



Rulebook



NHSDLC

友情提示： Please go to page16 for the Chinese version.

中文版请见第 16 页

Introduction

This rulebook provides the fundamental rules that govern National High School Debate League of China (NHSDLC) tournaments.

There are three main purposes to the rules. First, the rules contribute to the smooth and effective running of tournaments. Second, the rules are designed to ensure competitive equity for all participants regardless of their school, grade, gender, and other ascriptive characteristics; the rules should foster a competitive experience where the quality of a team’s debating should play an almost exclusive role in determining their competitive success. Third, the rules facilitate the maintenance of an educational debate environment. As an educational activity, participating in debate should aid the development of an academic skillset that helps debaters succeed.

This rulebook should not determine the winner or loser of a debate except in extreme circumstances. The primary role of the judge is to decide who wins the debate within the constraints of the rules. Judges cannot decide that a team has lost a debate for breaking the rules. While students and judges should be able to determine the application of rules to particular situations in a debate round on their own, relevant parties should immediately contact an NHSDLC staff member if there is disagreement or confusion. NHSDLC staff members will regularly wear a lanyard with “organizing committee” written on it. Complaints should be handled similarly.

An NHSDLC staff member always has ultimate discretion for what consequences, if any, should be administered for rule infractions. Consequences will vary depending on the severity of the situation. In extreme cases, an NHSDLC staff member may determine that a debater should lose a round, be disqualified from the tournament, or

be removed from the national rankings. Ignorance of the rules is not an excuse and will not mitigate potential consequences.

This rulebook will focus on the rules of the NHSDLC debate circuit instead of concentrating more broadly on the norms that shape the circuit. Rules mandate what debaters must do. In contrast, norms influence the debate community's sense of what debaters should do. This is because the NHSDLC believes that the debate community should play an important role in deciding norms for itself.

Debaters are welcome to come to the tab room to seek clarification about results. However, appeals of a judgement are almost never considered. All judgements are final unless there is a reason to believe discrimination occurred or that a team's code was recorded incorrectly.

This rulebook includes both an English and Chinese translation. The English translation has priority in the case of any discrepancies.

Rules

1. Tournament Conduct

NHSDLC tournaments are a professional and safe environment. If any participant, judge, teacher, parent, person or animal is exceptionally disruptive to this atmosphere, the NHSDLC reserves the right to remove them from the premises. Threats of violence, verbal abuse, discriminatory behavior, and acts that endanger anyone involved will not be tolerated. If a student is caught in possession of drugs, alcohol, cigarettes or other illicit substance they will be disqualified from the tournament and removed from the premises.

NHSDLC staff have ultimate discretion in determining application of this rule and the nature of the corresponding consequences.

2. Off Limit Areas

Debaters are not allowed in the tab room or judge lounge.

3. Being on Time

Students must arrive at their assigned room within 15 minutes of rounds being announced or they may forfeit the debate for being late. NHSDLC staff should be notified if a team or a judge is not present in their room within 10 minutes of rounds being announced. Debaters should tell a volunteer or judge to contact NHSDLC staff. NHSDLC staff have ultimate discretion in determining if the team that was late has forfeited the debate.

If a team forfeits a debate due to tardiness, the other team should remain in their assigned room unless they are given permission to leave by NHSDLC staff. A new opponent will be arranged when possible. If a new opponent cannot be arranged, the other team will receive a bye. A bye counts as a win. Speaker points for the round are

calculated by averaging a debater's speaker points from the rest of their preliminary debates.

4. Language

Debaters must communicate in English during speeches and crossfire unless they are communicating directly with their partner. Judges are instructed to not evaluate arguments made in a different language. Debaters may use any language they prefer when communicating during preparation time.

Students must debate the English text of the NHSDLC resolution. There is no official translation of the resolution. Translations are provided solely for the purpose of better informing observers and other community members. Therefore, they are not binding.

5. Use of Electronics

Students may use electronic devices that contribute to the competition during a debate. Laptops, tablets and similar devices are allowed. Cell phones may be used as timers. Downloaded translation apps may also be used. However, searching for information online, communicating with anyone electronically to gain a strategic advantage, or anything else that compromises the competitive integrity of the debate is strictly forbidden.

The NHSDLC tournament director has ultimate discretion to determine the consequence depending on the situation.

6. Spectating a Debate

Spectators are not allowed in preliminary debates. The only exception is if explicit permission is given by the NHSDLC tournament director.

Spectating elimination debates is fully permitted.

