

Internet Debate Research

Rich Edwards, Baylor University

2020

Terms

Internet Provider: The commercial service used to establish a connection to the Internet. Examples of a service provider are America Online, Sprint, ATT, MSN, Road Runner, etc.

Internet Browser: The software used to manipulate information on the Internet. The four major browsers in use are Chrome (the Google product), Mozilla Firefox (the successor to Netscape), Safari (the Apple product) and Internet Explorer (the Microsoft product). Each type of browser will give you access to the same group of search engines, which is the main thing you will care about.

Firefox has one feature that other browsers lack: it can report to you the last revision date of a Web page (select “Page Info” from the top “Tools” menu to access this function). I teach debaters that a Web page may be dated from the last revision date if no other date is shown on the page; Internet Explorer, Chrome and Safari offer no way to know this date.

The “Wayback Machine” offers another option for discovering the dates that a website was first created and last revised. The Wayback Machine archives Internet sites, and is available at <https://web.archive.org/>. The procedure here is as follows: (1) Copy the URL of the website for which you need the date; (2) Go to the webpage for the Wayback Machine; (3) Paste the URL of the desired website into the search box of the Wayback Machine. For almost all website, the Wayback Machine will then report the time the website was created and the last time it was revised.

URL: This stands for Universal Resource Locator. It is the <http://www.baylor.edu> etc.

Internet Search Engine: The software used to search for information on the Internet. You will use the same group of search engines, regardless of which browser (Explorer, Firefox, Chrome, or Safari) you may be using. Examples of search engines are Google, Bing, Teoma, Yahoo, Excite, and LookSmart. My personal favorites are Google and Bing.

Metasearch Engines: These are Internet search engines which will submit your search to other search engines. While there were once many metasearch engines, the only major ones remaining are Dogpile and Webcrawler. The metasearch engines advertise that they are superior to any one search engine since they will report results from multiple search engines. While this is useful for some purposes, it is not the best means to conduct debate research. The metasearch engine sends a simple search request to other search engines, meaning that you are foregoing the

opportunity to use the “advanced search” function that almost all major search engines make available to you. This means that you often are losing the capability to do exact phrase searching, limitation by date, limitation by domain, or limitation by file type. It is also often true that you will receive fewer hits from each of the major search engines than if you were to issue the search directly within that search engine.

Domain: Each web page on the Internet will have a closing three letter code such as “.com,” “.edu,” “.gov,” “.net,” etc. The domain tells you something about the origin of the web page. In most instances, the “edu” domain means the web page is housed in or provided by a college or university. The “gov” domain means the web page is maintained by a federal, state, or local government. The “com” and “net” domains usually mean a commercial enterprise. Most of the major search engines (in the advanced search options) allow the debater to limit a search to particular domains.

PDF: This stands for “portable document file” and indicates that a document is being made available in a format which will look just like an original document in print (complete with page numbers). PDF files are designed to be viewed and/or printed in Adobe Acrobat Reader (available free for download from the Internet). The advantage for the debater is that information gathered from a PDF file can be cited at a particular page number (the same page number it would have as if you had access to the original printed document). Almost all congressional hearings (starting with the 105th and 106th Congresses) are available in PDF format. This not only means that you can download a hearing which will be identical to the printed one, but it also means that you have almost immediate access to a hearing once it has been held. PDF files also carry the advantage that they generally are made available from well-established sources on the Internet. Again, however, the software necessary to “read” PDF documents is available free on the Internet. You will know that a document for download is available in PDF format if the Internet URL ends in “.pdf”. Most of the major search engines allow you to search for only those Web pages which make available a PDF download.

HTML: This stands for “hypertext markup language” and is the code used for creating web pages. You don’t really need to be an HTML programmer to be able to write a web page since numerous programs can create the code for you from simple-to-operate menu choices. If you want to view the HTML code used to construct a web page you can do so by selecting the top menu choice for “View” (In either Firefox or Chrome) and coming down to the choice for “Developer Tools.” By selecting “View Source” under “Developer Tools” you will see displayed the native HTML code which creates the Web page.

Maximizing the Use of the Search Engine

Why use a search engine? This is the only way to find material on the Internet unless you already know the URL you are looking for. The problem is that you must know the URL precisely; close will not be good enough. In the early days of the Internet

folks used to use printed resources such as *Internet Yellow Pages*. But now there are simply too many pages for these types of publications to be useful. Google and Bing, for example, index about 30 trillion Internet pages.

What should I look for in a good search engine?

Comprehensiveness: For the debater, the most important consideration is to find an Internet search engine that indexes as much of the Internet as possible. Powerful search engines do this through two means. First, they invite Web page creators to send a request to have their pages indexed. This is in the interest of Web designers since they almost always want their pages to be easily found. Second, they employ automatic searching programs which continually find new (and unindexed) pages on the Web and index them. The best search engines also do full text indexing. This means that you could literally pick a phrase out of the middle of a web page, enter the phrase in Google or Bing in quotation marks, and the search engine will find the page for you within about a second. This capability is especially important for the debater. You may have written down a portion of a quotation used against you that you would dearly like to find (either because you want to check its context or you want to locate the quotation to use in your own briefs). If the quotation is from an Internet source you can find it very quickly using a comprehensive search engine.

