

Basic Policy Overview

Side note from your pal Hailey: So I'm making this cheat sheet for anyone confused in case Trenton confuses everyone with his big words. I've done half a year of novice and half a year of varsity, so I'm not really super experienced but hopefully this will help you get a basic idea of what we're doing. DON'T LISTEN TO TRENTON WHEN HE SAYS "OHHH NO WORRIES YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO BE CONFUSED :D" BECAUSE THAT'S BULLSHIT AND I WANT EVERYONE TO FEEL SOMEWHAT PREPARED. Policy seems hella hard but it's just all the terminology you need to learn and you'll seem scary and confusing just like everyone else in no time. Just remember you always have generic arguments to go off of so as long as you have a basic idea of how to use them you'll be okay. Also realize that you will always be able to see your opponent's cases in rounds, and you are responsible for flashing (USB flash drive) each other a copy of your cases.

Here's a link to a traditional AFF case this year, don't worry it's not that scary. Just use this to try and point out the different pieces of a case for practice on the 1AC part of the file:

<http://openev.debatecoaches.org/bin/download/2015/Wake/ADT%20AFF%20-%20Wake%202015.docx>

Speech Times:

- 1AC - 8 min
- CX - 2NC asks 1AC - 3 min
- 1NC - 8 min
- CX - 1AC asks 1NC - 3 min
- 2AC - 8 min
- CX - 1NC asks 2AC - 3 min
- 2NC - 8 min
- CX - 2AC asks 2NC - 3 min
- 1NR - 5 min
- 1AR - 5 min
- 2NR - 5 min
- 2AR - 5 min

In Round:

- Speak to your JUDGE, not to your opponent in your speeches
- **Speaker Points:** These are points awarded for politeness, speaking skill, clarity, etc. Based on a 0-30 (usually 20-30) point scale, 30 being the best.
- Don't be a bitch to your opponents, be polite. @Kaylynn you barnyard animal.
- You may want to ask your judge for their experience, what they look for, how much prep time they give, and if they do tag team CX. This is okay but don't hammer them with questions or they might give you bad Speaker Points.

Basic Speech Structures:

- 1AC (First Affirmative Constructive) - This speech is used to introduce the Affirmative teams' initial case. A basic traditional AFF case goes over Inherency, 2-3 Advantages, and Solvency. Many teams put Solvency first just to make sure they read it in time, but you should aim to be prepared enough to get through your full speech with no worries.
- 1NC (First Negative Constructive) - This speech introduces the NEG strat (strategy), which can be off-case or on-case. You will want to give the judge a road map explaining the order of your arguments so they can flow properly and so you don't look like an idiot. A basic roadmap would be "2 Off-Case, in the order of CP (Counterplan) then DA (Disadvantage), then On-Case in the order of Solvency, Food Advantage, and Economy Advantage if time will allow." From here you'll attack with On-Case and Off-case arguments. On-Case means arguments the AFF has made in their 1AC, such as the Inherency, Advantages, or Solvency. Off-Case means arguments that don't directly attack the 1AC arguments, like a CP or a Disad.
- 2AC (Second Affirmative Constructive) - This is your chance to not only counter arguments made by the NEG, but also bring up any new ones you may have. **You can only bring up new arguments in the Constructive speeches. If your opponents even tries to bring up new arguments in the Rebuttals PLEASE call them out in your next speech saying something like, "Judge, the NEG is bringing up new arguments in the Rebuttals which is unfair to the AFF, making it nearly impossible for us to win and ruining our education."** You'll want to spend most of your time countering the NEG anyway, which can be tricky because **the AFF should not drop any points made by the NEG.** A lot of the time one argument you make will counter several arguments made by the NEG, in which case you can say that they **cross-apply. Make sure your judge knows that, because the judge will only consider things you tell them, and won't make assumptions for your benefit.**
- 2NC (Second Negative Constructive) - This is the NEG's final chance to bring up any new arguments they may have, but you should mainly focus on strengthening your current arguments and pointing out any that the AFF hasn't addressed properly. If you bring up for example, "If the AFF uses this much money, our country will go into debt," and the AFF never addresses that, then you should **tell the judge that the argument was dropped, meaning for the sake of the round, the country will go into debt no matter what if the AFF goes through with their plan.** This could be a winning argument, so make sure the judge knows it was DROPPED in the 2AC, meaning the AFF can't bring it up again. Carry an argument like this through the rebuttals, and this may just be a voting issue that will win you the debate.
- 1NR (First Negative Rebuttal) - Notice that the NEG gets two arguments in a row. This is called the NEG block. The NEG block should be evenly split between you and your partner. For example, the 2NC could take the Off-Case arguments, and the 1NR could take the On-Case arguments. If you do bring up any new arguments, make sure the 2NC handles them. Though I suggest you don't bring up a brand new CP, DA, Topicality, or some sort of long Off-Case argument in the 2NC because this is a bit rude and makes you look like a douche, and your opponents may call you out on it.

