with one of the following:
   a. Net benefits created by counter-plan action, or
   b. Net benefits avoided by the counter-plan, or
   c. Not a net benefit.

Sample Affirmative:
The affirmative team argues that social services are needed to reduce poverty. The federal government will provide billions for social services in the neediest areas of the country.
Sample Counter-plan:

**Text:** The United States will do the affirmative plan through the 50 state governments in the United States.

**Observation 1: Competition:** The counter-plan avoids DA’s and solvency turns. Additionally, it would not make sense for the federal government and states governments to enact the same proposal.

**Observation 2: Solvency:** States are more effective at social services than the U.S.F.G.

Beginning here, the students will need to label every argument as one of the following:

- **a.** Net benefit created by counter-plan action, or
- **b.** Net benefit from harm avoided, or
- **c.** Not a net benefit.

**Observation 3: Net Benefit: Federalism**

A. States are making the fight against poverty central to their governing mission.
B. Increased federal funding and control in social services hurts the balance of federalism.
C. Strong federalism is needed to promote democracy in the U.S. and abroad.

**Other negative arguments:**

1. A critical argument that says poverty is created by the greed of capitalism and therefore doomed to fail.
2. A solvency argument that says social services will fail.
3. A harms argument that says U.S. poverty programs are some of the best in the world.
4. A counter-plan solvency extension that says states create cheaper social service solutions.
5. A disadvantage that says federal action on social services hurts the economy.

**Key:**

- Net benefits created by counter-plan action: Argument 4.
- Net Benefits that come from avoiding harm the affirmative plan will create: Observation 3 and Argument 5.
- Not Net Benefits: Neg. Arguments 1, 2 and 3
Counter-plan Theory

Counter-plans are one of the most complicated arguments in debate. Now that you know the basic structure of a counter-plan, you need to understand what is known as “counter-plan theory.”

**Question:**
When the negative runs a counter-plan, must they support that counter-plan the entire debate round? Or can they decide in the middle of the debate that they would rather simply defend the current system?

This is a question creates a great deal of controversy. Some people believe once the negative runs a counter-plan, they must defend it during the entire debate. Others believe that the negative should be able to simply “kick” the counter-plan any time they want. Some people fall somewhere in between. The discussion of how the negative can run a counter-plan is what counter-plan theory is all about.

When you run a counter-plan, you must decide how you will defend it. This is called “the status of the counter-plan.” The affirmative has the ability to call your counter-plan abusive and unfair depending on how you chose to run it. The three basic ways you can run the counter-plan are detailed below.

**Ways to Theoretically Run a Counter-plan:**

1. **Conditional.** This means that the negative can jump ship on the counter-plan any time they want. They can keep it or kick it at whim. This is seen as the most unfair way to run a counter-plan. An affirmative team may claim that they had to stick to their plan, so the negative should stick to their counter-plan. The affirmative can also argue that negative can force them to spend a lot of speech time answering the counter-plan, only to drop it and then win on an argument the affirmative did not have time fully address. Of course, the negative has reasons why conditionality is good, but many people think conditional counter-plans are unfair.

2. **Unconditional.** This means that the negative will never drop or kick the counter-plan. Usually, the affirmative will not make any abuse arguments if the counter-plan is run this way. However, if the negative runs the counter-plan unconditionally and the affirmative team does a really good job answering the counter-plan, then the negative is stuck with a bad argument.

3. **Dispositional.** This is a combination of the first two. Most counter-plans are run this way. Dispositional means that the negative can drop the counter-plan only (a) if the affirmative makes philosophical objections to the counter-plan (such as the negative should not have fiat) or (b) if the affirmative makes a permutation (when the affirmative says we should combine the counter-plan and the plan).

A dispositional counter-plan is seen as more fair because it gives the affirmative a chance to force the negative to keep the counter-plan. Generally, permutations are the best arguments against counter-plans. If the affirmative gives up the right to permute the counter-plan, then the negative gives up the right to kick the counter-plan.
Example: Two men were going to fight each other. One man has a club, and the other has a knife. The man with the knife tells the man with the club that he will put away his weapon if the other man does the same. Now, it is the up to the man with the knife. He will lose his best weapon for the fight, but his opponent also loses a weapon. Although this example is violent (the author does not support fighting with clubs, knives or anything else), it shows that each side had to give up something. When the negative runs a dispositional counter-plan they are offering the affirmative a way to take away one of their best weapons—the ability to kick the counter-plan. However, the affirmative also must give up its best weapon—the permutation.

Class Discussion: Ask the class if they think that a negative should be allowed to kick a counter-plan whenever they choose.

Counter-plan theory does not end at status. There are several other theoretical issues concerning the structure of a counter-plan. Negatives can be very tricky and write counter-plans that are very difficult for the affirmative team to answer. If the affirmative feels that the counter-plan is unfair they will make “theory” arguments to claim that the negative should lose the debate because they ran an unfair counter-plan.

Affirmative Theory Arguments:

1. Plan Inclusive Counter-plans (PICS)
   Also known as PICS, plan inclusive counter-plans are exactly what they seem. Part or the entire affirmative plan is included in the counter-plan. Affirmatives may claim this type of counter-plan is abusive because the affirmative plan is the affirmative’s ground. The negative must prove that plan is a bad idea, and a counter-plan that includes the affirmative plan shows support of the plan.

   Example: The affirmative case is to send assistance for AIDS treatment in Africa. The negative runs a counter-plan that also sends assistance for AIDS but changes the type of medicine used. The affirmative could argue that the negative is supporting most of their plan. They could also say the counter-plan is a tiny change and it would impossible for them to think of every minor change made to their plan.

   There are also arguments that defend the idea of a plan inclusive counter-plan. For one thing, almost all counter-plans include part of the affirmative plan. For another, the affirmative should be able to defend every aspect of their plan. There are many more arguments to be made on both sides of PICS.

2. International Fiat
   If your counter-plan uses a country other than the US, it is considered international fiat. Affirmatives may say that this abusive for a multitude of reasons. It can difficult to find detailed information on other nations’ governments, and there are nearly two hundred countries the negative could pick to do the plan. The affirmative could never research all those countries.

   Likewise, the negative has some good reasons why international counter-plans are legit. It educates us about other countries. Moreover, in debate we search for the best
policy option, so if another nation could do the plan better, we should support that policy. Once again, this is just the tip of the iceberg on all of the possible arguments.

3. Multi-Actor Fiat
If the counter-plan uses more than one agent, such as having two countries do the plan, it would be using multiple actors. The affirmative would claim they only have one agent to use (the US federal government), so the negative should be limited in the same way. The negative would need to prove that they are no more abusive than the affirmative.

4. Delay
Some negatives will run a counter-plan that simply delays the affirmative plan. The negative will then run a net benefit based on timing. For example, a negative might claim that if the affirmative plan is passed immediately, it will trade off with important legislation trying to get passed by Congress. Delaying the plan would prevent such a tradeoff. Most people in the debate community find this type of counter-plan highly abusive because it is almost impossible for the affirmative to win.

5. Consult
A negative may contend that before the affirmative plan is passed, some important third party needs to be consulted first. These are most common for foreign policy debate topics. A negative may argue that some country should be consulted about the affirmative plan before the US passes it. These counter-plans are considered abusive by some because the negative is endorsing the plan and simply adding consultation. Despite concerns of fairness, they remain fairly popular.

**Class Discussion:** Ask the students which type of counter-plan appears to be the most unfair.

**The Perm...It’s Not Just a Hairdo Anymore.**
When the negative runs a counter-plan, the affirmative has the right to make a “permutation” or “perm.” This is done simply by combining the affirmative plan and the counter-plan.

Perms are almost always critical in counter-plan debates, and they are usually the affirmative’s best response. Perms prevent the negative from simply reading a random policy proposal and claiming that their counter-plan is more needed than the plan.

**Example:** You are making plans with your friends, and you suggest the group go to see a movie. Someone else says they would rather go eat dinner. Two plans have been presented. However, you could make a permutation by suggesting that you do both, see a movie and eat dinner. One perm would be to eat dinner first and then see a movie. Another perm could be to see the movie and then eat.

The negative team must do a very good job answering the perm to win the debate. The negative must prove that the permutation would be WORSE than simply doing the counter-plan. This can be done in several ways. If the negative has disadvantages that link to the plan but not the counter-plan, they can use them as answers to the perm. They could also make specific arguments about why the permutation will fail.
**Class Discussion:** Using the movie example from above, have the class brainstorm answers to the permutation of eating diner and seeing movie rather than simply seeing the movie.

**Example Answers:** If the plan is to go the movies, the counter-plan is go to dinner, and the perm is to do both—what are some arguments you could make to suggest that perm is a bad idea?

1. The perm costs too much. Adding dinner will double the cost of the friendly gathering. Some people will not be able to afford both.

2. Time. There is a limited amount of time for the friends to gather, eat dinner and see a movie. It would take more time than the group has.

3. Coordination problems. It is often difficult enough to get a group of people to decide on just one thing, like what movie to see. Adding dinner to the mix would be too complicated.

4. Poor dinner choices. Due to time constraints the dinner venue would need to be close to the movie theater, and there are very poor restaurant choices near the movie theater.
How to Answer the Counter-plan

1. Perms: As already stated the perm is usually the affirmative’s best argument against the counter-plan. Affirmative teams can make as many perms as they like. The most basic perm is to simply do both the counter-plan and the plan.

Evidence is needed for a perm to be most effective. The most common and useful evidence says the agent implementing a counter-plan can cooperate with the agent of the plan. Additionally, the affirmative should create reasons and benefits to the perm. Some teams will say that they get “double solvency” with the perm because two agents are carrying out the same plan.

There are several types of permutations, many of which are considered unfair. The two basic types labeled unfair are:

**Severance** - this perm has the affirmative team sever some part of the plan to effectively mesh with the counter-plan. If the affirmative can get away with it, more power to them. However, most people in the debate world believe that severance perms are unfair.

**Intrinsic** - the opposite of severance, here the affirmative adds something that is not in the plan or the counter-plan. Once again, considered unfair by most.

2. Solvency Deficit: The contention is that the counter-plan will not solve the harms presented in the case as effectively as the affirmative plan. In others words, the counter-plan will be less effective than the plan. Affirmatives will use this argument to claim that “case is a disadvantage to the plan”. This means that whatever harm the affirmative has identified will go unsolved if the counter-plan is used and the continued presence of those harms is like a disadvantage.

3. Use Theory: Counter-plans are complicated and require a lot of work for a negative team to successfully win them. One way to make it even more difficult for the negative to adequately win the counter-plan is by making various theory arguments. Previous discussions on dispositionality, conditionality, PICS and other theory arguments lay the ground work for what types of theory arguments the affirmative can make.

Even if the affirmative does not want to “go for” these theory arguments it is a good idea to at least make these arguments in the 2AC. Negatives will be forced to spend a good amount of time answering these arguments because they all have voting implications. A 2AC could read 30 seconds of theory arguments while it would take the negative one minute to effectively answer them. This is a very good time trade off for the affirmative.

4. Read DAs to CP and Add-Ons: If the negative has disadvantages they read against affirmative cases, the affirmative should read DAs against the counter-plan. If the counter-plan uses the courts instead of Congress, the affirmative could read a disadvantage that claims court action is bad for various reasons. This simply gives the affirmative more reasons why the counter-plan is a bad idea.
5. Try and link the CP to negative DAs: Most negatives read counter-plans with DAs that they claim link to the affirmative plan, but not to the counter-plan. Good affirmatives will argue that the counter-plan links to the DAs the same as the plan, removing a reason to vote for the counter-plan.

Example: Let’s say the affirmative case uses Congress and the President to pass the plan, and the counter-plan uses the courts instead. The negative could run a politics DA, saying the passage of the affirmative plan will trade off with some other important item on the political agenda by turning the President’s attention to the affirmative plan. The negative could claim that court action would allow the President and Congress to focus on the current agenda while the affirmative plan would still pass. The affirmative could claim that the courts are tied to the political process and that since the President appoints judges, court action on the plan will affect the current political environment as much as the affirmative plan. Thus, both the plan and counter-plan link to the DA.

Class Discussion: Are Presidents held responsible for decisions made by the courts?

6. Check the text: Counter-plans are often written moments before, or even during a debate round. Negatives can make numerous mistakes when they write the text. Affirmatives should examine the text and look for flaws.

Additionally, negatives could add some tricks to the counter-plan text. These “tricks” are debate round-specific but if the affirmative reads the text and asks questions they can avoid any tricks.

7. Turn Negative DAs/Net Benefits: As discussed earlier, counter-plans have net benefits, or independent reasons to endorse the counter-plan over the plan. DAs that only link to the plan are net benefits. Other net benefits are created by counter-plan action itself. The affirmative can turn these net benefits. The DA section covered how to turn disadvantages, and the same can be done with action-based net benefits.

Example: If the counter-plan used the courts, they might argue that new court action on civil liberties will increase court activism, which would be a good thing for various reasons. The affirmative could argue that yes the counter-plan will increase court activism; however, activism is actually bad for various reasons.

