

impact turnaround An impact turn argument in policy debate claims that the impact of a negative disadvantage would be good instead of bad. Consider a negative deficit disadvantage that claims that an increased deficit would result from the increased spending in an affirmative plan. A negative impact turn argument would claim that an increase in the deficit would actually be good because deficit spending stimulates the economy and will bring it out of recession.

independent voting issue An issue that, if won, would be sufficient all by itself to warrant a decision. In policy debate, most judges view topicality as an independent voting issue for the negative. Judges who view the debate from a stock issues perspective see each of the stock issues (significance, inherency, solvency) as independent voting issues for the negative.

inherency This is one of the stock issues in policy debate; the affirmative team must demonstrate that the harm cited in the case is inherent. One good way to view inherency is that the affirmative team must show that the harm will continue to exist absent the adoption of the plan. Inherency deals with causation—the affirmative team is called on to locate in the present system the cause that will perpetuate the problem.

jurisdiction This refers to a standard in policy debate for deciding the outcome of topicality debates. One of the reasons topicality is a voting issue is that, within the legal paradigm, the language of the resolution sets the outward limits of the judge's jurisdiction. According to this view, if the plan calls for doing something beyond the resolution, the judge has no power or jurisdiction to enact the plan.

justification Some negative debaters in policy debate argue that the affirmative team must justify the inclusion of each word in the resolution to show that the resolution is a true statement. If the resolution contains the phrase “federal government,” the affirmative team must be able to justify why the federal government as opposed to the state governments should adopt the plan. Working within the hypothesis testing model, a judge might believe that the resolution (or hypothesis) should be rejected unless each part of it is shown to be true. Justification arguments make little sense, however, outside of a hypothesis testing paradigm.

lay judges Debate judges whose backgrounds do not include debate participation or debate coaching. Some state leagues use local attorneys, businesspeople, or parents as judges for debates.

linear Some negative disadvantages in policy debate are linear and do not claim to have uniqueness, threshold, or brink. A linear disadvantage alleges that any additional increment of the disadvantage link will produce additional harm. A deficit disadvantage structured as a linear position would admit that the status quo has a huge deficit that is already hurting the economy. The affirmative plan, by increasing spending, will worsen the deficit and produce more of a bad thing.