



## Debate Glossary

- AFF (Pro)** the affirmative/ government team
- Card** a piece of evidence, usually a quote from an expert, that proves a point. The quote is provided in context with a complete citation.
- Case/Constructive** Set of reasons, supporting facts, and arguments that shows why we should affirm or negate the resolution. Most debaters type them up (or handwrite parts on the bus).
- Claim** Assertion. Example: cheese is good. Claim – an assertion.
- Contention** A large argument or set of smaller arguments that supports a case. They often have subpoints, flowed like this, with abbreviations
- Criterion /Value criterion** How you get to, measure, or define your value.  
Example: With the value of Societal Welfare, the criterion could be Preservation of Rights.
- Constructive Speech** First speech given by each debater (both sides) in a round; used to build a case
- Cross-examination, or CX** An opportunity for one debater to ask the other questions.
- Crystallize down the flow** Instead of crystallizing at the bottom of the second rebuttal, some debaters choose to argue down the flow and then make certain points voting issues.
- Drop** When a debater does not address or respond to a subpoint or argument. In other words, they didn't refute it, so they implicitly agree with it. NOTE: drops must be impacted to count. It's not enough to say your opponent didn't refute your argument – you must say why it matters (impacting – why that point is so important, and the fact that your opponent agrees with you means you win the round).
- Dropping** Losing a round
- Ethics** Rules or standards that govern conduct.
- Extend** To carry across the flow. I'd recommend literally drawing an arrow from one speech to the next to indicate that the same point is being argued in both speeches.
- Fallacy** A statement/argument based on a false or invalid inference.



<b>Flow</b>	A piece of paper with many rows and columns on which you write down an outline of what the debaters are saying. Also can be used to refer to a written outline of all the arguments in a debate.
<b>“Going down the flow”</b>	Responding to arguments starting at the “top” or beginning of the previous speech and going to the “bottom” or the end. This what good debaters do: they respond to arguments in a linear or line-by-line fashion, rather than jumping “all over the flow.”
<b>Grouping</b>	Usually used in the context of “Group these subpoints together.” The debater is addressing several points at once by responding to the underlying idea behind them. This is most common in the 1AR, when there’s only 4 minutes for Aff to cover everything.
<b>Harm</b>	Something bad that happens because of the position one side takes. For example, if Aff is advocating that democracy is better than anarchy, Neg might point out the harm that democracy makes people pay taxes. (The obvious response Aff would say is that we get more benefits from paying taxes than the comparatively small harm of losing income.)
<b>Inherency</b>	The current (status quo) policies regarding the debate resolution area.
<b>Impact</b>	Explains the importance of the warranted claim. Example: It’s important that cheese is good, because its nutrients, especially calcium, contribute to a healthy body.
<b>Link</b>	A connection between the impacted claim and the value. Example: Since cheese contributes to a healthy body, my value of Individual Welfare is upheld.
<b>NEG (Con)</b>	The negative team.
<b>Non-resolutional</b>	When a point does not pertain to the resolution. It can also mean something that goes beyond the duty or burden one side has to prove (e.g. a supererogatory action).
<b>Non-unique</b>	A harm or benefit that can happen on either side and is therefore a wash.
<b>Picking Up</b>	Winning a debate round
<b>Plan</b>	The specific new policy the Affirmative offers to adopt the resolution. A plan will define the following components: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Mandate: What will the Affirmative specifically do? What action will be taken to adopt the intent of the resolution? The mandate(s) is the key aspect of the plan and needs to be carefully thought out and detailed.</li> <li>2) Agency: What (new or existing) governmental agency will be responsible for carrying out the mandate?</li> <li>3) Funding: How will the mandate be financed or paid for?</li> <li>4) Enforcement: How will the plan be enforced? How will punishment be delivered if the mandates are violated?</li> </ol>



Advantages: claims of what will improve as a result of adoption of the Affirmative plan.

<b>Prep time</b>	Time to write down some responses in preparation for the rebuttal; total prep time can be 3-5 minutes depending on the tournament)
<b>Pre-Flow</b>	Outline one's arguments before the debate begins
<b>Rebuttal</b>	Rebuilds arguments after attacks, refutes arguments of the opposing team, and summarizes the debate.
<b>Refutation</b>	Directly attacking the opposing debater/s' arguments.
<b>Resolution</b>	The topic being debated.
<b>Significance</b>	- the problems or harms caused by the status quo policy.
<b>Signpost</b>	To indicate where one is on the flow. For example: "In my opponent's second contention subpoint A, he/she said [tagline]..." Second contention subpoint A can be abbreviated C2A.
<b>Sliming</b>	When a debater brings up a new point in the second rebuttal, to which the other debater does not have time for nor is obligated to respond.
<b>Solvency</b>	Argument that supports the Affirmative plan and shows that it has a high degree of possibility to reduce or eliminate the current Significance (harms) .
<b>Spirit of the Resolution</b>	Refers to the reasonable interpretation and limits of the resolution
<b>Subpoint</b>	A point that is a part of the larger umbrella contention.
<b>Tagline</b>	One-sentence summary of a contention or subpoint. For example: Community standards have a "chilling effect" on teachers which is detrimental to the education of high school students. Or, "the chilling effect."
<b>Timer</b>	An essential part of debate, whether you're a judging or debating. Be sure to have one – any ordinary kitchen timer will do (I use an egg timer myself). Don't be stuck using the clocks on the school wall, as they are notoriously inaccurate.
<b>Topicality</b>	The argument presented is pertinent to the resolution in spirit or literally, it is topical.
<b>Value</b>	The overall standard by which the round should be weighed. It should be something inherently good, like Societal Welfare, Justice, Individual Welfare, Democracy, Quality of Life, Quality of the Future, etc. "Free Speech" isn't so great as a value because it can be bad, like in wartime (for more info, go look up the Supreme Court cases Shenck v. U.S. and Abrams v. U.S.).



**Value criterion**      How you get to, measure, or define your value.

**Voting issue, voter, or crystallization point**   Why you win the round. It can be an impacted drop extended across the flow in both rebuttals; it can be anything, as long as the debater makes an argument and calls it a voting issue/voter/point of crystallization. Example: I win this round because [argument]. Usually, crystallization is done during the last 2 minutes of the 2NR and 2AR, or for the entire 2AR.

**Warrant**      A reason why an assertion is true. Warrants are typically data, news sources or studies.

**Wash**      Nullification of harms/benefits, as when they're equal on both sides, so they cancel out.