- 1AR - (First Affirmative Rebuttal) - This is arguably the hardest speech of the entire debate. The 1AR has the burden of answering the 2NC's 8 minute speech as well as the 1NR's 5 minute speech all in 5 minutes. Now, if your opponents bring up way too many things for you to answer then you COULD argue that it's an unfair time skew favoring the NEG, aka you don't have enough time to answer these arguments, OR you could skim through the arguments as best you can. You don't want to spend too much time on one argument, but rather decide which arguments are most significant in the debate and hit hardest on those, spending as little of time possible on the rest.
- 2NR - (Second Negative Rebuttal) - This is your final chance to decide which arguments you're winning, and which arguments are weak and really only used to make the AFF struggle with time. If you're losing a CP but winning a DA, you can "kick-out" of a CP by telling your judge that, and hitting hard on the DA. This is the argument that you will want to most prepare your offense against the AFF's last rebuttal. Try to say things like, "Don't allow the AFF to bring this up...blah blah blah, because we've clearly already won on this... blah blah blah, point." Finally, **give your judge a list of reasons/arguments why you've won the debate.**
- 2AR - (Second Affirmative Rebuttal) - This speech gives the AFF the chance to not only piss off their opponents, but hit hard on any arguments they've won that the NEG can no longer attack or argue. Based on the 2NR, go over why the NEG hasn't won the arguments they've claimed to win, and also **give your judge a list of reasons/arguments why you've won the debate.** A helpful tool is **Impact Calc** (Calculation.) Impact Calc is basically weighing out the overall impacts of the debate. Focus on **Timeframe, Magnitude, and Probability.** This is mostly On-Case, for example, "The NEG may have a strong argument on the possibility of debt in the country, but our extinction argument outweighs this. If we do the AFF we may go into debt, but if we don't, then everyone will die anyways so it doesn't really matter."

Cross-X:

- Policy debate is commonly called CX or Cross-X debate, standing for Cross Examination. This is unique because after each of the constructive speeches, the opposing side gets the opportunity to question speech just given. This time is used to find holes in your opponent's case and really just make them feel insecure about their own arguments. The judge isn't meant to flow CX, but if your opponent brings up something fucking stupid or doesn't defend a certain point with their answer in CX then be sure to bring it up in your following speech. **Don't argue during CX. Be polite, ask questions, and be respectfully aggressive.** Trenton will say CX isn't a time to scramble for prep, which it really isn't. It's meant for weakening your opponent, but I mean if you can seem intelligent with your questions while also giving your partner more time to prepare then it will give you a small advantage.

Prep Time:

- This is 5 minutes, sometimes 8 minutes on national circuits, that you and your partner are allowed to prepare. **Keep track of your own prep time. You should have a timer with you anyways for your speeches.** You can use this time before any of your speeches, but don't ask to take prep before CX because you'll look stupid. Use your

prep time wisely, some Judges are douche and count USB drive flashing as prep time. I recommend you use Verbatim with Word, which is a program meant to Debatify Word for you. If you don't have Word then I can try and get it for you sometime if you ask, but I'm shit with Macs and have only done it on Windows. **Also, make sure you always have a USB with you to avoid headaches.**

Stock Issues:

-These are basic Debate guidelines the AFF needs to follow. If the NEG can prove your AFF doesn't follow one of these, then shit brother, you're in for it now.

-SHITS:

- Significance - Why the hell does this matter?
- Harms - Reasons why the Status Quo (Current way things are done) is corrupt
- Inherency - Proof that the current Status Quo isn't solving your harms
- Topicality - Does your AFF affirm the resolution in a topical manner?
- Solvency - How your Plan solves your harms

Some Off-Case NEG Arguments:

-Topicality (T): (Courtesy of Debate God Dylan)

I. Basic Ingredients in T (Topicality) Debate

- Resolutions
- Plan
- Neg Interp (Interpretation)
- Reasons to prefer –credibility, time, etc.