If a spectator is disruptive, disrespectful, or otherwise unduly detracts from the debate that is happening, they may be told to leave by participating debaters, judges, NHSDLC staff or teachers. Spectators may not refuse.

7. Recording a Debate

Recording preliminary debates is not allowed. Anyone caught with an audio or video recording of a preliminary debate will be forced to delete them by NHSDLC staff.

Recording elimination rounds is strictly prohibited unless permission is explicitly given by both teams and participating judges. If there are multiple judges, all judges must consent to the debate being recorded. If any spectator or participant records the debate without first receiving permission they will be forced to delete their recordings by NHSDLC staff. If they refuse they will not be allowed to view other debates and may be subject to other penalties at the discretion of NHSDLC staff.

The exception to this rule is the finals debate. Recording the finals debate does not require permission from debaters or judges.

Short videos on WeChat by classmates, parents recording a single speech by their child, and coaches recording strategically valuable portions of a debate are drastically different situations. As such, the NHSDLC will apply this rule within reason.

However, people should ask all relevant parties before a debate begins if one wishes to record more than a short video. Short videos are defined as videos under 20 seconds.

Participating teams may request that audience members stop recording during a debate even if they provided permission before the debate. Audience members may not refuse.

8. Speech Time & Prep Time

Debaters must obey the time limits of speeches, crossfire and preparation time. When time is up debaters may finish a sentence they have already begun speaking, but may not begin a new one. Any ambiguity in what reasonably constitutes a concluding sentence will be determined by the judge.

Preparation time may be taken before or after any speech. It may not be taken during a speech or crossfire. Debaters can use any amount of preparation time they want as long as it is within their allotted time. Judges and volunteers will keep track of preparation time for advisory purposes, but teams are also required to keep track of their own time and are responsible in the case of any errors.

The following speech times are used at all NHSDLC tournaments:

Constructive speeches: 5 minutes

Rebuttal speeches: 4 minutes

Summary speeches: 2 minutes

Final Focus speeches: 2 minutes

Crossfire: 3 minutes

Preparation Time: 4 minutes

9. Speaker Roles

Every debater must either be the first or second speaker. The first speaker should give the constructive and summary. The second speaker should give the rebuttal and final focus. If a debater gives both the summary and final focus they may still win the debate, but NHSDLC staff should be notified immediately. The consequence will vary by circumstance.

10. If a Team Debates on the Wrong Side

Rarely, a team will accidentally debate on the wrong side of the resolution. For example, if they were assigned PRO by the coin flip they debate as if they were CON. Mistakes happen.

If teams and/or the judge do not recognize and mention this before the first rebuttal speech, the team arguing for the wrong side of the resolution cannot win the debate. They cannot win even if they debate better. They are not permitted to win even if they start arguing for the correct side after the constructive speech. Speaker points should be assigned according to the quality of debating that occurred. This means low point wins are possible in this situation.

If teams and/or the judge do recognize and mention this before the first rebuttal speech, the judge should contact NHSDLC staff promptly. NHSDLC staff will determine if the mistaken team will be allowed to redo their constructive speech with the case that defends the correct side. This determination will be heavily influenced by whether there is time in the schedule for the redo.

NHSDLC staff will give explicit approval to redo the constructive speech in select circumstances. If the redo is approved, it should happen promptly and the rest of the debate should occur as if the constructive redo happened originally. If explicit approval is not given, the team that argued for the wrong side of the resolution will automatically lose the debate. Speaker points should be assigned according to the quality of debating that occurred, which means low point wins are also possible in this situation.

11. Crossfire

Team A asks the first question in each crossfire. It is within a judge's jurisdiction to decrease speaker points if team B breaks this rule.

Talking over opponents, being rude, not answering questions and similar behavior is

not against the rules. It is within a judge's jurisdiction to penalize speaker points in response to such behavior.

12. Assisting Partners

Debaters are allowed to assist their partners during crossfire and speeches, but judges are instructed to only evaluate what the assigned speaker says. It is within a judge's jurisdiction to penalize speaker points of a team for assisting each other in an excessive manner during each other's crossfire or speeches.

13. New Arguments in the Final Focus

Judges are instructed to not evaluate arguments that are new in the final focus. New arguments are distinct claims or responses that are not restatements of ideas already mentioned in the debate. Examples of new arguments include, but are not limited to, new contentions and refuting an argument that was not already refuted.

The prohibition of new arguments does not mean that debaters are required to only repeat what was said before in the final focus. Debaters are encouraged to provide new analysis by telling the judge things like who is winning on each issue and why based on analyzing arguments made previously in the debate, which issues are the most important, etc.

