

The Belmont Hill School Invitational Debate Tournament – April 10, 2016

Dear Debaters:

The Belmont Hill Lyceum cordially invites you to its annual debate tournament on Sunday, April 10, 2016. The style of the debate will be Oregon prepared. This year we have chosen the following resolution:

This House should pass S.268, the “Rebuild America Act of 2015.”

There will be three rounds of debate, and debaters will argue on the same side of the resolution for each of the three rounds.

There will be novice and advanced divisions, and schools are invited to enter two teams in each division. Each team consists of four people. The charge for each four-person team is sixty dollars, and ten dollars per observer. Please send a check made out to Belmont Hill School or bring one on the day of the debate.

Each four-person team must supply a judge. We will not be able to supply judges.

Please RSVP by Friday, April 1, by email to jtift@belmonthill.org, indicating how many advanced and/or novice teams you plan to bring and the names of the debaters (although the names may follow in a later email).

Also, on the morning of the debate, please call 781-859-7256 if you have any changes; this will greatly facilitate the registration process.

Breakfast will be available for debaters, judges, coaches, and observers upon their arrival in the morning, and lunch will be available while the results are tabulated in the afternoon.

We hope you can join us, and we look forward to seeing you on April 10.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Tift

The Belmont Hill School Invitational Debate Tournament

Schedule of Events

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Registration (Library Corridor) Breakfast (Dining Hall)
10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Judges' & Debaters' Meeting (Dining Hall)
11:00 - 12:15 p.m.	Round One
12:15 - 1:30 p.m.	Round Two
1:30 - 2:45 p.m.	Round Three
2:45 - 4:00 p.m.	Lunch served (Dining Hall)
4:00 p.m.	Awards Ceremony (Dining Hall)

Oregon-Style Prepared Format

First Affirmative Constructive	7 minutes
Second Negative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Negative Constructive	7 minutes
First Affirmative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Second Affirmative Constructive	7 minutes
First Negative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Second Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Second Affirmative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
3 minute break	
First Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Second Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes

**The Belmont Hill School Invitational Debate Tournament
April 10, 2016**

Oregon (Cross-Examination) Debate Format

Order

First Affirmative Constructive	7 minutes
Second Negative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
First Negative Constructive	7 minutes
First Affirmative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Second Affirmative Constructive	7 minutes
First Negative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
Second Negative Constructive	7 minutes
Second Affirmative Cross-Examination	3 minutes
3 minute break	
First Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Second Negative Rebuttal	4 minutes
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes

Resolution

This House should pass S.268, the “Rebuild America Act of 2015.”

Affirmative Burden of Proof

To win a debate, the affirmative must justify the adoption of the change proposed in the resolution by showing that it is desirable on grounds of necessity, probable advantage, or the likely attainment of worthwhile goals, and attainable through means stated or implied in the resolution, without significant disadvantages.

The Negative Duty to Clash

To win a debate, the negative must show that the adoption of the resolution is not warranted. It may show this in several ways:

- There is no necessity for a change; even if there were, the change proposed by the affirmative would not be practicable; even if it were, it would secure no advantages (or meet none of the affirmative’s goals); even if it would, its adoption would necessarily entail significant disadvantages.
- The status quo is better than the change proposed by the affirmative.
- A change different from any stated or implied in the resolution would provide a better solution, secure greater advantages, or more effectively attain the affirmative’s stated goals than the change proposed in the resolution.
- The affirmative has not met the burden of proof.