8. Prepare Frontlines: As with most aspects of debate, preparation is critical. Affirmatives should create frontlines, or pre-written answers, for the most common counter-plans. Frontlines and how to make them will be discussed in-depth in Unit 14.

Class Discussion: What are the most compelling answers to the counter-plan? (Try to get the students thinking about how the counter-plan answers work to increase their understanding of counter-plans.)
Class Exercise 10C
Answer the CP as A Group

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will work as a class to analyze a counter-plan and think critically to make arguments that answer the counter-plan effectively.

Supplies:
- Counter-plan to read to the class in response to an explained affirmative (DKC novice affirmative is a fine choice).
- Evidence
  - Some evidence that answers the counter-plan
  - Some evidence that does not directly answer the counter-plan
  - Copy and scramble the evidence
- Pen
- Paper

Instructions:
1. Explain to the groups that you will be reading a counter-plan shell that answers the DKC Novice 1AC. Review the case briefly with the class to refresh their memory.

2. Instruct the class to flow the counter-plan as it is being read. Explain to them that later, they will need to select evidence that best refutes the counter-plan.

3. Read the counter-plan shell.

4. Divide the class into groups and provide them with scrambled answers to a counter-plan. This will be in the form of individual cards cut out from blocks/briefs. Some of the cards will answer the counter-plan effectively, others will not.

5. Ask the groups to select the best cards to answer the counter-plan.

6. Ask the groups to create analytical arguments that answer the counter-plan. The groups should be given 10-20 minutes to create their answers.

7. Each group should elect a leader to share the best responses with the class. The teacher will write each group’s answers on the board like they are flowing.

8. Once every group has delivered their responses, the teacher should direct a discussion where the class picks the best answers.
Class Exercise 10D

CP Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will learn how to debate a disadvantage in-depth, practice flowing and improve speaking and critical thinking skills.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Counter-plan and answers

Description:
You will have at least 2 students debate only a counter-plan. Those not debating will flow and vote for a winner.

Instructions:
1. Select two students to debate each other over one counter-plan (CP). You can set a class schedule so that everyone must debate once. You could use the DKC novice affirmative case as the hypothetical affirmative that the CP will be run against.

2. Give one student the CP and its extension evidence. Give the other student evidence to answer to the CP.

3. Prepare students for a one-on-one debate about the CP alone. Use the following speech times:
   - Reading of CP: 2 minutes (Speaker 1)
   - Cross x: 1 minute (Speaker 2 asks Speaker 1 questions)
   - Answer the CP: 3 minutes (Speaker 2)
   - Cross x: 1 minute (Speaker 1 asks Speaker 2 questions)
   - Extend the CP: 4 minutes (Speaker 1)
   - Answer the extension: 3 minutes (Speaker 2)

4. Have other students in the class flow and evaluate the debate

5. After the debate is over provide instruction on how to better explain and argue the CP and ask for class input. You can have the class vote on the winner.

Tips/Notes:
- Make sure you tell the debaters what type of judge they have: lay, college, etc.

- Tell the debaters ahead of time what CP they will be debating and make sure they understand the exercise beforehand.
**Unit 10**

**Talking Debate**

**Counter-plan**—An alternative to the affirmative’s plan proposed by the negative team.

Some types of Counter-plans:

- **Generic Counter-plan**—A counter-plan that can be prepared in advance to be used against almost any case.

- **States Counter-plan**—A counter-plan that uses states to enact the plan.

**Frontlines**—Answers to arguments that are prepared in advance of the debate.

**Kritik (or Critique)**—Philosophically-based arguments that question and criticize explicit or implicit assumptions made by the affirmative team.

**Net Benefit**—The benefits received by adopting the counter-plan by itself instead of adopting the affirmative plan or the counter-plan simultaneously with the affirmative’s plan via a permutation.

**Permutation**—An argument that says we should combine some or all of the counter-plan and the affirmative plan.

**To “Go For” an Argument**—Carry through a particular argument to the end of the debate round.
Unit 11: Kritiks

Academic policy debate has changed significantly from decade to decade. The latest change to hit the debate world has been the emergence of a powerful new argument called a “Kritik.” Kritiks are philosophically based arguments that question assumptions or language made by the affirmative team. These assumptions can be explicit or implicit. Assumptions are assumed truths without supporting evidence.

**Class Discussion:** What is the difference between implicit and explicit?

**Unit Focus:**

Differences between Kritiks and other Arguments

Parts of the Kritik

Answering Kritiks
So What is a Kritik Again?

Kritiks may sound a little confusing at first, and that is OK. Kritiks are complicated and relatively new, so they take time to fully understand. Kritiks ask fundamental questions and criticize elements of society, government and ethics that many of us take for granted. Some Kritiks argue that truth does not exist, or they will contend that the truths we have created benefit some while oppressing others. Kritiks often claim that whatever problem identified by the affirmative side is actually a symptom of some deeper problem.

**Example:** Let’s say that a child breaks his or her parents’ rules by cursing. The parent states that the child will be grounded for a week. The child, however, disagrees with the punishment. But let’s take it a step further. More than disagreeing with the punishment itself, the child disagrees with the notion that the parent has the right to punish.

1. The child argues that the parents do not have the right to control him/her, and therefore, they do not have the right to punish.
2. The child claims that the parental control exercised actually does harm.
3. The child claims personal autonomy and that learning from mistakes are the best way to develop into an adult.
4. Parental control does irreparable harm and thus the child claims that the punishment must be rejected.

This would be a “Kritik” in the debate world. The child is questioning the assumption that his or her parent has the right to exercise control over their personhood. If the child requested to do extra chores instead of being grounded for a week, that would have been a counter-plan. But by questioning the very notion that a parent can control and punish, he or she is making a Kritik.

Hopefully, you are beginning to see how a Kritik differs from other debate arguments. Here is a debate-specific example of a language Kritik.

**Debate Example:** If someone uses racist language in a debate round he or she would be extremely vulnerable to a Kritik (as we would hope).

1. The opponent could read evidence claiming racist language is harmful and should always be rejected.
2. The team running the Kritik against the racist language might contend that the language used in the debate round is more important than the topics being debated, and that before the judge evaluates any other issue in the round, they should first look at the abusive and offensive discourse used by their opponents.

**Another Example:** Let’s change the example. Most people in debate do not use overtly racist language, so the previous example is a little extreme. However, some elements of commonly used language have been criticized for being racist. The term “third world” in reference to economically undeveloped nations outside North America and Europe has been labeled racist by some. If a team read evidence that used the term “third world,” it could serve as a link to a racism Kritik.
It may seem like more of a stretch to punish a team for reading evidence that just used the term “third world,”—especially if that team had no idea the term could be considered racist. However, this is a more common Kritik argument than the example of blatantly racist language. To some, it appears unfair to punish a team for reading evidence that they did not know could be considered racist. Others, however, believe that examining the words we use is extremely important. If a word is racist, and it has a negative impact on policies and people, it ought to be rejected.

**Class Discussion:** Should a team lose a debate for reading evidence that has a term some consider racist, even if the team was unaware of the possible racism?

**Questions**
Kritiks make us examine the world around us, how it is structured and why we do what we do. Kritiks conclude that we can do better.

**Class Discussion:** Ask the class to discuss any of the following questions. (Some are pretty deep so be aware of time and the class’ level of thinking.)

- Who writes history and how do we know it’s true?
- Why do we have a government/state, why not anarchy?
- What values does our society embrace and who created them?
- Does truth exist and what is it?

**Basic Differences Between Kritiks and Other Arguments**

1. **Uniqueness does not matter.** Kritiks can be like disadvantages in many ways, but one big difference is that Kritiks don’t need to be unique. Kritiks take a more philosophical approach and it is contended that when considering moral questions uniqueness should matter. I.e., racism happens all the time, but that doesn’t a judge should accept a racist policy.

2. **Fiat is as an illusion.** Kritik advocates argue the affirmative plan will never really happen; nothing will really change in Washington. The ideas, words and attitudes in a debate round are more real, and thus, more important than some case/advantage that will never happen.

3. **Individual action replaces policy.** Kritik’s have an alternative that replace policy. The alternative is normally some kind of individual action. Sometimes the judge is asked support deconstructing or rethinking, sometimes it is as simple as rejection. Other times the alternative supports some kind of specific local action the judge is told to take or support. The alternative needs solve the problems identified by the Kritik impacts.
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Parts of the “K”
Kritiks are comprised of basic parts or components like other debate arguments and in recent years they have developed a consistent shape:

1. Link
2. Impact
3. Alternative

1. Link:
Just like a disadvantage, the Kritik needs a link. The link is the most critical part of the Kritik. Here are the types of links that are most common.

- **Language/Discourse**: This can arise from words debaters speak during the round, or it could be from evidence. The Kritik will argue that the words used by the opponent are harmful and should be rejected.

- **Word(s) in Resolution**: Some links come from words or phrases in the resolution. Since the affirmative must support the resolution, all cases could link.

- **Plan Action**: This link would be fairly specific. It would be based on something specific the plan did. For example, if the Kritik opposed the use of violence and the plan used military intervention, then the link would be based on the plan action that advocates using military force.

- **Affirmative Harms**: A Kritik may argue that the affirmative harms are the link. For example, imagine the Kritik claimed that our government uses threats to justify unnecessary military action. If the affirmative plan had harms about threats and war, then the negative could use those as the link.

- **Framework**: The framework is the system one uses to determine the best action. If an affirmative team justified their plan based on consequentialism (meaning the consequences of the plan are the justification for its support), then the negative may argue that such a framework leads to terrible atrocities or abuse of state power. The negative might argue that we should support or oppose policies based on their ethical merit, not their consequences.

- **System**: Many Kritiks get their link from the “system” that includes the affirmative plan. Capitalism is an economic system many teams choose to Kritik. By simply being part of the system of capitalism, an affirmative could link to a Kritik. Another popular “system” based link would be Statism. This Kritik contends that the state system is unjust, so a plan could link just by using the government.
2. Impact:
Like a disadvantage, Kritiks have impacts. The impacts can be large—such as human extinction, or they can be much smaller—such as claiming that the case will not solve (this sounds more like a solvency claim, but it is usually made under the impact). For example, if the link is racism, there is really good impact evidence claiming that racism will ultimately destroy the human race. The Kritik can also claim that a certain type of thinking will lead to destruction. Common impacts are oppression, violence, etc.

3. Alternative:
The alternative is the specific action the Kritik asks the judge to endorse instead of the affirmative. It can be like a counter-plan with a text and an endorsement of parts of the plan, or it can be to simply reject the affirmative. Some will claim that voting for the Kritik and endorsing the alternative will create a social movement. There are several types of alternatives, and some may even overlap a little.

- **Rethinking:** Literally, the word means to have second thoughts about a decision. In the world of the Kritik, it’s a little more complicated. In debate, rethinking means to avoid using the same thought process used by the plan. If the Kritik has exposed the problems of the state, then rethinking means to question the very notion of using states to govern over people. The Kritik will claim that if we use the mindset endorsed by the plan, we will only replicate the problems of the status quo.

- **Deconstructing:** This is similar to rethinking. It is a concept explained by a popular post-modern thinker named Derrida. It is defined as “a philosophical theory of criticism (usually of literature or film) that seeks to expose deep-seated contradictions in a work by delving below its surface meaning.”

  [http://www.wordreference.com/definition/deconstruction](http://www.wordreference.com/definition/deconstruction)

- **Textual Alternative:** This is text that clearly explains what the team running the Kritik is advocating. Sometimes it is personal action, other times it sounds more like a policy. Often, it is just a few words explaining the basic philosophy underlying the Kritik.

- **Movement/Personal Action:** Some teams will ask that the judge joins their movement by voting for the Kritik. They will claim that endorsing their radical politics in this one debate round will help lead to a movement that pursues change in the way the Kritik advocates. They may also claim that social movements in general are more effective than using the government. (Note: This works when Isaac is your judge; however, Nova assumes joining requires him to sell magazines door-to-door in support of the movement.)

  **Class Discussion:** Name some social movements and decide if they are more effective than government policy.
Common Kritiks

Kritiks have taken several common forms over the years. Topic after topic debaters the same kritiks will pop up. Here is a list of a few:

**Biopower** – Based on the work of Michael Foucault; argues that giving the state the power to regulate human health leads state control over the population. The state can then oppress and use people at its will.

**Critical Legal Studies** – Argues the law is unfair, oppressive and only serves the rich. Says we need to dismantle the current legal system because the system is currently unable to provide real justice.

**Capitalism** – Argues that the dominant economic system of capitalism unfairly distributes resources and makes nations more driven to fight wars.

**Deep Ecology** – Says the human approach to the environment is too anthropocentric. We view humans as superior to other animals and don’t understand that we are just a part of a larger world. The kritik argues we need to focus on developing a “deeper” understanding of our place in the biosphere.

**Development** – Argues that western nations exploit other nations in the name of development. Smaller countries are forced to open their economies to the West, and the West in turn exploits their resources.

