

# **Lincoln Douglas Debate**

---

## **The Maine Way**

---

**2008-2009 Edition**

**Prepared by**

***Joan Macri***

**Former Lincoln Douglas Moderator**

**Maine Forensic Association**

**Edited by**

**Daniel Haskell**

**Updated and added to in 2008 by**

**Brad Conant, MFA LD Moderator**

## ***Welcome***

**The Maine Forensic Association is pleased to welcome you to Lincoln Douglas Debate. This booklet is a primer on the activity and will help you begin your debating career. It is not meant to answer all questions nor to dictate a particular formula or style. It is meant to give you enough information so that you can enjoy this most rewarding activity. The final portion of this booklet includes the MFA Judging Manual so that you may see how this is done and share the information with potential and current judges.**

### **A few general items of information:**

**Lincoln Douglas topics are chosen by the National Forensic League. The November-December topic is announced October 1st, the January-February topic is announced December 1st and the March-April topic is announced February 1st. The topics are published in *The Rostrum*, the magazine of the National Forensic League, and on the web site nflonline.com.**

**At Maine tournaments, you will debate four rounds, presenting the negative twice and the affirmative twice. You should not have to debate anyone from your own school or the same opponent twice in one day. Exceptions to this are made at states and districts. Coaches are normally consulted when this occurs.**

**Three leagues exist which your school may join:**

- **The Maine Forensic Association which oversees all Maine tournaments and the State Championships**

**Kris Deveau, President.**

- **The National Forensic League which conducts the NFL District tournament which qualifies students for its national tournament.**

**Amy Trunnell, District Chair**

- **The National Catholic Forensic League which conducts the NCFL District which qualifies students for its national tournament.**

**D'Arcy Patey Robinson, Moderator**

**Schools that join the NFL will assign points to students for each win/loss at a tournament. Six points are awarded for a win, three points for a loss. The NFL has a system which awards degrees of distinction and many coaches award letters and jackets based on these point totals.**

**There are three divisions of Lincoln Douglas:**

**Novice: freshmen and sophomore debaters with no more than one year of experience.**

**Junior Varsity: for third year debaters or juniors and seniors with less than one year of debate experience.**

**Varsity: for experienced debaters.**

**Coaches may use some discretion on moving students up a level based on their maturity and skill.**

## **What is Lincoln-Douglas Debate?**

**The name comes from the famous debates in Illinois back in 1858 between Abraham Lincoln and Stephan Douglas. These were public one-on-one debates and did concern themselves with "values", those overriding reasons for action, as much as the practical "what to do " arguments. The namesake competition of today is a one-on-one battle between two competitors to see who best represents their side of a broad theoretical resolution, via a "value", hence the name "values debate". Though slavery is no longer an issue, today's resolutions can concern deep philosophical arguments over the environment, economics, political theory, justice, as well as war and peace. A student will then stand behind a value such as justice, safety or utilitarianism to build the case that their side is superior.**

**Above all, LD is about the "why" or philosophical reasoning behind an issue. The "how to" or practical side is the basis of Policy debate, not LD. A competitor delivers a case which; uses evidence to build a foundation of philosophical arguments; illustrates with practical examples or legal basis; applies logic at every turn; and then speaks eloquently as well as persuasively to an opponent and judge. The student listens to the opponent then offers compelling arguments and counter arguments to support their side. Competitors must argue each side of the resolution at a competitive meet and civilized behavior is expected at all stages. It's a cognitive challenge that some students find truly addicting.**

**Here is an excerpt from the NCFE Grand National Tournament (Appleton, WI, May 2008) "Information Sheet" that may be useful to you as a competitor or judge;**

**"The resolution is a proposition of value, not policy. Debaters are to develop argumentation on the resolution in its entirety, based on the conflicting underlying principles and values to support their positions. To that end, they are not responsible for practical applications. No plan shall be offered by the affirmative."**

**Thus, Lincoln-Douglas Debate is really about the merits of "big ideas" or concepts driving an issue, nearly as Lincoln and Douglas debated over slavery throughout Illinois in 1858.**

# How to Write an Affirmative Constructive

The affirmative constructive (AC) is a six-minute speech outlining the reasons why the affirmative supports the resolution. Start with an exact statement of the resolution and your stand on it. This may very well be the first time the judge has heard the exact wording of the resolution so it is important to speak clearly and at an appropriate pace.