II. How to View

- Link – Combo of Interp & Violation
- Impact – Combo of Reasons to Prefer & Voters

III. Why should you run T

- Non-Topical
- Annoy
- Time tradeoff

IV. Running T (Use examples & analogies) (Avoid repetition) (line-by-line debate)

- A- Interp
- B- Violation
- C- Standards
- D- Voters

V. Standards

- Credibility
- Time
- Division of Ground (Neg ground vs Aff ground)
- Limitation (Over vs. Under)
- Predictability
- Field Context
- Legal Context

The AFF will try to attack T with their own Counter Interps, “We Meet NEG interp,” arguing voters, and things like that.

-Counterplans (CPs) -

- CPs are plans introduced by the NEG that counter the AFF’s plan.
- **CPs do not have to be Topical.**
- Net Benefit - Something “extra” that the CP does that the Plan doesn’t. These may win you the case if you can prove your CP does everything the Plan does, but with a Net Benefit.
- A few different types:
 - Timeframe CP, takes the AFFs exact plan but does it at a different time.
 - Actor CP, takes the AFFs exact plan but uses a different actor, like Japan instead of USFG.
 - Completely different plan by the USFG, but these are difficult unless you can prove that your CP is better than the Plan, but also that the AFF can’t do their plan as well as your CP.

The AFF usually counters CPs with Perms (Permutations.) Some examples of these are:

Perm: do both

Perm: do one then the other

Perm: do one and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the other

You will either have to prove that the perm is unfair, or impossible to do.

-Disadvantages (Disads, DAs):

- Brink: States that a situation exists where something could go either way, having future risk.
- Uniqueness (UQ): This is the Status Quo (SQ) of a DA. Says a problem will not happen in the future, or is happening now.
- Link: The reason why the AFF plan causes the DA to happen. The “push” that the plan gives to something bad happening. The bad thing.
 - Internal Links: What the bad thing actually does.
- Impact: The overall outcome of the link, or the “bad thing.” This is the awful effect of the plan, which overall proves why the AFF can’t go through with the plan.

Cards:

-Your actual pieces of evidence used to debate with. Most of your constructives will be read off of cards, but most of your rebuttals should be analysis using the cards already introduced.

-Below is an example of a basic card. I’ve highlighted down the basic parts:

-Red: The tag line. You read this very clearly, as your judge will flow this. These usually flow along with the entire argument, so when this one says “That causes extinction” it’s referring to the previous card in the case causing it.

-Green: The author and the date, you read this very clearly as it will be flowed as well. If a card doesn’t have a year, such as this one (6/26), then you automatically assume it was written in this current year. Otherwise it will say something like “Prupis ‘13” for 2013.

-Purple: The citation, don't read this for the love of God do not read this it's only meant for referencing purposes.

-Grey: The actual piece of evidence.

-Blue: The important stuff you read out of the evidence. You'll want to learn how to highlight the important bits of information down, because time is vital and you'll use it up saying useless stuff if you don't.

That causes extinction

Prupis 6/26 (Nadia Prupis, staff writer for non-profit independent news center Common Dreams, Report: World's Oceans On Brink Of Collapse, June 24, 2014 <https://www.commondreams.org/headline/2014/06/24-2>) CHall

