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The Structure of a Debate

- Constructive Speeches
  - 1AC: 8 Minutes
    - Cross-Examined by 2NC: 3 Minutes
  - 1NC: 8 Minutes
    - Cross-Examined by 1AC: 3 Minutes
  - 2AC: 8 Minutes
    - Cross-Examined by 1NC: 3 Minutes
  - 2NC: 8 Minutes
    - Cross-Examined by 2AC: 3 Minutes

- Rebuttal Speeches
  - 1NR: 5 Minutes
  - 1AR: 5 Minutes
  - 2NR: 5 Minutes
  - 2AR: 5 Minutes
The Stock Issues

- **Topicality:** Is it germane?
- **Harm:** Is there a significant problem?
- **Inherency:** What is causing the problem?
- **Solvency:** Can the problem be solved?
- **Disadvantage:** Will the solution create more serious problems than the ones it resolves?

Constructive Speaker Burdens

- **1AC:** Present a “Prima Facie” Case
  - Harm, Inherency, Solvency, Plan
- **1NC:** Present the Negative Attack
  - Traditionally attacked the 1AC
  - More recently: Topicality, Disads, Case
- **2AC:** Re-Defends Against 1NC
  - Follows 1NC point-by-point
- **2NC:** Answer 2AC positions
  - Divide positions with the 1NR (division of labor)
Rebuttal Speaker Burdens

- No new arguments in rebuttal (new evidence OK)
- 1NR: Answer remaining 2AC arguments
- 1AR: Answer all 2NC & 1NR arguments
- 2NR: Extend winning negative arguments
- 2AR: Answer all remaining negative arguments & claim all affirmative positions that are no longer contested

Cross Examination

- The speaker completing the constructive speech remains at the podium for questions
- Both questioner and respondent face the judge
- The questioner controls the cross examination period
- What to ask?
  - Set up arguments for later speeches
  - Use all of your time (it’s prep time for your partner)
Keeping a Flow Sheet

I. Checks on NSA surveillance authority are inadequate.
   A. The FISA Court rubber-stamps NSA requests.
   B. Congressional oversight is meaningless.
   C. Internal executive agency checks are inadequate to limit NSA power.

| 1. FISA Court judges are highly distinguished jurists |
| 2. The NSA has been forced to modify many of its requests to meet FISA Court standards. |
| 1. Congressional committees receive full briefings. |
| 2. Passage of the USA Freedom Act proves Congress takes its role seriously. |
| Privacy advocates are in place in the NSA and all intelligence agencies |
| 1. The judges are appointed by the Chief Justice – a Bush Adm appointee |
| 2. They have approved 99.9% of all requests since 1979 |
| Only members of the Intelligence Committees receive the briefings and they have been defenders of the NSA |
| The USA Freedom Act does not significantly limit NSA power – they can still examine metadata stored by phone companies. |
| The privacy advocates are powerless to change policy |

Flowsheet Tips

- Use abbreviations appropriate to the topic (P=PATRIOT Act, S=surveillance, etc.)
- Use symbols for common claims: (up arrow for increasing, down arrow for decreasing, right arrow for “causes” or “results in”, etc.)
- Teach debaters to ask for missed points (in CX or prep time).
- Use lots of paper (separate sheets for plan arguments and for case arguments; each big argument should have its own sheet).
- Line up flowsheet paper with debaters’ “road-maps”
Judging Debates

- The affirmative team has the “burden of proof” – they must prove each of the stock issues that have been challenged by the negative team.
- Most judges won’t vote negative on an issue not raised by the negative team (i.e. – do not vote negative on topicality when the negative team has never made a topicality argument)
- The last two rebuttals are critically important; these issues are the ones the debaters believe to be most important.

The Decision

Div:    Rd:    Judge Name: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spkr 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spkr 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spkr 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spkr 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my opinion, the better debating was done by