The next step is to clearly state the *value* you will be supporting as you argue the affirmative side of the resolution. The value is the tool with which you (and hopefully your judge) will measure which side upholds the more moral view. Clearly explain your value AND how it is connected to your stand on the resolution. An advanced varsity or JV case would also include a "*value criteria*" which is a measure of how you intend to use the *value*. For example "safety" as a value might have a criteria of "personal well being" or "national security", so when ever the chosen criteria is discussed, it is in turn pointing toward the value of "safety".

It is the responsibility of the affirmative to define those terms that may be open to dispute. Use dictionaries or other sources to present clear, relevant definitions.

State the 3 major parts to your case. (Some debaters prefer to call them points, contentions, lines of analysis.) Be sure to number each one as you state them. This enables your judges to write them down on their flow pads and to follow your argument more easily. You may have more or less than 3 points but 3 seems to be a very workable number. Fewer than 3 points may indicate a poorly researched case and more than 3 can be difficult to cover adequately in the time allotted.

Now you are ready for the main body of your case. State each point being sure to number it as you go. This is known as *signposting*. Explain to the judge your reasons why the affirmative side is the correct side of the resolution. Use your research and reasoning to persuade the judge that the affirmative position is correct, moral and best upheld by supporting the resolution. LD or "values debate" is about the overarching or philosophical reasoning for a position rather than its actual application (policy debate). Therefore the evidence should emphasize the philosophical rather than practical (policy) side of the debate. Practical examples should not be eliminated however as they can illustrate a broader point very well. Logic by itself without a strong foundation of substantial, attributable ideas and concepts also misses the point of LD Debate. Logic itself, attributable only to yourself, pales when compared to timeless thinkers like Kant, Locke or Aristotle.

Within each point, tie your value back to the resolution and explain how it upholds the affirmative position.

In concluding, briefly remind the judge of your three reasons and the underlying value. End on a strong note, persuading the judge to your point of view and then say you are "now open for cross examination".

Throughout your AC, remember that clear and strong is better than fuzzy and flowery. Avoid the big words and jargon. Explain clearly and be persuasive.

## ***How to Write a***

### ***Negative Constructive***

The negative constructive is seven minutes long but this DOES NOT mean you are to prepare a seven minute case. Always remember that the negative speaks after the affirmative. You will have already heard the affirmative case and thus are REQUIRED to respond to it in your constructive. Debaters who use all their constructive time on their own points and do not attack the affirmative case WILL LOSE. Prepare a four to five minute negative constructive and reserve the remaining two to three minutes to respond to the affirmative case.

Start out with a strong statement regarding your stand on the resolution. The negative has the responsibility to disprove the affirmative's stand. It is not enough to offer an alternative case. You must attack each of the affirmative's points, stating why they are incorrect, flawed, lack support or are immoral. Often the negative has two alternative strategies from which to choose in terms of attack:

1. Persuade the judge that the exact opposite of the resolution is morally correct
2. Persuade the judge that in several situations, the affirmative stand is wrong and since it cannot be upheld in this instance, it must be incorrect.

Consider the following example:

**RESOLVED: "Medical experimentation on animals is immoral"**

The negative is not required to prove the opposite of the resolution which is that medical experiments on animals are moral. The negative case can point out that in some situations such experimentation is justified and therefore moral. This places the affirmative on the defensive. The affirmative must uphold the resolution and prove that the experimentation is moral.

A word here about extreme examples. Judges are not generally swayed by a negative case which has one extreme example to prove an affirmative case wrong. Several realistic examples will sway a judge but poking one hole in an affirmative case will not necessarily win the round.

Once the negative has determined how it will stand on the resolution, the constructive can be written. State your stand and explain your *value* position. You may do one of two things here. You may offer an alternative value, explaining why it is a better measure of the resolution's merit than the affirmative value, or you may use the same value as the affirmative but explain how it better upholds the negative position

You should be prepared to offer alternative definitions in case the affirmative does not define terms or has definitions which are harmful to your case. Debaters will try to play games with definitions. If you do not like the affirmative definitions, offer your own BUT be sure to explain why your definitions are superior. It is not enough to simply offer them. Your explanation may simply be that your definitions are less narrow and allow for more clash on the topic.