**Militarism** – Says that the military-industrial complex drives a constant desire for war. We fight wars so that companies can keep profiting from making new bombs, guns, tanks etc.

**Realism** – Argues that the system of international relations creates conflict because each state views the next as a threat. Nations around the world play “power politics” without considering the benefits of working together.

**Securitization** – Contends the way we discuss threats actually makes the threat real. For example, Iraq was said to be a major threat, and eventually, the threat was used to justified war.

**Statism** – Says that the “state” is a bad way to order society. The “state” oppresses people and makes war inevitable. As long as power is amassed in central locations most of the people will suffer. Many kritiks contain elements of statism.

**Speaking for Others** – Argues when trying to solve problems you should not use the voice of the oppressed to justify your cause. People should speak from their own point of view because the words of others can be exploited.

To get a very detailed run-down of Kritiks see:  
http://www.planetdebate.com/textbooks/view/2
Class Exercise 11A

Kritik or Not

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 4-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will learn the difference between a Kritik and other arguments.

Supplies: Pen/Paper/Chalkboard

Description: Provide a brief outline of an affirmative case and read a list of arguments against the case. Students will label arguments as a Kritik or as something else. You could do this exercise individually, in groups, or through a class discussion.

Instructions:
1. Tell the class that they must flow the case you are about to read. (You could have them turn this in for a grade.)
2. Read the case below.

Case outline

Observation 1: The U.S. is not equipped to deal with continuing increases in poverty.

Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services.

Advantage 1: U.S. Economic Leadership
A. The poverty rate is exploding.
B. Poverty will ripple through the entire economy and massively deplete the nation’s wealth.
C. The U.S. needs a strong economy to promote leadership around the globe.
D. U.S. leadership prevents war.
Class Exercise 11A

3. Read the arguments below against the case. Instruct your students to label each argument as a Kritik or another type of argument (solvency, DA, etc).

1. The way the affirmative ties poverty to larger U.S. economy turns people into numbers and is dehumanizing. This should be rejected.
2. Poverty rates are inflated.
3. Social services fail to reduce poverty because of bureaucracy.
4. United States economic leadership promotes capitalism. Capitalism is the root cause of oppression and war and it should be rejected.
5. The portrayal of poverty as a problem that can be fixed by government is misguided thinking. When the people trying to “fix” poverty are detached from the problem they invent solutions which only make the problem worse. We need to re-think our approach to poverty.
6. States are superior at social services. States should do the plan
7. Federal government social services waste resources.
8. Social services reduce motivation to work and make people more dependent on the government. This makes poverty worse.
9. U.S. leadership creates more wars around the world, increases terrorism and ultimately makes the U.S. less safe.
10. Social services give the government control over the people. The government defines what is needed to be a healthy citizen and abuses that power through social services. The government’s attempt to normalize and control the population leads to mass oppression.

4. Discuss students’ answers or have them turn in the assignment for a grade.

Answer Key: 1-Kritik 2-Advantage or Harms Takeout 3-Solvency 4-Kritik 5-Kritik 6-Counterplan 7--Solvency or Disadvantage 8-Advanatge Turn 9-Advantage Turn 10-Kritik
How to Answer the K

Kritiks can be very powerful tools, and the confusion they cause can scare teams into falling apart when they hear them. However, winning a Kritik can be extremely difficult if the opposition knows how to exploit the weakness of most Kritiks. When answering a Kritik, you need to take a deep breath, chill out, and answer it like any other argument.

1. Challenge the Link
The most important part of the Kritik is the link. However, many teams running Kritiks will use very generic links that are susceptible to good answers. Most judges want specifics, so the affirmative should always ask for specific actions or words that link to the Kritik.

*Example:* You are at the mall wearing a letter jacket from your school, and someone from another school sees you. They come up and say they do not like you because everyone from your school is a jerk. You ask what you have done to them—how have you been a jerk? They just repeat that everyone from your school is a jerk. In this example it seems clear that they failed to prove that you, specifically, were a jerk.

Teams running Kritiks will often get their link from highly generic arguments like “all state sponsored polices repress the people,” but that is not very specific. If a case gave people more rights and the government less power, it would not be oppressing people, and thus, the Kritik would not link.

2. Permute
Just like counter-plans, Kritiks can be permuted. A perm would advocate that the judge does the plan and endorses the philosophies of the Kritik. Often, you can find generic evidence that says we need to combine policy action with critical philosophy.

Some Kritiks cannot be permuted very easily, if at all. If the Kritik calls for the rejection of the plan, it is difficult to say we should do both.

3. Answer the Specific Kritik
Some teams will only answer Kritiks with arguments like “Kritiks are bad” and other highly generic arguments that could be run against any Kritik.

Successful teams will provide a diversity of answers to the Kritik. They will challenge the framework, argue Kritiks are unfair, and they will address the specific philosophy of the Kritik. This will require and preparation for a variety of Kritiks.

4. Question How the Alternative Solves
Almost all Kritiks will claim to solve the case harms and at the same time, solve some sort of impact the Kritik has addressed. To effectively answer this claim, opponents need to ask how the Kritik will solve the entirety of the case, and at same time, they must solve the huge impacts most Kritiks claim. Most alternatives are purposefully vague. You need to get as many specifics as possible.
Additionally, many Kritiks claim that what happens in the debate round matters most. You need to find out what happens once the judge votes for the Kritik and how that translates into real action.

5. Make Uniqueness Answers
One of the advantages to running a Kritik is avoiding that whole uniqueness thing. However, when you answer a Kritik, it is critical to force the opponent to address uniqueness. If, for example, they are running a Statism Kritik, you should contend that the state already exists regardless of the plan. Supporting or negating the plan will not affect the existence of the state.

6. Keep the Case Alive
When the negative runs a Kritik, they are trying to make the debate about their Kritik instead of the affirmative case. When answering the Kritik, keep your case alive and compare its advantages to the Kritik. If the negative does not even address the case, you should contend that all of your advantages have been conceded and must be given full weight.

7. Argue the Framework
Debate has traditionally been evaluated through a policy format; however, Kritiks have challenged that framework. Teams running Kritiks want the round to be evaluated without reference to policy. Instead, they want the round to be based on performance, discourse or personal action.

If the debate round is evaluated in policy framework, most Kritiks will have little chance of winning because they lack uniqueness or policy options. Below are some arguments that answer Kritiks with personal action alternatives (although they are not the world’s greatest arguments).

**Competition**
Debate is an arena for competitive argument. You debate both affirmative and negative at every tournament. How can you make a claim that you will lead to personal change when in the next round, you might have to directly refute that ideology? If wanted to cause change, you would only debate on one side or you would protest rounds on the side with which you disagree.

**Hypothetical Game**
Debate is about hypothetical situations—not reality. We debate about what should or should not happen in the government. Our arguments and choices during a debate round do not create actual changes.

**Judge Action**
If debate was about political change and personal advocacy, the round would not matter. Judges would simply vote based on their political leanings. The judge should vote for who argued the best, not for actual change.

**Class Discussion:** Should people use debate to promote their own political agenda?
Class Exercise 11B

K Debate

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will learn how to debate a Kritik in-depth, practice flowing and improve speaking and critical thinking skills.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- Kritik and answers

You will have at least 2 students debate only a Kritik. Those not debating will flow and vote for a winner.

Instructions:
1. Select two students to debate each other over one Kritik. You can set a class schedule so that everyone has to debate once. You can run the Kritik against an affirmative case from the DKC evidence packet.

2. Give one student the Kritik and its extension evidence. Give the other student evidence to answer to the Kritik.

3. Prepare students for a one-on-one debate about only that CP. Use the following speech times:
   - Reading of Kritik: 2 minutes (Speaker 1)
   - Cross x: 1 minute (Speaker 2 asks Speaker 1 questions)
   - Answer the Kritik: 3 minutes (Speaker 2)
   - Cross x: 1 minute (Speaker 1 asks Speaker 2 questions)
   - Extend the Kritik: 4 minutes (Speaker 1)
   - Answer the extension: 3 minutes (Speaker 2)

4. Have other students in the class flow and evaluate the debate.

5. After the debate is over, provide instruction on how to better explain and argue the Kritik, and ask for class input. You can have the class vote on the winner.

Tips/Notes:
- Make sure you tell the debaters what type of judge they have: lay, college, etc.
- Tell the debaters ahead of time what Kritik they will be debating and make sure they understand the exercise.
Unit 11

Talking Debate

A Priori—Arguments that are to be evaluated before anything else in the debate.

Framework—The structure that serves as a basis for evaluating a debate.

Post-Fiat—An assumption that the plan passes, and then examining the affects of the plan.

Pre-Fiat—The space that exists before we enter the pretend world of fiat, where we assume that the plan will pass. Kritiks contend pre-fiat impacts are more real because affirmative plans will never actually come to pass.

Rethinking—The process of tearing down all we know about subject, followed by a new thought process.
Unit 12: Judge Adaptation Expanded

On the next few pages you will see profiles for many types of judges

Unit Focus:

Lay Judge Preferences

Types of Experienced Judges and Their Preferences
Lay Judge

These judges want to be entertained to a degree—and ultimately, persuaded. They want to watch professional looking young people show-off their speaking and critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking style.</th>
<th>Slow and steady wins the race with the lay judge. Lots of explanation and persuasion is needed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-examination.</td>
<td>You must be polite, but avoid looking weak. It is a fine line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance.</td>
<td>Look as sharp as possible. You don’t want to lose a debate because someone thought you looked sloppy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock issues.</td>
<td>Lay judges will usually know little to nothing about the stock issues. They may have been given a quick information sheet explaining that the affirmative needs to have the stock issues, but they are more likely to vote on whether or not the affirmative plan sounds like a good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages.</td>
<td>Once you explain what a DA is, a lay judge should understand it. Avoid giant nuclear war impacts, or more complicated DAs. Case-specific DAs would be best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicality.</td>
<td>This can be a tough sell for a lay judge. They do not know the rules of debate and many would be uncomfortable voting on a rules violation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-plans.</td>
<td>Intuitively it seems lay judges would accept counter-plans. The affirmative offers one plan, the negative offers a different plan. It happens in Congress all the time. However, keep in mind counter-plans can get complicated with perms, theory, and everything else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritiks.</td>
<td>This may be asking a little too much, unless the Kritik is very specific with a more tangible alternative. Kritiks as solvency arguments would make sense. You could run some Kritiks, especially those that are more topic centered, but other arguments may get you further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New in 2.</td>
<td>Lay judges do not know what “new in the 2!” means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence.</td>
<td>For evidence to matter, you must clearly explain what you are reading and who the author is. You will need to stress why the evidence matters and explain what it means. Comparison to oppositional evidence is good. Keep in mind they won’t be reading cards after the round, and if you start to go fast, they will tune out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth vs. Breadth.</td>
<td>This a tough call. With a lay judge, fewer arguments will be made because extra explanation and a slower rate of speech are required. However, some lay judges will think about who made more points that seemed to go unanswered. Always stay slow but you can make diverse arguments that are not necessarily deep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experienced Judges

There are many types of judges that fall into this category, and we will review each one.

1. High School Stock Issue/Old–School

These judges have been around debate a long time and could be called traditionalists. They believe a debate round should be about whether the affirmative plan is a good idea or not. They still enjoy hearing persuasive speakers, not speed. Logic also goes a long way, and a good analytical argument combined with a quality piece of evidence could win a debate. Basically, they want persuasive speaking and common sense arguments backed by some decent evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Style:</th>
<th>They still value persuasion and usually detest speed. They want strong line-by-line debate with an emphasis on common sense arguments rather than outlandish impact debates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Examination:</td>
<td>Stay polite and professional without using tag–team cross-x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance:</td>
<td>Look sharp. Slacks and ties for boys, skirts, nice pants or dresses for the ladies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Issues:</td>
<td>The affirmative will need to win every stock issue with authority. This judge believes that the affirmative is putting the status quo on trial and it is their burden to prove overwhelmingly that the status quo is flawed and that the plan will work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages:</td>
<td>Somewhat important, but the negative can win without them by taking out a stock issue or two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicality:</td>
<td>A negative could spend 30 seconds on topicality and get a stock issue judge to vote on it. Topicality is seen as voting issue, but the judge will probably not require an all-or-nothing approach in the 2NR. It is not a question of ground, but a black or white question of whether the affirmative is topical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-plans:</td>
<td>Generally, stock issue judges do not like counter-plans. There are some exceptions but most want to hear case debate, not a debate about a counter-plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritiks:</td>
<td>Don’t run them with this judge unless they tell you otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New in 2:</td>
<td>Most stock issue judges prefer DAs to be in the 2NC. They call it “the division of labor” where the 1N debates the case and the 2N debates the DAs and solvency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td>Cards should be short and sweet. Read the full cites, not just last names, and don’t expect them to read evidence after the round. They will enjoy hearing about flaws in oppositional evidence. They will place equal value on evidence and logical/analytical arguments. Case specific negative is a must.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth vs. Breadth:</td>
<td>These judges favor breadth and coverage over depth on one or two issues. Affirmatives can win if they can make it through a round without dropping arguments. Meanwhile, negatives should go for as many arguments as possible hoping the affirmative mishandles one or two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Old-School Policy
This judge really enjoys smart strategies. You can go as fast as you want and make arguments with huge impacts. Evidence is at a premium and quantity matters as much, if not more than quality. They want debates where big case impacts are compared to big DA impacts, with counter-plans thrown in the mix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking style:</th>
<th>Go as fast as you want, just be clear enough.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Examination:</td>
<td>Most will allow tag team, but be sure to ask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance:</td>
<td>This will depend on the person. Many will not require fancy dress, however, a good number of old school policy judges have been known to reward nice dress with speaker points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Issues:</td>
<td>This judge will weigh competing policy options. If the plan is only slightly better than the status quo, the affirmative will still win.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages:</td>
<td>Absolutely critical. Pull out big, nasty, nuclear war impacts and don’t worry about how crazy they sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicality:</td>
<td>Needs to be explained as a voting issue with ground arguments. It will be difficult to win without dedicating 2-3 minutes of a 2NR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-plans:</td>
<td>Run whatever counter-plan you like, just make sure the net benefits outweigh the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritiks:</td>
<td>If they are truly old school, they will view the Kritik as a non-unique disadvantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New in 2:</td>
<td>They do not absolutely oppose new in the 2, but they consider it a strategic mistake because a good 1AR would straight turn all the DAs in the 2NC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
<td>Cards can be short and sweet, but you need a bunch of them. Sometimes it can be a matter of who read more cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth vs. Breadth:</td>
<td>These judges like big debates with lots of impacts to weigh. They don’t require the negative to only go for one DA, if you are winning them, go for 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Tabula Rasa
The literal meaning of tabula rasa is clean slate. This judge will attempt to evaluate only the arguments made in the debate, bringing no outside preference on style or substance. This type of judge will allow any speed and any argument. They are more likely to enjoy Kritiks than other judges and will try hard to be open-minded.

