

Internet Debate Research

Rich Edwards, Baylor University

2015

Terms

Internet Provider: The commercial service used to establish a connection to the Internet. Examples of a service provider are America Online, Sprint, ATT, MSN, Road Runner, etc.

Internet Browser: The software used to manipulate information on the Internet. The four major browsers in use are Chrome (the Google product), Mozilla Firefox (the successor to Netscape), Safari (the Apple product) and Internet Explorer (the Microsoft product). Each type of browser will give you access to the same group of search engines, which is the main thing you will care about.

Firefox has one feature that other browsers lack: it can report to you the last revision date of a Web page (select “Page Info” from the top “Tools” menu to access this function). I teach debaters that a Web page may be dated from the last revision date if no other date is shown on the page; Internet Explorer, Chrome and Safari offer no way to know this date.

URL: This stands for Universal Resource Locator. It is the <http://www.baylor.edu> etc.

Internet Search Engine: The software used to search for information on the Internet. You will use the same group of search engines, regardless of which browser (Explorer, Firefox, Chrome, or Safari) you may be using. Examples of search engines are Google, Bing (formerly Microsoft Live), AllTheWeb, HotBot, Teoma, InfoSeek, Yahoo, Excite, LookSmart, and AltaVista. I have described the strengths and weaknesses of the various search engines in later paragraphs. My personal favorites are Google and Bing for policy debate research and the Yahoo Directory Search for Lincoln Douglas research.

Metasearch Engines: These are Internet search engines which will submit your search to other search engines. The best of the metasearch engines are SearchOnLine, Dogpile, Mama, and Webcrawler. The metasearch engines advertise that they are superior to any one search engine since they will report results from four or five major Internet search engines. While this is useful for some purposes, it is not the best means to conduct debate research. The metasearch engine sends a simple search request to other search engines, meaning that you are foregoing the opportunity to use the “advanced search” function that almost all major search engines make available to you. This means that you often are losing the capability to do exact phrase searching, limitation by date, limitation by domain, or limitation by file type. It is also often true that you will receive fewer hits from each of the major search engines than if you were to issue the search directly

within that search engine.

Domain: Each web page on the Internet will have a closing three letter code such as “.com,” “.edu,” “.gov,” “.net,” etc. The domain tells you something about the origin of the web page. In most instances, the “edu” domain means the web page is housed in or provided by a college or university. The “gov” domain means the web page is maintained by a federal, state, or local government. The “com” and “net” domains usually mean a commercial enterprise. Most of the major search engines (in the advanced search options) allow the debater to limit a search to particular domains.

PDF: This stands for “portable document file” and indicates that a document is being made available in a format which will look just like an original document in print (complete with page numbers). PDF files are designed to be viewed and/or printed in Adobe Acrobat Reader (available free for download from the Internet). The advantage for the debater is that information gathered from a PDF file can be cited at a particular page number (the same page number it would have as if you had access to the original printed document). Almost all congressional hearings (starting with the 105th and 106th Congresses) are available in PDF format. This not only means that you can download a hearing which will be identical to the printed one, but it also means that you have almost immediate access to a hearing once it has been held. PDF files also carry the advantage that they generally are made available from well-established sources on the Internet. Again, however, the software necessary to “read” PDF documents is available free on the Internet. You will know that a document for download is available in PDF format if the Internet URL ends in “.pdf”. Most of the major search engines allow you to search for only those Web pages which make available a PDF download.

HTML: This stands for “hypertext markup language” and is the code used for creating web pages. You don’t really need to be an HTML programmer to be able to write a web page since numerous programs such as Netscape Composer and Microsoft FrontPage can create the code for you from simple-to-operate menu choices. If you want to view the HTML code used to construct a web page you can do so by selection the top menu choice for “View” (In either Netscape or Internet Explorer) and coming down to the choice for “Page Source.” You will see displayed the native HTML code which creates the Web page.

Maximizing the Use of the Search Engine

Why use a search engine? This is the only way to find material on the Internet unless you already know the URL you are looking for. The problem is that you must know the URL precisely; close will not be good enough. In the early days of the Internet folks used to use printed resources such as *Internet Yellow Pages*. But now there are simply too many pages for these types of publications to be useful. Google and Bing, for example, index about 30 trillion Internet pages.

What should I look for in a good search engine?

Comprehensiveness: For the debater, the most important consideration is to find an Internet search engine that indexes as much of the Internet as possible. Powerful search engines do this through two means. First, they invite Web page creators to send a request to have their pages indexed. This is in the interest of Web designers since they almost always want their pages to be easily found. Second, they employ automatic searching programs which continually find new (and unindexed) pages on the Web and index them. The best search engines also do full text indexing. This means that you could literally pick a phrase out of the middle of a web page, enter the phrase in Google or Bing in quotation marks, and the search engine will find the page for you within about a second. This capability is especially important for the debater. You may have written down a portion of a quotation used against you that you would dearly like to find (either because you want to check its context or you want to locate the quotation to use in your own briefs). If the quotation is from an Internet source you can find it very quickly using a comprehensive search engine.

Speed: Not a major criterion any more. In the early days of search engines you could sometimes issue a search and wait a long time (ten or twenty seconds) for the search to be completed. Those days are gone. All of the major search engines are really almost instantaneous now. If you are experiencing problems with speed it is probably due to your own modem's speed or to the limitations of your own computer processor's ability to handle the Web page graphics.

