

# Lincoln Douglas Debate Judging

This is 1 v1 debate focused on values or how society ought to be. *Examples: Civil disobedience in a democracy is morally justified. A just government ought to prioritize civil liberties over national security. Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech. The United States ought to limit qualified immunity for police officers.*

When you enter the room, ask for the resolution and write it down at the top of your ballot.

You will NOT need to flip a coin before the debate. The affirmative and negative have already been chosen for the debaters.

## **From the Ballot**

- 1. The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc. which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the contest of the resolution in question.**
- 2. Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.**
- 3. Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.**
- 4. Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.**
- 5. After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.**
- 6. The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points. Already advance or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.**
- 7. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators or both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.**

## **Filling Out Your Ballot**

**Write an RFD (Reason for Decision).** Try to be specific as possible. Better to say, "The con side did a better job of convincing me that the cost of loss of privacy outweighed the benefits of convenience" than "The con side was more convincing." Don't award a decision to best speaker. We have speech events for those kids. That said, if speaking impedes clear communication, this could weigh into your decision.

**Speaker Points.** Base this score on the strength of the arguments, not the strengths of the orator. It is better to be a little generous on Speaker Points that too hard. This is how they advance to future rounds in the event of a tie.

**Comments to debaters:** As above, be kind and gentle in your comments. Always make some positive comments on the ballot. Even if you have to make them up. Remember you have the power to crush a spirit. It is amazing that these kids have the courage to do this. Let's try to reward them. However, it is important to give them some specific constructive criticism. They will pour over every word you write.

You're not really supposed provide oral feedback, but if you do, be very brief.

Do NOT disclose who won.