14. Eligibility to Advance to Elimination Debates

Both partners of a team must debate with each other in every preliminary debate to be eligible to advance into elimination rounds.

The only exception to this is if one partner misses a single preliminary debate for a reason that is deemed acceptable by the NHSDLC tournament director. The NHSDLC tournament director may then give explicit approval for this team to be eligible to

advance. However, the NHSDLC tournament director may not do this for any team that has debated more than one preliminary debate without both partners.

15. When a Partner Cannot Debate

Debaters must inform NHSDLC staff any time a partner cannot participate in a debate. Debaters should tell a volunteer or judge to contact NHSDLC staff.

If a debater does not participate in a debate they are assigned to they will receive 20 speaker points and the 4th rank in the debate. The exception to this is if both debaters do not participate, resulting in a forfeit.

A debater may be permitted to debate alone for one elimination debate and still be eligible to advance to later elimination rounds if they receive explicit approval from the NHSDLC tournament director. This approval will only be given in exceptional and reasonable circumstances.

16. Switching Partners

Switching partners during preliminary debates is not permitted unless a team receives explicit approval from the NHSDLC tournament director. This approval will only be given in exceptional and reasonable circumstances.

A team that switches partners during preliminary rounds is not eligible to break unless they receive explicit approval from the NHSDLC tournament director. This approval will only be given in exceptional and reasonable circumstances and cannot be given if the relevant debaters have participated in more than one debate.

Switching partners is not permitted during elimination debates. This is not allowed in any circumstance.

17. Using Evidence in a Debate

Evidence may be utilized in a debate round either by providing a direct quote from the evidence or paraphrasing.

Upon introducing a piece of evidence, a debater should say at least the last name of the author, a short description of their qualifications on the subject, and the year of publication. If the evidence is written by an organization (a governmental body, think tank, university department, etc.) debaters may list the organization's name instead of a single author. If a piece of evidence has two authors both of their names should be listed. If a piece of evidence has three or more authors a debater may say just the most senior author's name followed by "et al," a Latin abbreviation meaning "and others."

For example, if a piece of evidence has 3 or more authors and the evidence is being paraphrased, a debater might say:

"According to Kaisa Snellman et al in 2015, an economic sociologist and assistant professor of organizational behavior at INSEAD, participating in extracurricular activities like debate is positively associated with higher educational and professional success. This is because they help develop soft skills like teamwork, communication and perseverance. These skills are important in our increasingly competitive and knowledge-driven economy."

If a piece of evidence is from an organization and the debaters are directly quoting it:

"According to the National Center for Health Statistics in 2017, the principal health statistics agency of the US, "Heart disease and cancer have remained the top two leading causes of death for the past 40 years in the US." Heart disease is responsible for "23.4% of deaths in 2015" and cancer is responsible for "22% of deaths in 2015.""

18. Having Evidence "In Context" or "In Full"

A team must have any paragraph that their evidence paraphrases or directly quotes ready if their opponent asks to view their evidence “in context” or “in full.” These paragraphs should be the original, unmodified version.

For example, for the National Center for Health Statistics evidence, the paragraphs “in full” that were directly quoted from are:

“Heart disease and cancer have remained the top two leading causes of death for the past 40 years.”

And

“In 1975, the five leading causes of death were heart disease, cancer, stroke, unintentional injuries, and influenza and pneumonia. In 2015, the five leading causes of death were heart disease, cancer, chronic lower respiratory diseases, unintentional injuries, and stroke. Throughout 1975–2015, heart disease and cancer remained the top two leading causes of death. The age-adjusted death rate for heart disease declined during 1975–2011, and then stabilized during 2011–2015 (23.4% of deaths in 2015). The age-adjusted death rate for cancer increased during 1975–1990, followed by periods of stability and decline during 1990–2000, and finally a steady decline during 2000–2015 (22.0% of deaths in 2015). Greater declines in heart disease than cancer mortality during 1975–2015 have narrowed the gap between heart disease and cancer deaths.”

It is helpful and encouraged, but not required, to highlight the direct quotes that were utilized. Similarly, the specific sentences that were paraphrased may be highlighted.

If a team is unable to provide their evidence in full, judges are instructed to weigh the argument made in the evidence as if it was not supported by evidence.

