This manual supersedes all earlier editions of every manual, constitution, or credit point instruction card. All obsolete copies of these items should be destroyed.
APPENDIX I Timing

NFL Time Limits

Debate

Aff. Constructive speech .................................................. 8 min.
Aff. is questioned by a Neg. speaker ................................. 3 min.

Neg. Constructive speech .................................................. 8 min.
Neg. is questioned by an Aff. speaker ............................... 3 min.

Aff. Constructive speech .................................................. 8 min.
Aff. is questioned by the other Neg. speaker .................... 3 min.

Neg. Constructive speech .................................................. 8 min.
Neg. is questioned by another Aff. speaker .................... 3 min.

Neg. Rebuttal ................................................................. 5 min.
Aff. Rebuttal ................................................................. 5 min.
Neg. Rebuttal ................................................................. 5 min.
Aff. Rebuttal ................................................................. 5 min.

DEBATE PREP TIME ......................................................... (per team) 5 min.
(Each debater must do one and only one Constructive, one period of questioning, one period of answering, and one rebuttal.)

Lincoln Douglas Debate

Affirmative Constructive 6 Minutes
Negative Cross Examination 3 Minutes
Negative Constructive 7 Minutes
Affirmative Cross Examination 3 Minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal 4 Minutes
Negative Rebuttal 6 Minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal 3 Minutes

L/D PREP TIME ...........................................................(per debater) 3 min.

Speech Events

EXTEMP ................................................................. Maximum 7 min.
EXTEMP PREP TIME ................................................... 30 min.
ORIGINAL ORATORY ........................................... Maximum 10 min.
DRAMATIC INTERPRETATION .................................. Maximum 10 min.
HUMOROUS INTERPRETATION ................................ Maximum 10 min.
DUO INTERPRETATION ............................................. Maximum 10 min.
EXTEMP COMMENTARY ........................................... Maximum 5 min.
EXTEMP COMMENTARY PREP TIME .......................... 20 min.
PROSE .................................................................. Maximum 5 min.
POETRY .............................................................. Maximum 5 min.
IMPROMPTU ....................................................... Maximum 5 min.
EXPOSITORY ....................................................... Maximum 5 min.

Instructions to Timekeepers

1. The envelope of judges’ ballots is to be picked up from the chairman of the timekeepers.

2. Timekeepers must make sure that the judges who have been assigned to that contest are present. Each judge is given one ballot.

3. Contestants are not to be identified by school. Identify contestants by code number. The judges will be able to do a more impartial job if they do not know what schools are represented.

4. If both debate teams are there, the debate is to start. If the first two speakers in a contest are there, the round is to begin. Other speakers may be competing in another event and will therefore arrive late. This is to be announced so that the judges will not penalize contestants who do arrive late.

5. Special instructions for Extemp: each speaker must be asked for the slip of paper containing his/her topic. The topic is to be read to the judges before the contestant speaks and again after s/he finishes. Then, the slip of paper is to be destroyed.

6. The contestant is to be timed from the beginning of his/her speech. On a sheet of paper, the minute and the second s/he began to speak are to be written so that the timekeeper will be able to check if s/he loses track of time.

7. When a speaker’s time has expired, the timekeeper is to stand and remain standing until the speaker has finished. The speaker is not to be stopped. If a judge asks the timekeeper for a speaker’s time, that information is to be provided. Otherwise, the timekeeper is to say nothing.

8. When the last speaker has finished, the timekeeper is to ask each judge to mark his/her ballot. The timekeeper should collect and put all ballots into the envelope and then seal the envelope. S/he should immediately return the envelope to the tournament office. The timekeeper must not accept anyone else’s offer to do it for him/her.

9. No one is to know the decision of the judges. If the timekeeper does not look at the ballots before putting them into the envelope, s/he cannot be tempted to reveal the decision.

APPENDIX II Judge Instructions

All Judges

1. All judges are to report to their assigned rooms at least five minutes before the time the contest is scheduled to begin.

2. Each judge’s ballot is to be secured from the timekeeper or a contest official.

3. Read instructions on the back of the ballot.

4. Do not confer with the other judges.

5. Judges should not interrupt the flow of debates or contests in any way. They are to be there as silent evaluators and should not reveal their decision.

