

Introduction to Cross Examination Debate

By Sara Pittman

Fort Davis High School

spittman@fdisd.com

Resolution

- **Resolved:** The United States federal government should substantially increase its protection of water resources in the United States.

What is Cross Ex Debate?

- CX Debate
- Policy Debate
- Partner Debate (2 per team)
- Affirmative-affirms the resolution
- Negative-negates the resolution
- 90 minutes possible
- Evidence based (Cards)

What to Expect

- Two teams compete in a classroom in front of a judge or panel of 3 judges
- Each team sits together so that they can collaborate during the debate
- You will speak from the front of the room facing the 'floor' (judge, teammate, opponents)
- In preliminary rounds you will be assigned affirmative or negative, out rounds are usually flip rounds

Aff vs Neg

- The affirmative will prove that their plan to implement the resolution is advantageous.
- The negative will try to prove that the affirmative is not topical and will not be beneficial.
- Clash-is the term given to addressing and refuting another debater's argument. Without clash, there isn't any debate. Debaters must clash directly and specifically to their opponents' arguments not just state their own points.

Speech Order

- First Affirmative Constructive(1AC)....8 minutes
- Cross Ex(2NC questions 1AC).....3 minutes
- First Negative Constructive(1NC).....8 minutes
- Cross Ex(1AC questions 1NC).....3 minutes
- 2nd Affirmative Constructive(2AC).....8 minutes
- Cross Ex(1NC questions 2AC).....3 minutes
- Second Negative Constructive(2NC)...8 minutes
- Cross Ex(2AC questions 2NC).....3 minutes
- First Negative Rebuttal(1NR).....5 minutes
- First Affirmative Rebuttal(1AR).....5 minutes
- Second Negative Rebuttal(2NR).....5 minutes
- Second Affirmative Rebuttal((2AR).....5 minutes

Prep Time

- Each team will have 8 minutes of prep time during the round to prepare responses to their opponents arguments
- Use your prep time wisely
- While one partner is flowing(taking notes) during an opponents speech, the other should be gathering evidence

Speaker Responsibilities

- **First Affirmative Constructive (8 minutes)**
- This speech is pre written and well practiced
- Present the case
- Present the plan
- Present the advantages of adopting the plan
- Cover the Stock Issues

Stock Issues

- HITSS
- **Harms**-problems occurring in the status quo(sq), ex. pain, poverty, unemployment, death...
- **Inherency**(inherent barrier)-reason why the harm has not been solved in the sq. **Structural** –a law, **attitudinal**-deeply held attitude prevents a solution, **existential**-the fact that the harms are not being solved in the status quo. State what is being done currently and why it is not working.

Stock Issues

- **Topicality**-the affirmative case must be within the scope of the resolution. You may have to defend your case against Negative interpretations of the words. This is why you need to have gathered definitions of all of the words in the resolution in relation to your case. (more on topicality later)

Stock Issues

- **Significance**-both the problems(harms) and the benefits(advantages) must be substantial/important
- **Solvency**-proof and argumentation that the affirmative plan text solves the harms presented. The affirmative must have specific evidence that the harms will be solved by their plan.

Speaker Responsibilities

- **First Negative Constructive**(8 minutes)
- Respond to the arguments of the 1AC
- The goal is to prove that the SQ is better than the affirmative plan
- Attack case: topicality, solvency, inherency, harms, significance
- Off case-Disadvantages, Counterplans, Kritiks

Speaker Responsibilities

- **Second Affirmative Constructive(8 minutes)**
- The 2AC should answer every major argument the negative made.
- Answer topicality
- Attack disads
- Attack counterplans
- Attack Kritiks
- Extend advantages

Speaker Responsibilities

- **Second Negative Constructive(8 minutes)**
- Extend Topicality
- Extend Negative arguments
- Add argumentation and depth to things that are already in the negative position

Speaker Responsibilities

- **First Negative Rebuttal(5 minutes)**
- Extend arguments the neg feels that they are winning

Speaker Responsibilities

- **First Affirmative Rebuttal**(5 minutes)
- Most important speech in the debate
- Answer all arguments made in the negative block
- Use evidence from the 1AC and 2AC
- Be very organized
- Address topicality if it is still being argued

Speaker Responsibilities

- **Second Negative Rebuttal(5 minutes(**
- Create a winning story that gives judges a reason to vote for you
- Focus on impacts

Speaker Responsibilities

- **Second Affirmative Rebuttal**(5 minutes)
- Convince the judge that your plan is a good idea
- Explain why your impacts outweigh the negative's impacts
- Uphold your stock issues
 - Significance-the problem is more important
 - Harms-our plan will reduce harms more than it causes them
 - Inherency-the problem we are solving is part of SQ
 - Topicality-accurate example of the resolution
 - Solvency-our plan solves and creates advantages