19. Citing Evidence in a Debate

Debaters must provide full citations for each piece of evidence they read. This citation must include the author or source name, their qualifications, the title of the piece of evidence, the most specific date of publication available, the page numbers used, and the URL if the evidence is available online. If the piece of evidence is from a journal, the citation should also include the name of the journal and the relevant issue and volume information. If the evidence is only available behind a paywall, the URL of the most relevant and accessible website page should be provided.

These citations should be in the footnotes or endnotes.

For example:

Snellman et al, economic sociologist, assistant professor of organizational behavior at INSEAD, “The Engagement Gap: Social Mobility and Extracurricular Participation among American Youth,” December 10, 2014, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol 657, Issue 1, 2015, pages 197 & 204, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0002716214548398>

National Center for Health Statistics, principal health statistics agency of the US, a part of the CDC and the US Department of Health and Human Services, “Health, United States, 2016: With Chartbook on Long-Term Trends in Health,” May 2017, page 18, <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus16.pdf#019>

If a team’s citation is missing key information, judges are instructed to weigh the argument made with the missing information in mind. For example, if a citation is missing everything except the author’s name, the argument made in a piece of evidence may be evaluated as if it was not backed up by evidence. Judges have discretion in determining the relative importance of the missing information and its effect on their evaluation of a piece of evidence.

20. Viewing an Opponent’s Written Material

A debater may ask to see their opponents' case, evidence, blocks and any other material that was written before the debate round started. They may only ask to see material that has been read during the debate. Their opponents cannot refuse to show this material upon being asked.

Debaters may only ask during a crossfire that they are participating in and during their own preparation time. If a team wants to view their opponent's written material but their opponent is using preparation time, the team must wait until their opponent concludes their preparation time, start their own preparation time, and then ask to view the material.

If crossfire or preparation time is not already running, time starts upon asking to view the evidence. Time does not pause when an opponent is looking for their evidence or case.

A debater that is not participating during crossfire may provide and receive material that their partner or opponents asked for. They may also read evidence that their partner asked for.

A debater may also ask to see their opponents' evidence "in context" or "in full." If a piece of evidence is a direct quote, the opponents must provide the full paragraph that the direct quote is from. If a piece of evidence paraphrases something, the opponents must provide the full paragraphs that have been paraphrased.

Debaters may share their written material either by having a printed copy or showing it on their laptop.

It is encouraged to have a printed copy of these paragraphs to simplify showing evidence. If evidence is shown on a laptop both teams should be respectful of each other's time. The debater reading the evidence should have time to process the information. However, they should not keep the laptop for an excessive amount of time so their opponent can continue preparing with their laptop.

21. Plagiarism and Evidence Falsification

According to dictionary.com, plagiarism is “an act or instance of using or closely imitating the language and thoughts of another author without authorization and the representation of that author's work as one's own, as by not crediting the original author.” Plagiarism is one of the most serious offenses in academia, regularly triggering expulsions and destroying reputations of those that are caught engaging in it.

Evidence falsification is the act of heavily misrepresenting a piece of evidence or creating a fake piece of evidence. It is lying to opponents and judges by presenting either of these cases as legitimate.

The NHSDLC takes these acts of academic dishonesty seriously. Debate is an academic competition that strives to ensure competitive equity for all involved. Therefore, if a team is caught engaging in either academically dishonest practice the NHSDLC tournament director has the ability to disqualify them from the tournament. If the case is particularly egregious, the team may also be barred from engaging in any future NHSDLC competitions.

If a debater feels that they have witnessed a case of academic dishonesty they should contact a NHSDLC staff member as soon as possible.

The NHSDLC recognizes that correctly citing evidence is a new skill for many and that mistakes happen. Therefore, the NHSDLC tournament director has ultimate discretion in determining the scope of the consequence.

简介

这份文件涵盖了中国高中生美式辩论联赛（NHSDLC）比赛的基本规范。

NHSDLC 制定规则主要有三大目的。第一，可以确保联赛的高效有序运行；第二，确保联赛的公正性，确保辩手的比赛结果不受学校、年级、性别以及其他因素影响，由此确保比赛的胜负只取决于辩论质量，创造一个公平公正的竞争环境；第三，确保辩论赛始终充满教育意义，使其教育性长久保持下去，帮助辩手获得成功。

除非在极端情况下，此‘规则’不能用来决定辩手的胜负。裁判最重要的任务是在‘规则’的框架内，按正常流程评判辩论的胜负。裁判不能仅因为一方违反规则而判其输掉比赛。由于辩手以及裁判对于‘规则’的解读都有自己的见解，如果出现对于‘规则’的争论、困惑或是希望投诉，有关方应立即联系 NHSDLC 相关工作人员。NHSDLC 的工作人员会佩戴一个印有“主办方”的工作牌。