Speed: Not a major criterion any more. In the early days of search engines you could sometimes issue a search and wait a long time (ten or twenty seconds) for the search to be completed. Those days are gone. All of the major search engines are really almost instantaneous now. If you are experiencing problems with speed it is probably due to your own wireless connection speed or to the limitations of your own computer processor's ability to handle the Web page graphics.

Proximity searches: This is a big concern for the debater. If you enter terms like <criminal justice reform> into your search engine, you will receive dramatically varying results depending upon the search engine you are using. Google does the best job of doing automatic proximity searching; meaning that it will order your search results by examining how close your search terms are in proximity to one another. Older or less capable search engines merely report the pages that contain some or all of these words.

Revision date reporting: Most of the major search engines allow the user to limit the search by entering a range for the last revision date (assuming you utilize the "advanced search" function). I teach debaters to use the last revision date as the citation date if the date is otherwise unavailable on the Web page. It should be remembered, however, that the Firefox browser makes it possible for you to determine this last revision date for any Web page you are viewing (unfortunately Chrome and Internet Explorer lack this useful feature). Remember, however, that the Wayback Machine (discussed on the first page of

this handout offers an alternative way to find the date of last revision).

Exact phrase searching: This is an essential feature, for the debater, of a good search engine. By placing your phrase in quotation marks you can instruct the search engine to return only those pages containing the whole phrase as a phrase. When searching for “criminal justice reform” you want to find the whole phrase, not just pages which contain the individual words “criminal,” “justice,” and “reform.” Almost all major search engines allow for exact phrase searching.

Procedures for effective searching:

What about capitalization? For Internet search engines capitalization no longer matters. Searching for “CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM” will produce the same results as “Criminal Justice Reform” or “criminal justice reform.”

What about quotation marks? Use quotation marks whenever you want the search engine to look for words together as a phrase (assuming you are using a search engine that enables exact phrase searching). If you search for Criminal Justice Reform (without the quotation marks), the search engine will look for web pages containing the word “criminal” and “justice” and “reform” but it will not require that the words be next to each other. By putting quotation marks around “Criminal Justice Reform” you are requesting only those pages containing the whole phrase. There is no need to put quotation marks around a single word.

How can one limit a search to a particular domain? The best Internet search engines have an “advanced search” or “power search” capability. One of the options in the advanced search engine is the capability to limit by domain. Limited your search to the .gov domain will, for example, provide an efficient means of finding government publications on the desired search. To access Google’s advanced search engine, simply place the words “advanced search” in the Google search box.

How can one search for a particular URL (you know part but not all of the URL)? Many of the advanced search engines provide the capability to enter a search term and then to indicate whether you wish to make this search apply to “title only,” “full-text,” or URL. You would, of course, select the URL option.

How does the search engine rank the web pages it reports? This is a somewhat controversial issue. Some search engines receive payment from Internet advertisers for the privilege of having their pages reported early in the search list. Most search engines, though, report the web pages in order of the greater number of occurrences of the term. Google’s patented PageRank system factors in not only the proximity of the terms but the number of times other users have accessed the web pages.

Quality of Evidence on the Internet

Setting rigid standards will be essential: The Internet makes available web pages from fourth grade students right alongside those from world-class experts. Just as in the print medium, one must make a distinction between the *New York Times* and the *Weekly World News*. Since most debate research is squad-based, meaning it is shared by many students, it is essential that there be agreement on minimum standards for the types of web pages which may be used for debate research. Following are some recommended standards:

NO use of web pages which come from discussion groups or chat rooms.

NO use of evidence from comments posted on blogs.

NO use of web pages where the author's qualifications are unknown.

NO use of web pages where the author is a student in grade school, high school, or college.

NO use of web pages from hate groups or from unidentified organizations.

NO use of web pages which are undated or for which a "last revision date" is unavailable.

Prefer web pages sponsored by one of the following groups:

A government institution

A major educational institution

A recognized "think tank" (RAND, Brookings Institution, Heritage Foundation, CATO Institute, Hudson Institute, etc.)

A reputable journalistic organization (CNN, New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, etc.)

Using the URL to sort out author qualifications: Consider the following example. You enter "John Rawls" and "social safety net" in a Google search. You have a web page returned to you entitled "Notes on 'A Theory of Justice.'" The web page contains some information which you find useful, but you have no information about the author other than just the name Chilton. You notice from the URL that the web page comes from an "edu" domain associated with something called d.umn, but you don't know what school this is, and you don't know whether the author is a professor or an undergraduate student. The URL is <http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/3652/Readings/3652.Rawls.ATheoryOfJustice.html>. Take apart the URL to discover more about the author. Click with your mouse up in the URL line and eliminate all of the end of the URL back to schilton, then return. See if you can find more information about the author. If the URL comes from an educational institution with which you are unfamiliar, eliminate all of the end of the URL back to the part which ends in "edu" then hit return. By clicking the button on his web page for "Vita" you can discover information about his background. You find that the author of the web page is Stephen Chilton, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, who earned his Ph.D. from MIT — a good source. But some additional work was needed to determine the qualification. **IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT YOU FIND THE PERSON OR GROUP**

RESPONSIBLE FOR AUTHORIZING THE WEB PAGE. It is NEVER a sufficient qualification that you found it on the Internet.

