

line-by-line This refers to a method of rebuttal that methodically answers an opponent's arguments in the same order in which they were presented, responding to each particular argument. This method of argumentation is the opposite of grouping arguments, or offering a big picture. Judges in policy debate typically expect line-by-line answers to an opponent's arguments.

link turnaround In policy debate, the link turn is an important type of affirmative answer to a disadvantage. The affirmative argument is that the plan not only is innocent of the disadvantage link claim, but also that the plan would actually solve for the problem alleged in the disadvantage.

low point win This refers to a situation in which the contestant (or team) winning the debate has a lower number of speaker points than the opposing contestant (or team). Judges sometimes assign low point wins because they believe that the winning contestant had the better argument but was inferior in speaking skill to the opponent. Not all debate leagues allow judges to assign low point wins.

Malthus disadvantage This is a negative disadvantage in policy debate based on the claims of nineteenth-century British economist Thomas Malthus. Malthus argued that population increases geometrically while the food supply (and other resources) increases only arithmetically. The net result, according to Malthus, is that humankind is on a collision course, heading for starvation and environmental devastation. Simply put, the earth cannot sustain huge human populations. Some negative teams have used the Malthus disadvantage to argue that saving lives is actually bad because it contributes to overpopulation. This is the prototypical "bad is good" argument.

mandates In policy debate, this term refers to the central provisions of an affirmative plan; the mandates list the specific changes offered by the plan.

minor repair This term in policy debate refers to small changes proposed by the negative designed to fix small defects in the status quo. Advocates of minor repair theory would argue that the affirmative case fails to establish inherency if the negative team can show that small changes in the status quo would alleviate the affirmative harm. Minimum standards for a minor repair argument would be propensity and potential. The negative team would be expected to show that the present system is already moving in the direction of the minor repair (propensity) and that the minor repair, once done, would alleviate the harm (potential).

moving target Debaters sometimes use this phrase when they want to criticize an argumentative shift by an opponent—the final form of an argument morphed into something totally different from the way it was originally presented.

mutual exclusivity standard for competition This is a *can not* standard for counterplan competition in policy debate. The mutual exclusivity standard for counterplan answers the question "Why not do both the plan and the counterplan?" by arguing that it is logically impossible to do both the plan and the counterplan. Suppose