Debate and L/D Judges

4. 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 simply answering the questions. The questioner should not be permitted to comment on the answers.

5. A judge must render a decision no later than 10 minutes after the final speaker concludes.

Speech Judges

6. If a contestant is not present when his/her number is called, the judge is to go on to the next one. When the tardy contestant arrives, s/he should be heard next. Many of the students are participating in another contest scheduled for the same hour and they cannot avoid being late. For the same reason, a student may have to leave immediately after speaking.
APPENDIX III Ballot Instructions

Debate

In arriving at your decision take into consideration the following aspects of good debating:

**Analysis:** Getting to the heart of the question.

**Proof:** Supporting contentions with sufficient and convincing evidence.

**Argument:** Sound reasoning; logical conclusions.

**Adaptation:** Clashing with the opposition.

**Refutation:** Destroying opponent’s contentions; reinforcing your own.

**Organization:** Clear, logical presentation of material.

**Speaking:** Effective delivery; favorable impact on audience.

**Speaker Points:**

The judge is to rate each debater's effectiveness on a scale from 18 to 30.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

1. Unlike team debate, the resolution to be debated will be a proposition of value rather than a proposition of policy. Thus the students are encouraged to develop argumentation on the resolution in its entirety based upon conflicting underlying principles and values to support their positions. To that end, they are not responsible for practical applications; no plan will be offered by the affirmative.

2. There are no prescribed burdens in L-D as there are in policy debate; no "burden of proof" and no "presumption." There is no status quo. Therefore, decision rules are fair issues to be argued in the round.

3. Evidence is not a primary consideration in L-D Debate. Logical reasoning is of primary consideration as well as the maturity of thought. Examples and analogies are to be used for purposes of illustration only. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of authoritative opinion.

4. This event is not unrelated oratory; as such there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. The clash must relate to the values argumentation. Cross Examination should clarify and advance argumentation.

5. Communication in L-D Debate should approximate superior speaking to community groups.

6. In making your decision, be as objective as you possibly can. Remember these are value propositions upon which you may have strong feelings of which the debaters are unaware. You should judge the round as it is debated, not as you personally feel. You might ask yourself the following questions:

   a. Which debater persuaded you that his/her position was more valid?
   
   b. Which debater communicated more effectively?
   
   c. Which debater logically supported his/her position more effectively?

Extemporaneous Speaking

The extempore speech should not be regarded as a memory test of the material contained in any one magazine article, but rather as an original synthesis by the speaker of the current fact and opinion on the designated topic as presented by numerous sources.

The contestant therefore should be held accountable for strict adherence to the precise statement of the topic drawn and discounted severely for shifting to some other phase of the topic on which s/he might prefer to speak. The information presented should be well-chosen, pertinent, and sufficient to support the central thought of the topic.

The material should be organized according to some logical plan to produce a complete speech within the time allowed. Delivery should be free from marked defects in the mechanics of speech -- poise, quality and use of voice, enunciation, fluency, bodily expressiveness -- and should be effective in enlisting and holding the interest of the audience.

The best extemporaneous speech combines clear thinking, good speaking, and interesting presentation to establish a definite thought with respect to the subject chosen.

Do not require a contestant speaking on a controversial subject to take a personal stand on that issue. S/He may do so, or s/he may elect to present both sides of the controversy as currently set forth in the public press. Judge him/her on the effectiveness with which s/he develops the subject according to his/her own plan.

There is NO minimum qualifying time for the extemp speech. Do not penalize a contestant for brevity unless s/he fails to cover adequately the subject s/he has chosen. Maximum time is seven minutes. Impose no penalty for slight overtime, but do so if in your judgment it is excessive.

Original Oratory

Since these orations have been written by the contestants delivering them, the judges should consider Thought, Composition, and Delivery. However, since this is a contest in speech rather than in essay writing, the emphasis should be placed on the speech phase. Thought and composition should be considered primarily in the way they are employed to make effective speaking possible.

