

elimination rounds. If a competitor already has two losses, each successive preliminary round is a break round, meaning that just one additional loss would make participation in elimination rounds impossible.

brief Groups of organized evidence in support of specific arguments are called argument briefs.

brink A disadvantage in policy debate can be structured either as linear or threshold. A linear disadvantage doesn't have to have a brink, and it doesn't have to be unique. With a linear disadvantage, the negative team argues that something bad is happening now and will become even worse with the adoption of the affirmative plan. With a threshold disadvantage—the most commonly used type of disadvantage—the negative team claims that some action in the affirmative plan will push us over a brink. In other words, the affirmative plan will become the straw that breaks the camel's back. The best brink evidence says that something catastrophic will happen if the present system is nudged just a little bit—a little more deficit spending, any additional terrorist attack in the United States, global warming speeds up (or whatever action is claimed in the disadvantage link).

burden of proof In policy debate, both affirmative and negative teams have a burden of proof to provide proof for their assertions.

burden of rebuttal Debaters have the responsibility to respond to the arguments made in the previous speech; if the debater offers no response, the judge has a right to assume that the argument of the opponent is accepted as true.

CEDA debate Cross Examination Debate Association is one of the formats for debate at the intercollegiate level.

clash Directly responding to the claims made by an opponent.

comparative advantage case In policy debate, this is one of the ways to organize an affirmative case; it is an alternative to the traditional need case or the goals/criteria case.

competitiveness This term refers to a requirement of the negative counterplan in policy debate. Competitiveness imposes a relevancy test on a counterplan; it gives a reason the judge should choose between the plan and the counterplan. Competitiveness answers the question "Why not do both the plan and counterplan?"

con In public forum debate, the team assigned to oppose the resolution is referred to as the *con* team.

concede To agree to, or accept as true, a particular argument made by an opponent. A debater might, for example, concede an opponent's argument that fairness should be the criterion for justice.

conditional counterplan A conditional counterplan—also called a *hypothetical* counterplan—is offered by a negative team in policy debate as a thought experiment. The negative team doesn't really advocate the counterplan, but offers it instead as a test