Terms to Know

- **Hegemony**-the ability of a power to influence the decisions of others
- **Soft power**-a means of influencing others using diplomatic measures
- **Hard power**-a means of influencing others using military force
- **Political capital**-the popularity and influence that a particular leader or party has to get things accomplished

Terms

- **Negative block-** the back to back speeches that the negative has
- **Pardigm-** the judges style as he/she views the round
- **Plan text-** the part of the plan that stipulates exactly what the affirmative is doing
- **Resolution-** the topic established to be debated
- **Fiat-** the affirmative's right to assume that if their case is proven, it will be put in place
- **Flowing-** taking notes in a structured fashion in a debate round

Terms

- **Offense-** arguments given that provide a reason to support their case
- **Defense-** argument given that negate the other team's arguments
- **Spreading-** speaking exceptionally fast
- **Extend-** to bring up an **argument** in later speeches that was explained earlier in the **round**
- **Cross apply-** take an argument made on one issue and use it to answer another argument

Terms

- **Overview-** a summary at the start of an argument or a speech that summarizes the key points and voting reasons
- **Impact calculus-** a part of a speech in which the debater weighs the offense of the affirmative over the offense of the negative in terms of timeframe, probability and magnitude
- **Turns-** making an argument for the other team into an argument for your team

Terms

- **Advantages-** positive impacts of the affirmative plan
- **Disadvantages-** negative impacts from the affirmative plan
- **Counterplans-** negative plan presented to counter the affirmative plan
- **Kritiks-** a philosophical argument that challenges a mindset or assumption made by the opposing team

Parts of Topicality Violation

- **Interpretation** - Definition and source of definition
Violation— how the affirmative violates the definition, and thus the resolution
Standards— Reasons that the definition provided is the one that the judge should consider in the round
Voters— reasons why Topicality should warrant a vote by the judge if the violation is proven

Topicality Shell

- Topicality Shell:
- We have a topicality violation.
- 1. Interpretation: You provide your counter definition for whatever word or phrase you're contesting.
- 2. Violation: This is what your opponents did wrong (so almost always you just repeat what their definition was, since their definition is wrong).
- 3. Standards: These are reasons that your definitions are good. For example, Common Usage or Academic Literature are common standards.
- 4. Voters: Why the judge should vote for your definitions over your opponents. For example, maximizing education and being fair are two really, really common voters in Ts.

Topicality Shell

- We have a counter definition for _____ Read your definition
- Violation: read their definition here.
- Standard: Bright line: Our definition is better because it draws a clear distinction between what is Topical and what is not.
- Voter: Jurisdiction-It is not within your jurisdiction as judge to vote for a non-topical case.
- Judge, you should prefer our definition of _____ Their
- Definition is _____ Our definition is
- better because ...read a standard here
- Our voter is ... read a voter here

Topicality Standards

- **Commonly Used Topicality Standards**
- 1. Limits or Breadth vs. Depth: We should restrict the number of cases we talk about and go in-depth on those **issues**.
- 2. Bright Line: Definition is better because it draws a clear distinction between what is topical and what is not.
- 3. Framer's Intent: Definition is better because it more accurately represents what the creators or writers of the resolution had intended.
- 4. Education: Definition is better because it allows both sides to gain a greater education of the issues at hand.
- 5. Fairness or Ground: The best definition is the one that is not partial to either side; allows both sides equal ground to argue.
- 6. Tradition: Definition is better because it is a more traditional, time-honored definition.
- 7. Grammatical Context: Definition is better because it fits into the resolution and still works.

Standards

- 8. Phrase: The best definition takes into account the entire phrase and the words' meanings in relation to one another.
- 9. Predictability: Affirmative interpretation forces the negative to debate trivial issues that it is impossible to prepare for. We preserve fairness by allowing cases that are feasible to prepare for.
- 10. Field Contextual or Field Expert: The best definition comes from an expert on the topic being debated.
- 11. Legal: Definition is better because we are dealing with legal matters and should use a legal definition.
- 12. Common Person: The best definition uses a more common, widely accepted definition.
- 13. Every Word Has a Meaning: Each word in the resolution was put there for a reason and should be defined independently.

Topicality Voters

- 1. Stock issues: Topicality is a stock issue of debate; if a case is not topical, you must vote against it.
- 2. Fairness: You cannot promote unfair treatment of the neg by the aff by granting them your ballot.
- 3. Clash: Non-topical cases destroy clash in debate because the Negative cannot argue the Affirmative case. Without clash, there is no point to debate.
- 4. Jurisdiction: It is not within your jurisdiction as judge to vote for a non-topical case.
- 5. Education: Debate is supposed to be about education, and we can learn only by being able to debate cases that we can prepare for and argue effectively. You, as the judge, should not vote for a case that impedes education rather than promotes it.
- 6. Debatability: We can prepare for only those cases that fall under the resolution and should not be voted against because we could not debate a non-topical case.
- 7. Predictability: The affirmative interpretation forces the negative to debate trivial issues that are impossible to prepare for. Your ballot should support only those cases that the neg can predict and prepare for.
- 8. Tradition or Rules of the Game: Topicality has traditionally been a voting issue.