Proximity searches: This is a big concern for the debater. If you enter terms like <domestic surveillance> into your search engine, you will receive dramatically varying results depending upon the search engine you are using. Google does the best job of doing automatic proximity searching; meaning that it will order your search results by examining how close your search terms are in proximity to one another. Older or less capable search engines merely report the pages that contain some or all of these words.

Revision date reporting: Most of the major search engines allow the user to limit the search by entering a range for the last revision date (assuming you utilize the "advanced search" function). I teach debaters to use the last revision date as the citation date if the date is otherwise unavailable on the Web page. It should be remembered, however, that the Firefox browser makes it possible for you to determine this last revision date for any Web page you are viewing (unfortunately Chrome and Internet Explorer lack this useful feature).

Exact phrase searching: This is an essential feature, for the debater, of a good search engine. By placing your phrase in quotation marks you can instruct the search engine to return only those pages containing the whole phrase as a phrase. When searching for "domestic surveillance" you want to find the whole phrase, not just pages which contain the individual words "domestic" and "surveillance." Almost all major search engines allow for exact phrase searching.

Image search: Not important for debate research but great for teachers looking for visual images to build PowerPoint presentations.

Procedures for effective searching:

What about capitalization? For Internet search engines capitalization no longer matters. Searching for “DOMESTIC SURVEILLANCE” will produce the same results as “Domestic Surveillance” or “domestic surveillance.”

What about quotation marks? Use quotation marks whenever you want the search engine to look for words together as a phrase (assuming you are using a search engine that enables exact phrase searching). If you search for domestic surveillance (without the quotation marks), the search engine will look for web pages containing the word “domestic” and “surveillance” but it will not require that the words be next to each other. By putting quotation marks around “domestic surveillance” you are requesting only those pages containing the whole phrase. There is no need to put quotation marks around a single word.

How can one limit a search to a particular domain? The best Internet search engines have an “advanced search” or “power search” capability. One of the options in the advanced search engine is the capability to limit by domain. Limited your search to the .gov domain will, for example, provide an efficient means of finding government publications on the desired search. To access Google’s advanced search engine, simply place the words “advanced search” in the Google search box.

How can one search for a particular URL (you know part but not all of the URL)? Many of the advanced search engines provide the capability to enter a search term and then to indicate whether you wish to make this search apply to “title only,” “full-text,” or URL. You would, of course, select the URL option.

How does the search engine rank the web pages it reports? This is a somewhat controversial issue. Some search engines receive payment from Internet advertisers for the privilege of having their pages reported early in the search list. Most search engines, though, report the web pages in order of the greater number of occurrences of the term. Google’s patented PageRank system factors in not only the proximity of the terms but the number of times other users have accessed the web pages.

Evaluating Search Engines

AllTheWeb: AllTheWeb is now a subsidiary of Yahoo. This search engine is useful, but not as useful for the debater as Google or Yahoo’s main search site at www.yahoo.com. www.alltheweb.com

AltaVista: AltaVista used to be my “hands down” favorite for conducting debate research, both for policy and LD. The problem is that AltaVista has stayed the same (or in some cases has actually removed some useful services such as the reporting of the last revision date and the use of the “NEAR” term) while other search engines have become more powerful. In 2003, AltaVista also became a subsidiary of Yahoo. www.altavista.com

Bing: This is the new Microsoft search engine product – formerly called Microsoft Live. Bing was first offered in June 2009 (followed a period of beta releases). The engine now rivals Google in comprehensiveness and ease of use. www.bing.com

Dogpile: This is a metasearch engine which searches Google, Yahoo, Bing, and Yandex (Russia’s leading search engine). Dogpile, like other metasearch engines, submits your search term to several search engines in order to report the top Internet sites. www.dogpile.com

Google: *Best search engine overall for policy debate research.* According to Forbes, Google has 75.2% of the U.S. market share for search engines. The next closest search engine is Yahoo at 10.4%, followed closely by Bing. What makes Google so useful for debate research? Two factors: (1) It provides the most comprehensive search and (2) It does automatic proximity searching among the terms listed in the search box. Suppose, for example, you enter in the search box the following words: domestic surveillance. Google will only return those web pages containing the listed search terms and (most importantly) it will list first those web pages which contain the search terms in the closest proximity to one another. Google also makes available a very capable image search database; this is very useful for classroom teachers interested in constructing PowerPoint presentations. www.google.com

HotBot: This search engine is provided by Lycos. www.hotbot.com

Lycos: Best map search engine on the Internet. Unfortunately, debate research doesn’t require many maps. Not great for debate related searches. Indexing is not very comprehensive. www.lycos.com

Webcrawler: Webcrawler used to be a premier search engine for debate research because it enabled the “NEAR” term in searches (a powerful way to conduct proximity searches). Unfortunately, it no longer has this capability. Now Webcrawler is a “metasearch engine,” meaning that it merely submits your search to a variety of other search engines (in this case AllTheWeb, AskJeeves, LookSmart, and FindWhat). I’m not a fan of metasearch engines for debate research because usually the debater wants to use the advanced search engine within whatever search engine is being used. When a metasearch engine is used, the search is submitted in rather simple form to numerous other search engines, failing to use the full potential of those other search engines. www.webcrawler.com