| Speaking style: | As long as you remain clear you can go as fast as you want. However, if the opponent made some sort of speed Kritik they would listen and evaluate the argument fairly. |
| Cross-examination: | Tag team is fine, just stay polite. |
| Appearance: | Clothing will not matter too much to most. |
| Stock issues: | If you can make a case that stock issues should be the paradigm, they would listen. |
| Disadvantages: | Any type of DA would be fine, just explain the impacts and why they matter. |
| Topicality: | You will need to make a clear case as to why topicality is voting issue. In round abuse is also important. |
| Counter-plans: | Your options are limitless. Keep in mind that they will listen to theory debates with an open mind, so if you run an abusive counter-plan, be prepared to defend it. |
| Kritiks: | They are going to be receptive to Kritiks, but the impacts and implications will need to be clear. |
| New in 2: | They will listen to arguments from both sides. |
| Evidence: | Quality will usually matter more than quantity, unless you make the case that quantity matters more. |
| Depth vs. Breadth: | They should not have a preference either way. However, it is critical that you provide the framework for how the debate should be evaluated. |
4. New-School Policy Plus
Many modern college debate judges fall in this category. They accept Kritiks and alternate forms and style. They still feel comfortable judging policy-based debate, and when Kritiks and performance-based arguments are presented, they want them to be somewhat pragmatic. Speed is fine, but clarity is essential. They want to hear debates with solid clash, smart strategy, and depth. Unlike old-school policy judges, they would not like to hear a debate where the 2NR went for four DAs and a counter-plan. They would prefer one really good DA and a well explained counter-plan.

**Speaking Style:** These judges have come down on speed just a little. You can still go pretty darn fast but they are requiring more clarity than a decade ago.

**Cross-Examination:** Tag team is allowed. Avoid looking uninterested or bored with cross-x because it will cost you speaker points.

**Appearance:** Most of these judges do not care about dress, but of course there are exceptions.

**Stock issues:** Don’t bother mentioning them.

**Disadvantages:** Very important if you are not going for a Kritik or Topicality. However, it is better to develop one or two with some depth rather than three to five.

**Topicality:** This is typically an all-or-nothing issue. If you want to win the debate on topicality, you should invest at least three minutes of the 2NR in it, and most of the time it should be your entire 2NR.

**Counter-plans:** If they are part of a smart strategy, they can a powerful tool. However, without somewhat decent solvency evidence, they will be given little consideration most of the time.

**Kritiks:** At first, many judges falling into this group resisted the “K.” However, Kritiks are now largely accepted. Some still prefer to avoid debates over Kritiks but most judges in this category will give any Kritik a fair listen. Many will still require a reasonably and tangible alternative. If you have a solid link it will help a lot.

**New in 2:** Probably a bad idea.

**Evidence:** Quality matters more than quantity. These judges will usually pour through evidence after a debate, comparing the warrants to each side’s cards.

**Depth vs. Breadth:** Depth all the way. You can’t drop a bunch of arguments, but these judges prefer debates to get into the gritty details with analysis that keeps getting more sophisticated.
### 5. Kritik Friendly

These are the most progressive/modern judges in the debate community. They enjoy hearing something different and generally align themselves with post-modernism. These judges will not ignore disadvantages or other types of more traditional debate arguments, but they prefer critical arguments. Many enjoy seeing performance based arguments that challenge the form debate has taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Style: You can still go fast, but clarity is very important. Additionally, Kritik Friendly judges prefer it when debaters slow down slightly to add elements of persuasion. They value debates that break form by using poetry or hip-hop. Many of these judges like debates that are close to a normal speaking rate with elements of persuasion and passion heightened.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Examination: They will allow tag team cross-x and value politeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Clothing does not matter unless it is used as part of the speech act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock issues: Don’t bother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages: Many find traditional impact calculus and body counts unpersuasive and sometimes immoral—especially DAs that are generic. They will be inclined to favor Kritiks of DAs and calculated thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicality: Many see topicality as too limiting. They like teams to stretch the bounds of resolution through metaphors. Winning at topicality may be an uphill battle at times. However, if you are good at explaining the impacts and extend the position well, they will listen and vote on topicality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-plans: These judges will not discount counter-plans, but they may see Kritiks as more effective counter advocacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritiks: As their title implies they enjoy critical arguments. Kritik alternatives can be less pragmatic than other judges. Performance elements can be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New in 2: Most would be inclined against brand new positions in the 2NC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence: Long pieces of evidence with numerous warrants are preferred. These judges will listen to the evidence quite carefully, and they will value quality over quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth vs. Breadth: Depth is certainly preferred. These judges don’t mind to hear the negative say “One off.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Exercise 12A
Who Said That?

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective: Students will identify judging preferences

Supplies
- Pen
- Paper
- List of questions

Instructions:
1. Discuss the types of judges and write each type on the chalkboard.

2. Read the quotes below, and ask students to match the quote with the judge. Students can be placed in groups and given the list to label together or it could be done through discussion. Students could also label the list individually. Whatever method is used, the instructor should discuss the list once the students have been given a chance to match the quotes with the labels and correct any misunderstandings.

Quotes:
1. “Please don’t go terribly fast, make sure you sign post, and don’t read any crazy impacts about nuclear wars”
2. “I am tired of the same old debates. Try something new and deconstruct the world or the activity.”
3. “Huh…what…slow down, please. This is all very confusing.”
4. “Only one disadvantage? What’s the matter, have you been skipping your speed drills?”
5. “Whatever…just whatever you like.”
6. “I am not sure why you went for all 3 DAs in the 2NR. Get a little deeper, weigh the impacts more clearly and read some better cards.”
7. “The case was just waiting to be Kritiked.”
8. “I am not sure why you spent four minutes on topicality in the 2NR. I mean, the case wasn’t topical, you could win that in about 45 seconds and then hit harms, solvency and maybe even that DA you read in the 2NC.”
9. “The Kritik was okay, but you did not have a clear link to the case. It was very generic. Plus, I am not sure about the alternative, it was a really vague.”
10. “That young lady sounded very passionate and she made a lot sense. However, the young man was rude and talked too fast.”

Key: 1-stock issue, 2-kritik friendly, 3-lay, 4-old school policy, 5-tabula rasa, 6-new school policy plus, 7-kritik friendly, 8-stock issue, 9-new school policy, 10-lay.
**Class Exercise 12B**

*Pick a Judge any Judge (Advanced)*

**Standards Met:**

MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6  
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

**Objective:** Students will practice adapting for their judges.

**Supplies:**

- Pen  
- Paper  
- Debate evidence

**Description:**

Each student will debate for a different type of judge in each of their two speeches. The teacher will prepare two teams for a practice debate. It will follow the same format and times as normal; however, the assumed judge is going to change.

Each debater will be told to pick two judge profiles that they wish to assume is their judge for the debate. If lay judges are common in your area, one of these assumed judges should be a lay judge. Since each debater has two speeches, they will pick a different judge type for each speech. It is probably best if everyone in the round debates for the same two judge types. It can be a little tough to conceptualize what this would look like in a debate so please refer to the example below.

**Example:** Let’s say Johnny is the 2A and wants to debate for a new-school policy-plus judge and a lay judge. He will need to decide in which speech he wants to debate for the lay judge and which speech will be tailored to the policy-plus judge. He might debate for a new-school policy-plus judge in the 2AC, and then debate for a lay judge in the 2AR. This means Johnny’s 2AC could be delivered at a rapid rate with quick analysis and less explanation. His 2AR would sound completely different. He might need to add explanation, and he would certainly go much slower. He would not emphasize big nuclear impacts, but rather instead focus on more commonsense based arguments.

The goal is not for one team to beat the other, but instead, to practice adapting. By changing the assumed judges within the same debate round, students can directly see the stark differences in style and substance when the judge changes.

**Instructions:**

1. Explain the exercise to the class and pair up the debaters.  
2. Have the students who are not debating flow the debate.  
3. **OPTION:** Students could write a one-page paper after the debate is over explaining what they saw and how the debaters changed styles when the assumed judges changed. They could include changes that were needed but not made.

(continued on next page)
**Class Exercise 12B**  
*(continued)*

**Evaluation:** Students can earn up to 100 points for the judge adaptation debate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Outcome needed for full points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student changed style substantially in each speech. Arguments were explained differently, rate of speech changed and evidence use was different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Speaking: the speech was clear and used elements of persuasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Argumentation: Demonstrated general knowledge of the issues in the debate and made arguments with warrants that were strategically sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evidence was used properly and explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Courteous to opponent at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Full participation in the debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rebuttals included and overview with clear impact analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student was organized and had everything needed to properly debate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 13: Evidence in Debate
Filing, Research & Argument Construction

Debate is a research intensive activity. Debaters use evidence in every round to help prove the validity of their arguments. Beginning debaters need to be guided through the research process. Organization and filing of debate evidence packets is a good starting place for building an understanding of how to construct arguments and where to locate research. Once acclimated to the research process debaters will be amazed at the knowledge they gain. It has been said that the research an average debater does on the yearly topic is equivalent to the amount or research required for a master’s thesis!

Unit Focus:
Cards, Blocks and Files
Affirmative/Negative Evidence Checklist
Filing Evidence
Frontlines
Research…Internet and Library Research Tips
Building Negative and Affirmative Files
Evidence in Debate
An Introduction to Filing, Research & Argument Construction

Arguments in debate are built around evidence. Debaters research the topic each year to learn about all the issues involved and to build arguments. This research can come from important studies, relevant philosophies, statistics, and educated opinions in a variety of publications.

Beginning debaters will be provided with evidence prepared in a common debate format, an evidence file. After working with these files debaters can learn to research and create their own files.

The Card
Debate evidence begins and ends with something called, “a card”. A card is direct quote from some source of evidence.

Cards got their name when debaters would organize their research quotes by writing them on note cards. When printing and copying technology advanced multiple cards could be placed on sheets of copy paper. Each sheet of paper containing cards is labeled an evidence block.

A card will contain the following:
- **Argument Tag**
- **Evidence Citation**
- **Direct Quote**

**Argument Tag**
The debaters explanation of the argument supported by the evidence they are about to quote.

**Evidence Citation**
Where the quote came from or its source. The cite should include the following:
- **Author**
- **Qualifications**
- **Source**
- **Year**
- **Article Title**
- **Page Number**
- **If Internet, Add Website and Download Date**

---Orally Citing the Evidence---
When you read the evidence out loud you only need to read: The author, qualifications, source and date. The other parts of the citation are only needed if others want to be able to locate your research.

**Direct Quote**
The direct quote is word-for-word from the source you are citing. It is usually not the complete quote, but rather a portion.
Card Example

TAG: Millions are entering poverty each year and the US has more poor than the entire population of Canada.

CITATION: Frances Moore Lappe, cofounder with Anna Lappe of the Small Planet Institute Sojourners Magazine September 1, 2008 Changing our minds: ending poverty begins with fresh thinking;

DIRECT QUOTE: DURING EACH of this century's first six years, nearly a million more Americans, on average, sunk into poverty. Almost one in 10 of us is expected to rely on food stamps this year; in New York City, make that one in seven. Today, there are more poor people in American than Canada's entire population.

