

Speech DEBATE

Student Eligibility

Senior High

1 team of 2

Specific Rules

1. A team will consist of two members, both of whom must be present to avoid forfeiture.
2. A team will be prepared to debate either the affirmative or negative position of the issue.
3. A debate will not be held unless there are two teams scheduled for competition.
4. A script or notes will be permitted.
5. Research is the key to effective debate—delivery is definitely secondary. Each aspect of the subject, both the affirmative and the negative, needs to be prepared in advance since students will not know until the beginning of the debate which side they will be debating. A flip of the coin will determine the position.
6. The affirmative team is responsible to come up with the plan to implement change.

The Affirmative Plan: Burdens of the Affirmative

When the Affirmative team presents a plan, they take upon themselves the Burden of Proof to prove that their plan should be adopted. They must prove that their plan is an example of the resolution, and their plan must prove that it can solve the problem. The Affirmative must uphold this burden using evidence from published sources.

The Affirmative team must hold/win the stock issues in a policy debate. They are generally interpreted to be as follows:

1. Significance / Harms: What is the significance of the problems stemming from the status quo? What is the problem in the status quo to justify implementation of the plan? How much impact will this plan have?

2. Solvency: Will the plan solve the harm(s) and is it workable in the real world?
3. Inherency: Is the affirmative's plan happening already, and if not, why?
4. Topicality: Is the plan an example of the resolution? Does the affirmative team's proposed policy comply with the wording of the resolution?

Negative Approaches: Six Strategic Options

1. Topicality: The Negative will attempt to argue that the Affirmative team does not fall under the rubric of the resolution and should be rejected immediately regardless of the merits or advantages of the plan.
2. Direct Refutation: The knocking down, challenging what is said, i.e., "That their plan won't solve the harms because . . ."
3. Disadvantages: The negative can claim that there are disadvantages, or adverse effects of the plan, which outweigh any advantages claimed.
4. Defense of the Status Quo (what is happening now)-The Negative argues that the present system is fine.
5. Minor Repairs: The problem can be solved by the present system.
6. Counterplan
 - a. The negative shows a better way of solving the problem.
 - b. The negative assumes the burden of proof and shows their plan to be equal or better than the affirmative's plan.
 - c. One side has to show that their plan is better than the other in order to win-this is a very risky strategy for the negative side.

Tournament Procedure

Time Limits

First Affirmative Constructive Speech	four minutes
First Affirmative is questioned by Negative speaker	two minutes
First Negative Constructive Speech	four minutes
First Negative is questioned by an Affirmative speaker	two minutes
Second Affirmative Constructive Speech	four minutes
Second Affirmative is questioned by other Negative speaker	two minutes
Second Negative Constructive Speech	four minutes
Second Negative is questioned by other Affirmative speaker	two minutes

First Negative Rebuttal	two minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	two minutes
Second Negative Rebuttal	two minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	two minutes
Debate Preparatory Time (per team)	five minutes

Each speaker shall have four minutes for constructive argument, alternating affirmative to negative. Following each constructive speech, one opponent shall cross-examine the speaker for two minutes. The questioner shall control the use of the time and may interrupt the respondent but may not comment on the answers or make any statement of his own views. Each debater shall question one opponent. Following the four constructive speeches and questioning, each speaker shall have two minutes for rebuttal, alternating negative to affirmative.

Each Team

Each team will participate in one preliminary round. The highest two scoring teams will compete in a final round. The third highest score will receive third place.

Timing

At the expiration of time, the timekeeper shall stand and remain standing for the judges to note the overtime, but that shall not disqualify the debater.

Cross-Examination

Cross examination is more than the art of debate. All the essential elements of good debate are necessary: a strong case, good adaptation to the audience, adequate evidence, and skillful delivery. Good cross-examination demands, in addition, a quick wit and facile tongue.