**State the points you will be making in order to defend your stand on the resolution. This will allow the judge to get the framework of your case before you present your entire constructive. Be sure to *signpost* (number your points). It is common for varsity negatives to have 2 major points or contentions to support their case.**

*Explain your points, tying in your value. Keep an eye on the time to be sure to allow yourself enough time to rebut the affirmative case. Two to three minutes should be sufficient for this. Say to the judge "I will now go over my opponent's case." Close with a reminder to the judge of your stand on the case.*

## **Road Maps**

**In advanced level rounds it is common for competitors to give a quick "road map" of the order of their speeches to the judge before the clock starts. This is common once rebuttals are involved in the round. For example, the 1AR may start with; " I intend to start with the value clash, go to the negative's case and then finish with my own case".**

## **Lincoln Douglas Format**

**Lincoln Douglas follows a set format with strict time restrictions. A judge or timekeeper will give you signals to let you know how much time you have remaining in your speech.**

# *The Round*

## **Time Allotted Responsibilities**

### **6 minutes Affirmative Constructive (AC):**

- **Be sure your judge and opponent are ready.**
- **State the resolution and your stand on it.**
- **Clearly define the terms of importance in the resolution.**
- **State the value you are employing to measure the morality of the resolution.**
- **State the 3 reasons for your stand.**
- **Discuss each point in depth offering reasons, research, and explanations for your points, linking your value to your points.**
- **Briefly restate your stand and why it is the correct stand on the resolution.**

*While the affirmative is speaking, the negative will listen carefully, taking notes on all the affirmative points and their supporting evidence.*

### **3 minutes Cross Examination (CX):**

*Both debaters stand in front of the judge, shoulder to shoulder, facing the judge.*

- **Having listened to the affirmative case and taken notes, the negative will ask questions to clarify the affirmative position and to lead the affirmative to agree with negative points.**

*During the CX, the affirmative will answer questions, try to avoid agreeing with the negative position and adding support for the affirmative stand. This part of the round is not judged. "Discoveries" must be "brought in" later during rebuttals.*

### **7 minutes Negative Constructive (NC):**

- **State your stand on the resolution. You may disagree wholly or in part.**
- **Offer alternative definitions if you think they are needed. However, if you do, you must explain why your definitions are superior to those of the affirmative.**
- **Explain which value you will be using to defend your stand and why.**
- **State your 2 or 3 reasons for your stand on the resolution.**
- **Explain your reasons, giving evidence for your thinking and linking them to your value.**
- **At the end of approximately 5 minutes, tell the judge you will "now go over the affirmative case."**
- **Using the notes you took during the affirmative speech, go over each point, identifying it by number, explaining why you disagree with the point and giving reasons why you disagree. Bring in any "discoveries" made during cross-examination.**
- **The last 30 seconds return to your value and stand and remind the judge of your reasoning.**

*While the negative is speaking, the affirmative should be taking careful notes on the negative points, the support for them and on the attacks made on the affirmative case.*



### **3 minutes Cross Examination (CX):**

- **It is the turn of the affirmative to ask clarification and leading questions. *This part of the round is not judged. "Discoveries" must be "brought in" later in rebuttals.***

### **4 minutes First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR):**

- **Tell the judge what you will be doing—going over the negative case and the attacks made on the affirmative case and then adding more support for the affirmative case.**
- **Using your notes, attack the negative case, point by point specifying which one you are attacking. Respond to the attacks made on the affirmative case. Bring in any "discoveries" made during cross-examination.**

### **6 minutes Negative Rebuttal (NR):**

- **This is your only rebuttal and your last chance to speak. Tell the judge what you will be doing--going over the attacks made on your case or attacking the affirmative case. Go over each point, specifying which point you are discussing by number. **DO NOT BRING UP ANY NEW ARGUMENTS.** Keep an eye on the time and use the last 30 seconds to reaffirm your stand on the resolution. Be persuasive and passionate and link back to your value.**

*The affirmative will take careful notes and use the remaining prep time to crystallize the major arguments in the round.*

### **3 minutes Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR):**

- **This is your final speech. Tell the judge you will focus on the main points of clash in the round and explain why the affirmative has won the round. End in a passionate, persuasive, value centered manner.**

*Despite the fact that you are finished with your case listen attentively. Do not pack up or acted bored. Be respectful of your opponent and judge.*

**At the end of the round, shake hands with your opponent and thank your judge for her or his time. Do not ask for an oral critique. Leave the room promptly so the judge can arrive at a decision in privacy.**