Yahoo: Yahoo is a good search engine for policy debate research, but it is not as good as Google, Bing, AltaVista, or AllTheWeb. *For LD research, it is my search engine of choice.* The reason is because of the Yahoo Directory system and the capability to search within directories. One of these directories is “philosophers.” To call the philosophers database, simply insert “philosophers>” in front of your search term. An example of such a search follows: philosophers>John Locke. The advantage of using this directory search is that the quality of materials returned in the search will be much better overall and much more specifically related to the philosopher John Locke (as opposed to the hundreds of other individuals who later shared his name).
www.yahoo.com

Tracking the Progress of Legislation

On the policy debate topic – substantially curtailing domestic surveillance – it will be especially important to keep track of the status of current legislation. Fortunately, the Web site of the Library of Congress offers an excellent way to keep track of the status of current legislation. This Web site is called Congress.gov. You can type the name of the proposed legislation (such as the “End Warrantless Surveillance of Americans Act”) in the search box and Thomas will show the current status of the legislation. Thomas will also offer the option of downloading a pdf copy of the proposed legislation.

Capabilities of Major Search Engines

(Ranked in Order of Preference for Policy Debate Research)

	URL	Exact Phrase Search	News Search Available	Proximity Search Capability	Advanced Search Capability	Limit to PDF files capability?	Image Search for Ayn Rand	“domestic surveillance”
Google	www.google.com	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	627,000	417,000
Bing	www.bing.com	Hard to Find	Yes	No	Yes	No	34,600	353,000
Yahoo	www.yahoo.com	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	26,389	351,000
AltaVista	www.altavista.com	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	23,351	Unavailable
HotBot	www.hotbot.com	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unavailable	351,000
AllTheWeb	www.alltheweb.com	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	23,556	351,000
Teoma	www.teoma.com	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1,380	Unavailable
Dogpile	www.dogpile.com	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	40	Unavailable
Webcrawler	www.webcrawler.com	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	40	Unavailable
Excite	www.excite.com	No	Yes	No	No	No	40	Unavailable
Mamma	www.mama.com	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unavailable	Unavailable
Lycos	www.lycos.com	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	23,368	80

Quality of Evidence on the Internet

Setting rigid standards will be essential: The Internet makes available web pages from fourth grade students right alongside those from world-class experts. Just as in the print medium, one must make a distinction between the *New York Times* and the *National Enquirer*. Since most debate research is squad-based, meaning it is shared by many students, it is essential that there be agreement on minimum standards for the types of web pages which may be used for debate research. Following are some recommended standards:

NO use of web pages which come from discussion groups or chat rooms.

NO use of evidence from comments posted on blogs.

NO use of web pages where the author's qualifications are unknown.

NO use of web pages where the author is a student in grade school, high school, or college.

NO use of web pages from hate groups or from unidentified organizations.

NO use of web pages which are undated or for which a "last revision date" is unavailable.

Prefer web pages sponsored by one of the following groups:

A government institution

A major educational institution

A recognized "think tank" (RAND, Brookings Institution, Heritage Foundation, CATO Institute, Hudson Institute, etc.)

A reputable journalistic organization (CNN, New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, etc.)

Using the URL to sort out author qualifications: Consider the following example.

You enter "John Rawls" and "social safety net" in a Google search. You have a web page returned to you entitled "Notes on 'A Theory of Justice.'" The web page contains some information which you find useful, but you have no information about the author other than just the name Chilton. You notice from the URL that the web page comes from an "edu" domain associated with something called d.umn, but you don't know what school this is, and you don't know whether the author is a professor or an undergraduate student. The URL is <http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/3652/Readings/3652.Rawls.ATheoryOfJustice.html>. Take apart the URL to discover more about the author. Click with your mouse up in the URL line and eliminate all of the end of the URL back to schilton, then return. See if you can find more information about the author. If the URL comes from an educational institution with which you are unfamiliar, eliminate all of the end of the URL back to the part which ends in "edu" then hit return. By clicking the button on his web page for "Vita" you can discover information about his background. You find that the author of the web page is Stephen Chilton, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, Duluth,

who earned his Ph.D. from the MIT — a good source. But some additional work was needed to determine the qualification. IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT YOU FIND THE PERSON OR GROUP RESPONSIBLE FOR AUTHORIZING THE WEB PAGE. It is NEVER a sufficient qualification that you found it on the Internet.

How to find the date. Some web pages will have the date prominently displayed at the top of the web page. Whenever you have this type of date listed, it should be used rather than the last revision date of the web page. Often, however, there is no date on the web page. In such cases, you can find the last revision date by using the “Tools” menu choice to select the “Page Info” option (available only in Firefox). (Resist the temptation to select “Source Info” because that will just show you the HTML code for the web page). Page Info will usually show you the name of the organization sponsoring the web page and the last revision date. If the Web page offers the download of a PDF document, a date can always be found. Simply download the PDF file to your computer and open it in Adobe Acrobat. From the “File” menu, select “Properties” to view both the creation and last revision dates.

How to prepare debate citations from the Internet. Example:

Richard Thompson, (Legislative Attorney, Congressional Research Service), *Drones in Domestic Surveillance Operations: Fourth Amendment Implications and Legislative Responses*, Apr. 3, 2013, Retrieved Jan. 15, 2015 from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42701.pdf>.

This is the citation standard required by the National Speech and Debate Association, which follows the Style Manual of the Modern Language Association (MLA). Authors must be listed if present. Qualifications must be given. The date of the web page must be given. The name of the web page should be presented. At the end of the citation, indicate that it was gathered online and that the online source was an Internet URL (as opposed to Lexis/Nexis, Dialogue, etc.). The final date is the date that you accessed the Internet material.

