putting each argument on a separate sheet of paper. When the first negative constructive speaker says, “I will present three disadvantages, one topicality argument, and then go to the case,” the judge knows that she will need four new sheets of paper before returning to the flow of the affirmative case.

shell In policy debate, this term refers to a brief version of the negative disadvantage, suitable for brief presentation in the first negative constructive speech. The shell must include all the essential elements of the disadvantage (the irreducible minimum being links and impacts).

shift An argumentative shift occurs when a debater abandons an original position (in the face of refutation) and adopts a wholly different argument.

solvency Solvency is one of the stock issues in policy debate; an affirmative case is said to have solvency if it demonstrates that the affirmative plan would, if adopted, resolve the harm cited in the affirmative case. Another term for solvency is *plan-meet-need (PMN)*.

speaker points In all forms of debate, the judge completes a ballot declaring a winner and a loser for the debate round. In addition, the judge assigns points to each contestant—usually on a 1-to-30 scale—where 30 means perfection. Speaker points are usually assigned only for preliminary rounds of competition; in elimination rounds, judges typically decide only a winner and a loser.

spread debating This term refers to the tendency of some debaters to make so many answers to an argument that the other team is unable to answer each of them.

squirrel cases A squirrel case in policy debate refers to an affirmative case that stretches the limits of the topic and is probably nontopical; the affirmative team is attempting to win the debate as a result of surprise.

status quo Things as they now exist. In policy debate, the negative team generally defends the present system or status quo; the affirmative team proposes to change from the status quo.

stock issues The traditional approach to the judging of a policy debate is the stock issues perspective. This approach is based on the legal analogy where the criminal law establishes certain independent elements that a prosecutor must prove. In the case of first-degree murder, for example, a prosecutor usually must prove motive, opportunity, forethought, and certain other elements contained in the criminal code of a particular state government. The stock issues in debate are (a) significance of harm; (2) inherency — what will cause the harm to continue absent the adoption of the plan; (3) solvency—how will the affirmative plan resolve the affirmative harm; (4) advantage over disadvantage—will the affirmative advantages outweigh the disadvantages suggested by the negative; (5) topicality—does the affirmative plan meet each of the words of the resolution. Judges who approach a debate from a stock issues perspective will vote negatively if the negative team successfully defeats any one of the five stock issues.