What Makes a Good Card?
A good card will make a good argument. Recall:

Components of an Argument:
- Argument/Claim: An assertion of truth. This is the base of the argument.
- Reason/Warrant: This ties the claim to the facts. Sometimes facts can be misleading, so warrants are needed to prove the facts actually back the claim.
- Evidence/Fact: Here is where you use statistics, empirical data, first hand testimonies and other forms of fact to back your claim.

A card does not have to include all three parts of an argument. Facts by themselves can be useful. Numbers and updates on current events can help you create an argument.

Class Discussion: Does the card above make a good argument?

How Long is a “Card”?
A card can be a couple of sentences, or it can be as long as a page. The key is knowing what you want the card to say. If you are looking for facts alone, it may be short. A developed argument with warrants can be a few paragraphs in length. One paragraph is often the optimum length for a card because it is relatively short, but just long enough to make a complete argument.
From Cards to Blocks

As mentioned above, cards are grouped together and placed on labeled sheets of paper known as evidence blocks.

Evidence blocks should contain:
- School or organization name in one corner
- File name in the middle
  - Below the file name is the specific block page label
- Date in one corner
- File author(s) name(s) in one corner
- File page number for the purpose of indexing

From Blocks to Files

As mentioned, similar cards are placed on evidence blocks. These blocks are put into files. The files have indexes to organize the research and make it accessible during a debate round.

Evidence Block Example

Problem: Poverty Increasing: High Poverty Neighborhoods

Concentrated poverty has enormous costs: health care problems, crime, incarceration and drained public resources.

Detroit Free Press (Michigan) February 17, 2000

Every American has a stake in this problem. In a rich nation, moral arguments can be made for improving the lives of millions who cannot afford decent place to live, adequate health care or reliable transportation. But reducing poverty is also in the national self-interest. Poverty, especially concentrated urban poverty, has created chronic unemployment affecting generations and, with it, a culture of hopelessness, anger and despair. It hinders economic development and exacts enormous costs in crime, health care, incarceration and public assistance.

Urban centers have concentrated areas of poverty with few jobs available.

Detroit Free Press (Michigan) February 17, 2000

Large cities such as Los Angeles, Detroit, Miami, Philadelphia and Milwaukee report poverty rates of more than 20% - in most cases more than double the rate for their states. Inside those cities are census tracts, in mostly minority neighborhoods, with poverty rates of more than 40%. Over the last 35 years, manufacturing jobs and much of the middle class have fled to the suburbs. The urban poor remaining in the central cities lack the skills for jobs in the new economy, and the transportation to get to them. Unemployment numbers for poor urban minorities greatly underestimate the problem, because they exclude the long-term unemployed. Studies of working age African-American men in Milwaukee and New York City, for example, show 40% or more without jobs.
Indexing your File
So, cards are placed on blocks. Blocks are labeled and numbered, and then indexed. The index categorizes the evidence and provides the page number for each grouping of blocks.

Indexes make finding evidence easier, which is quite valuable in a timed debate. Having tubs and tubs of evidence matters very little if you cannot locate the right evidence during the actual debate rounds.

Index Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community School Affirmative File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community School Affirmative File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Explanation Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Affirmative Constructive (IAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Affirmative Constructive (IAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Affirmative Constructive (IAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Increasing High Poverty Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty is a Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty is a Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty is a Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty is a Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Childhood Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Childhood Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Childhood Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Hurts Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Hurts Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Hurts Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Hurts Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Poverty Causes Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Community Schools Lack Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Edu. System Outdated Doesn't Recognize Socioeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Edu. System Outdated Doesn't Recognize Socioeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Schools Lack Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause: Schools Lack Social Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Evidence Files Do You Need?
Debate topics may seem narrow at first, but they are quite broad. Debates can be over many subjects—requiring a lot of evidence. Since debaters both affirm and negate the topic, they must have different sets of evidence for each side.
Affirmative Evidence Checklist

• 1AC
Before going to your first tournament, you should have a 1AC to read for every affirmative debate round. You should even keep some extra copies of the 1AC in case you lose it.

• Extension Evidence
You need evidence to back up your claims made in the 1AC. You should have a file with an index that has sections such as harms, solvency and inherency. You will use this file to answer negative attacks and rebuild the case.

• Frontlines
A frontline is list of prepared arguments that answer an anticipated argument. As the affirmative, you know there are certain arguments the negative is likely to make. To save time, be more prepared. Create a file full of frontlines. Later in this Unit, you will find a detailed explanation of how to create frontlines. You should have a frontline for every major argument you can think of against your case. There are at least 3 counter-plans, 5 DAs, 5 Kritiks and 5 case arguments you should have a frontline to answer.

Negative Evidence Checklist

• Specific Case Files
As the negative, you must be prepared to debate against a ton of different cases. This means you need evidence against a ton of different cases. You should have at least 30 different files to answer specific cases. These files should contain harms, inherency and solvency answers.

• Generic Case and Solvency
On any topic, negatives will find case and solvency arguments that can be used in nearly every debate. Additionally, you might have case files on this year’s topic that cover major topic areas but are not designed to answer a specific case.

• Disadvantages
As the negative, you must have some decent DAs that you can read against most cases. You should have at least 3 generic DAs in your files.

• Counter-plans
Counter-plans can be very useful if you lack quality evidence to answer the case. Many counter-plans, such as the states counter-plan, can be used against a variety of cases.

• Kritiks
These are sometimes reserved for advanced debaters because of their difficulty. However, they can be very useful and strategic. You could have anywhere from two to twenty Kritiks in your file.

• Back Files
In debate, many arguments reappear each year. Topics for back files include generic impacts such as “Economic downturn will lead to war,” or evidence about environmental issues like global warming.
How Do I File My Evidence?

It may seem simple, but how to file is very important. If you cannot find key pieces of evidence quickly, it could cost you a debate. There are several ways to file debate evidence, and each debater incorporates their own filing strategies. However, there are some basic tips that can be helpful.

What Files to Use

- **Manila folders vs. Hanging files**
  You can either use manila folders that are usually a light tan color or hanging files. You will keep each separate argument in one of these files. They are especially useful for case files. Hanging files take up more space and are heavier, but they are preferred by many debaters because they like the look of them.

- **Expandos**
  These are popular for affirmative extension evidence and frontlines or negative DAs, CPs or Kritiks. They are made of a brown cardboard-like material and can hold anywhere from ten to thirty file slots.

- **Tubs**
  Files and expandos will be placed in a tub. You should find a sturdy tub that holds a large number of files. Some teams will organize their arguments by tubs. They might have one tub that has case files, and another will have DAs and counter-plans.

Filing Tips

- **Keep the affirmative separate and organized**
  This sounds simple enough, and it is. You need to have separate files for everything affirmative. Remember, you need your 1AC, extensions and frontlines. Make sure you are comfortable with these files and have them well organized.

- **Keep all DA/Counter-plans/Kritiks separate from everything else**
  Your tubs should have a disadvantage section, a counter-plan section and a Kritik section. This will allow you to know every DA/CP/Kritik you have and allow you see your options before or during the round.

- **Put all case files in one place in alphabetical order**
  All of your specific case files should be labeled clearly, and then put in alphabetical order. This keeps your files organized and will help you find a file when you need it in a debate round.

- **Put all generic case/solvency files in one place in alphabetical order**
  You could file these types of arguments with your other case files. However, by keeping generic arguments separate, it reminds you that those files can be used against many cases.

- **Both team members should know how the files work**
  It is dangerous for one person to do all the filing. You need to rely on yourself to know your files even if they are shared.
Class Exercise 13A
Where Are My Briefs?

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3, 4, 6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will learn how to use and organize their research and debates files

Supplies:
- List of possible affirmative cases
- Debaters’ evidence

Description: You will help the students learn how to use and locate their debate files.

Instructions:
1. Create a list of several affirmative cases that your students could face at a local tournament.

2. Have every student get out their debate files.

3. Read a description of the first case, and then ask the students to pull every file that could be useful. This includes: case files, topicalities, disadvantages and more.

4. After reading each case, direct a class discussion on which files were pulled. Ask the students about which files they think would be the most useful.

5. OPTIONAL: To add excitement to the exercise, you could give small prizes/rewards for the student who finds certain files the fastest.
Working with Your Files: Frontline Creation

A great way to learn about evidence and its use in debate is to work with the debate files you have been provided. In Unit 4 we worked with the 1AC and its extension evidence. Getting to know your affirmative files is the perfect starting point for working with your files. The development of “frontlines” is an excellent to keep working with the affirmative files (though frontlines can also be used on the negative, but we will learn more later).

Frontlines

A frontline is a list of prepared arguments that answer an anticipated argument. In debate, being more prepared than your opponent can lead to victories. With the advent of the Internet and advanced research abilities, it is easier than ever to predict your opponent’s arguments.

Before the first tournament even beginning debaters can have a good idea of the basic arguments that will come up throughout the year. Since you can predict basic arguments, you can prepare your answers to them in advance by creating frontlines.

- **What Do I Prepare Frontlines for?**
  Before your first tournament, come up with a list of the negative arguments someone might make against your case. This list should include:
  - Disadvantages
  - Counter-plans
  - Kritiks
  - Topicality
  - Common case arguments such as solvency arguments and harms takeouts

- **How Do I Assemble a Frontline from Files I already have?**
  Once you have picked an argument to defend, there are several steps you need to take to create the best frontline.

  1. **Get to know the argument your opponent is making.** You should carefully read and review whatever argument you are creating a frontline to answer. Try to figure out the flaws and crucial aspects of the argument that you will need to answer.

  2. **Brainstorm and create analytic arguments.** After reading through the argument you should create analytical arguments (those without evidence). These are common sense responses that let you pick apart the opponents evidence and assumptions.

  3. **Collect evidence you already have against the position.** You can look to a number of places to find answers to whatever position you are defending with your frontline. These include:
     - The “answer section” of the file you are creating a frontline against
     - Your affirmative extension file
     - Files that oppose each other
     - Squad back-files (files from old topics)
4. **Select the best arguments, and place them on the frontline.** Once you have collected all the evidence you need, you are ready to create the frontline. However, you may have more arguments than you have time to read. Thus, you need to pick out the best arguments and create a frontline that you could read in 1-2 minutes. It should include evidence and analytical arguments.

**What Makes a Good Frontline?**
Creating the best possible frontline is essential. If a debater is going to take the time to make arguments in advance, they should get them just right.

- **A diversity of arguments**
  Unless you want to straight-turn a position (straight turn means you only read offense/turns against the position and leave the negative with no way to kick the position) you should include offense and defense in the frontline.

  **Offense:** In sports, offense refers to scoring. In debate, offensive arguments also gain points in a way. Offensive arguments are reasons to vote for you. They are impacts that you are capturing. Advantages are offense for affirmative teams, disadvantages are offense for negatives.

  **Defensive** arguments are those that reduce or mitigate the offense of your opponent’s arguments. If I was debating against an affirmative that claimed to strengthen the U.S. Military I could read evidence that said the U.S. military is already strong enough as a defensive argument.

- **Key arguments first**
  Most frontlines are too long to actually read every argument on them. Therefore, you need to put the most critical arguments first. Think about what arguments you would want to make if you had one minute, two minutes, three minutes, and maybe even four minutes.

- **Make use of 1AC evidence**
  Often, your case will have evidence that answers negative positions. Refer back to evidence you have already read to save time. There is no sense in reading evidence that says the exact same thing when you could be spending that time reading a different argument.

- **Update**
  Good debaters will *alter their frontlines* after each tournament. They will make adjustments based on judge comments and effectiveness. Additionally, debaters should constantly look for better and newer evidence to improve the frontline. How to do new research will be explained later in this Unit.
Economy DA Frontline Example

Budget/Economy DAs are run almost every year. Affirmative teams know there is a good chance that they will need to be able to answer a Budget/Economy DA. Instead of waiting until the middle of a debate round to come up with arguments, teams will prepare blocks that include evidence and analytical arguments. Here is a frontline from last year that shows a good example:

1. The DA is empirically denied. The government has a massive budget, and new programs are added weekly. Just look at the billions we continue to spend on Iraq. Yet, we have never seen new spending cause the disasters their DA predicts.

2. No link. Our plan does not spend enough money to get to the impact of the DA. The federal budget is in the trillions while we spend millions.

3. Non-Unicte. The budget deficit is already increasing from high spending.

Market Watch April 11, 2007
HEADLINE: Record federal spending boosts deficit to $96 billion

WASHINGTON (MarketWatch) -- The U.S. federal government spent more money in March than in any other month ever, the Treasury Department reported Wednesday. The federal budget deficit widened to $96.3 billion in March, compared with $85.3 billion last March, the government said. The deficit was slightly larger than the $95 billion estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

4. The case outweighs because its impacts are certain. By voting affirmative, you know that millions of people will benefit from access to better healthcare as our solution evidence explains. DAs are crazy scenarios full of holes and logical fallacies. The chance that the economy will tank because we added a few million dollars to the budget deficit is very low.