*During the round you will each have 4 minutes for preparation. Try to budget it so that you have sufficient time remaining toward the end of the round. You may ask the judge to call out your prep time in 30-second increments. (4 minutes adopted by the MFA in 2008)*

**Rebuttals**  
**in**  
**Lincoln Douglas**

*Let There Be CLASH!*

**As a debate activity, there must be clash. Many judges complain about "dueling oratories" when debaters speak only about their own cases and there is no attack, no clash. Debaters have a responsibility to attack their opponents' cases and to respond to the attacks made on their cases. For many novices this is the hardest part of the round. For most experienced debaters, this is when the debate becomes most enjoyable.**

**Keys to a Successful Rebuttal**

- 1. You must have a Good Flow of the opponent's case. If you do not know and cannot remember what the opponent's points are, you can not possibly attack them successfully. Take careful notes; ask clarification questions during CX and be sure to flow the attacks made on your points.**
- 2. Use your Prep Time. Three minutes is a long time if budgeted appropriately and used efficiently. Read over your notes on your flow pad. Make notations of what you want to highlight. Circle and star flaws in your opponent's case. Analyze the major issues so that you can crystallize them for the judge. Take a few calming breaths before you speak so that you can speak clearly when you begin your rebuttal.**
- 3. Anticipate what arguments your opponent may try to use and be prepared for them ahead of time. Have a few responses prepared for certain values you expect might be utilized or points you think might be raised. Some debaters like to use post-it notes. During the round they can just stick them on their flow pad and are prepared to use them during their speech.**
- 4. When attacking your opponent's contentions or responding to attacks on your points, Signpost. Use the numbers of your points and your opponent's points to signal to the judge where you are on the flow. This will enable the judge to more easily document your rebuttal and will result in a clear, organized presentation. Judges appreciate this and in a close round may be the difference in a win or a loss.**
- 5. Keep an eye on the Time while you are presenting your rebuttal. The judge will be using hand signals to indicate how much time you have remaining; be sure to notice and budget your time. Rebutting 2 of your opponent's points and not leaving sufficient time for the 3rd will cost you points and perhaps the round.**

# The Art of Flowing

Notetaking is an important key to success in debate. There are a few basics and then many debaters add their personal touches to their flows such as using different colors for affirmative and negative points. Advanced competitors often put the Aff and Neg cases on different sides of the same paper or even on two separate sheets. Competitors can "pre-block" their own case points on the sheet to note any responses to them.

Use a legal pad (8 ½ by 14 inches) held sideways. The best legal pads have a cardboard strip across the top which makes them sturdier.

AC	CX	NC	CX	1AR	NR	2AR
Value:		<i>Response to aff value</i>		<i>Defense</i>	<i>Attack</i>	<i>Crystallize value clash</i>
Definitions:		<i>Alternative defns</i>		<i>Defense</i>	<i>Attack</i>	<i>Hopefully not an issue</i>
Contention 1		<i>Attack on 1</i>		<i>Defense and support</i>	<i>Attack</i>	<i>Deal with major points of conflict</i>
Contention 2		<i>Attack on 2</i>		<i>Defense and support</i>	<i>Attack</i>	
Contention 3		<i>Attack on 3</i>		<i>Defense and support</i>	<i>Attack</i>	
		Value:		<i>Attack</i>	<i>Defend</i>	
		Definitions:				
		Contention 1		<i>Attack on 1</i>	<i>Defense and support</i>	
		Contention 2		<i>Attack on 2</i>	<i>Defense and support</i>	

Several styles of flow sheet are available at various tournaments and on the MFA website. Use the one that works for you or make your own. Competitors and judges have different needs in this respect.

# **A Few Advanced Considerations For Newer Coaches**

**Dozens of vendors around the country can sell you a wide variety of beginner manuals that tell you essentially the same information as this free manual. Naturally, their style of delivery or formatting may suit your needs well, but at a price. The 2007 & 2008 LD finalists in the NFL used the same "fundamentals" of LD found in this manual though they received their training elsewhere. Obviously they did evolve from this similar beginning to their own successful style, adapting the number of contentions, subpoints, c/x questions, timing and other parts to suit their needs. Strategy and tactics, plus their student, coach and club variations around the country are endless, so vendor provided materials are not to be dismissed. However, you should be aware that other districts around the country emphasize parts of the round differently. Value criteria for example, receives far more emphasis outside of Maine than in it. "Spreading", or rapidly speaking in order to "spread" more information into the round, is common in some districts and discouraged in others. In fact, 2007 & 2008 NFL LD finalists did not use "spreading", though a lot of competitors did. Policy jargon is often common as well around the country. Terms such as "card" or "link" are used frequently but while some judges may love it, other judges hate it, and newer judges may not understand the context of it. Again, jargon seemed to be less pronounced with the top level winners. A Maine competition compromise may be to understand these distinctions, but to apply them only when needed.**

