

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

- A. An orthodox variation of standard debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate is also known as "One-Man Debate" and has been utilized often during political campaigns. Only two speakers are involved, one fulfilling the affirmative case responsibilities and the other, the negative. Since students participating in Lincoln-Douglas debating are usually speaking to an audience, they should be encouraged to develop a direct and communicative delivery. Emphasis is necessarily placed upon the issues involved rather than upon strategy in developing the case. The Statement of the topic is a resolution of value rather than of policy results in emphasizing logic, theory, and philosophy while eliminating "plan" arguments. Because of time limits, a wealth of evidence cannot be used, but research supported by good background reading is necessary.

B. The District and State Tournaments will both use the NSDA topic for March/April.

C. The time limits of the speeches shall be as follows:

NOTE: Each debater will be allowed a total of four (4) minutes of preparation time during the course of the debate to be divided as he/she sees fit.

NOTE: Teams using flash drives will officially end their prep time when the flash drive is physically removed from the computer.

Affirmative constructive.....	6 minutes
Negative cross-examination.....	3 minutes
Negative constructive	7 minutes
Affirmative cross-examination	3 minutes
Affirmative rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative rebuttal.....	6 minutes
Affirmative rebuttal	3 minutes

No grace time will be given for debate speeches.

D. The distribution of evidence, visual aids and published material to debate judges is prohibited unless requested by the judge.

E. Judging shall be governed by the provisions in Section 6-B-1d.

F. Judging Criteria

1. Logic: Did the debater demonstrate clear, rational analysis of the proposition?
2. Topicality: Did his/her arguments clearly relate to the proposition? Did each debate address the relevant arguments of the opponent?
3. General Knowledge: Did the debater have a clear understanding of the topic? Did the debater bring general knowledge to bear on the proposition?
4. Persuasion: Is the speaker convincing? Is he/she sincere? Does he/she make reasonable and effective appeals to the judge? Is contestant aware of his/her judge?
5. Delivery: Does the debater control rate, volume, emphasis, and tone for maximum persuasive appeal? Does he/she communicate efficiently and effectively?
6. Organization: Are the speeches clearly structured? Was the judge able to understand and evaluate the debate without taking extensive notes?
7. No "plan" arguments should be presented by either debater.
8. In the final analysis the winning debater should be the one who presented the more believable position, who showed that values are more important than policies, and who demonstrated that logic is more important than evidence.

NOTE: Oral critiques are not permitted.

G. Unethical Conduct: Students participating in interscholastic debate are expected to follow all rules of the event and be ethical in their conduct and practices while preparing for or during debate. All conduct and actions should meet the rules of the event. These same actions should be honest, fair, reputable and good for the activity.

It is the responsibility of the speaker to orally deliver the following when introducing evidence in a debate round: primary author(s)' name (last) and year of publication. Any other information such as source, author's qualifications, etc., may be given, but is not required. Should two or more quotations be used from the same source, the author and year must be given orally only for the first piece of evidence from that source. Subsequently, only the author's name is required. Oral citations do not substitute for the written source citation. The full written citation must be provided if requested by an opponent or judge.

1. Challenging Evidence: It shall be the responsibility of the opponent(s) only to challenge the opposition for the falsification or fabrication of evidence.
 - a) Indictments or protests of the validity of evidence shall be made on substantive grounds.
 - b) The challenger must have either the original source or a copy of the source being cited, or
 - c) The challenger must demonstrate that reasonable search has not been able to locate the source. (Such as copies of relevant pages in "Books in Print," "Readers Guide," "P.A.I.S.," etc.)
2. Procedure of Challenge:
 - a) The challenge must occur during the round.
 - b) The judge(s) shall make note of the challenge with the round continuing. If evidence is taken from a "handbook" and better evidence is provided the judge(s) shall weigh in the regular decision.

- c) Entrants shall report to the Tournament manager along with school directors. The manager shall hear the evidence then if needed convene the grievance committee.
- d) If challenge is upheld the entrant(s) challenged shall be disqualified from the Tournament and lose that round with no other ballots from previous rounds being altered.
 - i. Should a disqualification occur at a District Tournament in Rounds 1, 2 or 3 a fill team, if available, shall be required to provide an entry to complete the preliminary rounds. If a disqualification should occur at the State Tournament the disqualified team shall forfeit all remaining rounds.
 - ii. Should the disqualification occur in an elimination round, the challenger(s) shall advance to the next round.
- H. Non-Internet connected computers, electronic storage, retrieval devices, etc. shall be allowed in rounds of Policy, Lincoln-Douglas and Public Forum Debate. Connectivity to any person, machine, device, server outside the competition room, wired and/or wireless networks is strictly prohibited during all rounds. Other prohibited devices include cell phones and personal digital assistants. (Ex: Palm/Treo/Blackberry/etc.).
- I. A violation of any rule/regulation for this event will result in disqualification from the event. Any official protest of a disqualification shall be directed to and ruled upon by the Tournament grievance committee who has the authority to overturn a disqualification.