

Internet Debate Research

Rich Edwards, Baylor University

2010

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 very useful. Google and Bing, for example, index more than two billion 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 which 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. There are some limitations to the ability to find text within a web page. Google, for example, indexes only the first 101 kilobytes of a web page (under normal circumstances, this is the first 8 to 10 pages of text).

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 <U.S. military presence> 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 which 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 “U.S. military presence” you want to find the whole phrase of the resolution, not just pages which contain the individual words “U.S.” and “military” and “presence.” Almost all major search engines allow for exact phrase searching but there are some unfortunate exceptions. Bing does not recognize quotation marks as an indication of a desire for an exact phrase search. In order to instruct Bing to conduct an exact phrase search, it is necessary to select “Advance Search” and use the drop down box to order an exact phrase search.

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 the major Internet search engines capitalization no longer matters. Searching for “U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE” will produce the same results as “U.S. Military Presence” or “U.S. military presence.”

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 U.S. military presence (without the quotation marks), the search engine will look for web pages containing the word “U.S.” and “military” and “presence” but it will not require that the words be next to each other. By putting quotation marks around “U.S. military presence” you are requesting only those pages containing the whole phrase. There is no need to put quotation marks around a single word. As mentioned earlier, Bing – unlike all other major search engines – does not recognize quotation marks as an indication of an exact phrase search.

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.

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 is a

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 has was first offered in June 2009 (followed a period of beta releases). The engine seems nearly as comprehensive as Google in the number of Web sites returned. It does not, however, recognize quotation marks are a shorthand way to order an exact phrase search. Bing also offers far fewer advanced search options than does Google. www.bing.com

Dogpile: This is a metasearch engine which searches Overture, Fast, LookSmart, FindWhat, and About. The main problem is that it doesn't search the best search engines and it does not return the same number of items for each search engine as if you were searching that engine individually. www.dogpile.com

Google: *Best search engine overall for policy debate research.* Other folks have discovered it as well: According to "Nielsen Netratings" of June 2007, Google is responsible for 56.3% of all search engine referrals worldwide. The next closest search engine is Yahoo at 21.5%, followed by MSN Search (www.live.com) at 8.4%. What makes Google ("Go" "Ogle") 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: wind power global warming. 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: Before 2005 HotBot provided a useful search engine which would report the last revision date of a web site in its search report. In 2005, however, HotBot became simply a portal site for searching Yahoo. www.hotbot.com

LookSmart: More a directory than a search engine. Not well oriented to conducting debate research. www.looksmart.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

Overture: Formerly GoTo. This is a good search engine but not especially useful for debate research. www.overture.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 reducing U.S. military and/or police presence – it will be especially important to keep track of the status of current legislation. For example, some members of Congress have made recent attempts to force a withdrawal from Afghanistan. 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 "Thomas" – honoring Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Library of Congress. The URL is <http://thomas.loc.gov/>, but you can also just type "Thomas" in any search engine (such as Google) and the Library of Congress Web site will be the first item returned in the search. You can type the name of the pending legislation (such as the "Afghanistan-Pakistan Security and Prosperity Enhancement 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	"U.S. military presence"
Google	www.google.com	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	627,000	4,360,000
Bing	www.bing.com	Hard to Find	Yes	No	Yes	No	34,600	80,200
Yahoo	www.yahoo.com	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	26,389	658.013
AltaVista	www.altavista.com	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	23,351	1,010,000
HotBot	www.hotbot.com	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unavailable	Number not reported
AllTheWeb	www.alltheweb.com	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	23,556	965,000
Ask	www.ask.com	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1,380	28,700
About	www.about.com	Yes	No	No	No	No	Unavailable	50
Dogpile	www.dogpile.com	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	40	58
Webcrawler	www.webcrawler.com	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	40	48
Excite	www.excite.com	No	Yes	No	No	No	40	15,280
Mamma	www.mama.com	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unavailable	Number not reported
Lycos	www.lycos.com	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	23,368	52,942
LookSmart	www.looksmart.com	No	Yes	No	No	No	Unavailable	Number not reported

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.

How to prepare debate citations from the Internet. Example:

Stephen Chilton (Professor, Political Science, U. Minnesota, Duluth), Mar. 8, 2004, “The Enlightenment.” Retrieved July 2, 2009 from <http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/3652/Readings/3652.Rawls.ATheoryOfJustice.html>.

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:

This method is useful when debaters have only short periods of access to the Internet.

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. Identify the source in such a way that it will match the text you will save (i.e. Ravitch1). Once the Internet session is completed, save all of these citations to disk as "Sources."
4. Save a text copy of the Internet web site, giving it a name which will match the citation (i.e. Crane1)
5. The student would then follow the steps below on the Online Method, but because they now have a disk copy of the stuff from the Internet, they can finish the work on their home computer.