**Maine varsity level debaters can be expected to depart from this manual in some strategic and tactical ways. The jobs are the same, the burdens are similar. However, as national qualifiers return and word gets around, varsity kids naturally use strategies and tactics seen or heard of elsewhere. One tactic might call for a clarifying c/x while another might go for the probing and trapping c/x. Using no prep time prior to c/x, or saving 3 minutes in the Neg. constructive to attack AFF are common variations employed. This is natural and in most ways should not be discouraged. Internet resources have allowed this to explode in recent years. Kids now communicate extensively about debate in ways undreamed of when this manual was originally drafted. The main caution would be to remember that only a few Maine judges have judged LD at a national level. The varsity student can easily alienate a judge with the use of policy jargon, resolution analysis, LD technicalities and so on that work well in Missouri or North Carolina. While it may seem to be a shame that an advanced student has to adapt to judging, it is a serious reality at the national level as well. The burden then falls on the advanced competitor to adapt rather than "dumb down" their work. After all, the main task of the debater is to speak persuasively, with organization, clarity and authority, while giving attention to the technical needs of the LD format. That's what the champions do.**

# **Tournaments and Judging**

**Including:  
"Materials on How to Judge Lincoln-Douglas Debate"  
Modified and updated from the 12/01 Tim Vogel Edition.  
The MFA "Lincoln-Douglas Briefing"**

**The following judging and tournament information is offered at the back of this manual so that a judge or coach can skip ahead to this point. Some information is therefore duplication. Coaches and competitors would be well advised to read on and know the full manual.**

# **An Introduction to Lincoln-Douglas Debate for Judges**

## **Origin:**

Lincoln-Douglas Debate (usually called LD) is derived from a style of debating made famous by the 1858 Congressional campaign debates between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas. (Lincoln won the debates while Douglas won that election.)

LD developed as a high school debate style in the late 1970's and early 80's as an alternative to the then predominate "policy" style debate. LD was intended to be a debate style emphasizing persuasive speaking, logic, rational thought, and philosophical argumentation focusing on issues of conflicting values. LD is designed so that inexperienced debaters can understand the debate format and rules in a short period of time. The goals of LD are to produce articulate, intellectual and logical persons who can apply a variety of philosophical methods and value systems to controversial issues.

## **Basics:**

An LD debate revolves around the interaction and conflict among competing values and value systems. The focus of an LD debate is a pre-established resolution. LD resolutions are established by the National Forensic League (NFL) to apply to all LD debates held throughout the country during a given time; September-October, November-December, January-February and March-April.

LD involves two debaters who debate in front of a judge. For each 2 LD debaters, the school must supply a judge. An LD judge may be a coach, a parent or friend of the student debater.

The debaters compete by promoting a value to address the issues raised by the resolution. The affirmative speaker attempts to prove a resolution true and the negative tries to prove the resolution false. Both the affirmative and negative debater should advance a value, measured by a value criteria, and proven by contentions composed of arguments supported by logic and evidence. Both sides are expected to present cases to persuade the judge that his or her side of the resolution is superior. Each debater will support his or her side of the resolution by presenting a value that clashes with and refutes his or her opponent's value. A value is what the debater is arguing that should be most valued in society. The value must affirm the resolution for AFF and negate the resolution for NEG. A value criteria is used by some debaters, most commonly varsity debaters and least commonly novice debaters, to establish a standard by which to determine if the debater's contentions support the debater's value.

In LD, both debaters carry an equal burden of proving his or her case and refuting the opponent's case through proof and refutation. There are no tie rounds in LD debate. The judge must declare a winner of the round of debate, even when the debaters are close.

LD debaters must prepare adequately for both sides of the resolution. Each debater will argue 2 affirmative and 2 negative in a 4 round LD debate tournament. LD debate has strict time rules that the judge will enforce (see below).