The orator should not be expected to solve any of the great problems of the day. Rather, s/he should be expected to discuss intelligently, with a degree of originality, in an interesting manner, and with some profit to his/her audience the topic s/he has chosen. Any appropriate subject may be chosen but the orator must be truthful. Any non-factual reference, especially a personal one, MUST be so identified.

Although many orations deal with a current problem and propose a solution, the judge is expressly reminded that this is not the only acceptable form of oratory. The oration may simply alert the audience to a threatening danger, strengthen its devotion to an accepted cause, or eulogize a person. The orator should be given free choice of subject and judged solely on the effectiveness of its development and presentation.
Interpretation

The art of interpretation is to be regarded as recreating the characters in the story presented and making them seem living and real to the audience. Presentation shall be from memory and without the use of physical objects or costume.

A selection for interpretation must be a cutting from a single literary work: one novel, or one short story, or one play, or one poem. Monologues are acceptable. During the presentation, the contestant must name the author and the book or magazine from which the cutting was made. Adaptation may be for the purpose of continuity only. The selection should be judged for its appropriateness as contest material and its suitability to the particular contestant using it. The use of good literature should be noted favorably and a selection devoid of literary merit graded lowest.

This is a contest in interpretation. The contestants should be evaluated on poise, quality and use of voice, inflections, emphasis, pronunciation, enunciation, physical expression, and especially the ability to interpret characters correctly and consistently. Narrative, if included, should be vivid and animated so as to be an interesting and integral part of the story rather than just “filler” between portions of dialogue.

The final test of good interpretation is the ability to use all these factors so successfully and unobtrusively that the hearer forgets that this is a contest and in a created atmosphere is carried away to the time and place of the story being unfolded.

Duo Interpretation

The art of interpretation is to be regarded as recreating the characters in the story presented and making them seem living and real to the audience. Presentation shall be from memory and without the use of physical objects or costume.

A selection for interpretation must be a cutting from a single literary work: one novel, or one short story, or one play, or one poem. In Duo Interpretation each of the two performers may play one or more characters, so long as performance responsibility in the cutting remains as balanced as possible. If the selection is prose or poetry and contains narration, either or both of the performers may present the narration.] During the presentation, the team must name the author and the book or magazine from which the cutting was made. Adaptation may be for the purpose of continuity only. The selection should be judged for its appropriateness as contest material and its suitability to the particular contestant using it. The use of good literature should be noted favorably and a selection devoid of literary merit graded lowest.

This is a contest in interpretation. The contestants should be evaluated on poise, quality and use of voice, inflections, emphasis, pronunciation, enunciation, physical expression, and especially the ability to interpret characters correctly and consistently. Narrative, if included, should be vivid and animated so as to be an interesting and integral part of the story rather than just “filler” between portions of dialogue.

The final test of good interpretation is the ability to use all these factors so successfully and unobtrusively that the hearer forgets that this is a contest and in a created atmosphere is carried away to the time and place of the story being unfolded.

APPENDIX IV Debate Evidence Rules

I. Responsibilities of teams reading evidence
A. The team is responsible for the validity of all evidence they read in the debate.
B. In all rounds of debate in NFL district and national competition, all debaters shall orally deliver during each round complete citations for each piece of evidence introduced to include the name of the author, qualifications, complete source title, complete date. Lack of a full citation shall void any effect of that piece of evidence in the round. Should two or more quotations be used from the same source, the complete citation need be given only for the first piece of evidence used from that source.
C. Either no internal ellipsis (Ellipses occur after the first word of the quotation and before the final word) may be used in evidence cited on a card, or ellipses may be shown on cards, if the original source or a xerox copy is present. The evidence may be read in ellipsed form, but the entirety of the evidence must be available in one of the two ways cited.
D. Personal letters or telegrams shall not be admissible as evidence.

II. Responsibilities of teams challenging evidence
A. Indictments or protests of the validity of evidence must be made on substantive grounds.
B. A challenger must have either the original source or a xerox copy of the source being cited, or
C. A challenger must demonstrate that reasonable search has not been able to locate the source -- xeroxed copies of relevant pages in Books in Print, Readers Guide, P.A.I.S., etc.