5. Impact Turn. The US needs MORE, not less debt. More spending will help the economy.


We shouldn't reduce debt. In fact, we need more debt—even from stupid borrowers. The right level of debt would be when we've borrowed enough to drive interest rates up, the return down, or a combination of both. Then, we'll be optimal. But we're far from that. The U.S. has $55 trillion in debt of all types—mortgages, car loans, local and federal, according to the Federal Reserve Flow of Funds Accounts. I would argue that tripling all these types of debt would probably get us close to profit maximization and increase wealth for society. Imagine what we could invest in!

6. No threshold. They can never say how much we must spend to trigger the impact.
Class Exercise 13B
Create a Frontline

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3, 4, 5, 6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Direct Objective:
Students will write their own frontline using DKC files.

Supplies:
- Affirmative Case File…including each partner sets preferred 1AC
- Economy DA File
- Photocopy access
- Scissors
- Tape
- Pen
- Blocking Paper

Instructions:
Students will be working with DKC evidence files to locate evidence that can be used to create a frontline against the Spending DA.

1. Tell everyone in the class to take out the Spending DA file. Discuss the DA and make sure everyone understands what it is about.

2. Place the students into pairs. If they have already been placed on teams for tournament competition have them work with their regular debate partner.

3. Review the guide sheet on the next page. It describes the steps the students need to take to create a frontline.

4. Walk around the class and provide assistance to each group as they work on the frontline. This exercise will take at least one class period, possibly two.

5. Once each pair has created a frontline they should share their arguments with the class. The class should discuss what arguments were most popular.

6. Students should turn in the frontlines for a grade. They will be given back to be used in debates.

A great follow up assignment would be to have the students perform the “Overview” exercise from Unit 5 on the Spending DA. You could then do the “DA Debate” exercise from that same Unit.
Class Exercise 13B
Create a Frontline
Guide Sheet

You will be creating a frontline, or prepared list of arguments, against the Spending DA. This frontline could be read in the 2AC to answer the Spending DA after it was read in the INC.

1. Read the Economy DA and discuss it with your partner.

2. Create analytical arguments against the DA and write them in the space below. Look for flaws in the evidence, or common sense attacks that come to mind.

3. Review ALL potentially useful files. Find 4-6 of the best “cards” in those files and make a copy of them.
   The files for your review include:
   - Your 1AC…look for evidence read in the 1AC that can answer the DA
   - Affirmative Case File…focus on the extension evidence from the case you are running
   - Economy DA File…the “affirmative answers” section

4. Make the frontline
   - Discuss the best arguments you have created and decide what order to put them in, beginning with the most important.
   - Take out your supplies…paper, pen, photocopied cards, tape and scissors.
   - Write out and number your responses
   - Cut out photocopied evidence and tape it to the frontline where you need to.
   - You need AT LEAST 6 responses, with AT LEAST 3 cards.
Research Guide

Often, students dislike research because they are unsure of how and where to research. It is easy to get frustrated if you do not know how to research. The key is practice and patience. Once you get the hang of research for speech and debate, you will be amazed at how easy it can be to finish. It’s a lot like riding a bike; you may fall a few times, but once you learn it you will never forget. If you are still having trouble, ask a librarian or your teacher. Think of them as holding the back of your bike until you get your balance.

What am I Looking for?
Research is used to build your knowledge and create arguments for speeches. You are looking for research that develops or supports your arguments and that you are comfortable defending. You are also looking for research that is on topic and offers insights into the subject you are debating or speaking about.

Your research will come in a variety of forms. These forms include:

- **News Articles**… These are shorter stories that focus on key details and facts. They contain short quotes from politicians, experts and other people involved in the story. Most reports try to write objectively - without taking a side. However, be sure to check for follow-up stories to see how a situation, or the understanding of the reporter, has changed.

- **Books**… These are the BEST resource because they are written by experts who put in a great deal of time and effort. Books will offer many insights into the background of an issue.

- **Journal/Magazine Articles**… These are a very good resource. They are timely and well written.

  *Class Discussion: What magazines can you name?*

- **Internet Papers/Articles**… Internet papers can come in many forms. They can be long papers written by experts, or short fact sheets. The important thing to keep in mind is who are the authors and why are they expressing their opinions on the issue. Be careful and watch for bias.

  *Class Discussion: What is bias and how could it affect an article written on the Internet? Example: What type of bias would a Chiefs fan have toward another team, like the Raiders?*

- **Poetry, Music and Movies**… Quoting from poetry and music lyrics in a speech can help build arguments. Poetry and music can offer human insights, tie in emotions and bring arguments to life.
• **Data Sources**… These provide acts and figures that can be used to support your arguments.

**Where to Look**
To find the research you need there are two primary places to go for research:

- The Library
- The Internet

**Researching at the Library**
The books and periodicals that you will find in libraries have some of the best evidence because they are written by experts.

You can go to *your school’s* library, a **public library** or **university libraries**. Your local university library will always have the most information.

**Library Research Tips**

- Use a library-only terminal and perform a keyword search on the library database. Find a book in the search that seems like a good starting point and go find it in the stacks.

- Books are usually grouped by section in the Dewey Decimal System, so where you find one good book, you are likely to find others that will be useful.

- You can also find useful magazines and journals by searching the library database.

- You will need to photocopy sections of the book or magazine you find useful, so bring some change with you to the library. Save money by only photocopying the pages with information you plan to use in a debate round.

- Some libraries will have databases, such as Ebscohost, where you can search for articles electronically.

- If you have any trouble, ask the librarian for assistance.

**Researching on the Internet**
Surfing the Internet can be a fast and easy way to research, but you must know where to look. With so many Internet websites, it is often difficult to find quality material. You cannot quote from any Joe Blow’s web-log or “blog.” You need to find material from trustworthy and qualified sources.

Below is a guide to the information you can access on the Internet. Included will be general research tips, such as search terms to use.
Internet Research Tips

Internet Research Tips

(DKC does not endorse any specific social or political opinion within these publications.)

- **Online Databases**
  The best place to find information online is a database. These are collections of constantly updated publications ranging from news sources such as the *New York Times*.

  Many schools and public libraries have access to these databases. Below are links to some online databases.
  - **Ebscohost**
    (requires a subscription…check your school)
  - **Political Information**

- **Search Engines**
  Search engines electronically filter through millions of websites based on the search terms you type.

  Today, the most commonly used search engine is *Google*. Other search engines exist and can be useful. A short list is provided below:
  - **Google** [www.google.com/](http://www.google.com/)
  - **Google Scholar** [http://scholar.google.com/](http://scholar.google.com/)
  - **MetaCrawler** [http://www.metacrawler.com/](http://www.metacrawler.com/)
  - **Yahoo** [http://www.yahoo.com/](http://www.yahoo.com/)
  - **Ask** [http://www.ask.com/](http://www.ask.com/)

---

**What Search Terms to Use**

When you search on a special database or with an Internet search engine, you are performing a keyword search. The text you type in the search box is the exact text that will be searched for on the internet. The search engine will filter through all available material and look for the key words.

**Start with the general and then get more specific.**

If I was researching for a evidence against wind energy I might start with a general search on “wind” and “energy” and “United States.” Such a search will retrieve hundreds, if not thousands of pages of information on the basic topic of national service.

**Look for repeated phrases or words in the most useful information to find more specific search terms.**

As you research key terms may start to reappear. If you researched wind energy you would find several articles about problems with noise and complaints from people living around wind farms. You could get more specific, search for all the information you can find about noise problems and develop a researched argument.
• **Think Tanks**
  Thinks tanks are not made of people who think while riding in tanks! They are collections of so-called “experts” who write their opinions on various issues. Though some people question the objectivity of many Think Tanks, the evidence they produce can be quite useful in speech and debate. The US Congress often quotes evidence and uses arguments developed in Think Tanks.

  o The Websites Below Contain Extensive Think Tank Lists:
    http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/psthink.html
    http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/politics/thnktank.htm
    http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Think_tanks

• **Domestic and International Internet News Publications**
  The Internet is filled with online news publications that provide up-to-the-minute news. A daily scanning of these publications can be useful as you look for any new speech and debate ideas.

  o Common Online News Sources
    The Kansas City Star http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/
    National Public Radio http://www.npr.org/
    The Washington Times...http://www.washingtontimes.com/

• **Government**
  The U.S. federal government has numerous websites that publish reports and studies, along with updates on government activity. Scanning through various government websites can provide detailed and direct information.

  o Links to Government Resources by the University of Michigan
    Michigan Resources...http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/
  o FirstGov: The Official Website of the US Government
    http://www.firstgov.gov/

• **General Knowledge Sources**
  Sometimes you just need the facts. You can find dictionaries, fact books and encyclopedias online throughout the web.

  o Nation Master (Global Nation Data Comparison)
    http://www.nationmaster.com/
  o CIA World Factbook:
  o MSN Encarta http://encarta.msn.com/
  o Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page
  o Merriam Webster Dictionary http://www.m-w.com/
  o Mooter http://www.mooter.com/
  o Ask.com http://www.ask.com
Evaluating the Research
Once you locate an article or book that appears helpful, you need to know how to evaluate it. Below are more specific tips for evaluating your research.

What to Find
- **Problems, Causes and Solutions**
  As you read, think about the problems, causes and solutions identified in the research. Good research will identify the problems relating to your topic. It will weigh the problems’ importance and identify causes. The best evidence will provide comprehensive solutions.

- **Recent Facts**
  News stories and brief commentaries will provide facts and figures about the problems, solutions and histories of the topics you research.

- **Explanations and Examples**
  For an issue to be understood, it must be clearly explained. Authors should go beyond one sentence statements. Additionally, examples can help take ideas and make them practical. Good examples can be used to build arguments.

- **Useable/Quotable Paragraphs**
  As you read, look for sections of the research that sound sweet out loud. Not all authors write text that becomes very persuasive when directly quoted in speeches. But the ones who do will greatly improve your arguments.

What to Avoid
- **Outdated Material**
  You should be aware of articles more than few years old. They could be outdated. This is especially true with facts, statistics and newspaper reports.

- **Too Much History**
  If the article or book mainly focuses on history and makes few connections to present polices, then it may not be useful.

- **Academic Studies... get to the Conclusion**
  Some books and articles will include long studies and explanations of those studies. The raw data, variable discussion, etc., will not be very useful to read in a speech. Despite the valuable information included, even academics rarely quote this material. Look for the best quotes in the conclusions of academic studies.

- **Unwarranted Claims**
  “Because I said so” is frustrating to hear from your parents. It’s even more frustrating to hear in speech or debate research. Any claim made in an article (or in a speech!) must be supported by clarifying sentences known as warrants.
Class Exercise 13C

How to Build a Negative Case File

This project will meet the following standards:

MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

What is a negative case file?

It is a file that contains all the necessary arguments to effectively debate against a particular affirmative case. It will have evidence to answer inherency, harms, and solvency (problem, cause and solution). It will also provide links for common disadvantages, counter-plans and Kritiks. It is usually 20-50 pages in length.

The file can be made to answer one very specific case that a particular team is running, or it can cover an entire case area (A case area on the civil liberties topic would be the Patriot Act or Immigration). Files that cover entire case areas are usually longer than files designed to answer one specific affirmative case.

How to create a negative case file:

1. Pick the affirmative case to answer.
   This sounds simple enough, but you need to pick a case that you could debate several times throughout the year. If a few teams in your area are running similar cases, those cases would be an excellent choice. You can also look at what teams will be at your next tournament and prepare for those cases. The key is to pick a case that you plan on debating several times. You can never be certain what case you will debate, but you can make an educated guess.

2. Get the affirmative case outline, plan and evidence cites.
   The more information you have on a case, the better. If you have debated the case you are preparing a file to answer, then you can use old flows to create the outline of the case and the plan. It is a good habit to write down not just the case outline from your flows, but to copy down the affirmative evidence sources after you debate them. Use the negatives evidence cites to look up their research. Often, affirmative articles have negative evidence within them. Reading their evidence will also allow you understand their argument better. It is crucial that you understand the affirmative argument to effectively answer it. It is a good idea to include an outline of the affirmative case in your negative file. This way, you will have their case in front of you before the affirmative even reads the 1AC.

3. Gather evidence from pre-existing files.
   You should have several files in your possession already that contain useful evidence. You should sort through all the evidence you already have and select pieces of evidence relating to the case you are answering.

4. Start researching the case.
   The previous pages, with the Library and Internet research tips, should guide you.
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5. The file should include the following arguments:

- **Cause/Inherency Answers**
  Inherency/cause answers are usually the smallest part of a negative case file. This is because inherency attacks can contradict other positions. You cannot argue that the affirmative plan is happening now and say that if the affirmative plan passed it would cause all kinds of problems.

Despite the potential problems, you should include a section in your file that answers affirmative inherency/cause claims. The best type of cause/inherency answers include research that says:

- Programs other than the affirmative proposal already exist and are solving problems in the status quo.
- Other institutions beyond the federal government, such as the states or non profit organizations, are already working.
- A cause other than one identified by the affirmative is more important.

