

sources, debaters have retained the term *cutting evidence* to refer to the process of selecting particular quotations.

DA Short-hand reference for a negative disadvantage in policy debate.

debatability This refers to a standard for deciding the outcome of topicality arguments in policy debate. The debatability standard argues that the judge should select an interpretation of the resolution that best enables good debate on the topic.

decision rule A decision rule is a standard for determining the outcome of the debate. Either side in the debate can suggest a decision rule. A decision rule might suggest that justice is the first among public virtues and that the judge should always choose the just policy regardless of expediency. Another decision rule might argue that human life is the ultimate value; whatever results in the greater saving of human life should be the preferred policy.

dilemma When a debater poses a dilemma, he suggests that the opponent must choose between one of two options, both of which are bad.

disadvantage This is a negative argument in policy debate; a disadvantage claims that if the affirmative plan were to be adopted, bad things would happen. The irreducible minimum for a disadvantage argument is link and impact. Threshold disadvantages also must have uniqueness and brink arguments.

division of labor This term is used in policy debate to refer to the need for the 2NC and the 1NR (back-to-back speeches) to coordinate their arguments so as to avoid needless repetition. Before the beginning of the 2NC, the second negative speaker should discuss with the 1NR which arguments will be left for the rebuttal.

double turn When an affirmative team in policy debate argues a link turn and an impact turn to the same disadvantage, the usual result is a double turn. This type of mistake can often result in the affirmative team losing the round. Consider the example of a deficit disadvantage. First, the affirmative team argues that the plan would not cost more money but would actually save money, thus lowering the federal deficit (this is a link turn). Then the affirmative team later in the answers to the disadvantage argues that a larger deficit is actually good rather than bad in that a larger deficit is needed to stimulate the economy (this is an impact turn). Putting the two arguments together, the affirmative team has argued that adopting the affirmative plan would cause the deficit to be lowered and that lowering the deficit would be a bad thing to do. When the negative team is certain that the affirmative team has committed a double turn, the affirmative team simply grants both halves of the double turn and argues that the affirmative team has provided its own justification for rejecting the plan.

drop Debaters say that their opponents have *dropped* arguments when they did not hear any answer to an argument in an opponent speech. If the judge agrees that the team has not answered the argument, the judge awards that particular argument to the other side; this does not necessarily determine the outcome of the round, however. The round