III. Penalties for use of non existent evidence or evidence which seriously distorts the intention of the original source.

A. Definitions
1. A “serious distortion” exists when the evidence itself contains added or deleted word(s) which do not clarify but in fact change the position of the author with respect to the issues in question.
2. “Non-existent evidence” means that
   a. Reasonable search is unable to produce the original source and/or the team reading the evidence is unable to provide the original source or a xerox copy of the relevant pages.
   b. The evidence cited is not located in the original source cited. Typographical errors in citation will not automatically result in the evidence being labeled nonexistent, if the team reading the evidence can produce the correct information.

B. Penalties
1. An infraction of debate evidence rules at the NFL District or National Tournament shall result in the disqualification of the offending team from the tournament.
2. The offending student or students will automatically have their NFL membership revoked and notification of such reason will be sent to the high school administration and chapter sponsor.

IV. Procedures for initiating and reviewing protest of evidence
A. Initiating and Reviewing protests
1. Any official protest on the validity of evidence citing specific violations must be presented in writing to the District Chair, the school challenged, and the National Executive Secretary no later than 7 days from the time of the conclusion of the final round.
2. The District Committee shall rule on the protest within 7 days of its receipt.

B. Appeals
1. Appeals of the District Committee’s decision shall be made in writing within 5 days to the NFL Executive
V. Tournament adjustments
   A. Under no circumstance shall a tournament or part of a
      tournament be re-run because of a violation of these rules.

VI. Reading case and/or plan:
   A. A team may decide, when asked by the opponent team for a
      copy of their case and/or plan, whether or not to provide it;
      if the team refuses they shall not be penalized in any way.

VII. Electronically retrieved evidence used in any NFL contest event
     must conform to the citation standard of the Modern Language
     Association [MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Fourth
     Edition].

APPENDIX V Citation rule for Electronic
Retrieval of Contest Materials

At the NFL Executive Council 1996 Fall Meeting:
   Moved by Roberts/seconded by Sferra “that electronically
   retrieved evidence used in any NFL contest event must conform to
   the citation standard of the Modern Language Association (recommended
   by the computer section of the NFL summer conference). Passed,
   unanimous.

The MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers Fourth Edition,
by Joseph Gibaldi, provides these guidelines:

Citing Online Databases

Citations of publications from online databases require some ele-
ments that citations of printed sources do not:
Publication medium. Many databases online are also published
in other formats and may not be exactly the same in each. You must
therefore include the publication medium (Online) in your [citation] .
.

Name of computer service or computer network. Online
publications are accessed through a computer service - such as BRS,
Dialog, Dow Jones News Retrieval, CompuServe, Nexis, OCLC, and
Prodigy - or a computer network, such as the Internet. For your
[citation] to be complete, you have to state the name of the service
or network that provided your source.

Date of access. Since each online publication must be consid-
ered unique, you may need to indicate two dates in your citation .
. For example, if the online database indicates that the material you
are using was originally published in the New York Times on 1 April
1993, you must, of course, include that date in the citation. In addi-
tion, to acknowledge that what you are using may differ from not only
the printed version but also any past or future online version, state
the date when you accessed the material.

Material Accessed through a Computer Service

Documents and data from online databases available through com-
puter services can be divided into two groups:

* Material that indicates publication information for a printed
  source or printed analogue
* Material that does not indicate a specific print counterpart

Publication Information for a Printed Source

Many databases collect and present materials previously or simul-
taneously made available in print.
If a printed source or analogue is indicated for the material you are
citing, your [citation] should consist of the following items:
1. Name of the author (if given)
2. Title of the material accessed (in quotation marks)
3. Date of the material (if given)
4. Title of the database (underlined)
5. Publication medium (Online)
6. Name of the computer service
7. Date of access

Angier, Natalie. “Chemists Learn Why Vegetables
Galloway, Stephen. “TV Takes the Fall in Vio-

No Printed Source Specified

If no specific printed source or printed analogue is indicated for
the material you are citing, your [citation] should consist of the follow-
ing items:
1. Name of the author (if given)
2. Title of the material accessed (in quotation marks)
3. Date of the material (if given)
4. Title of the database (underlined)
5. Publication medium (Online)
6. Name of the computer service
7. Date of access