How to find the date. Some web pages will have the date prominently displayed at the top of the web page. Whenever you have this type of date listed, it should be used rather than the last revision date of the web page. Often, however, there is no date on the web page. In such cases, you can find the last revision date by using the “Tools” menu choice to select the “Page Info” option (available only in Firefox). (Resist the temptation to select “Source Info” because that will just show you the HTML code for the web page). Page Info will usually show you the name of the organization sponsoring the web page and the last revision date. If the Web page offers the download of a PDF document, a date can always be found. Simply download the PDF file to your computer and open it in Adobe Acrobat. From the “File” menu, select “Properties” to view both the creation and last revision dates.

How to prepare debate citations from the Internet. Example:

Tanya Golash-Boza, (professor of sociology at the University of California at Merced), *5 Charts Show Why Mandatory Minimum Sentences Don't Work*. June 1, 2017. Retrieved Feb. 20, 2020 from <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/5-charts-show-mandatory-minimum-sentences-dont-work>

This is the citation standard required by the National Speech and Debate Association, which follows a modified version of the Style Manual of the Modern Language Association (MLA). Authors must be listed if present. Qualifications must be given. The date of the web page must be given. The name of the web page should be presented. At the end of the citation, indicate that it was gathered online and that the online source was an Internet URL (as opposed to Lexis/Nexis, Dialogue, etc.). The final date is the date that you accessed the Internet material.

Carding Evidence

ADVANTAGES OF ON-DISK EVIDENCE AND BRIEF PREPARATION

Minimize Printing: In the age of the information explosion, it is simply not feasible for debaters to print out a hard copy of everything they think they might need to read. The two major impediments are expense and time. It is expensive (in printer cartridges) for a debate squad to print out all of the materials that active researchers need. It is also time consuming to print big chunks of material; computer labs typically have many computers but a single printer. The printer becomes the bottle neck. The overuse of printing is also environmentally irresponsible. Debaters chunk huge volumes of paper, often printing out a two-hundred page law review article in order to extract two or three cards. This means that hundreds of pages per day of printed or photocopied materials are simply discarded.

More Usable Briefs: Word processed briefs are easier to read (no illegible hand-written tags, no red or blue ink which refuses to photocopy), and they contain much more evidence per page. This ends up saving a squad large amounts of money in photocopy cost. In fact, members of a large squad can simply distribute new positions via disk and have each squad member print out their briefs on their own printer. This dramatically reduces squad photocopy costs. If briefs are to be word processed, it simply makes sense to collect the evidence on-disk. Otherwise, the debater has to re-type the evidence which exists in hard copy.

Sorting is Easy: The old way for debaters to construct arguments (a hegemony disadvantage, for example) is to create piles on a table-top of evidence which is sorted into different parts of the argument. Inevitably, as the argument is being constructed, there are numerous times when the debater thinks, "I know I have that piece of evidence that says . . . but WHERE IS IT?" When evidence is collected, sorted, and filed on-disk, that doesn't happen. If the evidence isn't found in the right category, the debater simply uses the word processor's "find" function to search for the word or phrase. The card is located in seconds. When evidence is prepared on-disk, the debater can simply use the sorting function of the word processor to put the evidence in order.

HOW DOES ONE CARD EVIDENCE ONLINE?

Have Your Word Processor and Internet Browser Both Open at the Same Time: There was a time when computers simply didn't have enough RAM (current memory) to have two large programs open at once. Almost all current generation computers have plenty of memory to make this possible. Simply open the first program, then minimize the window (minimize button is in the top right corner) and start up the other program. If you are on a PC, switch back and forth between the two programs by clicking the desired program on the start-bar. On the Macintosh, you can switch between programs by using the icon in the top right hand corner of your screen. An alternative method for switching is to overlap the window just a bit so that a corner of both can be seen. When you desire to switch, just click with the mouse on the other window to make that program active.

Steps for On-Disk Carding of Evidence:

Text-Saving Method:

1. Locate the Internet site from which the evidence will come.
2. Construct the evidence citation on the word processor in accordance with NFL rules.
3. Highlight the portion of the text from the web page which will makeup the text of the card. Copy the text into memory (on the PC, this is Cntrl-C; on the Macintosh it is Apple-C).

4. Switch to the word processor and paste in the text just below the evidence citation. (On the PC, this is Cntrl-V; on the Macintosh it is Apple-V)
5. Eliminate unwanted carrier returns in one of two ways: (a) click at the beginning of each line and backspace, or (b) use the word processor's search and replace function to eliminate all paragraph breaks.
6. Continue pasting cards into the word processor until you have taken all of the desired cards from the web page. Then copy and paste as many evidence citation tops as needed to match each of the cards.

SORTING EVIDENCE ON THE COMPUTER

Design a filing scheme which will allow addition of categories.

Once filed and sorted, your on-disk evidence file functions just like the "piles of cards" on the table. You use the index to see where the cards are which will support the part of the argument you are putting together, then use the search function on the word processor to find the cards, by searching for R301, for example. Read the cards which are filed there, and select the card or cards you want to insert in the brief. Then cut and paste them.

Suggestions for Online Policy Debate Research

Finding Definitions of Terms:

[www.OneLook.com](http://www.onelook.com): Access to more than one thousand dictionaries is available through www.onelook.com.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/>: This Web resources says that it is "the world's largest and most authoritative free online dictionary and mobile reference resource."