Carding Evidence

ADVANTAGES OF ON-DISK EVIDENCE AND BRIEF PREPARATION

Minimize Printing: In the age of the information explosion, it is simply not feasible for debaters to print out a hard copy of everything they think they might need to read. The two major impediments are expense and time. It is expensive (in laser printer cartridges) for a debate squad to print out all of the materials that active researchers need. It is also time consuming to print big chunks of material; computer labs typically have many computers but a single printer. The printer becomes the bottle neck. The overuse of printing is also environmentally irresponsible. Debaters chunk huge volumes of paper, often printing out a two-hundred page law review article in order to extract two or three cards. This means that hundreds of pages per day of printed or photocopied materials are simply discarded.

More Usable Briefs: Word processed briefs are easier to read (no illegible handwritten tags, no red or blue ink which refuses to photocopy), and they contain much more evidence per page. This ends up saving a squad large amounts of money in photocopy cost. In fact, members of a large squad can simply distribute new positions via disk and have each squad member print out their briefs on their own printer. This dramatically reduces squad photocopy costs. If briefs are to be word processed, it simply makes sense to collect the evidence on-disk. Otherwise, the debater has to re-type the evidence which exists in hard copy.

Sorting is Easy: The old way for debaters to construct arguments (a federalism disadvantage, for example) is to create piles on a table-top of evidence which is sorted into different parts of the argument. Inevitably, as the argument is being constructed, there are numerous times when the debater thinks, "I know I have that piece of evidence that says . . . but WHERE IS IT?" When evidence is collected, sorted, and filed on-disk, that doesn't happen. If the evidence isn't found in the right category, the debater simply uses the word processor's "find" function to search for the word or phrase. The card is located in seconds. When evidence is prepared on-disk, the debater can simply use the sorting function of the word processor to put the evidence in order.

HOW DOES ONE CARD EVIDENCE ONLINE?

Have Your Word Processor and Internet Browser Both Open at the Same Time: There was a time when computers simply didn't have enough RAM (current memory) to have two large programs open at once. Almost all current generation computers have plenty of memory to make this possible. Simply open the first program, then minimize the window (minimize button is in the top right corner) and start up the other program. If you are on a PC, switch back and forth between the two programs by clicking the desired program on

the start-bar. On the Macintosh, you can switch between programs by using the icon in the top right hand corner of your screen. An alternative method for switching is to overlap the window just a bit so that a corner of both can be seen. When you desire to switch, just click with the mouse on the other window to make that program active.

Steps for On-Disk Carding of Evidence:

Text-Saving Method:

1. Locate the Internet site from which the evidence will come.
2. Construct the evidence citation on the word processor in accordance with UIL rules.
3. Highlight the portion of the text from the web page which will makeup the text of the card. Copy the text into memory (on the PC, this is Cntrl-C; on the Macintosh it is Apple-C).
4. Switch to the word processor and paste in the text just below the evidence citation. (On the PC, this is Cntrl-V; on the Macintosh it is Apple-V)
5. Eliminate unwanted carrier returns in one of two ways: (a) click at the beginning of each line and backspace, or (b) use the word processor's search and replace function to eliminate all paragraph breaks.
6. Continue pasting cards into the word processor until you have taken all of the desired cards from the web page. Then copy and paste as many evidence citation tops as needed to match each of the cards.

SORTING EVIDENCE ON THE COMPUTER

Design a filing scheme which will allow addition of categories.

Once filed and sorted, your on-disk evidence file functions just like the "piles of cards" on the table. You use the index to see where the cards are which will support the part of the argument you are putting together, then use the search function on the word processor to find the cards, by searching for R301, for example. Read the cards which are filed there, and select the card or cards you want to insert in the brief. Then cut and paste them.

Suggestions for Online Policy Debate Research

Finding Definitions of Terms:

www.OneLook.com: Access to more than one thousand dictionaries is available through www.onelook.com.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/>: This Web resources says that it is “the world’s largest and most authoritative free online dictionary and mobile reference resource.”

<http://www2.dictionaryreference.com>

<http://www.yourdictionary.com/>

<http://oxforddictionaries.com/>

<http://www.etymonline.com/>

Newspaper & Journal Articles:

Google News: Google news gives you access to otherwise hard to find news articles on the surveillance topic. The normal news database is limited to the past 30 days, but you can access the Google News Archive at <http://news.google.com/newspapers> for older articles.

FindArticles: The Web’s First Free Article Search. Their advertisement says that “FindArticles.com is a vast archive of published articles that you can search for free. Constantly updated, it contains articles dating back to 1998 from more than 300 magazines and journals.” Among this 300 are numerous publications debaters should find useful: <http://www.search.com/search?q=articles>

Library of Congress Online Reading Room. From this Web site, the debater can find links to hundreds of online newspapers and journals. <http://www.loc.gov/rr/news/lists.html>

The Write News. This site provides links to all major newspapers maintaining online services. <http://writenews.com/newslinks/>

Research Think Tanks:

American Enterprise Institute: “The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research is dedicated to preserving and strengthening the foundations of freedom—limited government, private enterprise, vital cultural and political institutions, and a strong foreign policy and national defense—through scholarly research, open debate, and publications. Founded in 1943 and located in Washington, D.C., AEI is one of America's largest and most respected think tanks.” <http://www.aei.org/library.htm>

Brookings Institution: “In its research, The Brookings Institution functions as an independent analyst and critic, committed to publishing its findings for the information of the public. In its conferences and activities, it serves as a bridge between scholarship and public policy, bringing new knowledge to the attention of decisionmakers and affording scholars a better insight into public policy issues. The Institution traces its beginnings to 1916 with the founding of the Institute for Government Research, the first private organization devoted to public policy issues at the national level. In 1922 and 1924, the Institute was joined by two supporting sister organizations, the Institute of Economics and the Robert Brookings Graduate School. In 1927, these three groups were consolidated into one institution, named in honor of Robert Somers Brookings (1850-1932), a St. Louis businessman whose leadership shaped the earlier organizations.”