“Comex Gold Contracts: Quotes from 4 Nov.
1992 to Dec. 1994.” Dow Jones Futures and
Index Quotes. Online. Dow Jones News Re-
trieval. 6 Nov. 1992.
Online. Dow Jones News Retrieval. 20 Aug.
1993.
Gllicken, Morley D. “A Five-Step Plan to Renew
Your Creativity.” National Business Employ-
ment Weekly. Online. Dow Jones News Re-
“Middle Ages.” Academic American Encyclo-
1994.
“U.S. Population by Age: Urban and Urbanized
Areas.” 1990 U.S. Census of Population and
Housing. Online. Human Resource Informa-
tion Network. 3 May 1994.

If you cannot find some of the information required—for example,
the name of the computer service—cite what is available.


Material Accessed through a Computer
Network

* Electronic journals, electronic newsletters, and electronic
  conferences (e.g., moderated forums, such as discussion lists)
* Electronic texts

Journals and Newsletters

Your [citation] from an electronic journal, electronic newsletter, or
electronic conference document should be similar to one for an ar-
ticle in a print periodical though there are a few necessary differ-
ences. The entry should consist of the following items:
1. Name of the author (if given)
2. Title of the article or document (in quotation marks)
3. Title of the journal, newsletter, or conference (underlined)
4. Volume number, issue number, or other identifying number
5. Year or date of publication (in parentheses)
6. Number of pages or paragraphs (if given) or n. page. (“no
  pagination”)
7. Publication medium (Online)
8. Name of the computer network
9. Date of access

2001 Ed.

At the end of the entry, you may add as supplementary information the electronic address you used to access the document; precede the address with the word Available.


Electronic Texts

A great variety of texts, such as literary works and historical documents, are available through computer networks. If you plan to study an electronic text, remember that not all texts are equally reliable or authoritative. Be sure to use a text that states the title, editor, and date of the edition serving as its source.

Your citation of an electronic text should contain the following items:
1. Name of the author (if any)
2. Title of the text (underlined)
3. Publication information for the printed source
4. Publication medium (Online)
5. Name of the repository of the electronic text (e.g., Oxford Text Archive)
6. Name of the computer network
7. Date of access


At the end of the entry, you may add as supplementary information the electronic address you used to access the document; precede the address with the word Available.


[For further information see the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Fourth Edition, by Joseph Gibaldi.]

APPENDIX VI Debate Guidelines

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Guidelines

A decision should be based upon:
1. Clear use of value argumentation throughout the round.
   a. Establishing of a value premise to support the debater’s position in the round.
   b. Establishing of values criteria to support the debater’s position in the round. Values criteria are a system upon which to judge values. These criteria may range in format, but the relationship between the value premise and criteria should be clear so that the resolution can be evaluated.
   c. Clash in the debate based upon the values criteria and/or the value premise.
2. Application of the presented value to the specific topic at hand.
   a. Validity of logic in relation to the value as applied to the specific topic.
   b. Logical chain of reasoning, using the value, which leads to the conclusions of the affirmative or negative position.
   c. Clear explanation of the relation of the value to the specific topic.
3. Clarity of ideas in the debater’s presentation expressed in an easy-to-follow structure to aid the listener’s notetaking.
4. Presentation of contextual definitions. Each speaker has the option to define terms. Interpretation of definitions is a legitimate component of clash.
5. Debating the resolution in its entirety. Neither the affirmative nor the negative is to debate his or her position exclusively from the standpoint of isolated examples.
6. Effectiveness of delivery. The Lincoln-Douglas debater should be one who uses his or her oral communications skills to persuade the listener with logic, analysis, and mode of delivery. Delivery should approximate superior speaking to community groups.
7. Since this debate, clash is necessary. With the exception of the affirmative constructive speech, neither speaker should be rewarded for presenting oratory unrelated to the rest of the debate. Clash in the debate should be on one or more of the following as they are applied to the specific topic: the value premise, the values criteria, the argumentation.
8. The debate is to be judged on the overall presentation. Insignificant dropped arguments are not enough to give a speaker a loss in the round.
9. A judge’s preference for a particular value(s) position should not enter into the decision. Objectivity must be the primary goal of any judge.
10. Persuasiveness and logic should be primary considerations of the Lincoln-Douglas debate judge. The nature of the event centers upon the value resolution. Arguments must be supported by reasoning and evidence. The arguments may be philosophic or pragmatic, but they must be linked to the value resolution.
11. The affirmative obligation is to support the resolution with value(s) and to clash with the negative position. The negative obligation is to clash with the affirmative position by using refutation and/or opposing value(s).