<http://www.yourdictionary.com/>

<http://oxforddictionaries.com/>

<http://www.etymonline.com/>

Newspaper & Journal Articles:

Google News: Google news gives you access to otherwise hard to find news articles on the criminal justice topic. The normal news database is limited to the past 30 days, but you can access the Google News Archive at <http://news.google.com/newspapers> for older articles.

FindArticles: This article search site is maintained by CBS News, available at <https://www.findarticles.com/>

Library of Congress Online Reading Room. From this Web site, the debater can find links to hundreds of online newspapers and journals.

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/news/lists.html>

The Write News. This site provides links to all major newspapers maintaining online services. <http://writenews.com/newslinks/>

Research Think Tanks:

American Enterprise Institute: “The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research is dedicated to preserving and strengthening the foundations of freedom—limited government, private enterprise, vital cultural and political institutions, and a strong foreign policy and national defense—through scholarly research, open debate, and publications. Founded in 1943 and located in Washington, D.C., AEI is one of America's largest and most respected think tanks.”

<http://www.aei.org/library.htm>

Brookings Institution: “In its research, The Brookings Institution functions as an independent analyst and critic, committed to publishing its findings for the information of the public. In its conferences and activities, it serves as a bridge between scholarship and public policy, bringing new knowledge to the attention of decisionmakers and affording scholars a better insight into public policy issues. The Institution traces its beginnings to 1916 with the founding of the Institute for Government Research, the first private organization devoted to public policy issues at the national level. In 1922 and 1924, the Institute was joined by two supporting sister organizations, the Institute of Economics and the Robert Brookings Graduate School. In 1927, these three groups were consolidated into one institution, named in honor of Robert Somers Brookings (1850-1932), a St. Louis businessman whose leadership shaped the earlier organizations.” <https://www.brookings.edu/>

CATO Institute: “The Cato Institute was founded in 1977 by Edward H. Crane. It is a non-profit public policy research foundation headquartered in Washington, D.C. The Institute is named for Cato's Letters, a series of libertarian pamphlets that helped lay the philosophical foundation for the American Revolution. The Cato Institute seeks to broaden the parameters of public policy debate to allow consideration of the traditional American principles of limited government, individual liberty, free markets and peace. Toward that goal, the Institute strives to achieve greater involvement of the intelligent, concerned lay public in questions of policy and the proper role of government.” www.cato.org

Heritage Foundation. “Founded in 1973, The Heritage Foundation is a research and educational institute — a think tank — whose mission is to formulate and promote conservative public policies based on the principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom, traditional American values, and a strong national defense.” <http://www.heritage.org/>

Hudson Institute: "In Hudson Institute's policy recommendations, articles, books, conferences, and contributions to the electronic media, we share optimism about the future and a willingness to question conventional wisdom. We demonstrate commitment to free markets and individual responsibility, confidence in the power of technology to assist progress, respect for the importance of culture and religion in human affairs, and determination to preserve America's national security."
<http://www.hudson.org/>

RAND Corporation: "RAND (a contraction of the term research and development) is the first organization to be called a "think tank." We earned this distinction soon after we were created in 1946 by our original client, the U.S. Air Force (then the Army Air Forces). Some of our early work involved aircraft, rockets, and satellites. In the 1960s we even helped develop the technology you're using to view this web site. Today, RAND's work is exceptionally diverse. We now assist all branches of the U.S. military community, and we apply our expertise to social and international issues as well." <http://www.rand.org/>

Law Reviews:

University Law Review Project. <http://www.lawreview.org/>

LawTechnologyToday.org. This site provides links to hundreds of law reviews many of which make their archives available online.

<http://www.lawtechnologytoday.org/free-full-text-online-law-review-journal-search/>

Top Criminal Justice Web Sites for Policy Debaters

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU): <https://www.aclu.org/>

The ACLU website identifies the organization "as our nation's guardian of liberty, working daily in courts, legislatures and communities to defend and preserve the individual rights and liberties that the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee everyone in this country." By clicking the "Issues" tab, the debater will see the link for "Criminal Law Reform." The ACLU website is possibly the best single source of information on the affirmative side of the criminal justice topic.

American Enterprise Institute: www.aei.org

This organization states its purpose as follows: "The American Enterprise Institute is a public policy think tank dedicated to defending human dignity, expanding human potential, and building a freer and safer world. The work of our scholars and staff advances ideas rooted in our belief in democracy, free enterprise, American strength and global leadership, solidarity with those at the periphery of our society, and a pluralistic, entrepreneurial culture." One recent AEI document entitled, "A Smarter Approach to Federal Assistance with State-Level Criminal Justice Reform," provides interesting suggestions for ways that federal action can influence policing and sentencing practices throughout the fifty states.

Amnesty International: <http://www.amnestyusa.org/>

Amnesty International describes its work in the following way: “We work to protect people wherever justice, freedom, truth and dignity are denied. Currently the world’s largest grassroots human rights organization, we investigate and expose abuses, educate and mobilize the public and help transform societies to create a safer, more just world.” By entering “Policing” in the main search box, you will find numerous useful reports including the following: “Trump’s Views on Policing Flout Rule of Law and Endanger Both Civilians and Law Enforcement,” and “Criminalizing Pregnancy: Policing Pregnant Women Who Use Drugs in the USA.”