CATO Institute: “The Cato Institute was founded in 1977 by Edward H. Crane. It is a non-profit public policy research foundation headquartered in Washington, D.C. The Institute is named for Cato's Letters, a series of libertarian pamphlets that helped lay the philosophical foundation for the American Revolution. The Cato Institute seeks to broaden the parameters of public policy debate to allow consideration of the traditional American principles of limited government, individual liberty, free markets and peace. Toward that goal, the Institute strives to achieve greater involvement of the intelligent, concerned lay public in questions of policy and the proper role of government.” www.cato.org

Heritage Foundation. “Founded in 1973, The Heritage Foundation is a research and educational institute — a think tank — whose mission is to formulate and promote conservative public policies based on the principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom, traditional American values, and a strong national defense.” <http://www.heritage.org/>

Hudson Institute: “In Hudson Institute’s policy recommendations, articles, books, conferences, and contributions to the electronic media, we share optimism about the future and a willingness to question conventional wisdom. We demonstrate commitment to free markets and individual responsibility, confidence in the power of technology to assist progress, respect for the importance of culture and religion in human affairs, and determination to preserve America’s national security.” <http://www.hudson.org/>

RAND Corporation: “RAND (a contraction of the term research and development) is the first organization to be called a "think tank." We earned this distinction soon after we were created in 1946 by our original client, the U.S. Air Force (then the

Army Air Forces). Some of our early work involved aircraft, rockets, and satellites. In the 1960s we even helped develop the technology you're using to view this web site. Today, RAND's work is exceptionally diverse. We now assist all branches of the U.S. military community, and we apply our expertise to social and international issues as well." <http://www.rand.org/>

Law Reviews:

University Law Review Project. <http://www.lawreview.org/>

Yahoo Law Directory. This site provides links to hundreds of law reviews many of which make their archives available online.

<http://dir.yahoo.com/Government/Law/Journals/>

Top “Domestic Surveillance” Web Sites for Policy Debaters

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU): <https://www.aclu.org/>.

The ACLU Web site identifies the organization “as our nation's guardian of liberty, working daily in courts, legislatures and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country.” By clicking the “Issues” tab, the debater will be given links to numerous topics relevant to the 2015-16 topic, including “Racial Profiling,” “Surveillance and Privacy,” “Prison Conditions,” among others. The ACLU Web site is possibly the best single source of information on the affirmative side of the domestic surveillance topic.

American Enterprise Institute: www.aei.org.

This organization states its purpose as follows: “The American Enterprise Institute is a community of scholars and supporters committed to expanding liberty, increasing individual opportunity and strengthening free enterprise. AEI pursues these unchanging ideals through independent thinking, open debate, reasoned argument, facts and the highest standards of research and exposition.” One recent AEI document entitled, “NSA Surveillance Reform: A Tilt Toward Privacy Over Security,” provides an in-depth analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of reforming the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court process as proposed in the USA Freedom Act.

Amnesty International: <http://www.amnestyusa.org/>.

Amnesty International describes its work in the following way: “We work to protect people wherever justice, freedom, truth and dignity are denied. Currently the world’s largest grassroots human rights organization, we investigate and expose abuses, educate and mobilize the public and help transform societies to create a safer, more just world.” By entering “Surveillance” in the main search box, you will find numerous useful reports including the following: “Surveillance of American Muslims Underscores Lack of Safeguards,” “Congress Must Put Human Rights at the Center of Surveillance Reform” and “President Obama: Stop Surveillance Secrecy and Hunt for Whistleblowers.”

Brookings Institution: www.brookings.edu.

The Brookings Institution explains that it pursues three broad goals: “strengthen American democracy; foster the economic and social welfare, security and opportunity of all Americans and secure a more open, safe, prosperous and cooperative international system.” Numerous Brookings reports examine the impact of recent revelations about NSA snooping. One 2014 report is entitled, “The Big Snoop: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Terrorists.”

Cato Institute: www.cato.org.

Cato describes its purpose as follows: “the Cato Institute is a public policy research organization – a think tank – dedicated to the principles of individual liberty, limited government, free markets and peace. Its scholars and analysts conduct independent, nonpartisan research on a wide range of policy issues.” Cato Institute scholars typically argue for limiting the range of federal government power. Recent reports have questioned the wisdom of domestic surveillance programs, including a January 27, 2015 report entitled, “No, Mass Surveillance Won’t Stop Terrorist Attacks.”

Center for American Progress (CAP): www.americanprogress.org/.