1. Purpose of Cross-Examination: To clarify an obscure point in an opponent's case, to expose factual error or unsupported assertion, or to obtain damaging admissions. It should not be used to attack the witness's personal integrity.
2. Attitudes of Questioner and Witness: Both should appear to be reasonable, cooperative, and eager to please. Either one should be "marked down" for unpalatable sarcasm, obvious stalling, or appearing to browbeat his opponent.
3. Relation to Case: The virtue of a cross-examination decreases unless results are tied to later speeches. The cross-examination should be an integral part of the debate, not a sideshow.
4. Delivery: Both speakers must talk to the audience. Cross-examination takes the form of an exchange between two debaters, but it is basically for the benefit of the listeners. In public debates it is vital that both speakers face the audience while questioning or responding.

The Questioner

1. Controls the time and may interrupt the witness to request shorter or more direct answers, or to indicate that the answer he has given is insufficient.
2. Must ask fair and relevant questions. He should use his time for questioning alone, not for either constructive argument or summary. In fact, a conclusion is all the more effective if the audience reaches it without the questioner's help.
3. Should have considerable scope in the questions he asks. Since the time is his, he may waste time if he so desires. The witness should answer even if the significance or relevance of the question is not immediately apparent to him.
4. Should begin with common ground on which agreement may be expected, and progress to areas in which disagreement develops or the witness makes significant admissions. The questioner may well begin with the questions which reveal his purpose: "Do you maintain that the Nationalist Chinese Army stands as a bulwark against Communism in Asia?" "Yes." "And do you further maintain that recognition of Red China would weaken or destroy this bulwark?" "Yes." Agreement on such questions is almost certain, and the questioner clearly indicates the direction of his inquiry.
5. Should develop his attack along the lines of his basic case. He should limit the number of objectives he tries to reach. A series of at least five questions, probing a single issue of the debate thoroughly and following up the leads which the witness' answers provide, is preferable to a miscellaneous assortment of questions lacking interrelation and adaptation to the witness' answers.
6. May not insist on a simple "yes" or "no" answer unless his question is simple, direct, and factual. Questions about why something is true are necessarily complicated, and the questioner cannot expect the witness to answer them briefly. Factual questions are best, and the questioner can ask them in enough different ways to lend variety to the cross-examination.
7. Should phrase questions with the verb first, then the subject, and finally the object or modifying phrase. Example: "Do you admit that Joseph R. McCarthy is the junior senator from Wisconsin?" He should avoid negative questions or any phrasing with *not*: "Do you not know that there have been thirty-seven violations of the Korean truce by the Red Chinese?" The answer to this can only be confusing.
8. May remind the audience and the witness of relevant facts by beginning the question with "Are you aware that...?" or "Are you familiar with...?" However, the questioner's motive in putting such questions should be to put the witness on record concerning the statement involved and not to present materials of his own.
9. Should summarize a series of questions on an issue by repeating an opening question. Example: "Do you still consider, in light of these facts, that the Chinese Nationalist Army stands as a bulwark against Communism in Asia?" This calls for a "yes" or "no" answer, clearly indicates the Questioner has concluded that particular approach, and allows the members of the audience to draw their own conclusions.

The Witness

1. Must answer any legitimate question directly and briefly. He should not question the questioner (except in using a rhetorical question as an answer), nor should he engage in stalling tactics.
2. May refuse to answer a tricky or unfair question if he states a good reason for doing so. Example: "When did you stop beating your wife?"
3. May ask questions to clarify a question, possibly giving his reasons for considering the question obscure, or may ask the questioner to stop making speeches and to continue his questioning.
4. May clarify a question, if to do so is appropriate. He should state the qualification before his answer. Example: "Do you believe in the desirability of democratic elections?" "For people educated in the tradition and practice of democracy, yes."
5. Can exercise some control over the question period by controlling the timing of his answers rapidly, exposing the questioner's ineptitude.
6. Should not be afraid to admit ignorance if the question demands knowledge of an obscure fact.
7. Must answer without consulting his colleague or receiving help from him.