The world's oceans face irreparable damage from climate change and overfishing, with a five-year window for intervention, an environmental panel said Tuesday. Neglecting the health of the oceans could have devastating effects on the world's food supply, clean air, and climate stability, among other factors. The Global Oceans Commission, an environmental group formed by the Pew Charitable Trust, released a report (PDF) addressing the declining marine ecosystems around the world and outlining an eight-step "rescue package" to restore growth and prevent future damage to the seas. The 18-month study proposes increased governance of the oceans, including limiting oil and gas exploration, capping subsidies for commercial fishing, and creating marine protected areas (MPAs) to guard against pollution, particularly from plastics. "*A healthy ocean is a key to our well-being*," said Jose Maria Figueres, co-chair and former president of Costa Rica. "Unless we turn the tide on ocean decline within five years, the international community should consider turning the high seas into an off-limits regeneration zone until its condition is restored." Government subsidies for high seas fishing total at least \$30 billion a year and are carried out by just ten countries, the report said. About 60 percent of such subsidies encourage unsustainable practices like the fuel-hungry "bottom trawling" of ocean floors — funds that could be rerouted to conservation efforts or employment in coastal areas. Meanwhile, environmental nonprofits and governmental bodies are starting to recognize the insufficient protections offered by systems like the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which aims to regulate portions of the ocean but cannot actually enforce any laws. The report includes a proposal to ratify the UNCLOS, increasing and extending its oversight to 64 percent of the ocean which is currently outside of national jurisdiction. "Without proper governance, a minority will continue to abuse the freedom of the high seas, plunder the riches that lie beneath the waves, take more than a fair share, and benefit at the expense of the rest of us, especially the poorest," said Trevor Manuel, co-chair of the commission and former minister of finance of South Africa. Failure to reverse the decline of the ocean's ecosystems would be an "unforgivable betrayal of current and future generations," said David Miliband, co-chair and former British foreign secretary.

Policy Vocab:

(Everyone tried to put one of these little Policy Vocab handbooks together last year, but it kind of flopped. Here's some basic terminology but I encourage you to add to it as time goes.)

- Abuse: arguments fundamentally unfair in some intuitive way. abusive arguments often impose impossible burdens.
- Affirmative (AFF): the team advancing the Resolution with some sort of Plan
- Analysis: a **strong** form of arguing and reasoning in your own words
- Answer To (AT): self explanatory, just make sure you know the abbreviation

- Ballot: the piece of paper the Judge writes their decision, gives tips, and awards speaker points on
- Cards: See above.
- Claim: a point you're trying to make, the beginning of your argument structure
- Conditionality (Condo): a way of playing it safe, allowing you to take on 2 positions. example: 1. this won't put us in debt, but 2. even if it did it wouldn't matter because...
- Counterplan (CP): See above.
- Counter Interpretation (Counter Interp, CI): a definition or interpretation that challenges your opponent's given interp.
- Critique (Kritik): the theoretical position that indicts the resolution's ideology, framework, or language. basically claims the resolution is fundamentally flawed based on the way we're forced to think of it.
- Cross Apply: instructs everyone to apply one point you make to several points on the flow
- Cross Examination (Cross-X, CX): See above.
- David: most likely to be asked, "do you even go here?" also very chill and easy to talk to. feel free to ask him any questions, he's great at explaining.
- Disadvantage (Disad, DA): See above.
- Dispositionality: the idea that a team can drop something under a certain circumstance.
- Drexciya: if anyone even tries to use this word punch their teeth out
- Drop: the failure to answer an argument brought up by the other side
- Extend (Ext): Extensions are used to bring up a previous argument either using previous or new evidence. Do NOT be vague with these and say "Ext card Prupis 6/26 'That causes extinction.'" your judge will hate you. Say the tag line, the author, and also have some analysis on what arguments this card attacks, and why it's so significant.
- Flow: your flow is where you will record cards brought up by the other team. you should write down the tag line and the date. asks questions about how to flow in class! it's important and you should always try to keep a steady flow.
- Flashing: when a debater lifts up their shirt to distract their opponent. JOKES... it's just slang for when you give your opponent a copy of your cards/case on a USB flash drive.
- Ground: basically there's AFF and NEG ground, and you can think of these as your boundaries. this is the realm of what each side can argue. this is to make things fair, so for example, AFF can argue a plan, but NEG can argue a CP. AFF can argue a case, but NEG can argue a DA. you can argue if your opponent has too much ground, but this is a vague explanation and you should probably ask trenton.
- Hailey: queen of shade. better than beyonce.
- Harm: See above.
- Impact: See above.
- Inherency: See above.
- Internal Link: See above.
- Intrinsic: used by the NEG to argue that the AFF is not allowed to add on to their initial plan to out-do the CP by saying it makes AFF a moving target for the NEG.

