

Proposal #4 – remove normative language from the LD event description and judge instructions

(requires majority to pass)

Justification: The purpose of the following by-law changes is to remove normative and coercive descriptions of the activity that would discourage participation and continued involvement from students of underrepresented identity categories and novice debaters. Debaters should debate, and judges should judge. The NFA committee should not be making determinations of when or if “rules violations” determines a debate, those are tournament director decisions, not adjudication questions.

The “Let judges judge and let debaters debate proposal.”

Amend by-law II.A.12 to read -

12. Lincoln-Douglas Debate:

PURPOSE: A debate event designed to engage the audience through a policy-oriented dialogue.

DESCRIPTION: NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate is a one-person, persuasive, policy debate **on the traditional stock issues of policy debate (harms, inherency, solvency, and topicality).** It is a communication event, in which competitors will be evaluated on their analysis, use of evidence, and ability to effectively and persuasively organize, deliver and refute arguments. **Rapid fire delivery, commonly called “spread delivery,” is considered antithetical to the purpose and intent of this event.**

RULES:

1. **Recommended** paradigm for Judging Lincoln-Douglas Debate – **While the** official decision making paradigm of NFA LD is that of Stock Issues: Harm (Advantage or Goals), Inherency, Solvency, and Topicality, **judges are also encouraged to develop a decisionmaking paradigm for adjudicating competitive debates and provide that paradigm to students prior to the debate. Under the stock issues paradigm:**
The affirmative is required to propose a plan that meets four initial burdens. The plan need not be detailed, but should be sufficient to prove the plan’s propensity to solve the problem area.
2. The affirmative must prove:
 - a) The harm of the present system or that a comparative advantage or goal can be achieved over the present system;

- b) The inherency which prevents solving those harms or achieving those advantages or goals;
 - c) The proposed plan's propensity to solve the harm or achieve the advantage or goal claimed by the affirmative; and
 - d) The topical nature of the proposed plan as an inductive proof of the resolution. If, at the end of the debate, the negative has convinced the judge that the affirmative proposal has violated the parameters set by the resolution, then the decision in the debate should be awarded to the negative. However, the plan does not need to deal with all the possible problem areas suggested by the resolution. Topicality is a voting issue.
3. The negative may attack any of these issues, but need only win one to win the debate. Additionally, the negative may argue that one or more disadvantages to the proposed plan outweigh its benefits. The negative may also present one competitive counterproposal specific to the affirmative problem area and not dealing with the form of government, economic system, or need for further study (unless specifically identified as a key issue in the resolution).
 4. Counterproposals should be logically consistent with all other negative arguments constructed during the debate. If inconsistencies arise and the affirmative points them out, the judge should reject the arguments inconsistent with the counterproposal. Counterproposals are subject to the same burden of solvency as are required of affirmative plans.
 5. Rebuttals are to be used to respond to the opposition's lines of argument and to extend arguments made in constructive speeches. No new lines of argument may be presented in rebuttals. By new lines of argument, we mean those which are not clarifications or responses made to arguments made in constructive, but those which are completely new and unrelated to previous argumentation. New evidence to extend or clarify constructive arguments is permitted in rebuttal.
 6. ~~Speeches should be pleasant, comprehensible, and persuasive in tone, especially since not all judges will have traditional debate experience. Speech delivery and quantity of evidence should not be excessive.~~ Since LD debate adheres to the communication principles of individual events, judges are encouraged to give a verbal warning to debaters speaking too rapidly in a round. If the speaker does not heed the warning in that particular round, the judge is strongly encouraged to give that speaker a loss for that round even if the student has otherwise "won" the debate on the basis of the stock issues. ~~On the other hand, judges who encourage students to speak rapidly should be reported to the tournament director. At the national tournament, these judges will be pulled from the judging pool and their schools assessed judging fees for the rounds not covered. Local tournament directors are encouraged to develop their own responses to such judges.~~