组委会工作人员对于事件是否涉及违反规则，以及违反规则最终的后果，保留最终决定权。组委会将视违反程度不同，作出不同决定。在极端情况下，组委会工作人员可能会判违反规则一方输掉本轮比赛，或者取消其继续参赛资格，或者将其成绩从联赛全国排名中抹除。任何一方不能以没有阅读‘规则’为由，在比赛中违反规则或者向组委会要求免除惩戒措施。

本文件仅注重说明 NHSDLC 比赛的规则，而不是更广义的比赛常态。‘规则’强制规定了辩手在比赛中必须要做的事情；而‘常态’则是广大辩手群体交流得出应该做的事情。

NHSDLC 相信辩论的‘常态’应该是广大辩手群体共同智慧的结晶。

在辩论赛中，辩手们随时可以到记分室对比赛结果寻求证实和解释。然而，组委会工作人员几乎不会因为辩手的上诉而修改比赛结果。除非工作人员确认裁判在比赛中有信息填写错误（例如队伍代码填写错误）或者有多方人员或证据证实裁判的歧视问题，最终结果永远以裁判裁决为准。

本文件包括英文原版和中文翻译。如果出现任何理解偏差，应以英文版为准。

规则

1. 比赛行为规范

NHSDLC 比赛始终致力于为参赛选手们提供一个专业、安全的比赛环境。如出现任何参赛选手、裁判、带队老师、家长，个人或者动物，干扰比赛的正常进行的情况，NHSDLC 组委会有权将其驱逐出比赛场地。组委会坚决反对任何形式的暴力、辱骂、歧视行为，以及其他侵害他人权益的行为。如果任何参赛学生携带毒品、烟草、酒精饮料等违禁物品，一经发现，组委会将立即取消其比赛资格，并将其驱逐出比赛场地。

组委会对惩戒违规人员的方式及惩戒后果持有最终决定权。

2. 限制区域

记分室或者裁判休息室不允许辩手逗留。

3. 按时到达比赛场地

辩手应在工作人员宣布对阵表 15 分钟之内到达各自比赛教室，否则将会失去该轮比赛资格。如果在对阵宣布之后 10 分钟，辩手或者裁判没有出现在比赛教室，有关方应及时通知组委会工作人员。辩手应主动通知裁判或者志愿者联系组委会工作人员。如有队伍没有在规定时间内到达比赛场地，对于是否取消该队本轮参赛资格，组委会工作人员持有最终决定权。

如果辩论一方由于迟到而被取消该轮比赛资格，另一方仍需留在原教室，直到组委会工作人员准许其离开。在可能的情况下，组委会尽力安排其他队伍来参加比赛。如果没有新队伍前来参加比赛，留在教室这一方就将会得到一个“轮空”，该轮辩论自动获胜。获胜队伍的辩手分将通过其在小组赛其他轮次中辩手分的平均值来决定。

4. 语言

在个人发言和交叉质询中，辩手必须使用英文发言（除非与自己队友交流可以使用其他语言）。组委会将要求裁判在评判结果时自动忽略在英语之外的语种下进行的辩论。在准备时间内，辩手可以使用任何语言与自己队友进行交流。

学生在辩论中必须参考 NHSDLC 辩题英文原文。组委会将不会提供官方辩题翻译。组委会提供的辩题翻译仅供参考，方便观赛者和其他特殊人群的理解。如有差异，应以英文为准。

5. 电子设备的使用

参赛学生可以使用平板电脑、笔记本电脑等电子设备帮助他们准备比赛。参赛学生也可以使用手机作为计时器，或者提前下载好的翻译软件。然而，使用以上电子设备上网查找资料、上网与他人沟通以寻求帮助等影响比赛公平竞争性的行为都是组委会明令禁止的。