- Keely: if you see her twirling a fricken' pen in her fingers it means she needs something to do so go ask her questions she's nice okay.
- Kick out: when the NEG "kicks out" of an argument, it means they forfeit on it. this is usually when the NEG was using the argument to make the AFF struggle to answer in their time given, and the NEG usually goes for one or two strong points they know they can win on.
- Justification: reason or foundation for believing so. you can do anything in Policy as long as you justify it, just asks the debaters that decided to dress up as pirates and steal the ballot.
- Link: See above.
- Meet: to satisfy some standard.
- Negative (NEG): the team attempting to negate or prevent the advancement of the resolution
- New argument: an argument brought up in the rebuttals that was unheard in the constructives. don't fucking bring these up okay.
- Non-unique: not the only cause of one effect.
- NSA: National Security Agency
- Off-Case (Off): See above.
- On-Case (On): See above.
- Outweighs (o/w): when one consequence is significantly more preferred than the another
- Paradigm: a judge's paradigm states what the judge will weigh the round on most
- Permutation (Perm): See above.
- Plan: the part of the Affirmative Case that posits a Topical solution for presented Harms through a specified course of action.
- Post-date: when one piece of evidence post-dates your opponents, you can argue that yours is more reliable as it's more recent
- Pre-requisite: something that HAS to happen before the Plan can take place
- Reasonability: an argument made claiming that your argument is good within reason, not outrageous or anything
- Resolution: the debate topic the AFF attempts to affirm. This year's: The United States Federal Government should substantially curtail its domestic surveillance.
- Road Map: See above.
- Severance: takes away from the AFF plan (ex. Immediacy, 'time limit')<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5yB3n9fu-rM&feature=youtu.be>
- Shade: being shady, or throwing a funny sly jab at someone. basically insulting someone in a shady joking manner.
- Significance: See above.
- Sign Post: clearly describing where an argument you're referring to is on on the flow.
- Solvency: See above.
- Speaker Points: See above.
- Speed Read (Spread): spreading your legs at your desk in an attempt to get better speak points. Joke, (unless you're Victoria :\$) spreading is reading as fast as you can, while screaming, usually hardly understandable.

- Standard: some gauge by which to evaluate an argument
- Stock Issues: See above.
- Surveillance: to keep a close watch over someone or something
- Tag Team: tag team cross examination is where the judge allows you AND your partner to answer and ask questions. you should do most of the talking during YOUR cross-x, but a few blurbs from your partner isn't bad. most judges allow tag teaming.
- Throwing Shade: (see Shade.) the action of delivering shade
- Timeframe: the time needed to achieve some result or Impact
- Topicality (T): See above.
- Trenton (Treetnan): our little debate mom. Trenton will probably confuse the shit out of you but go to him for detailed answers. we love him to death, but leave the room when he's practicing his spreading.
- Turn: taking one of your opponent's arguments and turning it back around on them, using it as your own
- USFG: United States Federal Government
- Victoria (Chinktoria): victoria will give you stereotypical white girl answers and metaphors for any questions you have. go to her for basic understanding.
- Violation: failure to meet a rule or Standard
- We Meet: ability to fit within an interpretation given by your opponent.

Ways to practice:

- Go over cases! <http://openevidence.debatecoaches.org/> This link always has a bunch of free already set up cases and files, and learning to interpret cases quickly is key! It also helps to have a basic idea what you'll be up against.
- Practice speech drills. Try tongue twisters, reading backwards, reading with a pen in your mouth, or any others you can think of. David showed me <http://www.spreader.com/> which I definitely reccommed if you're serious about learning to spread well.
- Practice your own case.
- Research the topic.
- Read Debate forums online.
- Ask anyone on the Policy team, or look for Debate Alumni.

Helpful Links:

- <http://www.debateteamdocumentary.com/resourcesfolder/dtdictionary.html> - Policy Debate Dictionary, I pulled some of my definitions from this
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hBM8n3PyatI> - A basic introduction to this year's topic, you should definitely watch this.
- <http://www.scribd.com/doc/8035628/Emory-Policy-Debate-Manual> - I pulled some of my explanations from here, but if you're confused or looking for a more in

depth explanation, or if I'm just missing things, you should definitely check this out.

- <http://snfi.wikispaces.com/Files> - These are Stanford's debate camp files, courtesy of Victoria.
- http://commfaculty.fullerton.edu/jbruschke/debate_bible.htm - This has literally everything.
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5yB3n9fu-rM&feature=youtu.be> - You should probably know who Edward Snowden is.
- Google is your friend okay. Be careful though because some files cost money which is bullshit.