

# Internet Debate Research

## Rich Edwards, Baylor University

### 2016

#### 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 105<sup>th</sup> and 106<sup>th</sup> 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 <economic engagement> 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 "economic engagement" you want to find the whole phrase, not just pages which contain the individual words "economic" and "engagement." 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 “ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT” will produce the same results as “Economic Engagement” or “economic engagement.”

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 economic engagement (without the quotation marks), the search engine will look for web pages containing the word “economic” and “engagement” but it will not require that the words be next to each other. By putting quotation marks around “economic engagement” 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](http://www.yahoo.com). [www.alltheweb.com](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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: economic engagement. 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](http://www.google.com)

**HotBot:** This search engine is provided by Lycos. [www.hotbot.com](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.yahoo.com)

### **Tracking the Progress of Legislation**

On the policy debate topic – substantially increasing U.S. economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People’s Republic of China – 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 “China Human Rights Protection Act of 2015”) in the search box and Congress.gov will show the current status of the legislation. Congress.gov 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	"economic engagement"
Google	<a href="http://www.google.com">www.google.com</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	627,000	209,000
Bing	<a href="http://www.bing.com">www.bing.com</a>	Hard to Find	Yes	No	Yes	No	34,600	168,000
Yahoo	<a href="http://www.yahoo.com">www.yahoo.com</a>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	26,389	168,000
AltaVista	<a href="http://www.altavista.com">www.altavista.com</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	23,351	Unavailable
HotBot	<a href="http://www.hotbot.com">www.hotbot.com</a>	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unavailable	118,000
AllTheWeb	<a href="http://www.alltheweb.com">www.alltheweb.com</a>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	23,556	168,000
Teoma	<a href="http://www.teoma.com">www.teoma.com</a>	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1,380	Unavailable
Dogpile	<a href="http://www.dogpile.com">www.dogpile.com</a>	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	40	Unavailable
Webcrawler	<a href="http://www.webcrawler.com">www.webcrawler.com</a>	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	40	Unavailable
Excite	<a href="http://www.excite.com">www.excite.com</a>	No	Yes	No	No	No	40	Unavailable
Mamma	<a href="http://www.mama.com">www.mama.com</a>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unavailable	Unavailable
Lycos	<a href="http://www.lycos.com">www.lycos.com</a>	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:

Department of Homeland Security, First U.S.-China High-Level Joint Dialogue on Cybercrime and Related Issues Summary of Outcomes, Dec. 2, 2015. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2016 from <http://www.dhs.gov/news/2015/12/02/first-us-china-high-level-joint-dialogue-cybercrime-and-related-issues-summary>.

This is the citation standard required by the National Forensic League, 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 NFL 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](http://www.OneLook.com): Access to more than one thousand dictionaries is available through [www.onelook.com](http://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 China 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](http://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 China Web Sites for Policy Debaters**

AFL-CIO: [aflcio.org](http://aflcio.org).

The AFL-CIO describes itself in the following way: "We are the umbrella federation for U.S. unions, with 56 unions representing 12.5 million working men and women. We work to ensure that all people who work receive the rewards of their work – decent paychecks and benefits, safe jobs, respect and fair treatment." This AFL-CIO produces a steady stream of reports complaining about unfair Chinese trade practices and the unemployment impacts of outsourcing of jobs to China. Examples of such reports are "China's Currency Devaluation Deepens Unfair Trade Practices," "Our Incoherent China Policy" and "Walmart's Policies Have Sent 400,000 Jobs to China."

American Enterprise Institute: [aei.org](http://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." By simply entering "China" in the Web site's search box, the debater can access dozens of recent reports such as "The Double-Edged Sword of China's Global Investment Success," "Doing Stupid Stuff in the South China Sea" and "China's Discomfort in an American World."

Amnesty International: [amnestyusa.org](http://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 "Human Rights in China" (inside quotation marks) in the main search box, you will find numerous useful reports including the following: "Tiananmen, 26 Years On, the Repressive Patterns Intensify," "Human Rights Is Not a Side Issue, It's the Issue" and "Censorship of the Internet Must Stop in China."

Asian Institute for Policy Studies: [en.asaninst.org](http://en.asaninst.org).

This organization offers the following description of its history and purpose: “The Asian Institute for Policy Studies was founded by Dr. Chung Mong Joon, honorary chairman and a seven-term member of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, on February 11, 2008. We currently have 17 full-time research fellows, 20 program officers and 32 regular staff members. The institute conducts research in national security and foreign policy, area studies, public opinion and domestic politics, social science methodology and global governance.” The majority of the issue briefs available here include a discussion of the problems in East Asia created by the belligerent stance of North Korea. Examples include “North Korea’s 4th Nuclear Test and the International Response,” “The Days After the Fall of North Korea” and “Breaking the Myth of Missile Defense.”