- **Harms/Problem/Advantage Answers**
  This section of your file will answer the affirmative impact claims. These impacts are also called harms/problems/advantages. This section will have evidence that says the problems identified by the affirmative are over-stated and misunderstood.

Here are some arguments you should try to find as you research:

- Evidence that says the status quo is working to solve the problems already.
- Research stating affirmative authors have over-hyped the problems.
- Evidence that uses historical comparisons to make affirmative problems empirically denied.
- Data or facts that contradict affirmative claims.
- Evidence saying some other problem matters more.
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- **Solution/Solvency Answers**
  On the negative, it is your job to give reasons why the plan will not solve. Some common solvency attacks are listed below.

  - Evidence stating another factor that the affirmative cannot solve is the real cause of the problem (Alternate Causality)
  - Evidence claiming that plans such as theirs have been used before, but failed.
  - Research stating that the affirmative will actually make the problem worse. (Case Turn)
  - Evidence about similar proposals that have failed.

- **Links to Generic Arguments**
  Your file should have a section that contains link to generic arguments. Generic arguments can be run against many cases. The link allows you to make the argument more specific to the affirmative case.

  - Links to Disadvantages.
  - Links to Counter-plans.
  - Links to Kritiks.

- **Case Specific Off-case Arguments**
  Sometimes you will find enough evidence to support a specific off-case argument against the affirmative you are researching. This can take the form of:

  - Disadvantages
  - Counter-plans
  - Topicalities
  - Kritiks
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6. Putting it all together

- Organize evidence and arguments into groups.
  This step is pretty simple. Just put all your harms cards in one group, all of your solvency cards in one pile, etc. This will help you as you organize the file.

- Put all evidence on similar blocking paper and label it.
  Once you have the cards grouped, put them into a useful debate form by adding them to blocking paper.

Recall that an evidence block includes:

- School or organization name in one corner
- File name in the middle
  - Below the file name is the specific block page label
- Date in one corner
- File author(s) name(s) in one corner
- File page number for the purpose of indexing

Block Example…see page 169

6. Putting it all together…continued

- Number all pages and index them
  At this point, you should have every card on blocks, labeled and ready to use in a debate round. The last step is numbering and indexing. You should have the pages grouped together by argument. Once you have all the pages in a sensible order, number the pages. Then, use those page numbers to create an index.

Example: Let’s say the first five pages of the file are harms answers. The next section, pages six through fourteen, is solvency answers. On the index, you would put the following:

  Harms answers……………….1-5
  Solvency……………….6-14

7. What does the final product include?

- Case outline (if you have it)
- Inherency answers
- Harms/Advantage answers
- Solvency frontline and extensions
- Links to generic arguments…(example below missing links)
- Case specific DAs, Ts, CPs (if you have them)

Index Example…see page 170
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Make Your Case

How to Build and an Affirmative 1AC & Extension

This project will meet the following standards:

MO: Show- Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

The following pages will guide you through the process of creating an affirmative case. Times for discussion should involve the entire class. Research should be done individually at first, with all debaters investigating cases.

Step 1. Gut Reaction, Discussion & Brainstorming

This year’s resolution is:

**The resolution for 2009-10 is:** Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

Think about your Gut or initial reaction to what this resolution means and how you could approach the topic. Discuss this response with your teammates and coach.

During the discussion you can consider the following questions about this year’s resolution:

**Class Discussion:** Ask the following questions:

- Who is the actor in the resolution?
  - What branch of the government deals with energy?
  - What government agencies would be involved and how do they function?

- What must the actor do or support in order to be topical?
  - What type of law and by whom? The President? Congress? Local?

- What would be the relative cost?

- What history is the topic associated with?
  - What do you know about government social service programs?
  - What progress has been made in reducing poverty in the history of the country?

- What concepts, ideologies, and philosophies are embedded in the resolution?

- How does the topic relate to other issues?

- How does the topic relate to me?
  - How do you relate with poverty?
  - Could you personally do something about poverty?

© 2009 DEBATE–Kansas City – All Rights Reserved.
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Brainstorming:
Create a list of affirmative research areas. Based on your discussion and responses to the above questions, begin a brainstorming session about possible affirmative cases. You should brainstorm as a group to create a list of affirmative case areas. From this list you can find a case that interests you. Remember, during the brainstorming no idea is bad, let your ideas flow and then pick the best.

Class Brainstorming: Here some topics to consider as you brainstorm about possible affirmative case areas:

- What problem areas are associated with poverty?
  - What problem areas would you enjoy researching?
  - What problem area would have good research?
- What do you like most about social service programs?
- What ideas associated with poverty do you support?
  - Are their any political ideologies or philosophies you support?
  - Can you think of assistance programs that sound useful for society?
- What solutions can you find?

Step 2. Research Wave One…preliminary reading
After you have listed a number of interesting case areas, based on your gut reaction to the topic, you are ready to learn from the literature.

- **Start with the General**: You should begin by reading general information on the topic.
  - Search Terms: poverty, United States and social services.
    - Use the Research Guide
  - See the national topic paper.

- **Investigate your Interests**: Once you have read some general information about national service, consider what interested you the most. You are going to start reading about the parts of the topic that interest you most.
  - Use terms from your reading to create more specific searches
  - Find titles of programs you might want to support
  - Research specific changes to the law
  - Research a problem area that interested you
  - Are there programs you could get involved with or create?
  - What steps would you need to take to create your own project?
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Step 3. Pick the Case
At this point you have thought through and researched the topic. You should have looked into several potential cases, some with more detail than others. Your research should give you a new perspective on the topic, one that goes beyond your gut reaction.

- **List as a Team:** Everyone should list the case ideas they found through their research. The group should discuss what ideas they liked most and why.
  - Consider the following as you discuss case ideas:
    - What case idea is most exciting and sounds like the most fun to defend?
    - What case ideas would our judging pool support?
    - What case idea will have the best available research?
    - How easy will the research be to find?
    - Do we want our case to be something we could actually do?
    - What matters most: local, national or international issues?

- **Pick Research Teams:** After all case ideas have been listed and discussed; the debate team needs to organize research teams to create full affirmative case files.
  - **Research Team Options:**
    - *Create one Case as a Class:* In this option the class votes on case idea to become a project for the class. Each part of the affirmative research would be divided up amongst the entire class.
    - *Research Groups:* In this option, groups of 4-8 debaters pick a case to research. Research tasks would be split up amongst the group.
    - *Debate Partner Research Pairs:* Each pair of debate partners would write their own case.

Step 4. Create the File
Finally, you will be creating the end product. This size of your research group will dictate how much and what research you will need to do. This final section will detail everything your affirmative case will need to be complete.

- **Read EVERYTHING You Can Find on the Case.** You need to research every place can, read every article, book, or report on your case. Use the *Research Guide* to help you.

- **Cut EVERYTHING You Read.** As you read through your research, you will to turn it into cards. You need to cut both Affirmative and Negative cards. Anything that could be a card should be saved.
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- **Put the Cards in Piles.** Each person in the research group should bring all their cards together. The group should organize the cards by creating piles of similar cards.
  - Below are some possible pile categories:
    - Problems/Harms
    - Solvency
    - Cause/Inherency
    - Negative
    - Disadvantage Answers
    - Topicality Answers
    - Counter-plan Answers
    - Kritik Answers

- **Evaluate the Piles.** After you have organized all of your evidence, evaluate it. You need see what holes might remain and you need to select the best cards to create the 1AC.
  - Below is a list of evidence you will need for your case:
    - 1AC
    - Problems/Harms Extensions
    - Solvency Extensions
    - Cause/Inherency Extensions
    - Disadvantage Answers
    - Counter-plan Answers
    - Kritik Answers
    - Negative Section

After looking at this list and evaluating your evidence, perform any remaining research.

- **Write the 1AC.** Once all the evidence is collected you need to write the 1AC. You can review DKC provided 1AC’s as examples.

- **Make the File.** If the 1AC is written all remaining evidence should placed on blocks and then indexed. The file should include the elements listed above. The beginning of this Unit explained what evidence blocks and indexes look like.
Unit 14: Appendix

This Unit contains various class exercises, guide sheets and presentation notes. The material, aside from the “DKC Useful Links” is largely targeted for advanced debaters.

Unit Focus:

DEBATE Kansas City Links

Read, Question and Attack the 1AC

Block that Case

Group Research: DA

Make a Case List

Impact Comparison
# DEBATE Kansas City Useful Links

## Websites to Help Generate Topics for Debate

- **Debate Article Database by the International Debate Education Association**
  
  [http://www.idebate.org/debatabase/](http://www.idebate.org/debatabase/)

- **Policy Debate Research over Past Debate Topics (University of Vermont)**
  
  [http://debate.uvm.edu/](http://debate.uvm.edu/)

- **Parliamentary Debate Topics** at Debate Central (Vermont)
  
  [http://debate.uvm.edu/parlitopics.html](http://debate.uvm.edu/parlitopics.html)

- **Current Events**
  - Google Current Events
    
    [http://directory.google.com/Top/News/Current_Events](http://directory.google.com/Top/News/Current_Events)
  - KidsNews
    
    [http://sp.askforkids.com/docs/askforkids/help/tours/newsresources.htm](http://sp.askforkids.com/docs/askforkids/help/tours/newsresources.htm)

## Introductions to Debate

- **Policy Debate Demonstration Videos with Flows and Supplemental Materials**
  
  - National Association of Urban Debate Leagues
    
    [http://www.naudl.org/resources?category=Policy%20Debate%20Instruction|Demo%20Debates](http://www.naudl.org/resources?category=Policy%20Debate%20Instruction|Demo%20Debates)

- **Sample Debate Videos of all Types**
  
  - Debate Central (University of Vermont)
    
    [http://debate.uvm.edu/watchdebate.html](http://debate.uvm.edu/watchdebate.html)

- **Explanation of Multiple Debate Formats, Including Individual Events**
  
  - International Debate Association
    
  - Debate Central (University of Vermont)
    
    [http://debate.uvm.edu/learndebate.html](http://debate.uvm.edu/learndebate.html)

## Debate Resources

- **Planet Debate**
  

- **National Debate Coaches Association**
  
  [http://debatecoaches.org/](http://debatecoaches.org/)
**Search Engines**

Google  
www.google.com

Metacrawler  
http://www.metacrawler.com/

**Databases**

Ebscohost  
http://ejournals.ebsco.com/login.asp?bCookiesEnabled=TRUE

Political Information  
http://www.politicalinformation.com/

*Also look for Lexis Nexis and Infotrack at your school or a local library*

**Think Tanks**

The Websites Below Contain Extensive Think Tank Lists:  
http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/psthink.html  
http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/politics/thnktank.htm  
http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Think_tanks

**Domestic and International Internet News Publications**  
(DEBATE-Kansas City does endorse any specific social or political opinion within these publications)

Aljazeera  
http://english.aljazeera.net/HomePage

C-SPAN  
www.c-span.org/resources/media.asp

The Christian Science Monitor  
http://www.csmonitor.com/

The Kansas City Star  
http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/

KCUR Kansas City National Public Radio  
http://www.kcur.org

National Public Radio  
http://www.npr.org/

The New York Times  
www.nytimes.com

The Washington Post  
http://www.washingtonpost.com/

The Washington Times  
http://www.washingtontimes.com/
Government

All Purpose Government Information
- Michigan Resources  
  http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/

President  
  http://www.whitehouse.gov/

Congress  
  http://www.house.gov/  
  http://www.senate.gov/

Supreme Court  
  www.supremecourtus.gov/

Legal News  
- Findlaw  
  www.findlaw.com  
- Legal Information Institute  
  www.law.cornell.edu

General Knowledge Sources

Sources for Facts  
- Fact Monster  
  www.factmonster.com  
- Reference Desk  
  www.refdesk.com  
- Nation Master  
  www.nationmaster.com

Encyclopedia  
- Altapedia  
  www.altapedia.com

Dictionary and Thesaurus  
- One Look  
  www.onelook.com  
- Merriam Webster  
  www.m-w.com/home.htm

Public and Social Policy Facts  
- Understanding USA  
  www.understandingusa.com  
- Justice Learning  
  www.justicelearning.com
Poverty Topic Links

Poverty Topic News
http://debate-central.ncpa.org/research/poverty-topic-news

Poverty Search Engine
http://www.google.com/coop/cse?cx=005297658902504136197:fqnr0fhhtdm

Poverty Forum
http://www.thepovertyforum.org/

Poverty and Race Research Action Council
http://www.prrac.org/

Tim Wise – Works About Race
http://www.redroom.com/blog/tim-wise/this-your-nation-white-privilege

Poor New Network
http://www.poormagazine.org/

National Poverty Center
http://www.npc.umich.edu/poverty/

Institute for Poverty Research
http://www.northwestern.edu/ipr/

Urban Institute
http://www.endpoverty2015.org/

Understanding Poverty – Heritage Foundation
http://www.heritage.org/Research/Welfare/bg1796.cfm

Cost of Poverty – Center for American Progress

Poverty, Work and Policy – Brookings Institute

Department of Housing and Urban Development
http://www.hud.gov/

Child Welfare
http://www.childwelfare.gov/

National Institute of Heath
http://www.nih.gov/

Working Poor Project
http://www.workingpoorfamilies.org/

Spotlight on Poverty
http://www.spotlightonpoverty.org/
Class Exercise 14A

Read, Question and Attack the 1AC

Standards Met:

MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will question and attack each others cases to help prepare for negative attacks and better their affirmative cases.

