The 14th National High School English Debate Tournament

Tournament Rulebook
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This tournament will have high school students attending from various prefectures all over Japan, which means, many styles of debates will have to compete on a common ground. The purpose of this tournament rulebook is to set up a minimum common field of debating; a common field that will realize a fair, educationally fruitful tournament, and will, most importantly, show the students the joys of English debating.

Some of the rules here are for tournament management purposes, so it is not necessary to read through all of the statutes in this rulebook. However, we’d like the students, their coaches and judges to look through relevant rules before attending the tournament. Topics of importance are framed so please pay extra attention to them. Further comments are provided after the asterisks (\*).

This rulebook provides only minimum requirements for debating. Lack of direct prohibitions does not mean you are allowed to do anything else. Needless to say, students should behave in a morally appropriate manner for a high school student, according to the “HEnDA Make Friends Pledge”. At all times, we expect students and teachers to show the spirit of fair play.

If something irregular happens during the tournament, which has no corresponding statute in this rulebook, final decision will be up to the Judging Committee and the Tournament Organizer. In case of such irregularities, all participants will be notified as soon as possible.

NB: If in any case there are discrepancies among the Japanese and the English version of this rulebook, basically the **Japanese version will be used** to organize the tournament.
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# 1. Procedures of the Tournament

In this tournament, maximum of 64 teams will compete in the 6 preliminary rounds. Then according to the following criteria, top eight teams will be selected for the finals: Semifinals and the Final. Winners will be awarded by the results of the final.

\* Revised (2019) Major change for this year’s tournament is that be there will be 6 preliminary rounds, and the finals will start from the Semi-finals.

\*The team that debated on the Aff. side in an odd number round will basically debate on the Neg. side on the next round, vice versa.

## 1.1 Preliminary Rounds

Each team will have 6 rounds in the preliminary rounds. The team will basically have 3 rounds arguing on the Affirmative side, and 3 rounds arguing on the Negative side. (Exception may happen only when there will be bye rounds.) The side in the 3rd, 5th rounds will be allocated randomly.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds) The team that debated on the Aff. side in an odd number round will basically debate on the Neg. side on the next round, vice versa.

1.1.1 Management of preliminary rounds

During the preliminary rounds, teams will not debate each other more than once, and teams from the same prefecture will basically not match against each other.

The Tournament Organizer will decide who the 1st and 2nd round opponents are by lottery. From the 3rd to the 6th round, matches will be allotted according to the results of the previous rounds, using the Power-pairing system. This Power-pairing system basically matches teams that won the same number of votes.

In this system, we will adopt the so-called “high-low” rule, in which if several teams have the same number of votes, the team that is higher in rank among the group with the same votes, will be matched against the lower team in the same group.

Each preliminary round will have two judges. The two judges will decide the winner independently and will vote separately. Each judges’ vote has equal value. (If the judges’ votes split, the round will be virtually a “tie”)

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

\* The teams that debate on the Aff. side in the 1st round, will basically be the winners of the regional block tournaments and prefectural tournaments that were the most competitive.

The Power-pairing system is employed so that the winner is not decided by sheer luck. Moreover, it will decrease the number of schools that win all or no rounds. Furthermore, teams of supposed equal debating skills will have more chance to face each other, enabling more enjoyable debates for all who are involved. This system is often used in debating at universities in both Japan and the USA.

In some rare cases, the teams that have not won the same number of wins may be matched, for the sake of other tournament requirements: the number of Affirmative/Negative rounds each team should debate on should be the same, opponent of the previous rounds will not be matched again, and teams from the same school will not have a match against each other.

**1.1.2 Criteria for deciding the finalists**

The top teams who advance to the final rounds will be decided by the following criteria (The winners of the 5th to 8th place awards will also use the same criteria.):

.

The 1st criterion: Teams who won the most votes will be in the upper ranking; this would include the team who received a bye round.