Brookings Institution: [www.brookings.edu](http://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.” From the main Web site, the debater should select the “Research” tab then choose “Asia and Pacific.” “China” then appears as a specific option. By selecting “China” the debater can access numerous 2016 reports, including “What Does China Really Want?,” “Should We Worry About China’s Economy” and “Assessing the Outcomes and Implications of Taiwan’s January 2016 Elections.”

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: [carnegieendowment.org](http://carnegieendowment.org)

This organization describes itself as “a unique global network of policy research centers in Russia, China, Europe, the Middle East and the United States. Our mission, dating back more than a century, is to advance the cause of peace through analysis and development of fresh policy ideas and direct engagement and collaboration with decision makers in government, business and civil society. Working together, our centers bring the inestimable benefit of multiple national viewpoints to bilateral, regional and global issues.” By navigating to the Asia Program page, the debater can access documents such as the following: “Why America No Longer Gets Asia,” “China’s Counterbalance to the American Rebalance” and “China’s Economic Downturn: The Facts Behind the Myth.”

Cato Institute: [www.cato.org](http://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 free trade and for reducing U.S. military commitments abroad. Recent reports include “Is Free Trade With China a Bad Deal?,” “A Case for Calm About China” and “Getting China to Become Tough With North Korea.”

Center for American Progress (CAP): [www.americanprogress.org](http://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." In order to access information on China, locate the list of "Issues" at the left side of the home page and select "Foreign Policy and Security." Recent reports include "Beijing's Energy Revolution Is Finally Gaining Serious Momentum," "Climate-Related Risk Insurance: A New Opportunity for U.S.-China Collaboration" and "Dealing With a Proactive China."

Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS): [www.csis.org](http://www.csis.org).

This highly respected think tank focuses on international issues such as "defense and security, regional stability and transnational challenges ranging from energy and climate to global development and economic integration." From the CSIS home page, locate the "Topics & Regions" section at the right side of the screen; click the plus sign to the left of "Asia" and then select "China." Recent reports include "The Threat to China's Security Isn't THAAD, It's North Korea," "The Future of U.S.-Taiwan Relations" and "The Changing Landscape of U.S.-China Relations."

Century Foundation: [tcf.org](http://tcf.org).

This New York-based think tank describes its history and mission in the following way: "Over its nearly century-long history, the Foundation has been on the forefront of positive change in some of the most critical areas of domestic and foreign policy, including the promotion of equality of educational opportunity, the strengthening of economic security, the protection of workers and consumers, the empowerment of voters and the fostering of international peace and security." Reports available from this Web site present an optimistic view of the changes underway in China. By entering "China" in the main search box on the home page, the debater can locate articles such as the following: "A U.S.-China Breakthrough," "China's Green Leap" and "China's Climate Solution."

Council on Foreign Relations: [cfr.org](http://cfr.org).

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) publishes a bi-monthly magazine – Foreign Affairs – that is commonly regarded as the top publication dealing with U.S. foreign policy. Unfortunately, Foreign Affairs is available only by subscription – most likely available in your local public library. But CFR also maintains a foreign policy think tank where more than seventy foreign policy experts produce reports that can be accessed from the "Publications" link on the Web page. Examples of these reports include the following: "The Future of Free Expression in China," "Report to Congress on China's World Trade Organization Compliance" and "China's Market Plunge: Correction or Crisis?"

EastWest Institute: [eastwest.ngo](http://eastwest.ngo).

The EastWest Institute, founded in 1980, says that it “works to reduce international conflict, addressing seemingly intractable problems that threaten world security and stability. We forge new connections and build trust among global leaders and influencers, help create practical new ideas and take action through our network of global decision-makers.” By clicking the “Reports” tab and using the filters at the right side of the screen, the debater can access numerous recent documents, including “Can China Be Deterred in Cyberspace?,” “The South China Sea Problem Has Been Militarized” and “U.S.-China Internet Cooperation.”

Engage China: [engagechina.com](http://engagechina.com).

The “About Us” link at this Web site provides the following explanation: “Engage China is a coalition of 12 financial services trade associations united in support of high-level engagement between the United States and China. Trade between the U.S. and China is the most important bilateral economic relationship in today’s global economy. Over the past five years, U.S. exports to China have grown at seven times the pace of U.S. exports to the rest of the world. Continued financial sector reforms and expanded market access are needed to create more opportunity for the people of China and jobs for America.” This group features a document entitled, “The Case for Engagement With China.” In addition, the “Newsroom” tab will provide access to dozens of recent articles presenting a positive view regarding U.S.-China economic ties.