Brennan Center for Justice: [www. https://www.brennancenter.org/](https://www.brennancenter.org/)

This organization describes itself as “a nonpartisan law and policy institute. We strive to uphold the values of democracy. We stand for equal justice and the rule of law. We work to craft and advance reforms that will make American democracy work, for all.” By selecting the tab for “Our Work” the debater can access numerous articles relevant to the 2020-21 topic, including “Predictive Policing Goes to Court,” “A Bill to Oversee 21st Century Police Surveillance” and “The Importance of Community Policing.”

Brookings Institution: www.brookings.edu

The Brookings Institution explains that it pursues three broad goals: “strengthen American democracy; foster the economic and social welfare, security and opportunity of all Americans and secure a more open, safe, prosperous and cooperative international system.” Numerous Brookings reports discuss criminal justice reform. One 2019 report is entitled, “Policing in America: Race Relations, Community Policing and Technological Innovations.”

Cato Institute: www.cato.org

Cato describes its purpose as follows: “the Cato Institute is a public policy research organization – a think tank – dedicated to the principles of individual liberty, limited government, free markets and peace. Its scholars and analysts conduct independent, nonpartisan research on a wide range of policy issues.” Cato Institute scholars typically argue for limiting the range of federal government power. Recent reports have questioned the federal practice of supplying military-grade equipment to local police forces, including an August 31, 2017 report entitled, “Trump’s Decision on Military-Style Weapons Will Harm Communities.”

Center for American Progress (CAP): www.americanprogress.org/

The Center's website declares that "an open and effective government can champion the common good over narrow self-interest, harness the strength of our diversity and secure the rights and safety of its people. And we believe our nation must always be a beacon of hope and strength to the rest of the world. Progressives are idealistic enough to believe change is possible and practical enough to make it happen." Recent reports include "Expanding the Authority of State Attorneys General to Combat Police Misconduct," "The Trump Administration Is Putting DOJ Policing Reform Efforts at Risk" and "The Negative Consequences of Entangling Local Policing and Immigration Enforcement."

Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR): <http://ccrjustice.org/>

The "Who We Are" tab discloses the following information: "The Center for Constitutional Rights is dedicated to advancing and protecting the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Founded in 1966 by attorneys who represented civil rights movements in the South, CCR is a non-profit legal and educational organization committed to the creative use of law as a positive force for social change. Recent reports on policing practices are entitled, "When It Comes to Police Misconduct, Body-Worn Camera Videos Are Slow to Come," "NYPD All But Ignores Thousands of Racial Bias Reports Against Officers" and "Reimagining the Criminal Justice System."

Center for Public Integrity: www.publicintegrity.org

This group says it is committed "To protect democracy and inspire change using investigative reporting that exposes betrayals of the public trust by powerful interests." By entering "policing" in the Center's search box, the debater can find numerous useful articles including the following: "New Documentary Traces Controversial History of Policing in Schools," "Trump Plans to Collect DNA from Nearly a Million Immigrant Detainees" and "States Caught in Tug-of-War Over Whether Cops Can Keep Your Stuff."

Congressional Research Service (CRS): <https://crsreports.congress.gov/>

According to its website, "The Congressional Research Service (CRS) works exclusively for the United States Congress, providing policy and legal analysis to committees and Members of both the House and Senate, regardless of party affiliation. As a legislative branch agency within the Library of Congress, CRS has been a valued and respected resource on Capitol Hill for more than a century. CRS is well-known for analysis that is authoritative, confidential, objective and nonpartisan. Its highest priority is to ensure that Congress has 24/7 access to the nation's best thinking." Numerous recent reports are relevant to criminal justice reform, including "Community Oriented Policing Services," "What Role Might the Federal Government Play in Law Enforcement Reform," "Do Warrantless Searches of Electronic Devices at the Border Violate the Fourth Amendment" and "School Resource Officers: Issues for Congress."

Criminal Justice Policy Foundation (CJPF): www.cjpf.org

This group describes itself as “one of the oldest drug policy reform organizations in the United States. CJPF’s primary mission is to educate the public about the impact of drug policy on the criminal justice system. We provide information and strategic advice to policymakers, criminal justice organizations, interest groups and the public through direct consultation, conferences, publications, the news media and blogs.” This organization offers information on ending drug prohibition, abolishing mandatory minimum sentencing and limiting police use of civil asset forfeiture.

Death Penalty Information Center: www.deathpenaltyinfo.org

This organization describes itself as follows: “The Death Penalty Information Center is a national non-profit organization serving the media and the public with analysis and information on issues concerning capital punishment. Founded in 1990, the Center promotes informed discussion of the death penalty by preparing in-depth reports, conducting briefings for journalists and serving as a resource to those working on this issue. The Center releases an annual report on the death penalty, highlighting significant developments and featuring the latest statistics. The Center also produces groundbreaking reports on various issues related to the death penalty such as arbitrariness, costs, innocence and race.” Recent articles available under the “Resources” tab include “Death Penalty Erodes Further as New Hampshire Abolishes and California Imposes Moratorium” and “Secrecy and the Death Penalty in the United States.”