Judging Guidelines

1. A decision is not to be based upon the following:
 - a. The merits of the question. The judge should not be influenced by prejudices in favor of or against the proposition.
 - b. Partiality. The judge should not be influenced by the reputation of or show partiality for or against either of the competing teams, their schools, or coaches.
 - c. Pre-conceived notions on arguments. The judge should not allow his idea of what the best affirmative or negative arguments or cases may be to influence his decision.
 - d. Personal preferences on debating style. A judge should not penalize a team if its style differs, either in case construction or delivery, from that which he personally prefers; but the judge should evaluate all styles on the basis of effectiveness in winning the conviction.
2. A decision should be based upon the following:
 - a. Skill in analysis. This includes not only the analysis of the proposition, but also analysis of the debate as it progresses.
 - b. Use of evidence. This includes the use of sufficient evidence and proper reference to its source.
 - c. Validity of argument. This includes reasoning and conclusions drawn from the evidence presented.
 - d. Clarity of organization. This includes clear outlining of constructive arguments and easily followed handling of refutation.
 - e. Effectiveness of delivery. This includes all matters pertaining to oral presentation with special emphasis upon extempore abilities.
3. A team should be penalized for the following:
 - a. An unfair interpretation. If the interpretation is disputed by the negative, it shall rest with the judge whether or not the affirmative is supporting a tenable position.

- b. Discourtesy toward opponents. Discourtesy should be penalized according to the seriousness of the offense.
 - c. Falsification of evidence. If a team falsifies evidence in support of a point, it shall lose the point, and if the falsification is obviously deliberate, the judge shall impose an additional penalty according to the seriousness of the falsification.
 - d. Misconstruing an opponent's arguments. A speaker who misconstrues an argument unintentionally should not be penalized more than the time wasted. If it is intentional, the team should, in addition, forfeit the argument.
 - e. Introducing new arguments into rebuttal. The judges shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the answering of arguments introduced by opponents.
4. Speaking overtime. When a speaker's time is up, the judge shall disregard anything beyond a closing statement.

Additional Guidelines

1. Technicalities. The team shall debate the basic principles underlying the proposition. Too much emphasis should not be placed upon a technicality.
2. Burden of proof. A debate team need not destroy all opposing argument. It need only show that the preponderance of argument and evidence rests on its side.
3. Affirmative burden. An affirmative team need not destroy all negative argument. It need only show that the preponderance of argument and evidence rests on its side. This holds true equally for the negative team.
4. Questions. A team need answer questions only when they are shown to be pertinent and consequential to the debate. During the questioning periods, the time belongs to the debater asking the questions. The questions should be brief and the answers short and specific. The person answering the questions should not be permitted to refute but should be limited to comment on the answers.
5. Irrelevant arguments. Arguments as to whether the proposition is constitutional or whether it will be adopted are irrelevant.
6. Direct clash. The negative team is primarily responsible for a direct clash, providing the affirmative team is not evading the proposition. The affirmative team is responsible for a clash on arguments advanced by the negative as evils in the proposition.
7. Delayed replies. An argument introduced in constructive cases should be replied to by the opponents in time to give the team which advanced the argument an opportunity to reply.
8. Adaptation. A high premium should be placed upon adaptive extempore debating. This should not excuse a team for lack of clarity in organization or for errors in the use of English.
9. Persuasion. A premium should be placed upon the ability of the debaters to utilize human interest and accepted premises. Fallacies committed in an attempt to gain persuasive power should be treated the same as other fallacies.

10. Fallacies. A judge should not discredit an argument as fallacious, unless the fallacy is exposed by the opposition, except in the closing affirmative rebuttal, when the judge shall discredit it upon discovering the fallacy.
11. Constructive solution. Credit should be given to the team which most nearly approximates a constructive solution to the problems.
12. Point of order. The negative team shall not be denied the right to rise to a point of order after the closing affirmative rebuttal. However, if they argue the point instead of stating the point, they shall be heavily penalized on the point. In this contingency, final disposition of the matter shall rest entirely with the judge. In general, this practice is to be discouraged.