Online 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:

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

Google: Google (www.google.com) also provides two little-known definition tools. The first approach is to enter the term “define” in the main search box, followed by a colon, then the term or phrase you wish to have defined. Try, for example, the following Google search – define: federal government. You will find dozens of web-based definitions of the term. Notice the difference made by the colon after the word “define.” If the colon is absent, Google looks for any Web pages containing the word “define” and the phrase “federal government.” With the colon present, Google detects that you wish to examine only those Web sites which intend to define the specific phrase, “federal government.” A second definitional tool built into Google involves the capability to click any underlined term appearing below the search box. Try, for example, entering the phrase “federal government.” You will notice that when Google returns the pages for this search, it now also presents a number of related terms, including “United States federal government.”

Newspaper & Journal Articles:

Google News: Google news gives you access to otherwise hard to find news articles on the civil liberties topic. In fact, I have found this resource as useful on the military presence topic as the Lexis/Nexis news database (and it is sure a lot cheaper). The normal news database is limited to the past 60 days, but you can click at the left side of your screen on the news archive, allowing access to articles over the past few years. <http://news.google.com/>

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://articles.findarticles.com/p/home?tb=art>

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 "U.S. military presence" Web Sites for Policy Debaters

Asia Foundation: <http://asiafoundation.org>.

This group "supports programs in Asia that help improve governance, law and civil society; women's empowerment; economic reform and development and international relations. Drawing on more than 50 years of experience in Asia, the Foundation collaborates with private and public partners to support leadership and institutional development, exchanges and policy research." One of the documents available from the "Publications" tab on this Web site is a 321-page comprehensive report in 2008 on U.S. relations with Japan and South Korea entitled, *America's role in Asia: Asian and American views*. Another useful document is the February 2009 report entitled *Benchmarking America's Military Alliances: NATO, Japan and the Republic of Korea*.

Brookings Institution: www.brookings.edu.

This organization offers the following statement of its mission: "The Brookings Institution is a nonprofit public policy organization based in Washington, DC. Our mission is to conduct high-quality, independent research and, based on that research, to provide innovative, practical recommendations that advance 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." By clicking the link for "World" at the left side of the Brookings home page, the debater will find numerous relevant resources available for free download. Some of the outstanding resources available from this site include the following: *Unfinished Business: U.S. Overseas Military Presence in the 21st Century*, *Why We Can't Go Small in Afghanistan*, *Refocusing the U.S.-Japan Alliance: It's not Just About an Air Base, Could We Still Lose Iraq?* and *What's Next in Turkish-American Relations?*

Carnegie Middle East Center: www.carnegieendowment.org.

This subdivision of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace focuses on the prospects for peace in the Middle East. The Middle East Center is based in Beirut, Lebanon. The organization says that its reports are "deeply informed by knowledge and views from the region, enhancing the prospects for effectively addressing its particular challenges." The best way to locate the outstanding resources available from this Web site is through use of the "Search this site" box. Two 2009 reports are especially helpful in providing affirmative case ideas on the 2010-2011 topic: *Reconciling with the Taliban: Toward an Alternative Grand Strategy in Afghanistan* and *Focus and Exit: An Alternative Strategy for the Afghan War*.

Cato Institute: www.cato.org.

The Cato Institute is a libertarian think tank with a mission “to increase the understanding of public policies based on the principles of limited government, free markets, individual liberty and peace.” This Web site provides free access to hundreds of publications advocating a reduction in U.S. military presence abroad. To gain access to these publications, the debater can either click on the “Publications” link at the left or use the search box to enter any of the six countries named in the 2010-2011 resolution.

Center for a New American Security: www.cnas.org.

The Center describes itself as follows: “The Center for a New American Security (CNAS) develops strong, pragmatic and principled national security and defense policies that promote and protect American interests and values. Building on the deep expertise and broad experience of its staff and advisors, CNAS engages policymakers, experts and the public with innovative fact-based research, ideas and analysis to shape and elevate the national security debate. As an independent and nonpartisan research institution, CNAS leads efforts to help inform and prepare the national security leaders of today and tomorrow.” This Web site provides free access to PDF copies of hundreds of reports on U.S. military strategy in Turkey, Afghanistan, Iraq, South Korea and Japan.

Center for Defense Studies (CDS): www.defensestudies.org.

