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What is Cross Examination (CX or Policy) Debate?

- Partner Debate
- Affirmative (supports status quo)
- Negative (opposes affirmative)
- 1 ½ hrs. in length (if all time is used)
- Policy option resolutions
- Evidence based
Important Terms to Learn

- **Constructive Speech** – the first four speeches in a round. Used to build the basis for your case.

- **Rebuttal Speech** – the last four speeches in a round. New arguments cannot typically be brought up here. New evidence is OK but NOT new arguments.

- **Prep Time** – 8 minutes per team given in round for the team to prepare responses to their opponents' arguments.

- **CX Time** – 3 minute time period after each constructive speech in which a team asks questions of the person who just spoke.

- **Open CX** – CX time in which both partners on each team are allowed to participate in the questioning session.
Times for CX Debate

- 8 min. 1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC)
- 3 min. CX by 2nd Negative
- 8 min. 1st Negative Constructive (1NC)
- 3 min. CX by 1st Affirmative
- 8 min. 2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC)
- 3 min. CX by 1st Negative
- 8 min. 2nd Negative Constructive (2NC)
- 3 min. CX by 2nd Affirmative
- 5 min. 1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR)
- 5 min. 1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)
- 5 min. 2nd Negative Rebuttal (2NR)
- 5 min. 2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR)
More Important Terms to Learn

- **Negative Block** – the back to back speeches that the negative has in the middle of the round
- **Paradigm** – the way the judge will adjudicate the round
- **Plan Text** – The part of the plan that stipulates exactly what the affirmative will be doing
- **Resolution** – The topic established to be debated
- **Fiat** – The affirmative’s right to assume that if their case is proven, it will be inacted.
- **Flowing** – Taking notes in a structured fashion in a debate round.
Even More Terms to Learn

- **Offense** – arguments given by debaters that provide a reason for you to support a vote for them or their side
- **Defense** – arguments given by debaters that negate arguments by the other team (only a mitigator)
- **Spreading** – speaking exceptionally fast in order to get a vast majority of evidence and argumentation in the round
- **Extend** – take an argument or piece of evidence made earlier in the round and keep it in the round for consideration
- **Cross-Apply** – take an argument or piece of evidence made on one issue and use it to answer another argument
Almost Done with Terms

- **Overview** – A summary at the start of an argument or a speech that summarizes the key points and voting reasons on the argument.
- **Underview** – A summary at the end of an argument or a speech that summarizes the key points and voting reasons on the argument.
- **Framework** – The way that the debaters are asking the judge to view the round.
- **Impact Calculus** – A part of a speech in which the debater weighs the offense of the affirmative over the offense of the negative to see who should win the round.
- **Turns** – Making an argument for the other team into an argument for your team.
- **Take-Out** – Mitigating an argument that your opponent makes.
TERMS YOU MAY HEAR IN ROUND

- **HEGEMONY** – the ability of a power to influence the decisions of others.
- **SOFT POWER** – a means of influencing others using diplomatic measures.
- **HARD POWER** – a means of influencing others using military might or other force.
- **POLITICAL CAPITAL** – the popularity and influence that a particular leader or party to get things accomplished.
STOCK ISSUES pt. 1

- HITSS
- HARMS – the problems that the affirmative team establishes are in the status quo that they seek to solve.
- INHERENCY – Proof that the harms aren’t being solved already in the status quo and/or that there is something preventing the resolution of the harms in the status quo
- TOPICALITY – Arguments centered around whether or not the affirmative is actually debating the topic.
STOCK ISSUES pt. 2

- Significance – (rarely argued anymore) argument about the significance of the harms

- Solvency – proof and argumentation surrounding the ability of the affirmative plan text to solve the harms that are presented in the case
OTHER TYPES OF IMPORTANT COMPONENTS OF THE ROUND

- ADVANTAGES – positive impacts to the affirmative plan being passed
- DISADVANTAGES – negative impacts to the affirmative plan being passed
- COUNTERPLANS – negative plan presented to counter the affirmative plan
- KRITIKS (pronounced critiques) – arguments attacking the philosophical implication of something that is done in the round or the mind set created through the argumentation within the round.
HARMS

- Those problems occurring in the status quo that must be solved with the passage of the affirmative plan.
- There does not have to be a substantial number of harms, but the harms presented must be solved by the aff plan.
- Harms should fall within the resolution.
Arguing Harms

- Affirmative – presents them in the 1AC
- Negative – argues that the harms presented by the status quo don’t truly exist or that they are exaggerated and not sufficient to be considered
Inherency