The Center’s Web site declares that “an open and effective government can champion the common good over narrow self-interest, harness the strength of our diversity and secure the rights and safety of its people. And we believe our nation must always be a beacon of hope and strength to the rest of the world. Progressives are idealistic enough to believe change is possible and practical enough to make it happen.” Recent reports include “Domestic Data Collection and Privacy Rights,” “It’s Time to Get the Government Out of the Mass Collection Business” and “Common-Sense Reforms to Protect Americans’ Privacy.”

Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR): <http://ccrjustice.org/>.

The “About Us” tab discloses the following information: “The Center for Constitutional Rights is dedicated to advancing and protecting the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Founded in 1966 by attorneys who represented civil rights movements in the South, CCR is a non-profit legal and educational organization committed to the creative use of law as a positive force for social change. Recent reports on domestic surveillance are entitled, “Surveillance and Attacks on Dissent,” “Government Spying: FISA Court” and “NSA Domestic Spying Program.”

Center for Immigration Studies (CIS): www.cis.org.

This group describes its mission as follows: “The Center for Immigration Studies is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit, research organization. Since our founding in 1985, we have pursued a single mission – providing immigration policymakers, the academic community, news media and concerned citizens with reliable information about the social, economic, environmental, security and fiscal consequences of legal and illegal immigration into the United States.” As a practical matter, the CIS opposes the current levels of immigration and urges a substantial reduction in the number of undocumented immigrants living in America. Numerous reports comment on the role of surveillance in the immigration setting, including “Congress Pushes Dubious Drone Program,” “Amnesty, Government Surveillance and High-Tech Companies” and “On Profiling, Irony and Hypocrisy.”

Center for National Security Studies (CNSS): www.cnss.org/.

This organization describes itself as “a civil liberties think-tank and advocacy organization that serves as a watchdog in defense of civil liberties, human rights and constitutional limits on government power.” By clicking on the “Surveillance” tab near the top of the Web site, the debater can access numerous useful articles including “NSA Surveillance Leaks: Fact or Fiction,” “The NSA Telephone Metadata Program” and “Domestic Use of Spy Satellites Set to Widen.”

Center for Public Integrity: www.publicintegrity.org.

This group says it is committed “to serve democracy by revealing abuses of power, corruption and betrayal of public trust by powerful public and private institutions, using the tools of investigative journalism.” By entering “surveillance” in the Center’s search box, the debater can find numerous useful articles including the following: “Drones Not Used Effectively on U.S. Borders,” “Privacy Advocates Want Stricter Rules on Online, Patient- Controlled Health Records” and “Patient Data Safety Rules Widely Disregarded.”

Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS): www.csis.org.

This highly respected think tank focuses mainly on international issues, but debaters will find useful the many articles that evaluate the terrorist threat. A good example is the December 9, 2014 article entitled “Underestimating Risk in the Surveillance Debate.” CSIS scholar, James Andrew Lewis, offers the following warning about plans to curtail domestic surveillance: “The constant planning and preparation for attack by terrorist groups is not apparent to the public. The dilemma in assessing risk is that it is discontinuous. There can be long periods with no noticeable activity, only to have the apparent calm explode. The debate over how to reform communications surveillance has discounted this risk. Communications surveillance is an essential law enforcement and intelligence tool. There is no replacement for it.”

Citizens Council for Health Freedom: www.cchfreedom.org/.

This Minnesota-based organization says that it is devoted to “protection of patient autonomy and dignity through medical record privacy and strong patient consent provisions.” This group consistently expresses concern about government surveillance versus medical privacy. Recent articles include “The Obamacare Surveillance System,” “Health Care Surveillance: HIPAA – the Grand Deception” and “Vaccination Surveillance System.”

Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR): www.cair.com/.

This group describes itself as “America’s largest Muslim civil liberties organization.” CAIR says that it embraces its “civic and religious duty to work with law enforcement to protect our nation. Even one incident of violent extremism is too many.” Yet the organization also expresses concern over the many ways that current federal government surveillance methods violate the civil rights of Muslims. By clicking the “Government Affairs” tab, the debater can access useful articles, including the following: “The Trouble With an All-Knowing NSA,” “It’s Time to Tell Our Nation’s Leaders to Stop Spying on Calls” and “FBI Entrapment Harms Vulnerable Muslims.”

Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF): www.eff.org.

The mission and history of this organization is described on its Web site as follows: “The Electronic Frontier Foundation is the leading nonprofit organization defending civil liberties in the digital world. Founded in 1990, EFF champions user privacy, free expression and innovation through impact litigation, policy analysis, grassroots activism and technology development. We work to ensure that rights and freedoms are enhanced and protected as our use of technology grows.” A majority of the articles posted at this Web site are relevant to the 2015-16 national topic. One of the most recent articles entitled, “EFF Wins Battle Over Secret Legal Opinions on Government Spying,” describes improper intelligence agency use of census records.

Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC): www.epic.org.

Founded in 1994, the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) works to focus public attention on emerging civil liberties issues and to protect privacy, the First Amendment and constitutional values. EPIC publishes reports and an online newsletter on civil liberties in the information age. By clicking the “Policy Issues” tab, the debater will see a list of research areas that will approximate the range of affirmative case possibilities on the 2015- 16 national topic. These policy areas include the following: Big Data, Body Scanners, Census Records, Cloud Computing, Cybersecurity, Drones, FBI Watch List, FISA, Fusion Centers, Location Privacy, Medical Records, National ID, Right to Be Forgotten and Video Surveillance.

Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR): www.fairus.org.

This anti-immigrant group describes its mission as “to stop illegal immigration and to promote immigration levels consistent with the national interest.” FAIR “advocates a temporary moratorium on all immigration except spouses and minor children of U.S. citizens and a limited number of refugees.” This organization urges stronger border surveillance. A report entitled, “Illegal Immigration Is a Crime,” warned of the connection between illegal immigrants and the potential for terrorist entry to America: “While most illegal immigrants may come only to seek work and a better economic opportunity, their presence outside the law furnishes an opportunity for terrorists to blend into the same shadows while they target the American public for their terrorist crimes.”

Freedom of the Press Foundation: <https://freedom.press/>.

The Freedom of the Press Foundation was founded in 2012 with the following declaration of purpose: “To support journalism that uncovers unlawful and corrupt government practices and that aims for increased transparency and accountability on the part of our leaders. The foundation recognizes that modern media are strongly influenced by corporations and government agencies, resulting in vapid news coverage and outright censorship.” The foundation has provided support for WikiLeaks. Numerous articles posted on this Web site focus on the negative impact of government surveillance on the practice of responsible journalism.

Heritage Foundation: www.heritage.org.

This conservative think tank promotes the principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom and a strong national defense. Using the search option available on this Web site, the debater can find dozens of useful reports on domestic surveillance, including ones entitled “PRISM is Essential to U.S. Security in War Against Terrorism,” and “Preserving Freedom Online.”

Human Rights Watch: www.hrw.org/.

This organization describes its mission as follows: “We scrupulously investigate abuses, expose the facts widely and pressure those with power to respect rights and secure justice. Human Rights Watch is an independent, international organization that works as part of a vibrant movement to uphold human dignity and advance the cause of human rights for all.” By clicking the “Publications” tab, the debater will find numerous useful articles including the following: “Say No Today to Mass Surveillance,” “Surveillance Harming Journalism, Law, Democracy” and “Surveillance Practices Violate Rights.”

Immigration Policy Center: www.immigrationpolicy.org.

This is a pro-immigration think tank with the avowed mission of countering what it believes to be the misinformation provided by anti-immigration groups. By selecting the “Research and Publications” tab, the debater can access numerous reports on the harmful excesses of current border surveillance practices. A selection of recent documents includes the following: “Children in Danger: A Guide to the Humanitarian Challenge at the Border,” “Bordering on Criminal: The Routine Abuse of Migrants in the Removal Process” and “The Fallacy of ‘Enforcement First.’”

Independent Institute: www.independent.org.

This politically conservative think tank generates numerous reports critical of federal government surveillance tactics. The Web site provides access to the group's online publication, *The Independent: Newsletter of the Independent Institute*. The lead article in the Winter 2014 edition, written by Anthony Gregory, was entitled, "End the Surveillance State!"

Information Technology Industry Council: www.itic.org/.

This is the policy organization advocating on behalf of the nation's leading technology companies such as Google, Yahoo, Apple and Microsoft. These companies have been economically impacted by the recent Snowden revelations about NSA snooping. Consumers in the United States and around the world have become increasingly concerned about whether they can trust their personal data to cloud storage systems. Accordingly, the Information Technology Industry Council argues for restrictions on government surveillance in order to restore public trust. Examples of recent articles available from this Web site include, "Ideas to Address Adverse Impacts of Government Data Collection," "State Efforts to Counter NSA Surveillance Are Misguided" and "Yes, We Can Protect the Nation, Advance the Global Economy and Respect Civil Liberties."

Library of Congress: www.congress.gov/.

This Web site is replacing Thomas.gov as the one-stop-shop for access to current legislation. By clicking the "Legislation" tab and using the search box, the debater can receive an update on the status of bills designed to curtail domestic surveillance. Some recent examples are the Secure Data Act of 2015, a bill designed to prevent the federal government from requiring software companies to insert "back doors" into their encryption systems and the Email Privacy Act of 2015, a measure to prevent an electronic communication service from divulging the content of emails to the government in the absence of a specific court order.

Migration Policy Institute: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org>.

This organization, founded in 2001, grew out of a program operated by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The philosophy of the Institute is that "given the opportunity, immigrants become net contributors and create new social and economic assets." This Web site also provides access to its Online publication, The Migration Information Source. Recent reports include the following: "Quiet Demise of the Virtual Fence," "The Evolution of Border Controls as a Mechanism to Prevent Illegal Immigration" and "Reconciling Tough and Humane Enforcement."

National Coalition to Protect Civil Freedoms: www.civilfreedoms.org.

This group does not post a mission statement, but an examination of the articles available from the Web site reveals that it is committed to opposing the current level of state and federal government intrusion into Muslim immigrant communities in America. By selecting the "Islamophobia & Civil Freedoms" tab from this Web site home page, the debater can access numerous articles about the hazards of profiling in Muslim communities, including the following: "Islamophobia Is a Form of Racism That Needs to be Stopped," "The Feds Are Watching – Badly" and "9/11 Racial Profiling: Where Civil Rights Met National Security."

National Immigration Law Center: www.nilc.org.

This organization's "About Us" tab provides the following information: "Founded in 1979, the National Immigration Law Center is the only national legal advocacy organization in the U.S. exclusively dedicated to defending and advancing the rights of low-income immigrants and their families. We envision a U.S. society in which all people – regardless of their race, gender, immigration or economic status – are treated equally, fairly and humanely, have equal access to justice, education, government resources and economic opportunities and are able to achieve their full potential as human beings." By clicking the "Get Informed" tab, the debater can gain access to many useful publications, including "How E-Verify Affects America's Workers" and "Deportation Without Due Process."