## **How an LD Debate Tournament Works**

After the morning judges and coaches meeting, the tournament officials will post Round One of the debate. The list of debaters competing in Round One is composed by the TAB (tournament administration board) officials who will keep "tabs" on the debater's scores and results throughout the tournament. To avoid any bias for or against a particular debater or school, each debater is assigned an anonymous code (usually a letter and number, for example A10). The posting for each round of LD debate will have four columns: the affirmative debater (AFF); the negative debater (NEG); the judges' last name; and the room number. Once the round is posted, please note the code for the AFF and NEG debaters and the number of the classroom number where the debate will be held. Then pick up a ballot. Frequently flow sheets for the judge's note taking will also be available. Then proceed to the assigned classroom.

Start the round as soon as both students are present and ready. Before the round it is common to inform the students how you as the judge and timekeeper will show the time remaining in the round.

It is traditional to count down from three minutes with finger showing for the remaining minutes. At 1/2 minute remaining you can one-half your index finger or your entire hand bent in half. You can show that time has expired with a closed fist or by saying that time is expired. When time is up, you may allow the student to finish his or her sentence of thought.

During Cross Examination (CrossX), both students should face the judge. CrossX is where the examining debater may ask the questioned debater to clarify his or her statements. The examining debater may also ask questions to lay the groundwork for later arguments. The judge should not decide the round based on the questions or answers in CrossX. A debater must make reference to an opponent's CrossX answers during other parts of the debater's presentation in order for it to "count". The judge may wish to pay attention during CrossX to see what the two debaters see as the most important issues of the round. The debate round will proceed as described in the guidelines for judging LD.

At the end of the round, both debaters may shake hands with each other and the judge. Depending on the performance and conduct of the debaters, the judge may make some short comments at the end of the round. The judge may not make any comments during the round. If you do give the students an oral critique, be fair to both sides, and try to stay balanced so as not to reveal your decision. Quickly make any comments to the debaters, as the TAB room needs the results of your judge's decision as soon as possible. Do not reveal to the debaters who won the round. The debaters will learn the results of the round at the end of the tournament. To keep the tournament running quickly, make your decision as soon as you can fairly and accurately make it. Mark your decision and the speaker points on the top half "White Sheet" part of the ballot and quickly take that white sheet to the TAB room. You may then sit down in the judges' room or an empty classroom to compose your longer comments to the debaters and the reason for your decision on the ballot. The next debate round will start as soon as the TAB room can make the pairings.

Stay near the judges' room so you are ready when the next round is posted. The TAB uses the win / loss results and the speaker points to pick the winner at the end of the day in each of the Varsity, Junior Varsity and Novice divisions. Rounds 3 and 4 are often "power paired" between students with a similar record for the tournament.

### Judging Guidelines for Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Whether you are an experienced judge, or a new judge a few things may help make your judging experience in this LD tournament a success for both you and the debaters.

While the debaters should introduce their presentation by stating the resolution being debated at this tournament, it is helpful if the judge knows the wording of the resolution prior to judging the debate round. During the course of a round, you as the judge may be asked to make a decision on how the round is run. While there are certain rules mentioned here, other rules are either implied or set by tradition. If you are put in the position to decide something about how the debate round is run, please be fair to both sides. Please report any discrepancies in the conduct of the round to the TAB. If you feel that you need clarification on an issue, ask an experienced coach or a member of the TAB room. Lincoln-Douglas debate tournaments run on the generous efforts of parents, coaches and other adults to judge debate rounds. We thank everyone involved for his or her contributions to the success of the tournament. We know that a judge has to make a win or loss decision in every debate round. There are no ties in LD debate. We know that for many persons this is the first time judging. We understand the problems that arise in such situations. Judges need to make decisions. No one will yell at you for what you decide. Do the best that you can and be fair to both debaters. Be fair, be consistent and be unbiased in your final decision. Everyone will appreciate a good faith effort.

### Round times:

LD debate has strict time rules that the judge will enforce. The judge should bring a watch to the tournament, as it is not dependable to rely on there being a working clock in the classroom.

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Negative Cross Examination	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Affirmative Cross Examination	3 minutes
1st Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
2nd Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes

Each debater has 4 minutes of preparation time to use throughout the debate round.

### A few specific LD rules:

All arguments must be brought up in debater's constructive argument.

No new arguments can be brought in rebuttal, with the exception that AFF may bring up arguments against NEG's case during the 1st Affirmative Rebuttal.

A speaker may give a "road map" of how their work will proceed prior to starting the clock.