Global Warming Policy Foundation: [thegwpf.org](http://thegwpf.org).

This London-based group, founded in 2009, offers the following statement of purpose: “We are an all-party and non-party think tank and a registered educational charity which, while open-minded on the contested science of global warming, is deeply concerned about the costs and other implications of many of the policies currently being advocated.” While the group indicates that it invites all viewpoints on the topic of global warming, most of the publications made available at this Web site question the significance of the threat. Examples of such documents include “The Climate Wars and the Damage to Science,” “Should We Celebrate Carbon Dioxide” and “Antarctic Sea Ice Growing, Not Shrinking.”

Heritage Foundation: [www.heritage.org](http://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 China including “Why China’s Human Rights Violations Do Matter,” “China’s Pivot to the Sea: The Modernizing PLA Navy” and “China Enjoys All of the Benefits of Obama’s Engaging Folly.”

Hoover Institution: [hoover.org](http://hoover.org).

According to its Web site, “the Hoover Institution seeks to improve the human condition by advancing ideas that promote economic opportunity and prosperity, while securing and safeguarding peace for America and all mankind.” By entering “China” in the search box on the Web site’s home page, the debater can access document such as “The Best Way to Win Trade Deals With China,” “Stronger Military Ties With China Key to Peace” and “China As an Ally in Cyberspace.”

Hudson Institute: [www.hudson.org](http://www.hudson.org).

This think tank, founded in 1961, describes as its purpose, “promoting American leadership and global engagement for a secure, free and prosperous future.” Recent reports on China include “Wanted: A Real National Cyber Plan,” “China’s Massive Debt Problem” and “Beijing’s Next Gambit: The East China Sea.”

Human Rights Watch: [www.hrw.org](http://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.” Searching for “China” in the main search box will provide access to many recent reports including “Free ‘Disappeared’ Booksellers,” “Reverse Downward Rights Spiral” and “China: Allow Independent Investigations into Xinjiang Violence.”

Independent Institute: [www.independent.org](http://www.independent.org).

This politically conservative think tank declares that its mission is “to boldly advance peaceful, prosperous and free societies grounded in a commitment to human worth and dignity.” Independent Institute scholars typically advocate that the United States government should limit its military involvement abroad, including in the Asian Pacific region. Recent reports include “The United States Should Peacefully Let China Rise,” “Let’s Not Get into It With China” and “U.S. Alliances Encourage Asian Allies to Be More Antagonistic.”

Initiatives for China: [initiativesforchina.org](http://initiativesforchina.org).

This organization describes itself as follows: “Initiatives for China is a grassroots movement dedicated to advancing a peaceful transition to democracy in China. Our movement is embedded with the belief that such a transition can only be achieved through structural reform of the current system of government that by its very nature denies universally recognized political and social rights to its citizens.” By selecting the “News” and “Op-Ed” tabs, the debater can gain access to articles such as “Head Off a Tiananmen Massacre in Hong Kong,” “China Hasn’t Earned a Spot on Human Rights Council” and “China Urged to Release Nobel Prize Laureate.”

International Crisis Group: [crisisgroup.org](http://crisisgroup.org).

This organization identifies itself as “an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization committed to preventing and resolving deadly conflict.” Recent reports include “Fishing for Ways to De-Escalate South Sea Tensions,” “Stirring Up the South China Sea: A Fleeting Opportunity for Calm” and “Washington Says One Thing, But China Hears Another.”

Library of Congress: [congress.gov](http://congress.gov).

This Web site has replaced 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 or resolutions dealing with U.S.-China relations. Some recent examples are H.Res 343: “Expressing Concern Regarding Persistent and Credible Reports of Systematic, State-Sanctioned Organ Harvesting From Non-Consenting Prisoners of Conscience in the People’s Republic of China” and H.R. 2621: “China Human Rights Protection Act of 2015.

Natural Resources Defense Council: [nrdc.org](http://nrdc.org).

The “About Us” link on this Web site offers the following statement: “NRDC is the nation’s most effective environmental action group, combining the grassroots power of more than 2 million members and online activists with the courtroom clout and expertise of nearly 500 lawyers, scientists and other professionals.” Numerous NRDC documents focus on international environmental issues involving China, including the following: “China Is Phasing Out Its Ivory Trade,” “China’s Dropping Coal Consumption Is Putting the Brakes on Global Carbon Emissions” and “Common Myths About Shark Fins.”

New York Times: [nytimes.com](http://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 U.S.-China relations, including cyber threats, human rights issues and trade matters.

Paulson Institute: [paulsoninstitute.org](http://paulsoninstitute.org).