- Typically more important to stock judges than to policy or tab judges (will discuss in next session)
- 3 types
  - Structural – Some legal (usually) barrier in the status quo that is preventing the harms from being solved now or the affirmative being passed
  - Attitudinal – The attitude of the government, people, etc. that is currently preventing the plan being passed in the status quo
  - Existential – The fact that the harms are not being solved in the status quo or that there is no framework for them to be solved.
Arguing Inherency

- Affirmative – plan can’t be solved in the status quo because.....
- Negative – there are already plans or programs established in the status quo to solve the harms or there is nothing preventing the solving of the status quo
TOPICALITY TYPES

- **Not Topical** – concept that the affirmative is not debating the topic. (ex. The USFG should substantially reduce poverty in the US. Aff teaches farmers in Ethiopia how to farm and create income to reduce poverty there)

- **Effects Topical** – concept that the affirmative doesn’t directly do what the topic calls for them to do. (ex. The USFG should substantially reduce poverty in the US. Aff gives tax cuts to the business owners which, the aff proves, will cause lower prices and increase wages)

- **Extra Topical** – concept that the affirmative plan does more than what the topic requires. (ex. The USFG should substantially reduce poverty in the US. Aff provides more food stamps to Americans living in poverty and decreases the mortgage interest rates for the middle class.)
Parts of a Topicality Violation

- Interpretation - Definition and source of definition
- Violation – how the affirmative violates the definition, and thus the resolution
- Standards – Reasons that the definition provided is the one that the judge should consider in the round
- Voters – reasons why Topicality should warrant a vote by the judge if the violation is proven
Answers to a Topicality Violation

- We Meet (if possible) – show how the affirmative plan meets definition provided by the negative
- Counter-Interpretation – Another definition presented by the affirmative that their plan meets
- Counter-Standards and/or Standards comparison – Reasons that the aff. Definition is better and reasons why the neg. standards are not true or valid.
- Voters – Reasons NOT to vote the affirmative down based on topicality
Arguing Significance

- **Affirmative** – Argues that their harms are significant (either quantitatively or qualitatively) enough to validate the affirmative plan

- **Negative** – Argues that the problems are insignificant so as to not validate money being spent, potential lives being lost, etc.
Arguing Solvency

- **Affirmative** – provides evidence and analysis that their plan text will solve the harms they presented in the 1AC.

- **Negative** – can
  - Take-out – show that they can not access their solvency or can not solve their harms
  - Turn – make the solvency they claim into a bad thing (ex. Aff increases hegemony. Neg turns that to say that increasing hegemony makes their harms worse)
Arguing Advantages

- **Affirmative** – Argues that there are other benefits that the plan creates beyond solving the harms

- **Negative** – Can
  - **Take-Out** – Shows how the advantage cannot be garnered by the affirmative plan
  - **Turn** – Makes the affirmative advantage into a disadvantage to passing the affirmative plan
Arguing Disadvantages

- Negative Argues that there are big issues that the affirmative plan creates that creates a reason to reject the affirmative.

- Components
  - Uniqueness – The DA isn’t happening in the Status Quo and/or the Aff plan uniquely causes the impacts to the disadvantage
  - Link – What the aff does that causes the DA impacts
  - Brink – (not always presented) Provides the point at which the impacts will occur (when is the threshold reached)
  - Internal Link – A story painted of how we get from the link to the impacts
  - Impacts – The bad thing that will happen if the aff plan is put into action
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link Turn</td>
<td>No Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Turn</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note don’t double turn)</td>
<td>Non unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Brink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Internal Link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arguing Counterplans

- Negative presents a plan to counter the Affirmative
- Status of counterplans
  - Unconditional – the negative will argue the CP throughout the round without “kicking” it
  - Dispositional – the negative will argue the CP throughout the round unless the aff answers with offense or theory at which point they can “kick” it
  - Conditional – the negative can “kick” it at anytime
- Components
  - Plan Text
  - Solvency
- Types of most common counterplans
  - PIC – Plan inclusive counterplan – they keep most of the aff but change some part of it.
  - PEC – Plan exclusive counterplan – they can run another plan totally separate from the aff.
  - Topical vs. untopical
  - Consult
  - Alternate Agent
  - Delay
  - Utopian
  - Conditions
Arguing Kritiks

- One side argues that the other side does something that is fundamentally wrong or creates a mindset that is wrong or inherently dangerous to society

- Components
  - Link – what the team does that creates this issue
  - Impact – what bad thing occurs that necessitates a ballot for the other team

- EX. Gifts, Language, Feminism
TO BE CONTINUED:

- In the Next Session, we will cover:
  - Judging Paradigms
  - Filing
  - Researching
  - Writing Cases and Blocks
  - Card-Cutting
  - Behavioral Expectations
  - Circuit Rules (UIL, NFL, TFA)