Supplies:
- Each team will need a completed 1AC
- Pen
- Paper

Instructions:
1. Have each team read their 1AC to the class. (This assumes that each varsity team has developed their own 1AC.) Everyone in the class should flow the 1AC and write down arguments that point out flaws in the case.

2. Have each student in the class ask one question about the case. The affirmative will get a chance to respond to each question. Questions can only be only asked once.

3. Have each student ask a second question.

4. Have students ask the team any other questions they might have.

5. The affirmative team should write down questions and arguments for which they have poor answers.

6. You should take notes for each case, writing down possible holes, and follow-up with each team individually to improve their case.
Class Exercise 14B
Block that Case

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will work together as a class to come up with arguments against a particular affirmative case.

Supplies:
- Outline or complete version of an affirmative case another school in the area is running
- Pen
- Paper
- Tubs with negative evidence

Instructions:
1. Read the outline (unless they have the complete version) of a 1AC run by a local oppositional school. Students should flow as the outline is read.

2. Give students a chance to look through their files and come up with arguments against the case.

3. Lead a class discussion about the best arguments to make against the case. The following could be considered:
   - What off-case arguments should be read (DA, CP, K, etc.)?
   - Should the off-case arguments include a counter-plan or Kritik?
   - How will the strategy change depending on the judge?
   - What arguments should be made against the case?
   - What research may be needed to adequately answer the case?

5. Lead a point by point blocking of the case itself, with students writing down the negative arguments on the flow to save and use when they hit the case.

6. Have every student create a strategy for blocking the case. Instruct them to include the case outline with the strategy guide. Let them know that they should select two to five off-case arguments—such as two disadvantages with strong links—and write those options down in the strategy guide.
Class Exercise 14C

Group Research: DA

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will create a disadvantage through original research and teamwork

Supplies:
- Access to research
- Access to current debate evidence
- Pen
- Paper
- Tape
- Scissors

Description:
The instructor will divide the class into research groups that will construct useful disadvantages for the current debate topic. Students will need to be comfortable with the basics of disadvantages, know how to research, and have a reasonable amount of knowledge on the current topic.

Instructions:
1. Brainstorm over generic disadvantages the students would like have for the negative side. Create a list of 5-10 disadvantages.

2. Divide the class into groups of around five students, and assign each group a leader to help delegate research. This leader (an advanced debater) will be responsible for the final product.

3. Have each group select a disadvantage from the list and create a full file for it. The file should include:
   - A shell
   - An explanation page that gives a brief summary of the argument and the file
   - An overview that could be read in the 2NC
   - Uniqueness extension evidence
   - Link extension evidence
   - Impact extension evidence
   - An index

To create the file the groups should take the following steps:

1. Discuss the disadvantage and brainstorm over what kind of evidence they will need.

2. Look through their current files and see if they already have a camp or handbook version of the argument. They should copy any evidence that is useful.
Class Exercise 14C

Group Research: DA

3. Assign research responsibilities to each person. On person may do link work, another may focus on the impacts.

4. Do the research and process the evidence.

5. Collect all the evidence from original research and other sources and place it into groups.

6. Sort through the evidence to find the best evidence for the shell.

7. Put the remaining evidence onto blocks/briefs.

8. Assemble the file and create an index.

9. Share the file with the rest of the class—providing an explanation of how to use and answer any questions.
Exercise 14D

Make a Case List

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective:
Students will document the cases they debate throughout the year and create case file.

Supplies:
- Computer
- Flow/Outline of cases faced

Note: To make this happen, you will need to require that EVERY debater save their flows after each debate round. When students return from tournaments, their flows will be used to create the case list.

Instructions:
1. Select one or more debaters to help create a list of every affirmative case that the team has debated.

2. After the first debate tournament, collect all flows for participation points.

3. Turn the flows over to a student who is in charge of creating the case list. This can be the same person all year, or the responsibility could rotate.

4. This person will include the name of the team, and outline of the case and any evidence cites that were written down. On the next page you find an example of a case list template.

5. The student will make enough copies of every case for the class and distribute them to the students.
Exercise

Make a Case List

Tournament:

Opponent school name and code:

Plan text:

Case Outline (you are encouraged to include evidence cites):

Key evidence citations:

Did they do anything tricky or unordinary?
Impact Comparison

Good debaters can handle line-by-line arguments, avoid dropping key arguments, and speak with a degree of persuasion. Great debaters can do all of those things and something else that is even more critical in advanced policy rounds: impact comparison.

What is Impact Comparison?

When students first start debating, they attempt to convince the judge that they are winning every single argument in the round. However, it is extraordinarily rare that one team can beat the other so badly. In reality, most debate rounds are close, with both sides winning some arguments and losing others. Impact comparison happens when a debater compares the arguments and weighs the impacts they are winning to ones that their opponent could be winning. They explain why their impacts are more important.

Impact comparison requires a degree of maturity and realism. A debater will need to objectively evaluate the debate round, consider which arguments they are winning, which they are losing, and then make the necessary arguments to prove that the arguments they are winning matter most.

Impact is the ultimate outcome of an argument. When impacts are being compared, the uniqueness and links are shortchanged for a moment. If you can win that your impact is drastically more important than the impact of your opponent, uniqueness and link will matter a little less.

**Example:** One team runs an affirmative case that claims to prevent one million deaths. The other team runs a politics disadvantage that has a nuclear war impact. Clearly, the nuclear war impact is bigger. The disadvantage is shown to have some link problems, but it has not been completely taken out. Even if the judge believes that the case will solve, they might vote on a smaller risk of the DA because the impact of nuclear war is so much bigger. This is called *impact calculus*.

Impact Calculus and Cost-Benefit-Analysis

In policy debate, many judges use cost-benefit-analysis to compare the teams in a round and decide the winner. This simply means that the judge will compare the benefits and costs of each side, weigh them, and pick the side that has the greatest benefit with the least cost. We make many decisions in life in the same way.

**Example:** You are very hungry on a cold night. You have nothing more than PBJ to eat at home, and you could really go for a juicy hamburger. You really don’t want to go out in the cold, and you would have to ride the bus, which might require a ten minute wait in the cold. Plus, you only have $1.50 in change. You might decide that PBJ, even though it does not have the greatest reward, is the better option because of all the costs that go along with getting a hamburger on a cold night with limited funds.
Many judges use a kind of numeric system for their impact calculus. They will look at the end impact and come up with a percentage for how likely it is to come true. If an affirmative case has held relatively solid and is claiming to save 500,000 lives a year, the judge might think that there is a 70-80% chance that voting affirmative will save 500,000 lives. That means it will surely save 200,000 lives because it is a systemic impact (see below). The judge might have to compare that impact to a DA being ran by the negative with a nuclear war impact. If the negative had some trouble extending the DA, there might be a 5% risk that DA would happen. The judge would have to compare a 70-80% percent chance of saving lives (and really a definite saving of a few million lives because it is a systemic impact) to the 5% risk of nuclear war. One could make compelling arguments on each side of the comparison.

**Class Discussion:** Would you vote for a plan that would save at least 200,000 lives with a 75% chance saving 5 million even if there was a 5% chance it would cause a nuclear war?

**Impacts Types:**

1. **Systemic**
   In the previous example, systemic impacts were mentioned, but what are they? A systemic impact is one that happens through an entire system or structure on a regular basis. Pollution, for example, is a systemic harm in the United States because each year it causes damage throughout the country. Disease is another systemic impact. Systemic impacts are guaranteed, there is very little risk involved.

2. **One Shot**
   One-shot impacts are the opposite of systemic impacts. They are temporary and usually time sensitive. They are heavily based on risk. If a negative team ran a spending disadvantage that said the plan would cause a US economic collapse, it would be a one shot impact. One shot impacts usually end in some sort of big nasty war. However, if there is a low risk of the one shot impact, it may not compare favorably to a systemic impact. A more compelling impact is one that ends in a nasty war, but is claimed to be inevitable.

3. **Inevitable**
   Inevitable impacts are based on predictions. An affirmative team might claim that war will inevitably break out if we do not adopt their policy. This gives the impact substantially more weight than the one shot impact because the impact becomes a certainty, just like the systemic impact. However, the inevitable impact is usually much bigger than the systemic impact. This type of impact has become very popular in advanced debate rounds.

4. **Moral (Moral Obligation)**
   Some people find risk calculus a bit too harsh. Weighing death totals can sound a little morbid. Some impacts add a whole new element to decision calculus: morality. These impacts claim that certain values must be upheld, regardless of potential cost. If a plan reduces racism, the affirmative claim that there is a moral obligation to reject and reduce racism whenever possible. Weighing moral claims versus consequential impacts can be challenging for debaters and judges.
Class Exercise 14E

Pick the Impact

Standards Met:
MO: Show-Me Goals 1-4, Communication Arts 1, 3-6
KS: Reading Standard 1, Communication Arts Listening, Viewing & Speaking

Objective: Students will learn the difference between impact types.

Supplies:
- Pen
- Paper
- List of impacts

Instructions:
Instruct students to label the following list of impacts as one-shot, systemic, inevitable or moral.

Students can work individually, as a group, or the exercise can be done through class discussion.

Impact Claim (Some will require a little set-up to provide the necessary context):

1. A disadvantage claims that the plan will trigger a war between the U.S. and another country.
2. An affirmative claiming we must always act to stop the evils of terrorism.
3. A Kritik claiming that racism will lead to extinction if we fail to solve it.
4. A disadvantage claims that the plan increases pollution.
5. An affirmative claiming that, without liberty, life is not worth living.
6. A disadvantage claiming that the plan will cause a civil war in the U.S.
7. An advantage that claims, without the new policy of the plan, tension between the U.S. and another nation will cause a war.
8. An advantage claiming millions of people have their rights violated every year.
9. A disadvantage impact extension claiming that we must always avoid nuclear war, because it is the ultimate evil.
10. A disadvantage claiming that the plan will cause the balance of federalism to shift in the US, reduce liberty, and make policies less effective.

Key: one shot: 1, 6; inevitable: 3, 5, 7; systemic: 4, 8, 10 moral: 2, 9.
Talking Debate

**Offensive Arguments**—Reasons to vote for you. They are impacts that you are capturing. Advantages are offense for affirmative teams, disadvantages are offense for negatives. If the affirmative can turn a disad, it becomes offense for the affirmative.

**Cost-Benefit Analysis**—Comparing the benefits and costs of each side, weighing them, and selecting the side that has the greatest benefit with the least cost.

**Defensive Arguments**—Are the arguments that reduce or mitigate the offense of your opponent’s arguments.

**Impact Calculus**—The system the judge uses to evaluate the impacts in a debate round.

**Impact Comparison**—When debaters compare the arguments and weigh the impacts, they are winning ones that their opponent could be winning. They explain why their impacts are more important.

**Negative Case File**—Contains all the necessary arguments to effectively debate against a particular affirmative case.

**Straight-Turn**—Only reading offense/turns against the position and leaving the negative with no way to kick the position.

**Systemic Impact**—An impact that happens through an entire system or structure on a regular basis.
Kansas Standards

http://www.ksde.org/outcomes/lvsstd.html

- **Listening**: Listening is the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages. People apply different listening skills depending on whether their goal is to comprehend information, critique and evaluate a message, or appreciate a performance.

- **Viewing**: Viewing is the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to objects, images, sounds, and words. People apply different viewing skills for different purposes: to understand information, critique and evaluate a message, or appreciate a performance.

- **Speaking**: Speaking is the act or process of transmitting and exchanging information, ideas, and emotions using oral language. Whether in daily interactions or in more formal settings, communicators are required to organize coherent messages, deliver them clearly, and adapt to their listeners.

http://www.ksde.org/outcomes/lvsstd4192006.doc
Missouri Standards

http://dese.mo.gov/standards/

Performance Goals

Goal 1 -- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to gather, analyze and apply information and ideas.

Goal 2 -- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.

Goal 3 -- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to recognize and solve problems.

Goal 4 -- Students in Missouri public schools will acquire the knowledge and skills to make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

Communication Arts

1. Speaking and writing in Standard English (including grammar, usage, punctuation, spelling, and capitalization).

2. Reading and evaluating fiction, poetry and drama.

3. Reading and evaluating nonfiction works and material (such as biographies, newspapers and technical manuals).

4. Writing formally (such as reports, narratives and essays) and informally (such as outlines and notes).

5. Comprehending and evaluating the content and artistic aspects of oral and visual presentations (such as story-telling, debates, lectures and multi-media productions).

6. Participating in formal and informal presentations and discussions of issues and ideas.

7. Identifying and evaluating relationships between language and culture.