Drug Policy Alliance: www.drugpolicy.org

This group openly advocates the legalization (or at least the decriminalization) of drug use: “The Drug Policy Alliance envisions a just society in which the use and regulation of drugs are grounded in science, compassion, health and human rights, in which people are no longer punished for what they put into their own bodies but only for crimes committed against others, and in which the fears, prejudices and punitive prohibitions of today are no more.” By clicking the “Resources” tab, the debater can access documents such as “Drug Decriminalization in Portugal: Learning from a Health and Human-Centered Approach,” “Marijuana Decriminalization and Legalization” and “The Drug War, Mass Incarceration and Race.”

Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF): www.eff.org

The mission and history of this organization is described on its website as follows: “The Electronic Frontier Foundation is the leading nonprofit organization defending civil liberties in the digital world. Founded in 1990, EFF champions user privacy, free expression and innovation through impact litigation, policy analysis, grassroots activism and technology development. We work to ensure that rights and freedoms are enhanced and protected as our use of technology grows.” By entering “policing” in the search box, the debater can find numerous articles relevant to the 2020-21 national topic. One of the most recent articles entitled, “The Fight Against Government Face Surveillance,” describes the threat to privacy from police use of facial recognition software.

Equal Justice Initiative: www.eji.org

According to its website, “the Equal Justice Initiative is committed to ending mass incarceration and excessive punishment in the United States, to challenging racial and economic injustice and to protecting basic human rights for the most vulnerable people in American society.” This group provides resources opposing mandatory minimum sentences, use of the death penalty and sentencing juveniles to confinement in adult prisons.

FWD.us: www.fwd.us/

This group, founded by business and tech leaders such as Bill Gates and Mark Zuckerberg, describes itself as a “bipartisan political organization that believes America’s families, communities and economy thrive when more individuals are able to achieve their full potential. For too long, our broken immigration and criminal justice systems have locked too many people out from the American dream.” Numerous articles dealing with sentencing are available, including “Harsh Sentences Are Hurting America’s Families” and “Bipartisan Coalition Files Initiative to Put Sentencing Reform on the 2020 Ballot.”

Heritage Foundation: www.heritage.org

This conservative think tank promotes the principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom and a strong national defense. Using the search option available on this website, the debater can find dozens of useful reports on criminal justice reform, including ones entitled “Trump’s Counterattack on Sanctuary Cities Has Begun, and It’s About Time,” “Why Trump Was Right to Reverse Obama’s Policy on Military Gear for Police” and “Cops Count, Police Matter: Preventing Crime and Disorder in the 21st Century.”

Human Rights Watch: www.hrw.org/

This organization describes its mission as follows: “We scrupulously investigate abuses, expose the facts widely and pressure those with power to respect rights and secure justice. Human Rights Watch is an independent, international organization that works as part of a vibrant movement to uphold human dignity and advance the cause of human rights for all.” By clicking the “Reports” option from the menu, the debater will find numerous useful articles on the 2020 criminal justice topic, including the following: “United States Deportation Policies Expose Salvadorans to Death and Abuse,” “The U.S. Deported Them, Ignoring Their Pleas, Then They Were Killed” and “High-Tech Police Weapons Do More Harm Than Good.”

Independent Institute: www.independent.org/

This group explains its purpose as follows: “Our mission is to boldly advance peaceful, prosperous and free societies grounded in a commitment to human worth and dignity. Applying independent thinking to issues that matter, we create transformational ideas for today’s most pressing social and economic challenges. By connecting these ideas with organizations and networks, we inspire action that can unleash an era of unparalleled human flourishing at home and around the globe.” By entering “criminal justice reform” in the search box, the debater can access dozens of articles on the 2020-21 topic, including “Ethical Hurdles to Combating Racially Biased Police Algorithms,” “Sanctuary Cities Are Not the New Nullification Crisis” and “What We Can Learn From Portugal’s Drug Policy.”

Institute for Justice (IJ): www.ij.org

According to its website, the Institute for Justice “litigates to limit the size and scope of government power and to ensure that all Americans have the right to control their own destinies as free and responsible members of society. Since 1991, IJ has come to the aid of individuals who want to do the simple things every American has the right to do – including own property, start and grow a business, speak freely about commerce or politics and provide their children with a good education – but can’t because they find the government in their way. This organization provides free access to articles in its publication, *Liberty & Law*; this option is available by using the menu bar at the top right side of the screen. Numerous articles in this publication oppose the police practice of funding their operations through civil asset forfeiture. Recent articles include the following: “Bringing Justice to Policing for Profit Victims in California,” “Does the Eighth Amendment Protect Against State and Local Forfeitures?” and “Trump Should Be Appalled by Police Asset Forfeiture.”

Library of Congress: www.congress.gov/

This website is a one-stop-shop for access to current legislation. By clicking the “Legislation” tab and using the search box, the debater can receive an update on the status of bills dealing with criminal justice reform. Some recent examples are the Next Step Act of 2019, a bill designed to reform sentencing and other law enforcement practices, and the Justice in Forensic Algorithms Act, a measure designed to compensate for “the disparate impact, on the basis of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender and other demographic features, in the development and use of the computational forensic software.”