NHSDLC 比赛负责人将视情节严重情况，对于违反规定的学生做出最终惩戒决定。

6. 观赛

除非得到 NHSDLC 比赛负责人明确允许，小组赛中，除辩论双方，裁判，志愿者以外的任何人不得观赛。

淘汰赛中，任何人均可观赛。

如果观赛人员在辩论进行中言行举止不当，或者影响辩论的正常进行，那么双方辩手、裁判、带队老师或者组委会人员有权责令其离开比赛场地。观赛人员且必须服从指示。

7. 录音录像

小组赛中，任何人不得录音录像。如有人持有录音录像设备，一经发现，必须当场删除所有录音录像资料。

淘汰赛中，任何人只有明确征得辩论双方以及裁判的同意，方可进行录音录像。如果一场辩论中有多名裁判，则需征得所有裁判同意。如果没有得到以上参赛人员明确许可而擅自

录音录像，一经发现，将必须当场删除所有资料。如若不服从组委会工作人员的指示，那么该观赛者将被剥夺继续观赛的权利，并受到其他相应处罚。

本规则的唯一例外情况是决赛。对决赛进行录音录像不需要征得辩手或者裁判的同意。

如果辩手的同学、家长在微信上传了一段该辩手的发言，或者指导老师上传了该场辩论的精彩片段，则需要视具体情况而定。组委会将需要具体考察视频内容，客观做出决定。然而，任何人若想录制一段更长的视频，必须要在比赛正式开始之前征求辩论双方以及裁判的同意。短视频时长应少于 20 秒。

辩手即使在赛前同意录音录像请求，在赛中也可以要求观赛人员停止录音录像。观赛人员必须服从请求。

8. 发言时间&准备时间

在辩论中，辩手必须严格遵守发言时间及准备时间的限制。若辩手在规定时间内没有完成发言，裁判可以允许其完成最后一句话，但不能开始新的陈述。最后一句话的组成部分如果并不明确，将以裁判判断为准。

比赛中，辩手可以任何发言之前或者之后使用准备时间，但是在个人发言或交叉质询过程中不能使用准备时间。在准备时间总时长不超过四分钟的前提下，辩手可以任意支配使用他们的准备时间。裁判和志愿者会记录准备时间的使用情况以供参考，但辩手们同样需要自己计时。如有任何误差，辩手需负全责。

以下发言时间适用于所有 NHSDLC 比赛：

开篇立论：5 分钟

反驳发言：4 分钟

总结发言：2 分钟

最终陈述：2 分钟

交叉质询：3 分钟

准备时间：4 分钟

9. 辩手职责

每位辩手在一轮辩论中必须有固定辩位。一辩需要进行开篇立论与总结发言；二辩需要进行反驳发言与最终陈述。如果有辩手既做了总结发言也做了最终陈述并且该方队伍赢得本轮辩论，请立即通知组委会工作人员。组委会将根据具体情况做出处理。

10. 如果辩论一方发言与持方不符

在极少数情况下，辩论一方可能意外搞错自己的持方。举个例子，抛硬币决定了一支队伍为正方，该队却误认为自己是反方。这是一个明显的错误。

如果在第一个反驳发言开始之前，裁判或者双方辩手没有发现并改正该方立场错误问题，那么站错立场的队伍不能赢得该轮辩论。即使该队论述质量优于对手，他们也不能赢得该轮辩论。即便该方在开篇立论时的立场是正确的，该方也不能赢得该轮辩论。裁判会根据辩手的表现按正常流程给出辩手分。因此，这时很可能出现低辩手分队伍赢得辩论的情况。

如果双方辩手或者裁判在第一个反驳发言开始之前发现错误，裁判应立刻通知组委会工作人员。组委会将根据情况决定站错立场的队伍是否可以重新进行开篇立论，而这个决定很大程度上取决于时间是否充裕。

如果组委会明确同意了立场错误一方重新进行开篇立论，队伍应即刻开始重新发言，接下来的辩论正常进行。

除非得到组委会的明确同意，犯错误一方才可以重新进行开篇立论。如果组委会同意重新做开篇立论，那么接下来的辩论正常进行。如果组委会没有给出明确同意，那么该方将自动输掉本轮的辩论。但是裁判仍然会根据该方辩手的表现情况给出辩手得分，在这种情况下，辩手得分低的一方可能最后会赢得该轮辩论赛。

11. 交叉质询

每个交叉质询中，先发言的队伍先提问。如果后发言的队伍违反本条规则，裁判有权扣除相应辩手分。

打断对手发言、表现粗鲁、不回答问题等类似行为不算是违反规则。但是裁判有权扣除相应辩手分，以示惩戒。

12. 帮助搭档

在交叉质询或者个人发言中，辩手可以为搭档提供帮助。但是裁判只会听取指定辩手的发言，进行相应评判（提供协助的辩手的发言将不作数）。但请注意，如果辩手在搭档个人发言或交叉质询中提供帮助过多，裁判有权扣除相应辩手分。

