

structural inherency This is the traditional approach to inherency in policy debate; the affirmative team would point to some law or structure in the present system that causes the harm to continue. See also *inherency*.

study counterplan The study counterplan in policy debate argues that the affirmative plan should be rejected in favor of the establishment of a systematic program to study the affirmative harm area to locate the optimal solution.

summary speech This is the term used in public forum debate to refer to the first rebuttal; the first speaker for each team gives a summary speech. The second rebuttal speech in public forum debate is called the final focus.

tab room The place at a tournament where debate schedules are prepared and judges are assigned.

tabula rasa This paradigm for judging a policy debate establishes the willingness of the judge to be a blank slate or to keep an open mind about the decisionmaking standards for the debate. It is, accordingly, up to each team to present and defend its own standards for determining who wins and who loses. In one debate round, this type of judge might be a stock issues judge and in another round a policymaker.

Ted Turner Debate This was one of the first names given to public forum debate. Ted Turner, the media entrepreneur who created CNN (Cable News Network), provided early encouragement for the creation of public forum debate competition. The official name is now simply *public forum* debate.

threshold This is a type of negative disadvantage in policy debate that alleges that there is a definite point beyond which apocalyptic impacts will happen. With a deficit disadvantage, for example, the negative team would argue that our economy has found ways to absorb the multi-trillion-dollar deficit that has been accumulated, but there is a point at which any further increases in the deficit would cause the whole economy to collapse.

topical counterplans One of the typical requirements for a successful negative counterplan in policy debate is that the plan be nontopical, meaning the counterplan fails to meet at least one of the terms of the resolution. Most debate theorists are adamant in their insistence that a legitimate negative counterplan be nontopical. A significant minority of theorists, however, argues that competition is an adequate test of the relevance of a counterplan and that the nontopicality of a counterplan is a nonissue.

topicality In policy debate, the affirmative plan must meet each of the terms in the resolutorial sentence. Most judges consider that topicality is an independent voting issue, meaning that if the negative team wins topicality, it automatically wins the debate. Most judges will not vote against a case that seems (to the judge) nontopical unless the negative team raises the issue and wins the argument. See also *extratopicality*.

traditional need case affirmative This is the case structure that dominated policy debate before the middle 1960s (at which point the comparative advantage case