Team Debate Guidelines

A. -- A decision is not to be based upon:
1. The merits of the question. The judge should not be influenced by prejudices in favor or against the proposition.

2. Partiality. The judge should not be influenced by the reputation of, or partiality for or against, either of the competing teams, their schools, or coaches.

3. Preconceived notions on arguments. The judge should not allow his idea of what the best affirmative or negative arguments or cases may be to influence the decision.
4. Personal preferences on debating style. A judge should not penalize a team if its style, either in case construction or delivery, differs from that which s/he personally prefers; but should evaluate all styles on the basis of effectiveness in winning conviction.

B. -- A decision should be based upon:

1. Skill in analysis. This includes not only the analysis of the proposition, but also analysis of the debate as it progresses.

2. Use of evidence. This includes the use of sufficient evidence and proper reference to source.

3. Validity of argument. This includes reasoning and conclusions drawn from the evidence presented.

4. Clarity of organization. This includes clear outlining of constructive arguments and easily followed handling of refutation.

5. Effectiveness of delivery. This includes all matters pertaining to oral presentation with special emphasis upon extemporaneous abilities.

C. -- A team should be penalized for:

1. 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.

2. Discounting toward opponents. Discounting should be penalized according to the seriousness of the offense.

3. 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.

4. Misconstruing an opponent's arguments. A speaker who misconstrues and argument unintentionally should not be penalized more than the time wasted. If it is intentional, the team should in addition, forfeit the argument.

5. 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.

6. Speaking overtime. When a speaker's time is up, the judge shall disregard anything beyond a closing statement.

D. -- There is general agreement among debate coaches on:

1. Interpretation. Judges should regard no interpretation of the question as official, unless the National Wording Committee issues an official interpretation and labels it as such.

2. Technicalities. The team shall debate the basic principles underlying the proposition. Too much emphasis should not be placed upon a technicality.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Questions. A team need answer questions only when they are shown to be pertinent and consequential to the debate.

6. Irrelevant arguments. Arguments as to whether the proposition is constitutional, or whether it will be adopted are irrelevant.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. Adaptation. A high premium should be placed upon adaptive extemporaneous debating. This should not excuse a team for lack of clarity in organization or for errors in the use of English.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Constructive solution. Credit should be given to the team which most nearly approximates a constructive solution to the problem.

13. 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.

Cross-Examination Guidelines

General

A. 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 are the purposes of cross-examination. It should not be used (as it is in law) to attack the witness' personal integrity.

B. 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.

C. Relation to Case:

The virtue of any cross-examination decreases unless the results are tied to later speeches. The cross-examination should be an integral part of the debate, not a sideshow.

D. Delivery.

Both speakers must talk to the audience. Cross-examination takes the form of an exchange between two debaters, but basically, it is for the benefit of the listeners. In public debates it is vital that both speakers face the audience while questioning or responding.

The Questioner:

A. Controls the time, and may interrupt the witness to request shorter or more direct answers, or to indicate that the answer s/he has given is insufficient.

B. Must ask fair and relevant questions. S/He should neither comment on the answers, argue with the witness, nor make speeches. S/He should use 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.

C. Should have considerable scope in the questions s/he asks. Since the time is his/hers, s/he may waste time if s/he wants to. The witness should answer even if the significance or relevance of the question is not immediately apparent to him/her.
D. Should begin with common ground on which agreement may be expected, and proceed 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.

E. Should develop an attack along the lines of his/her basic case. S/he should limit the number of objectives s/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.

