

outcome depends on the importance of the argument in relation to the other arguments being won by both sides.

each-word-has-meaning standard for topicality The each word standard in policy debate argues that the framers of the resolution placed each of the words into the resolution for additive meaning; the affirmative plan must, therefore, meet each and every individual word in the resolution. The topicality violation then alleges that there is one word in the resolution that the affirmative plan fails to meet.

effects topicality In policy debate, some affirmative plans fulfill the terms of the resolution only if certain intervening steps are completed. Most judges and debate theorists would hold that the plan must be topical on its face, meaning that the text of the plan must do directly the things called for in the resolution. We should not have to wait for several months or years to determine whether the change made in the plan will in fact eventuate in the resolutorial action. The central theoretical objection to effects topicality is that it collapses the stock issues of topicality and solvency; the topicality of the affirmative plan is provided only if the plan works.

elimination rounds Debate tournaments are divided into preliminary rounds and elimination rounds. Whereas all attendees participate in preliminary rounds, only the most successful contestants (based on wins and losses in preliminary rounds) participate in elimination rounds. After elimination rounds begin, only the winners of each round advance until the tournament culminates in a final round between the top two competitors.

empirical proof Proof arising from actual experience.

evaluative term Some, but not all, propositions of value contain an evaluative term. An evaluative term describes the measure to be used in determining how highly something is to be valued. In the resolution “A just society ought not use the death penalty as a form of punishment,” the evaluative term is *just*.

existential inherency In policy debate, affirmative teams sometimes claim that the problem cited in the case is inherent because it has continued to exist over a prolonged period of time. This approach to demonstrating inherency is referred to as *existential* inherency. Few judges who care about inherency are willing to accept existential inherency—such argumentation circumvents questions of causation and claims that the continued existence of harm is a demonstration of inherency.

extend When a debater asks the judge to extend an argument, she is really saying that the opponent didn’t answer the argument. The debater is simply asking the judge not to forget about this argument.

extratopicality Whereas topicality arguments in policy debate allege that the plan fails to meet the resolution, extratopicality arguments allege that the plan does the resolution and more. The affirmative team is attempting to claim an advantage from a portion of the plan that goes beyond the resolution.