Manhattan Institute (MI): www.manhattan-institute.org/

This group offers a conservative political viewpoint on criminal justice and other social policy issues. They describe themselves in the following way: “The Institute serves as a leading voice of free-market ideas, shaping political culture since our founding in 1977. Ideas that have changed the United States and its urban areas for the better – welfare reform, tort reform, proactive policing and supply-side tax policies, among others – are the heart of MI’s legacy.” By entering “policing” in the search box, the debater can access articles such as the following: “Increasingly Lenient Treatment of Career Criminals Is Putting More Police in Danger,” “America’s Shrinking Police Forces Could Spell Trouble for Our Safety” and “Empty Prisons Mean Dangerous Streets.”

Marshall Project: www.themarshallproject.org/

This group describes itself as “a nonpartisan, nonprofit news organization that seeks to create and sustain a sense of national urgency about the U.S. criminal justice system. We achieve this through award-winning journalism, partnerships with other news outlets and public forums. In all of our work we strive to educate and enlarge the audience of people who care about the state of criminal justice.” By clicking under “About,” then the “Reports” tab, the debater can access numerous documents detailing this group’s efforts to reform the criminal justice system.

National Coalition to Protect Civil Freedoms: www.civilfreedoms.org

This group does not post a mission statement, but an examination of the articles available from the website reveals that it is committed to opposing the current level of state and federal government intrusion into Muslim immigrant communities in America. By selecting the “Profiling” tab from this website home page, the debater can access numerous articles about racial or religious profiling by police, including the following: “Terrorism’s Double Standard,” “Government Reports Show Domestic Anti-Terrorism Efforts Target Minorities” and “Black Communities Stop Calling 911 After Instances of Police Brutality.”

National Immigration Law Center: www.nilc.org

This organization’s “About Us” tab provides the following information: “Founded in 1979, the National Immigration Law Center is the only national legal advocacy organization in the U.S. exclusively dedicated to defending and advancing the rights of low-income immigrants and their families. We envision a U.S. society in which all people – regardless of their race, gender, immigration or economic status – are treated equally, fairly and humanely, have equal access to justice, education, government resources and economic opportunities, and are able to achieve their full potential as human beings.” By selecting “Immigration Enforcement” under the “Issues” tab, the debater can gain access to many useful publications, including “Understanding Trump’s Executive Order Affecting Deportations and Sanctuary Cities” and “President Trump’s Raids on Immigrant Communities.”

National Juvenile Justice Network: www.njjn.org

According to its website, “the National Juvenile Justice Network (NJJN) leads a movement of state-based juvenile justice reform organizations and alumni of its Youth Justice Leadership Institute to fight for a smaller, fairer youth justice system that’s appropriate for youth and their families. NJJN advocates for policies and practices that treat youth in trouble with the law with dignity and humanity and which strengthen them, their families and their communities. Founded in 2005, NJJN is currently comprised of 53 organizational members in 43 states and the District of Columbia and a growing cadre of graduates from our Youth Justice Leadership Institute.” This group provides resources advocating the diversion of juveniles from the criminal justice system, eliminating racial and ethnic disparities in the sentencing of juveniles and creating a range of effective community-based programs.

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty: www.nlchp.org

This group’s website says that it is “the only national advocacy organization dedicated solely to using the power of the law to end and prevent homelessness in America. With the support of a large network of pro bono lawyers, we use our legal expertise to help pass, implement and enforce laws addressing the immediate and long-term needs of those who are homeless or at risk.” By selecting the “Resources” tab, the debater can access the 121-page report on the criminalization of homelessness in America: “Housing Not Handcuffs: Ending the Criminalization of Homelessness in U.S. Cities.”

National Police Foundation: www.policefoundation.org

This organization explains its mission as follows: “The purpose of the Police Foundation is to help the police be more effective in doing their job, whether it be deterring robberies, intervening in potentially injurious family disputes or working to improve relationships between the police and the communities they serve. To accomplish our mission, we work closely with police officers and police agencies across the country, and it is in their hard work and contributions that our accomplishments are rooted.” By selecting the “Publications” tab, the debater can access reports such as “Reducing Violent Crime in American Cities,” “A Preliminary Report on the Police Foundation’s Averted School Violence Database” and “Engaging Communities One Step at a Time: Policing’s Tradition of Foot Patrol as an Innovative Community Engagement Strategy.”

New York Times: www.nytimes.com

The New York Times is a premier U.S. newspaper for coverage of national security and privacy issues. As with many newspaper websites, however, access is limited for non-subscribers. This website allows non-subscribers free access to up to 10 articles per month. By using the search engine, the debater can follow the latest news on police practices, sentencing trends and criminal justice reform in general. Complete access to the site is available for a weekly subscription price of about one dollar for students or two dollars for coaches.

Open Society Foundations: www.opensocietyfoundations.org

This organization describes itself as “the world’s largest private funder of independent groups working for justice, democratic governance and human rights.” By selecting the “What We Do” tab, then “Justice Reform and the Rule of Law,” the debater can locate information on programs to reduce pretrial detention, reform drug laws and promote fair policing.

Pew Research Center: www.pewresearch.org

This organization explains its mission as follows: “We generate a foundation of facts that enriches the public dialogue and supports sound decision-making. We are nonprofit, nonpartisan and nonadvocacy. We value independence, objectivity, accuracy, rigor, humility, transparency and innovation.” By using the search box, the debater can find numerous articles relevant to policing and sentencing, including the following: “Public Support for the Death Penalty Ticks Up,” “U.S. Ends Year With Fewest Executions Since 1991” and “Reimagining the Police Through Training and Reforms.”