13. 最终陈述中的新论述

组委会将要求裁判不将辩手在最终陈述中提出的新论述纳入考虑。新论述指的是那些在之前环节中没有提到的新的主张或反驳。新论述的例子包括但不限于新的论点和对于之前没有反驳过的论点的回复等。

虽然在最终陈述中辩手不可以提出新的论点，但并不是说辩手只能重复之前说过的内容；辩手应该努力提供新的分析，通过分析之前提到的论点，向裁判展示双方赢得的论点，以及为什么己方论点更重要。

14. 淘汰赛资格

辩手必须始终与搭档一起完成每轮小组赛，才可能有资格进入淘汰赛。

唯一例外的情况是：小组赛中，队内有一名辩手因为某特殊原因而错过某一轮辩论，并且征得了 NHSDLC 比赛负责人的同意。在这种情况下，联赛负责人将会给予该队伍明确许可，同意其保留淘汰赛晋级资格。然而，组委会通常不会给予单人辩论多于一轮辩论的队伍进入淘汰赛的资格。

15. 如果搭档无法参赛

如果出现搭档无法参赛的情况，辩手必须尽快通知组委会工作人员。辩手可以通过志愿者或者裁判来联系工作人员。

如果队伍的一名辩手没有参加某一轮辩论，该辩手将会在该轮收到 20 分的辩手得分以及第 4 名的个人排名。例外：如果队伍的两名辩手都没有参加该轮的比赛，则该轮比赛作废，队伍自动判输。

如果联赛负责人明确同意某位辩手在某一轮淘汰赛中单独参加比赛，那么该队仍然有资格继续晋级。请注意，组委会负责人只会对十分正当的理由予以采信。

16. 变更搭档

小组赛中，除非得到联赛负责人的明确许可，辩手不得自行变更搭档。请注意，组委会负责人只会对十分正当的理由予以采信。

如果辩手在没有得到组委会明确许可的情况下私自变更搭档，那么该队将失去晋级资格。只有在极特殊合理的情况下，组委会负责人才会允许辩手变更搭档。

在淘汰赛中，无论何种理由，辩手不得变更搭档。

17. 证据的使用

辩手可以通过直接引用来源的资料或者用自己的话解释资料作为证据进行辩论。

辩手如果需要引用文献内容，那么最少需要提供引用文献作者的姓氏，文献简介以及该文献的发布日期。如果辩手引用的文献来源于某个组织（比如政府部门、智库、大学学院等），那么辩手需要提供组织名称。如果引用的文献有两名作者，那么辩手需要提供两名作者姓氏；如果作者超过三个，那么辩手提供主要作者姓氏，接着说“等人”。

举个例子，如果一个证据中有三名或者三名以上作者，辩手用自己的话解释证据，这名辩手可以这样陈述：

“According to Kaisa Snellman et al in 2015, an economic sociologist and assistant professor of organizational behavior at INSEAD, participating in extracurricular activities like debate is positively associated with higher educational and professional success. This is because they help develop soft skills like teamwork, communication and perseverance. These skills are important in our increasingly competitive and knowledge-driven economy.”

如果辩手引用的证据来源于某组织，并且辩手直接进行引用：

“According to the National Center for Health Statistics in 2017, the principal health statistics agency of the US, ‘Heart disease and cancer have remained the top two leading causes of death for the past 40 years in the US.’ Heart disease is responsible for “23.4% of deaths in 2015” and cancer is responsible for “22% of deaths in 2015.””

18. 保留好证据原文及全文

队伍必须保留好他们所引用的证据原文及全文，以便对手在辩论中要求查看。辩手应保证保留的证据全文是原始资料，不能做任何修改。

例如，前文提及的世界卫生组织这个证据中，直接引用的原始资料为：

“Heart disease and cancer have remained the top two leading causes of death for the past 40 years.”

And “In 1975, the five leading causes of death were heart disease, cancer, stroke, unintentional injuries, and influenza and pneumonia. In 2015, the five leading causes of death were heart disease, cancer, chronic lower respiratory diseases, unintentional injuries, and stroke. Throughout 1975–2015, heart disease and cancer remained the top two leading causes of death. The age-adjusted death rate for heart disease declined during 1975–2011, and then stabilized during 2011–2015 (23.4% of deaths in 2015). The age-adjusted death rate for cancer increased during 1975–1990, followed by periods of stability and decline during 1990–2000, and finally a steady decline during 2000–2015 (22.0% of deaths in 2015). Greater declines in heart disease than cancer mortality during 1975–2015 have narrowed the gap between heart disease and cancer deaths.”