This Institute was founded in 2011 by former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury and former chief executive of Goldman Sachs, Henry M. Paulson, Jr. The declared mission of the Paulson Institute is to “advance global environmental protection and sustainable economic growth in the United States and China, while fostering broader understanding between the two countries.” Examples of documents available from this Web site include “How the United States Can Reinforce Chinese Action on Climate Change,” “A Better Approach to Intellectual Property” and “Why China Needs Coordinated Air Quality and Climate Strategies.”

Peterson Institute for International Economics: [www.iie.com](http://www.iie.com).

This group declares its purpose as follows: “The Peterson Institute for International Economics is a private nonpartisan nonprofit institution for rigorous, intellectually open and in-depth study and discussion of international economic policy. Its purpose is to identify and analyze important issues to make globalization beneficial and sustainable for the people of the United States and the world and then to develop and communicate practical new approaches for dealing with them.” Simply using the search box to search for “China” seems to produce mainly book items listed for sale. The debater may find the following process more useful: After clicking the “Publications” tab, a series of filters will appear over at the right side of the screen. Under the “Select Topic” filter, you will see an option for “China.” By clicking the “Apply Filter” button, you will find numerous useful reports including “Can the World Adjust to China’s New Normal?,” “The United States Still Runs the World” and “China Sneezes, Global Markets Get a Cold.”

Public Citizen: [www.citizen.org](http://www.citizen.org).

This group says that it “leads the charge against undemocratic trade agreements that advance the interests of mega-corporations at the expense of citizens worldwide.” Numerous reports opposing trade deals, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), can be located by selecting the “Our Work” tab and then “Globalization and Trade.”

RAND Corporation: [rand.org](http://rand.org).

This organization, founded in 1948, describes itself as “a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan and committed to the public interest.” RAND produces more than 500 detailed reports each year, all of which can be downloaded without cost. Debaters should click the “Research” tab and then select the “Center for Asia Pacific Policy” under the “RAND International” heading. Examples of recent China-related reports available from RAND include “China Has Done More About Pollution than You Think,” “The U.S.-China Military Scorecard” and “China’s International Behavior.”

Roosevelt Institute: [rooseveltinstitute.org](http://rooseveltinstitute.org).

This group is associated with the Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum in Hyde Park, New York. It offers the following explanation of its purpose: “We bring together thousands of thinkers and doers – from a new generation of leaders in every state to Nobel laureate economists – working to redefine the rules that guide our social and economic realities. We rethink and reshape everything from local policy to federal legislation, orienting toward a new economic and political system: one built by many for the good of all.” Examples of China-related documents from this Web site include “TPP [Trans-Pacific Partnership] Would Weaken U.S. Economy and Fail to Check China’s Rise” and “Straws in the Wind: Google in China.”

Stimson Center: [stimson.org](http://stimson.org).

The Stimson Center, founded in 1989, describes itself as “a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank devoted to addressing transnational challenges in order to enhance global peace and economic prosperity.” Entering “China” in the main search box will provide access to dozens of documents, including “Uighur/Han Clashes in China,” “U.S. Energy Independence: Disaster or Blessing for China?” and “Sea Lanes and Territorial Claims.”

USA\*Engage: [usaengage.org](http://usaengage.org)

This Web site, sponsored by the National Foreign Trade Council, advocates U.S. economic engagement: “SA\*Engage is a coalition of businesses, agriculture groups and trade associations working to promote the benefits of U.S. engagement abroad and educate the public about the ineffectiveness of unilateral economic foreign policy sanctions. USA\*Engage believes that positively engaging other societies through diplomacy, multilateral cooperation, the presence of American organizations, the best practices of American companies and humanitarian exchanges better advances U.S. objectives than punitive unilateral economic sanctions.” While a few of the articles posted on this Web site deal with China, the major focus is on the current push to end U.S. sanctions against Cuba.

Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars: [wilsoncenter.org](http://wilsoncenter.org).

This Web site provides the following explanation of the Wilson Center’s history and purpose: “The Wilson Center, chartered by Congress as the official memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, is the nation’s key non-partisan policy forum for tackling global issues through independent research and open dialogue to inform actionable ideas for the policy community.” One of the programs of the Wilson Center is the Kissinger Institute on China and the United States. The reports from Kissinger Institute scholars can be accessed by selecting the “Research” tab and then clicking the “Kissinger Institute” under the “Asia” subtitle. Examples of useful documents made available from the Kissinger Institute include the following: “Engage China and Russia With Issues,” “Debate: Are the U.S. and China Long-Term Enemies?” and “A U.S.-China Grand Bargain.”

### **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](http://www.yahoo.com)