F. May not insist on a simple "Yes" or "No" answer unless the 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.

G. Should phrase questions with the verb first, then the subject, and finally the object or modifying phrase: e.g. "Do you admit the Joseph R. McCarthy is the junior senator from Wisconsin?" S/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.

H. May remind the audience and the witness of a relevant fact by beginning the question: "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 material.

I. Should summarize a series of questions on an issue by repeating an opening question: "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 that the Questioner has concluded that particular approach, and allows the members of the audience to draw their own conclusions.

The Witness:

A. Must answer directly and briefly any legitimate question. S/He should not question the questioner (except in using a rhetorical question as an answer), nor should s/he engage in "stalling" tactics.

B. May refuse to answer a tricky or unfair question -- "When did you stop beating your wife?" -- if s/he states a good reason for doing so.

C. May ask questions to clarify a question possibly giving the reasons for considering the question obscure, or may ask the questioner to stop making speeches and to continue the questioning.

D. May clarify a question, if to do so is appropriate. S/He should state the qualification before his answer: "Do you believe in the desirability of democratic elections?" "For people educated in the tradition and practice of democracy, yes."

E. Can exercise some control over the question period by controlling the timing of answers. If s/he feels that the questioner is dragging out the question period, s/he can answer rapidly, exposing the questioner's inaptitude.

F. Should not be afraid to admit ignorance if the question demands knowledge of an obscure fact.

G. Should answer without consulting his/her colleague or receiving help from him/her.

(Adapted from Cross Examination Debating by Dr. Robert P. Newman and Lloyd H. Fuge, University of Pittsburgh.)

APPENDIX VII. L/D Topic Selection


"There should be a set number of members on the NFL LD Wording Committee. We recommend 9 members + co-chairs.

Nine members to serve staggered 3 year terms so that 3 are up for selection each year. This allows change, but insures that there will be some stability.

Co-chairs should be appointed and non-voting, except to break ties.

Their job is to prepare topics for the committee's work.

Geographic distribution should be a concern in appointment to the committee. Nominations should be gathered from the widest possible sources. Self-nomination, nomination by districts, district chairs, Executive Council, etc. should be sought.

Appointment should be by the President based on recommendation from the Council LD Committee.

No one should serve on the NFL LD Wording Committee for more than six years.

Meetings should be held at the NFL National Tournament.

In case of vacancy the President will appoint someone to complete the term. Process will be subject to review in one year."

Sferra, C; Sterner; Ferguson


Executive Council Implementation

Moved by Belch/seconded by Roberts that "nominations for the L/D Wording Committee be received in the National Office by March 1, 1997. The Council L/D Committee (Sferra, chair, Sterner, Ferguson) will screen the nominees and present a list of twenty to the President at the Spring Meeting. The President will appoint the nine members and co-chairs to various terms by the end of April and notify them by mail. Passed, unanimous (Brannan, for Sterner; Burton, for Sferra).

 Moved by Keller/seconded by Ferguson that "nominations for the L/D Wording Committee be received in the National Office by March 1, 1997. The Council L/D Committee (Sferra, chair, Sterner, Ferguson) will screen the nominees and present a list of twenty to the President at the Spring Meeting. The President will appoint the nine members and co-chairs to various terms by the end of April and notify them by mail. Passed, unanimous (Brannan, for Sterner; Burton, for Sferra).

Moved by Keller/seconded by Roberts beginning in the 1998-9 school year the September-October L/D topic be the 5th place vote getter from the previous year's vote and the November-December topic be the 4th place vote getter from the previous year's vote. The third place topic in the current vote be the January-February topic; the second place in the current vote be the March-April topic; The first place topic be the National topic, each year. The topic vote will take place from September 1 to November 1 each year. In 1997-8 school year only the September-October topic will be the 6th place voted topic and the November-December, the 5th place vote getter in the 1996 vote. [The 4th place topic was used in November-December, 1996.] Passed, unanimous, Brannan for Sterner, Burton for Sferra.

Moved by Keller/seconded by Ferguson to release the topic list at the end of the National Tournament. Passed, unanimous except Brannan, for Sterner, abstain.