



Judging Lincoln Douglas Value Debate Manual

Thank you for your willingness to judge debate. Your support is greatly appreciated by all the students and parents participating in this tournament, and your feedback provides valuable information that will help each debater improve his or her communication and debate skills. The following pages are designed to equip you to do the best job possible in judging a debate round. If after reading this overview you have any additional questions, the judge coordinator or tournament director will be happy to clarify any issues for you.

Again, thank you!

Before You Judge

As a debate judge, you are in control of the debate round. There is no need to feel nervous judging. The debaters you will be seeing are probably more nervous about speaking. They want to impress you and win your vote. Your job is simply to listen and decide which debater is the most persuasive.

Value Debate

Values are principles universally accepted or agreed upon by a society, culture, or group of people. Values are so integral to the decisions we make that they are rarely analyzed objectively. Debating a value resolution forces the debater to define, analyze, and argue values. This style of debate concerns itself with a clash of values. As a judge, you will be deciding whether a particular value should be upheld in the context of the resolution.

In the Round

In Lincoln Douglas debate there will be only one debater on each side. When each debater enters the room, he should give you his code, name, and the side of the debate he is on. You should insert this information in the appropriate places on your ballot. When you and the debaters are ready, you should let them know that they can begin the round. It is very important to start the round as close to the scheduled time as possible. Each speech and cross-examination is timed.

Time Schedule for Each Round of Lincoln Douglas Debate

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes
Cross-Examination (of A by N)	3 minutes
Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Cross-Examination (of N by A)	3 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes
Prep time allowed	3 minutes per side

Each debater receives a total of **three** minutes preparation time, not to be used prior to cross-examination. Preparation time is deducted from the debater who speaks next.

Taking Notes

To help you decide which debater to vote for at the end of a debate round, it is important that you take notes. Flowing (or flowcharting) is a note-taking method that both debaters and judges have found helpful in understanding and following the flow of arguments from speech to speech. This process of note-taking allows you to see how each speaker responds to the arguments of the previous speaker.

Affirmative Debater

In a debate round, the affirmative debater will affirm the resolution by means of a case presented during the debate round. In the end, the underlying goal of the affirmative is to uphold the resolution.

It is the role of the affirmative to provide an interpretation of the resolution, also called the *affirmative case*. This simply means that the affirmative will be describing what the resolution means and why the judge should vote in favor of the resolution. Many different styles are used by affirmative debaters in upholding the resolution. In the end, you must decide whether the advocacy provided by the affirmative adequately demonstrates that the resolution should be upheld.

In building its case, the affirmative may provide analysis and evidence to show the importance of a value or values in the resolution. This can be achieved in many ways, including providing support for the value's intrinsic worth, its application, and/or its relation to other values.

The affirmative must also refute the negative's arguments. The negative may choose simply to provide direct refutation to the affirmative case. The affirmative can then rebut the arguments of the negative and re-assert the importance of the affirmative value premise.

Negative Debater

The negative has at least two options when refuting an affirmative case. First, the debater may argue against the resolution and the affirmative case through *refutation*. By pointing out flaws and negative implications of the case, and providing analysis and evidence, the negative may demonstrate how the affirmative does not uphold its value and/or the resolution.

The second option is to provide a *negative interpretation* of the resolution. This may look similar to the Lincoln Douglas case organization below; however, the negative will be assembling a case that refutes, rather than upholds, the resolution. In addition to providing its own case, the negative may still refute the affirmative case and attempt to show that the negative interpretation of the resolution or negative value is more important than the affirmative case.

If the negative chooses the value premise case organization, it will most likely include definitions, a value premise, criteria, and contentions, just like the affirmative case. The negative may choose to accept any of the elements of the affirmative resolution analysis or propose counter-definitions, a counter-value premise, and/or counter-criteria.

The counter-value should compete with the affirmative value premise. Contentions can be used to demonstrate the importance of the counter-value premise.

The Lincoln Douglas Case

The affirmative should propose an interpretation of the resolution. The negative may choose to argue for its own interpretation of the resolution. We often call the interpretation of the resolution the *case*. There are usually two main parts of the case: resolution analysis and contentions.

A debater may adopt one of many different styles in building a case. As a judge, you should analyze whether the interpretation provided is logical and corresponds with the resolution. If you believe that an interpretation of the resolution does not correspond with the resolution, you have the option, based on the arguments in the round, to vote against the debater who proposed that case and vote in favor of the other debater.