The Center is the creation of The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) with the following mission statement: “The primary purpose of the center is to impart a distinct identity to the scholarship on defense issues and military affairs currently produced at AEI, while signaling a new, focused intent to pursue rigorous studies and analysis on a range of strategic, programmatic and budgetary issues.” CDS scholars generally support a strong military overseas military presence and forward basing strategy. Excellent support for the negative position on the 2010-2011 topic is available from this Web site. Especially helpful is the link provided at the bottom left side of the page to the *Joint Force Quarterly (JFQ)*. The articles are made available free for download in PDF format. The January 2010 issue of the *JFQ* is devoted to the Afghanistan conflict. Another of the links available from this page provides free access to *DefenseNews* – another valuable resource. A December 27, 2009 article in *DefenseNews* discussed how Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama has now reconsidered his demand that the U.S. marine base at Futenma be relocated out of Japan to the U.S. territory of Guam. Hatoyama now says that maintaining deterrence would be impossible if the base were to be moved out of Japan. Numerous other resources are available through other links offered on the CDS Web site.

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

This is the premier think tank on matters of U.S. foreign policy. CSIS describes its mission in the following way: “At a time of new global opportunities and challenges, the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) provides strategic insights and policy solutions to decisionmakers in government, international institutions, the private sector and civil society. A bipartisan, nonprofit organization headquartered in Washington, DC, CSIS conducts research and analysis and develops policy initiatives that look into the future and anticipate change.” To locate the publications most relevant to the 2010-2011 topic, select the link at the top right side of the CSIS home page for “Defense and Security.” You will be taken to a date-ordered list of hundreds of reports on all aspects of U.S. military policy.

Century Foundation: www.tcf.org.

The Century Foundation describes itself as “a nonprofit public policy research institution committed to the belief that a mix of effective government, open democracy and free markets is the most effective solution to the major challenges facing the United States.” To locate documents dealing with U.S. military policy, click the link at the left for “International Affairs” and then examine the link options available under the heading “Issues In Depth.” Valuable evidence can be found in recent reports entitled *Price of Success in Afghanistan*, *Rethinking U.S. Military Presence in the Persian Gulf and Nation-Building* and *Counterinsurgency After Iraq*.

Council on Foreign Relations (CFR): www.cfr.org.

The Council on Foreign Relations is a think tank that publishes *Foreign Affairs*, perhaps the most prestigious journal on U.S. foreign policy. CFR describes itself as “an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank and publisher dedicated to being a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, civic and religious leaders and other interested citizens in order to help them better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other countries.” While CFR does not provide access to *Foreign Affairs* from its Web site, it does offer free access to dozens of other reports on matters relevant to the 2010-2011 topic. A sampling of 2009 reports includes the following: *The United States in the New Asia*, *Preparing for Sudden Change in North Korea*, *A Sea Change in Japanese Politics* and *Reversal in Iraq*.

Friends Committee on National Legislation: www.fcnl.org.

This organization describes its function as follows: “The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) fields the largest team of registered peace lobbyists in Washington, DC. Founded in 1943 by members of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), FCNL staff and volunteers work with a nationwide network of tens of thousands of people from many different races, religions and cultures to advocate social and economic justice, peace and good government.” Selected articles of *Peacework Magazine* are made available from this Web site. The February 2007 edition of that magazine offered an article by Joseph Gerson entitled, “Ten Reasons to

Withdraw All U.S. Foreign Military Bases.” The Friends Committee has this to say about Afghanistan: “War is not the answer to the perplexing problems in Afghanistan. The presence of foreign troops has become the most important element driving the insurgency. Escalating the U.S. troop presence will increase anti-U.S. sentiment further and escalate the violence. It will also undermine prospects for successful diplomatic and development efforts in the region. The U.S. problem in Afghanistan is not that it is losing the war against the Taliban but that the U.S. war in Afghanistan is helping the Taliban to grow and win.”

Hoover Institution: www.hoover.org.

The Hoover Institution offers the following explanation of its mission: “The principles of individual, economic and political freedom; private enterprise and representative government were fundamental to the vision of the Institution’s founder. By collecting knowledge, generating ideas and disseminating both, the Institution seeks to secure and safeguard peace, improve the human condition and limit government intrusion into the lives of individuals.” Some of the reports from this Web site are available only by purchase, but many others are free. Issues of the journals, *Hoover Digest* and *Policy Review*, are made freely available. Almost every issue of those journals contains articles relevant to the 2010-2011 topic.

Hudson Institute: www.hudson.org.

The Hudson Institute says it is “a nonpartisan policy research organization dedicated to innovative research and analysis that promotes global security, prosperity and freedom.” This site provides access to dozens of recent reports by selecting the “Publications and Op-Eds” tab at the left side of the page. Examples of materials likely to be helpful on the 2010-2011 topic are Zeyno Baran’s March 2009 report entitled “Turkey’s Identity and Strategy: A Game of Three-Dimensional Chess” and Herbert London’s September 2009 report entitled “The Need for Missile Defense.”

