



**Montana High School Association**  
**1 South Dakota Avenue**  
**Helena, MT 59601**

## **LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE**

Round Number:  Room Number:  Date:  Judge's Name:

Affirmative Name/Code:  Negative Name/Code:

Points \_\_\_\_\_

29-30	Outstanding
27-28	Excellent
24-26	Good
22-23	Average
20-21	Below Average

Points \_\_\_\_\_

1. In LD debate, the resolution to be evaluated is a proposition of value. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments etc. that serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question. A proposition of value concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is.
2. Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. No debater can realistically be expected 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 in LD debate 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/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 advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
7. Because LD debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of 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.

### Comments

Please provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach – for example, suggestions on improving: case construction, refutation, logic, delivery etc.

**Affirmative**

<u>Format</u>	
Aff Constructive	6 min
Neg Cross-Exam	3 min
Neg Constructive	7 min
Aff Cross-Exam	3 min
Aff Rebuttal	4 min
Neg Rebuttal/Summary	6 min
Aff Summary	3 min
Prep Time	4 min/debater

**Negative**

**Reasons for Decision** (Provide a detailed justification of your decision, referring to the central issues the debaters presented in the round):

Based on my evaluation, the debate was won by \_\_\_\_\_ (code) on the \_\_\_\_\_ (side).

Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation/Occupation \_\_\_\_\_