Political Research Associates: <http://www.politicalresearch.org>

This organization, founded in 1981, says that its purpose is to defend human rights and social justice, while opposing the agenda of right-wing political groups. One recent publication, entitled “Black Lives Over Broken Windows,” questions the police tactic of aggressively targeting minor offenders. Another intriguing report, entitled “Anti-Death Penalty Activism Reinforces Racist Status Quo,” argues that abolishing the death penalty perpetuates the status quo in racist policing practices by propagating the myth of a “post-racial” society.

Prison Policy Initiative: www.prisonpolicy.org

According to its website, “the non-profit, non-partisan Prison Policy Initiative produces cutting edge research to expose the broader harm of mass criminalization, and then sparks advocacy campaigns to create a more just society.” Recent articles available from this website include “Neither Justice Nor Treatment: Drug Courts in the United States,” “The Human Toll of Criminalizing Drug Use in the United States” and “Federal Drug Sentencing Laws Bring High Cost, Low Return.”

R Street Institute: www.rstreet.org/

This group describes itself as “a free-market think tank with a pragmatic approach to public policy challenges. We draw inspiration from such thinkers as Milton Friedman, Friedrich Hayek, Ronald A. Coase, James M. Buchanan and Arthur C. Pigou. We favor consumer choice; low, flat taxes; regulation that is transparent and applied equitably and systems that rely on price signals rather than central planning. Thus, it’s fair to say that we’re on the political right.” By selecting the “Issues” tab, the debater can discover numerous publications dealing with criminal justice, including the following: “Policing Requires an Epic Shift,” “Building a New Narrative Around Policing” and “Are Robot Cops the Future of Efficient, Bias-Free Policing?”

Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC): www.splcenter.org

According to its website, “the SPLC stands up for the powerless, the exploited and other victims of discrimination and hate. For more than four decades, we’ve won landmark cases that brought systemic reforms in the Deep South. We’ve toppled remnants of Jim Crow segregation and destroyed violent white supremacist groups. We’ve shattered barriers to equality for women, vulnerable children, the LGBT community and the disabled. We’ve protected migrant workers and immigrants from abuse, ensured the humane treatment of prisoners, reformed juvenile justice practices and more.” Recent documents, available under the “Resources” tab, include “10 Best Practices for Writing Policies Against Racial Profiling,” “Alabama’s War on Marijuana: Assessing the Fiscal and Human Toll of Criminalization” and “Detainer Requests: Controversial and Unconstitutional, According to Some Courts.”

The Sentencing Project: www.sentencingproject.org

This group describes its history and mission as follows: “Founded in 1986, The Sentencing Project works for a fair and effective U.S. criminal justice system by promoting reforms in sentencing policy, addressing unjust racial disparities and practices and advocating for alternatives to incarceration.” Numerous recent articles are available under the “Issues” tab, including the following: “The Case for Abolishing Life Sentences,” “The Impact of Mandatory Minimum Penalties in Federal Sentencing” and “Eliminating Racial Inequity in the Criminal Justice System.”

Suggestions for Online Lincoln Douglas Research

A Glossary of Philosophical Terms:

This site provides a downloadable PDF containing 34 pages briefly defining major terms in philosophy: http://global.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780199812998/studentresources/pdf/perry_glossary.pdf

Dictionary of Western Philosophy:

Philosophy professor, Garth Kemerling, maintains this site, offering the following description: “This is a concise guide to technical terms and personal names often encountered in the study of philosophy. What you will find here naturally reflects my own philosophical interests and convictions, but everything is meant to be clear, accurate, and fair, a reliable source of information on Western philosophy for a broad audience”: <http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/index.htm>

Guide to Philosophy on the Internet:

Operated by Peter Suber of the philosophy department at Earlham College. <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/philinks.htm>

Immanuel Kant: An Introduction to the Work of Kant:

This is an excellent site – part of the “Great Thinker” series – providing an overview of the moral philosophy of Kant: <https://thegreatthinkers.org/kant/introduction/>

Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

This is a one-stop-shop for finding the meaning of key terms in philosophy as well as a brief overview of the biography and teachings of major and minor philosophers. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/>

Introduction to Philosophy:

This is an Online philosophy textbook (in seventeen chapters) written by Dallas M. Roark, professor at Emporia State University : [http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/Social Sciences/ppecorino/roark-textbook/default.htm](http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/Social_Sciences/ppecorino/roark-textbook/default.htm)

Project Gutenberg:

The description offered by this site: “Project Gutenberg offers over 54,000 free eBooks: Choose among free epub books, free kindle books, download them or read them online. You will find the world's great literature here, especially older works for which copyright has expired” <http://www.gutenberg.org/>

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

This site describes itself as follows: “The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy organizes scholars from around the world in philosophy and related disciplines to create and maintain an up-to-date reference work.” The site allows a simple search box as well as a clickable Table of Contents: <https://plato.stanford.edu/>

The Basics of Philosophy:

This site offers the following selectable tabs dealing with all aspects of philosophy: General, By Branch/Doctrine, By Historical Period, By Movement/School, By Individual Philosopher: <http://www.philosophybasics.com/>