我们建议辩手额外标注直接引用的部分，标注不是必需的。同样的道理，辩手最好额外标注他们用自己的话解释的部分。

如果一方队伍不能提供可供查看的证据全文，那么裁判将视该论点为没有用论据支持的论点，按正常流程评判辩论的胜负。

19. 证据的引用

辩手在辩论中如果引用任何文献作为证据，均需要提供完整的引文，包括作者或机构名称，作者及机构的资质、文章标题、文章发布日期、页码及（如果引自网站）URL 等。如果证据来源于杂志，那么引文需要包含杂志名称及相关期刊号。如果证据只能通过‘付费墙’的方式获得，那么辩手需要提供最相关且可获取的网页 URL。

以上引用需要以脚注或尾注的形式呈现。

举个例子：

Snellman et al, economic sociologist, assistant professor of organizational behavior at INSEAD, “The Engagement Gap: Social Mobility and Extracurricular Participation among American Youth,” December 10, 2014, The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol 657, Issue 1, 2015, pages 197 &

204, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0002716214548398>

National Center for Health Statistics, principal health statistics agency of the US, a part of the CDC and the US Department of Health and Human Services, “Health, United States, 2016: With Chartbook on Long-Term Trends in Health,” May 2017, page 18,

<https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus16.pdf#019>

If a team’s citation is missing key information, judges are instructed to weigh the argument made with the missing information in mind. For example, if a citation is missing everything except the author’s name, the argument made in a piece of evidence may be evaluated as if it was not backed up by evidence. Judges have discretion in determining the relative importance of the missing information and its effect on their evaluation of a piece of evidence.

如果一方队伍的引文缺少关键部分，那么裁判视该论点为缺少相关信息的论点，按正常流程评判辩论的胜负。举个例子，如果一方的引文仅包含作者名而没有其他信息，裁判将视该论点为没有证据支持的论点。裁判有权最终决定引文缺少信息的重要性，缺少信息以及对于证据的意义。

20. 查看对手的准备材料

辩手可以在比赛过程中要求查看对手在赛前准备的材料，如案例和证据等。辩手只能要求查看对手在该轮辩论中引用的证据或使用的案例。一经要求查看，另一方必须将其材料展示给辩手。

辩手只能在自己的交叉质询环节或己方准备时间中提出查看材料请求。如果辩手在对方的准备时间内希望查看对方材料，那么辩手必须在对手准备时间结束后，开始自己的准备时间并要求查看对手的材料。

如果交叉质询环节或准备时间还没有开始，查看材料的时间从请求提出的时间开始计算。对手查找自己材料的时间计入总时长。

不参加交叉质询环节的辩手可以提供和接收搭档或对手所需要的材料，也可以按照搭档的要求朗读材料。

辩手可以要求查看对手的证据原文。如果某一个证据是直接引用，那么对方辩手必须提供完整的引用段落。如果某一个证据是用自己的话解释的，那么对方辩手必须提供被解释说明的原文完整段落。

辩手们可以将其材料打印成纸质版或者存储在电脑里以供查看。

为方便辩手查看证据，我们鼓励辩手将材料打印成纸质版。如果材料是电子版，双方应相互尊重对方的阅读时间。阅读论据的一方需要足够时间去消化理解信息。然而，他们不能占用对方的电脑太长时间，保证对方也有足够的准备时间。

21. 抄袭和作假

根据 dictionary.com 的定义，抄袭是指“未经授权使用或者模仿其他作者的语言或者想法的举动或情况，以及在不著名或认可原作者的情况下将别人的成果据为己有的行为”。抄袭是学术领域最严重的侵权行为之一，通常会造成抄袭者被学术机构除名和名声尽毁的后果。

证据作假是指严重歪曲某则证据或者制造不实证据的行为，是向对手和裁判撒谎的行为。

NHSDLC 组委会严厉禁止抄袭剽窃和证据作假的行为。辩论是建立在公平原则上的学术竞赛。因此，如果参加比赛的任何一组选手被发现上述任何一项违规行为，联赛负责人有权取消其参赛资格。情节极其恶劣者将被禁止参加任何 NHSDLC 的比赛。

如果辩手在比赛过程中发现任何形式的学术造假行为，应立即联系组委会工作人员。

NHSDLC 组委会理解正确引用文献证据对于许多辩手是一项新的技能，在引用过程中可能无意犯下错误。因此，组委会负责人将会依据不同情况，慎重作出裁判。