Mother Jones: <http://motherjones.com/military-maps>.

Mother Jones is a counter-culture journalistic organization owned by the Foundation for National Progress. They describe themselves as “a nonprofit news organization that specializes in investigative, political and social justice reporting.” This Web site offers an interactive map with the title, “U.S. Military Presence Worldwide.” By clicking on any country, the user can view total U.S. troop strength, the location of U.S. bases and the dollar cost associated with maintaining the bases.

New America Foundation: <http://newamerica.net/>.

The New America Foundation is a think tank devoted to bringing “innovative, cutting-edge policy solutions to the fore of the national debate.” The Foundation’s “Global Programs” have initiatives designed to address arms and security, nuclear strategy and nonproliferation, privatization of foreign policy, counterterrorism and global governance. By selecting the “Events and Publications” link, the debater can locate dozens of reports relevant to the 2010-2011 topic.

Qatar Tribune: www.qatar-tribune.com/data/20100108/archive.asp.

This is an outstanding daily newspaper detailing national and world events from a Middle Eastern perspective. This link to their archive makes available back issues of the newspaper in a downloadable PDF format. The *Qatar Tribune* provides extensive coverage to controversies related to the basing of U.S. troops. Consider the following section of an article in the Nov. 14, 2009 edition, entitled “Obama Vows to Deepen Ties With Asia,” which deals with the U.S. troop presence in Japan: “Opposition to the U.S. bases has simmered for decades, with locals complaining about aircraft noise, pollution, the risk of accidents and crimes committed by servicemen, especially a high-profile 2005 gang-rape. On Sunday, more than 20,000 Okinawans rallied against the continued presence of 47,000 troops in Japan, a legacy of its post-war occupation and a smaller protest was held in Tokyo Friday” (p. 2).

U.S. Department of Defense: www.dod.gov.

This government Web site provides direct access to the latest military assessments of the U.S. Department of Defense. A December 10, 2009 article by Jim Garamore of the American Forces Press Service, offers the following positive outlook on President Obama’s decision to expand forces in Afghanistan: “President Barack Obama’s decision to send in an additional 30,000 U.S. troops and further contributions from NATO allies will give the commander of U.S. and international forces in Afghanistan ‘all the forces he needs in 2010 to reverse the momentum of a growing and increasingly lethal insurgency,’ the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said here today.”

United States Department of State: www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2800.htm.

This Web site provides an essential overview of the government, foreign relations and political conditions in each country in the world. By using the dropdown menu at the right side of the screen under the term “Country Profiles,” the debater can find a description of any one of the six countries listed in the 2010-2011 resolution. In most cases, the State Department site provides a description of U.S. military commitments to each country. Following is the statement provided about the U.S. commitment to South Korea: “In 2004, agreement was reached on the return of the Yongsan base in Seoul – as well as a number of other U.S. bases – to the R.O.K. and the eventual relocation of all U.S. forces to south of the Han River. Those movements are expected to be completed by 2016. In addition, the U.S. and R.O.K. agreed to reduce the number of U.S. troops in Korea to 25,000 by 2008,

but a subsequent agreement by the U.S. and R.O.K. presidents in 2008 has now capped that number at 28,500, with no further troop reductions planned. The U.S. and R.O.K. have also agreed to transfer wartime operational control to the R.O.K. military on April 17, 2012.”

United States Forces Korea: www.usflk.mil/usfk/

This Web site is maintained by the U.S. military, primarily for the purpose of providing information to U.S. military families. By clicking on the “Speeches” link at the left side of the screen, you can gain access to dozens of recent speeches from military officials describing the importance of U.S. troop presence in South Korea.

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars: www.wilsoncenter.org.

This Wilson Center explains its history and mission as follows: “Established by an act of Congress in 1968, the Wilson Center is our nation’s official living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson. As both a distinguished scholar – the only American President with a Ph.D. – and a national leader, Wilson felt strongly that the scholar and the policymaker were ‘engaged in a common enterprise.’ The Wilson Center is a nonpartisan institute for advanced study and a neutral forum for open, serious and informed dialogue. It brings pre-eminent thinkers to Washington for extended periods of time to interact with policymakers through a large number of programs and projects. The Center seeks to separate the important from the inconsequential and to take a historical and broad perspective on the issues.” By clicking the Publications tab, the debater can gain free access to many of the articles in the *Wilson Quarterly*. Recent articles include the following: “Cracks in the Jihad” and “The Expeditionary Imperative.”

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 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