New York Times: www.nytimes.com.

The *New York Times* is a premier U.S. newspaper for coverage of national security and privacy issues. As with many newspaper Web sites, however, access is limited for non-subscribers. This Web site allows non-subscribers free access to up to 10 articles per month. By using the search engine, the debater can follow the latest news on NSA spying, border surveillance and the terrorist threat.

Political Research Associates: <http://www.politicalresearch.org>.

This organization, founded in 1981, says that its purpose is to defend human rights and social justice, while opposing the agenda of right-wing political groups. One recent publication, entitled "Platform for Prejudice," questions the wisdom of the federal government's Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative (SAR). Another 89-page report, accessed by clicking the "Resources" tab, is entitled, "Manufacturing the Muslim Menace."

Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB): www.pclob.gov/.

This is a federal government agency created by Congress in the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007. The five members of the Board are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Board is charged with ensuring that the federal government's effort to counter terrorism are balanced with the need to protect personal privacy and civil liberties. The "Newsroom" tab on this Web site provides access to the reports of the Board, including the 238-page report entitled, "Telephone Records Program Conducted Under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act and on the Operations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court."

Privacy International: www.privacyinternational.org.

This London-based group describes its purpose as follows: "We investigate the secret world of government surveillance and expose the companies enabling it. We litigate to ensure that surveillance is consistent with the rule of law. We advocate for strong national, regional and international laws that protect privacy. We conduct research to catalyze policy change. We raise awareness about technologies and laws that place privacy at risk, to ensure that the public is informed and engaged." While many of the reports provided by this group focus on countries other than the United States, some are focused on privacy in the United States, including "Biometrics: Friend or Foe of Privacy" and "Eyes Wide Open."

Project SALAM: <http://www.projectsalam.org/>.

This Web site declares that its purpose is to provide support and legal advocacy for Muslims. Project SALAM is especially concerned about the federal government's "use of 'agent provocateurs'/'informants' who agitate in the Muslim community leading to the conspiracy arrest of everyone who did not notify the FBI about the agent's provocative conduct. These 'informants' are either criminals spared long prison sentences and deportation for their help and/or are paid large sums of money by the government." The following reports can be downloaded from this Web site: "Inventing Terrorism: The Lawfare of Preemptive Prosecution" and "Civil Rights and Wrongs: Targeting and Entrapment of Muslims and the State of Civil Liberties Today."

R Street Institute: www.rstreet.org/.

This group describes itself as "a free-market think tank with a pragmatic approach to public policy challenges. We draw inspiration from such thinkers as Milton Friedman, Friedrich Hayek, Ronald A. Coase, James M. Buchanan and Arthur C. Pigou. We favor consumer choice; low, flat taxes; regulation that is transparent and applied equitably and systems that rely on price signals rather than central planning. Thus, it's fair to say that we're on the political right." By selecting the "Issues" tab, the debater can discover numerous publications dealing with "digital privacy," including the following: "Fix Surveillance Reform," "It's Time to Protect Data in the Cloud" and "Yes, the Government Can Open Your Mail Without a Warrant."

Suggestions for Online Lincoln Douglas Research

Yahoo Philosophy Directory: Some web sites provide an index of major philosophers with quick ways of finding biographical and other types of information about them. One such useful web site is as follows:

<http://dir.yahoo.com/arts/humanities/philosophy/philosophers/>

American Philosophical Association Online: Much of the this site is available only to APA members, but there is a public archive which includes APA Newsletters and some other publications. <http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/index.html>

EpistemeLinks.com: Maintains links to dozens of philosophy resources on the Internet. <http://www.epistemelinks.com/Main/MainLink.asp>

Guide to Philosophy on the Internet: Operated by Peter Suber of the philosophy department at Earlham College. <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/philinks.htm>

Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: This is a one-stop-shop for finding the meaning of key terms in philosophy as well as a brief overview of the biography and teachings of major and minor philosophers. <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/>

Philosophy Sites on the Internet: This is a links page maintained by Tel-Aviv University Department of Philosophy. <http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/philos/links.htm>

The Radical Academy: Unlike what the name would suggest, this site provides information on a wide range of philosophical topics. It includes “The Classic Philosophers,” “Glossary of Philosophical Terms,” “Adventures in Philosophy,” and “Religion Resource Center.” In the “Philosophical Resource Center,” there is a database of quotations from great philosophers, searchable by keyword or by philosopher. <http://www.radicalacademy.com/searchpage.htm>

The WWW Virtual Library: Philosophy — This philosophy library is made available through the University of Bristol’s Department of Philosophy. This site makes available the philosophy section of the “Social Science Information Gateway” (SOSIG). SOSIG provides a philosophy search engine. <http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/Philosophy/VL/>

UM-Flint Department of Philosophy: The top part of this page simply presents information about the course offerings of the University of Michigan-Flint Department of Philosophy. At the bottom of the page, though, is a wonderful collection of philosophy sites on the web. <http://www.flint.umich.edu/departments/phl/>

Yahoo Philosophers search: In the normal Yahoo search engine, type “philosophers>” in front of your search to search their philosophy database. Example of a search: philosophers>John Locke. www.yahoo.com