Both sides must present a value. There is a school of thought in LD debate that NEG does not have to promote a value, but may simply refute AFF's case and value. This approach is not favored, and NEG debaters will most commonly have to propose their own value in opposition to AFF's value.

### Filling out your ballot:

Please fill out the "White Sheet" portion of your ballot, as quickly you can decide the round in fair, consistent and unbiased manner, and take it to the TAB room.

After you have delivered the white sheet, you can take time to write your comments on the ballot.

When you state the reason for your decision on the ballot, any tips you can give the debaters on ways they can improve are most helpful. Debaters and coaches will pour over the ballots after the tournament.

Please do not tell the debaters your decision at the end of the round. They will either be positive they won, or think they lost. Either way, if the judge tells them the results of the round, can either devastate them or make them over-confident of victory. The debaters will know the results of the round when they read the ballots at the conclusion of the tournament.

Depending on the printed form of the ballot there may be either space for general comments on the debater, or specific spaces for the judge's comments on case and analysis; support of issues through evidence and reasoning; delivery; and the reason for the decision. Typical comments on ballots include:

- Good eye contact
- The debater showed convincing poise in her delivery
- It is useful for the judge to note a particular argument that the judge did or did not understand. (It is important for the debaters to communicate their ideas to the judge.)
- Anything you liked or disliked about the round
- Things about either debater that you found distracting
- Anything that will help the debaters improve their debate skills
- How the debater's case supported the debater's value in regards to the resolution being debated.

Please write your comments firmly on the ballot, as it must print through several copies. There is nothing more frustrating to a debater or coach to receive a ballot at the end of the tournament, and then not be able to read the judge's comments.



## Speaker Points

The TAB uses the win / loss results and the speaker points to pick the winner at the end of the day in each of the Varsity, Junior Varsity and Novice divisions. Speaker points may also be used in rounds 3 and 4 to “power pair” students or to otherwise break ties with a similar record for many tournaments.

Speaker points generally run a range from 22 to 30 points. The speaker points are printed on the top of the ballot in the following ranges:

<b>Below Average</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
<b>20-21</b>	<b>22-23</b>	<b>24-26</b>	<b>27-28</b>	<b>29-30</b>

LD speaker points are usually awarded in the range from 22 to 30. Speaker points from 16 to 21 are reserved for debaters with clearly inadequate, inappropriate or disruptive conduct. While some debaters deserve speaker points of 30 for an outstanding round, likewise a 30 point round is uncommon.

Sometimes a judge will determine that one debater had an impressive presentation style deserving of high speaker points, but that the other speaker was more persuasive in promoting a value for the particular resolution in contention. Thus it infrequently occurs that the debater the judge declares the round winner will have the lower speaker points. When this happens, Low Point Win or "LPW" should be clearly marked on the white sheet and ballot so that TAB does not think that there has been an error in indicating the speaker points and the debate round winner on the ballot.

Thank you for your effort to learn the skills of judging LD debate, as well as your effort to be the best LD judge possible. Lincoln-Douglas debate tournaments run on the generous efforts of parents, coaches and other adults to judge debate rounds. We thank everyone involved for his or her contributions to the success of each LD tournament.

## **New Coaches and Judges: TAB**

During the course of the season, feel free to ask questions of any kind. Most veteran coaches in the judges lounge will freely dispense any kind of coaching and judging information you might desire. If they don't have an answer, they usually will know where to find it. The MFA Lincoln-Douglas Moderator is usually available at tournaments for questions of any kind concerning LD as well and acts for the MFA as their "designated expert" on rules. As outlined already, the Tournament Administration Board or "TAB" room is where you go to turn in ballots and to report round "irregularities". However, when all else fails someone there can also direct you to who might be able to answer any question for you. This sort of thing may seem like a bother but in fact it is appreciated since it shows your interest in doing well.

The league officers would also like to extend an invitation for you to learn how the "TAB" room functions. Every coach should arrange to help out even once just to see how it works. Non-coaches are quite welcome as well. It's quite painless to help out and you could become indispensable at some future tournament when another set of eyes is required. Most of the procedures are outlined at the NFL website under "Tournament Manual" but the MFA By-Laws do modify the procedures for simplicity during regular season and state tournaments. Each tournament is unique and is the domain of the local tournament director. This person chooses their own TAB staff and may choose some minor rules variations as well. They are in charge of briefings, food, awards and the other endless details of a tournament. The three league tournaments (MFA 'States', NFL and CFL Qualifiers) are run by the officers of each league. Your help would be appreciated but more importantly the league benefits from informed judging.