Resolution Analysis: Definitive Issues

One method often used to interpret a resolution is the *resolution analysis*, the portion of the case where the debater will communicate his or her interpretation of the resolution. In the commonly used case structure known as the *value premise* case, the resolution analysis consists of definitions, value premise, and criteria.

The purpose of definitions is to describe the nature and boundaries of the resolution. The debater may also propose a specific value that he or she will be upholding in the round. When defined, we call that value a value premise. A value premise is simply a specific value chosen and defined by a debater that he or she will be supporting in the round. Since values are often abstract ideas, criteria may be necessary to better understand the value. Criteria are the mechanism for measuring the value premise – determining a practical framework for how the value premise is impacted by the contentions or arguments in the round. If the goal is upholding the value premise, the criteria are the road you will take to get there.

The value premise case organization is just one of many styles that can be used in the interpretation of the resolution. As a judge, it is up to you to decide, no matter which style a debater chooses, whether the interpretation provided corresponds with the resolution and is justified by the debater.

Contentions: Designative Issues

After a debater has provided an analysis of the resolution, the debater may provide arguments – or *contentions* – showing why the resolution should be upheld (for the affirmative) or negated (for the negative). In the example of a value premise case, the debater will tell you why his or her value is the most important in the round. Remember, you are going to judge which value is the most important in the context provided by the resolution. This can be achieved in many ways; including showing the value's intrinsic worth, its application, and/or its relation to other values.

Contentions are designed to give merit to the value premise, often by providing analysis, philosophical importance, application, and real world examples. As much as possible, the judge should try not to interject his or her own thoughts on the merit of the value, but should instead attempt to analyze whether the debater is providing adequate analysis, evidence and support for the importance of the value presented. This can take many forms. It could be a quotation, journal article, news report, or some other printed source. Support for the value can also take the form of references to history, common knowledge, or commonly accepted ideas.

Debate Protocol

Cross-Examination

A cross-examination period follows each constructive speech. Debaters should be confident and persistent, but should not become hostile or rude during the cross-examination. It is up to you to determine the line between persistence and hostility.

Rebuttal Speeches

Rebuttal speeches are designed to clarify the important arguments in the round. They should focus on issues proposed during the constructive speeches. Major arguments that are significant to the round are often called voting issues, meaning that each debater is going to pick out several arguments that he or she feels are the most persuasive reasons for voting on his or her side. In rebuttals, completely new threads of argumentation should not appear. A debater may respond to an argument raised in a previous speech, but completely new arguments should not be introduced.

Deciding Who Won

At the end of the debate round, you will have to decide who has won the round. In making this decision, it may be helpful to ask yourself the following questions. It may be that the answer to some of these questions is “no.” This does not mean that either the affirmative or negative should lose the round. Instead, these questions are helpful in determining the general direction of the debate and who you think has persuaded you in the round.

Affirmative Questions

Overall

- Has the affirmative persuaded you that you should vote in favor of the resolution?
- Does the affirmative interpretation of the resolution and case correspond with the resolution?
- Has the affirmative upheld the resolution with its analysis of the resolution and contentions?

Value Premise Case

- Has the affirmative identified a value premise?
- Has the affirmative persuaded you that in the context of the resolution its value is the most important?
- Has the affirmative introduced contentions/arguments to support the importance of its value?
- Has the affirmative demonstrated the application of its value in the realm of the resolution?
- Has the affirmative adequately addressed the arguments brought against its value by the negative?

Negative Questions

Overall

- Has the negative persuaded you to vote against the resolution and/or the affirmative case?
- Has the negative provided arguments that persuade you to vote against the affirmative interpretation of the resolution?
- Has the negative introduced a more persuasive interpretation of the resolution that outweighs the affirmative case?

Value Premise Case

- Has the negative introduced a counter-value premise into the round?
- Has the negative introduced arguments to support the importance of its counter-value?
- Has the negative demonstrated the application of its value in the realm of the resolution?
- Has the negative persuaded you that the counter-value is more important than the affirmative value?
- Has the negative introduced any significant value implications that would persuade you to vote against the affirmative case?

Your decision in the round should NOT be based on . . .

- opinions possessed by the judge but not mentioned by the debaters.
- conversation with any persons (such as parents) during or after the debate round.
- arguments or explanations obtained from debaters after the round.

Filling Out the Ballot

On the ballot, you will record which debater won the round, the reasons why you voted for that debater, and any constructive comments you have for each of the debaters in the round. The ballots are then taken to the tabulation room to record the results of each round. After the tournament, every competitor receives a copy of each ballot to see why he or she won or lost and to learn from the judge's critiques. You should not reveal your decision to anyone other than the tab room staff until the tournament is completed.