

RUNNING HEAD: CORRESPONDENT, COMIC, AND COMBATANT

Appendix A: Script

Moderator Key: Bold: Correspondent; Italic: Combatant; Underline: Comic

Guest Key: Bold Italic: Uncivil; Italic Underline: civil

Moderator: Up next, a topic (that's been heavily debated/that's been deeply divisive/that's been - how can I put this gently? - a giant clusterfuck.). Paul says that cap and trade lets companies decide for themselves how to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Alan says it's just government telling people how to run their own businesses. Paul, (can you explain why you support this policy/can you refute this claim/can you explain why you and your hippie-friends support this policy)?

Paul: Yes I can. Cap-and-trade is a great first step that allows companies to decide how to invest their money, either by developing new technology or buying emissions permits. My opponent is (blatantly) disregarding what the American people want, in favor of (corrupt) special interests. (He knows as well as I do that/According to recent polls) most Americans support cap-and-trade. Big (greedy) corporations got us into this mess, so they should pay to fix it or develop the technology to solve it.

Moderator: (So I think you're saying corporations can be a key part of the solution/So you want these corporations you call incompetent to help solve the problem?/So the folks that got us into this mess are supposed to get us out of it? Okay...like that could possibly fail). Alan, Paul says most Americans support this policy. (Is Paul giving us an accurate picture of public opinion/Are you putting special interests ahead of the American people/Is Paul giving us an accurate picture of public opinion)?

Alan: (Absolutely not! Paul is playing with facts/No. Paul isn't telling the whole story). (What he won't admit is) the majority of Americans oppose cap-and-trade if it increases their electric bills by (only) \$25 a month. What (these flower-power) environmentalists (ignore/forget) is that cap-and-trade hits average folks in the pocketbooks. It's great to care about the environment, (but I care about Americans more/but I am more concerned about keeping costs low for Americans).

Paul: (We're not talking about "who loves America more."/I understand where Alan's coming from, but) we're talking about solving problems. Let's talk costs. Americans are (understandably) concerned about energy costs, but what if their electric bill increases 2 dollars a month? Or 5 bucks? Who, (except for a corporate hack), wouldn't want to help the environment for the price of a cup of coffee?

Moderator: (Alright, so you're both talking about dollar amounts and who is going to shoulder the costs/Alright, so you're both fighting over imaginary costs and who's going to get stuck with the bill./Are we talking about a cup of coffee or a triple non-fat carmel machiatto?...Not that I drink that.) But what about other countries? We're not the first to have this debate - who else can we look to?

Alan: I'm glad you asked. Paul (*is obviously ignorant of/may be unaware of*) the problems Australia ran into. Their government had to pay the electric bills for low-income families because of the (*ridiculous*) increases brought about by cap-and-trade.

Paul: (*Alan, comparing the U.S. to Australia is just plain wrong/Okay, but the Australia comparison isn't relevant*). (*You should know*) the U.S. plan is modeled after the European system. Under their plan, emissions are falling by 100 million tons each year. And, despite predictions from (*nay-saying*) opponents, electric bills actually decreased.

Moderator: (**Apparently the experiences elsewhere with cap-and-trade have been mixed, but you both seem to agree we need to address global warming/There's a lot of rhetoric here, but few real facts. Since we can't agree, let's just move on/Hmmmm...Cap-and-Trade. Australian for Fail...**) *There's been a lot of talk about creating environmentally friendly green jobs. Will cap-and-trade help? (After all, there are a lot of trees out there that need hugging.)*

Paul: Absolutely. Contrary to what Alan (*claims/says*), moving toward a green economy will create millions of jobs, and not just within (*the/large*) corporations (*Alan answers to*) but in small businesses across the country.

Alan: Sure, green jobs seem to be an ideal solution for a nation facing dire economic and energy challenges. (**But Paul needs to wake up and face reality/But let's look at this rationally**). This (*pipe-dream of a*) policy makes promises it just can't keep.

Moderator: *You know, we've talked a lot about emissions, but haven't talked about the biggest source: cars. What about changing mileage standards or making smaller, more efficient vehicles?*

Alan: (**Paul keeps trying to force Americans to buy these puny little deathtraps. Americans/Americans may say they want fuel-efficient vehicles but they**) have always liked big cars. New standards would end the production of cars Americans love.

Paul: Alan, an increase in standards is only going to help the auto industry. Consumers are demanding fuel-efficient cars; (**the auto lobby just doesn't get that it's in their best interest to provide that/it's in the industry's best interest to provide that**).

Alan: (**Look**) (*forceful, raise voice*), (*I don't disagree that fuel-efficiency is important, I just think*) an (**irresponsible**) jump in standards is going to hurt consumers and the auto industry, both of which are already struggling. (**This just shows how out of touch Paul is with the average American**).

Moderator: (**You both offered your opinions/I don't think the average American cares about your opinions/You two have more opinions than Simon Cowell**), (**but/.but c/C/can**) *either of you provide (any) evidence? Stay tuned; we'll tackle that question after a short commercial break.*