# The MFA Judges Briefing : Lincoln – Douglas Debate

**Welcome!** Refer to pamphlets and flow charts available. Prior coaching is essential to judge well.

This is “value based” debate - who best upholds their "value" over the resolution. In short, it is a battle over the value placed on the resolution, not necessarily whether or not it is practical to do so.

Examples of a value: Justice, with a criteria of human rights, or Utilitarianism, with criteria of efficiency. The round should be very polite, objective & civil - “my opponents case” vs. he or she. The resolution should be stated along with the position of the speaker. Neg must overturn Aff. and possibly have superior case too. Moral/philosophical content with supporting evidence is essential. Clash of ideas: They must “attack” each other. Otherwise it's just “dueling constructives”, not debate. Judge what is said, not what you think. This is 2-way debate, not 3-way . What you think is immaterial. Level – novices make more mistakes and varsity should know what to do. Adjust points to each level. Shut down all electronic devices like cell phones, cameras, recorders, iPods, computers during the round.

## **Going down the flow – in brief. Timings are on ballots.**

**Aff. Constructive:** In some ways this resembles a “5 paragraph essay”.

Should hear resolution and relevant definitions stated. Moral/ philosophical position outlined.

Should be a value and value criteria (how you will judge the value)

Contentions – usually 3 statements of viewpoint/opinion backed by evidence

**Cross X's** – do not judge this – used by competitor to clarify or trap – anything found here

must be brought into later rebuttals to “count”. COMPETITORS SHOULD FACE JUDGE.

**Neg Constructive** – Broken into 2 parts; neg case and first – 1<sup>st</sup> rebuttal ( and attack aff side)

Resolution, definitions case/value like aff before except restated for neg side.

**1<sup>st</sup> Rebuttals** – attack opponent; review own case; clarify position; address any conflicting definitions ie.

adolescence: 18 or reasoning ability. No mention of defs is conceding that they are okay.

Must address each of opponent contentions and value, or they become “dropped”

**2<sup>nd</sup> Rebuttals** – “crystallize” down to important issues. Give judge reasons for voting outcome.

**New Info.** - only up to first rebuttals – after that – ignore it, opponent should point it out.

This is for new concepts, but new examples for old, “in-play” concepts are okay.

**Dropped items** – contentions should be at least repeated to keep in play – ideally attacked. Just because a competitor says something is new or dropped doesn't mean it is so.

## **Ballots:**

DO NOT ASK FOR FULL NAMES OR SCHOOLS. First name is okay. Do not disclose results!

Confirm the codes for aff. and neg. when competitors arrive. Fill in round and date.

After round fill in winner side and codes (should match). Fill in speaker points.

## **Speaker Points:**

MAIN GOAL IS CONSISTENCY.

Stay generally in the 22-28 range unless someone really is uncivil or belligerent.

Be conscious of level (novice, JV or varsity) – compare within level but not between levels.

Leave room at the top – 30 is for someone running for governor. 29 is really quite good.

THIS IS MAINLY FOR SPEAKING ABILITY – STYLE, VOICE, TONE, MANNERS ETC.

These are used to break ties of 3 or more at the same win/loss level.

Much lower than 26-27 for a good speaker can knock them out of contention.

LPW or SPW should be written on ballot if you deliberately assigned lower points or a tie to the winner.

TAB will check otherwise. “Low Point Wins” happen but aren't common.

## **White Sheeting:**

Turn in – to TAB room - the top “white sheet” as soon as possible with the decision. Speed is important.

Fill in feedback details on remaining copies at your leisure. Turn those in to TAB before the day ends.

**Time signals:** Judges keep track of time during the round.

Hand signal the last 3 minutes, 30 seconds and end. Count down prep time (4 min. now) in 30 sec. increments.

## **Disclosures:**

Do not disclose the results of your rounds to anyone during the tournament day. It's okay after awards.

Avoid discussions of your rounds during the day - future round judges may hear it and become biased.

It is okay to ask each other “how to” questions but avoid identifying anyone.

*If a round starts and you don't have an assignment, stay in the judges lounge around for 10 minutes in case a crisis arises where TAB needs another judge - mistakes happen and you may be needed.*

**Any further questions? Feel free to ask any coach or the LD Moderator.**