Disadvantages

- the most common negative strategy in debate today.
- harms caused by implementation of the affirmative plan.
- the impacts or effects of the disadvantage will be so disastrous that it would be foolish to pass the plan.
- The negative claims that to solve the problem through implementation of the plan proposed by the affirmative team would be worse than the present situation.

Disadvantage Structure

- **Uniqueness:** the impacts of the disadvantage have not happened yet.
- **Link:** the disadvantage is linked to this affirmative case.
- **Brink:** this affirmative case is the last straw and that if the case is enacted, bad things will happen.
- **Impacts:** document the bad things that will happen if the affirmative case is enacted in terms of timeframe, probability and magnitude

Counter Plans

- negative strategy that admits that the present system should be changed, but argues that the negative has a better plan than the affirmative.
- presented in the first negative constructive.
- shows the negative counterplan solves the problem that the affirmative plan presents, and it is faster/better in solving for the problem.

Answering Arguments

- 1. My opponent said...
- 2. That's not true...
- 3. Because...

Resources

- [https://www.uiltexas.org/files/academics/CX Handbook 2122 CV2.pdf](https://www.uiltexas.org/files/academics/CX_Handbook_2122_CV2.pdf)
- <http://www.debatecoaches.org/resources/open-evidence-project/>
- <https://communican.org/>

Code of Ethics

The primary goal of the debate contest is to provide students with an opportunity to develop leadership skills for effective and responsible participation in a democratic society.

The debate contest is a competitive event, evolving from the basic rivalry between individuals and schools and conducted within the framework of established rules.

The responsibilities of democratic citizenship demand that the student participate with fairness and integrity at all times.

Courtesy

A. Debate is a contest between friendly rivals who should exhibit courtesy, fairness and sincerity at all times.

B. Humor is appropriate in a debate, but sarcasm and ridicule are in bad taste.

C. Anger is an admission of a contestant's inability to control his emotions and his inability to answer logically the opponent's arguments.

D. Arguments should be presented with fairness and good taste. Dogmatic methods of presentation should be avoided.

E. Debaters should never do anything that would detract from their opponent's presentation. Excessive movement and audible noises should be avoided while the opponent speaks.

Honesty

A. The debater should prepare his own case and should not rely on the work of his coach or others.

B. All evidence should be honestly presented and clearly identified. Each quotation should be accurately stated and should correctly reflect the opinion of the source. Statements should not be taken out of context nor altered in any way.

C. The opposition should not be credited with statements they did not make nor should they be accused of ignoring points that they have discussed.

Trickery

A. There is no place in academic debate for trickery. Debaters should avoid “trick cases,” the substitution of strategy for evidence and logic, the scouting of opponents, the asking of long lists of questions, and all other forms of chicanery or intellectual dishonesty.

B. The position of the debater should be clearly stated as soon as possible. The withholding of pertinent information solely to gain a strategic advantage is to be discouraged.

C. New issues should never be introduced in the rebuttal speeches; however, this does not imply that debaters should not support previously introduced issues with new evidence.

D. Debaters should refrain from arguing about debate rules instead of dealing with the cases and supporting materials of their opponents.

Judging

A. Debaters should avoid attempts to influence judges by excess emotionalism, personal friendship, or other appeals not inherent in good persuasive speaking.

B. Debaters should never attempt to argue with the judge about the debate decision. It is the obligation of the debater to persuade the judge during the debate and not afterwards. The judge should be treated courteously at all times by the debaters and the coaches.

C. Protests by students are rarely in good taste. There is no substitute for knowledge, presented skillfully and fairly with sincere persuasiveness. The debater should never lose sight of the academic goals of debate.

Commonly Misunderstood UI Rules

Rapid Fire Delivery

Debate is a form of public speaking, making clear communication a key element of the event. To help restore the fundamental purpose of training debaters to communicate with their audience, all UIL guidebooks and ballots carry the instructions that rapid delivery which interferes with effective communication is to be severely penalized. Debaters who run so many arguments that it results in “spreading” to the extreme and poor communication which interfere with the audience’s understanding of the issues risk losing speaking points and even the round. Spreading is not disallowed, but when it results in unintelligible rapid-fire delivery, it’s strongly discouraged in UIL debate. Any individual, not just the trained debater, should be able to listen and follow the arguments in a round.

Prompting

UIL considers prompting a major violation. Decorum is significant in communication and debaters should not interrupt nor instruct their partner while she/he has the floor. No written prompts may be handed to your partner while he or she is speaking. Do not hand your partner printed material unless he or she solicits it of their own accord. Each debater on the team should be prepared to carry their own weight in presentation of arguments. Violation of the UIL prompting rule carries a penalty, as specified in this excerpt from the Contest Rules.