The 2nd criterion: For each team, the total number of votes of the *opponent* teams will be totaled. Among the teams with the same number of votes, the team with the higher total opponent votes will be in the upper ranking. If in case the team or its opponent has received a bye round, the total number will be modified according to the team’s average vote rate.

The 3rd criterion: If both the number of votes and the total opponent votes are the same, the team getting the higher average communication points (average not including the “bye round”) will go to the upper rankings.

The 4th criterion: If the above three criteria are all same, the teams which get the more ‘best debater awards’ on average (average not including the “bye round”) will go to the upper ranking.

The 5th criterion: If the above four criteria are all same, the student leaders of the tied teams will be required to do a “Janken” (Rock, Scissor, Paper) in front of the judges. The winner of the Janken will be ranked higher among the tied teams.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

**1.1.3 Late or absent for the preliminary**

In case that a team is late for their first preliminary round because of an unavoidable accident, for example sickness or traffic accident, the Tournament Organizer and the Judging Committee will decide whether it is appropriate to give them one or two defeats, or to reschedule the match. If the team is late for other reasons, the team cannot participate in the whole preliminary rounds.

**1.1.4 Prohibition of forfeiting the rounds**

Teams are not allowed to forfeit any of their preliminary rounds, except for the aforementioned reasons. If a team forfeits a round, the team will be regarded as forfeiting the qualification for the finals.

\*Forfeiting a round is not permitted, as it will not only deprive the opponent’s chance to debate, but also it may be used for some intentional manipulation or rankings.

**1.1.5 Exceptions for deciding the finalists**

The top 4 teams will be decided excluding the forfeited teams due to some above mentioned exceptions.

If the judging committee ruled that a team has maliciously cheated against the tournament rules, such as forging the team membership enrollment, distorting the evidence that are used in a round, or a team has behaved in apparently unbecoming manners for high school students, the team will be disqualified and will not be qualified for the finals.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

**1.1.6 Supplementary Team**

If the total number of participating teams in the preliminary rounds is an odd number, because of some unexpected cancels, the Tournament Organizer will let a Supplementary team participate in the preliminary rounds. Exceptionally, the Supplementary team can be from a school which has another participating team. In the Preliminary rounds, the Supplementary team will be treated as the same as other teams, and will match against other teams regularly (except against the team from the same school) and its wins and losses will be counted when deciding the matching and the finalists.

However, the Supplementary team will not proceed to the finals, regardless of its ranking. The top 4 teams will be chosen from the teams excluding the Supplementary team.

The Supplementary team rule will not be applied when the total number of teams become an odd number (for some unexpected reason) *after* the preliminary rounds have started. If in rare occasions, when the total number of teams including the Supplementary team changed to an odd number, the Supplementary team will continue participating until the end of the preliminary rounds and no additional teams will participate.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

## 1.2 The Finals

The qualified 4 teams will debate in the finals, which consist of semifinals, and the final round. The finals will be single elimination, which means that if a team loses a round, their tournament is over and they will not move on to the next stage.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

1.2.1 Management of the final rounds

The 4 teams will be matched according to their preliminary round results. The following chart shows how the finals will be assigned.

In the finals, teams that have debated each other in the preliminaries may face each other again. Teams from the same prefecture may also face each other.

In the finals, the Affirmative and Negative side will be decided as follows: Both teams will count how many times they have debated on the Affirmative side so far (including both the Finals and the prelims). The team with less Affirmative side debates will be the next Affirmative. If both teams have had equal number of past Affirmative side debates, then the student leaders of both teams will do a “Janken” (Rock, Scissor, Paper) in front of the officials at the designated room. The winner team of the Janken will debate on the Affirmative side. Even if the two teams have faced each other in a preliminary round, the Affirmative/Negative sides in that particular preliminary round will not affect the sides in the finals.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1st |  |  |  | 3rd |
|  | Final |  |
| Semi- |  |
| 4th | Finals |  |  | 2nd |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The team that won the final round will be the winner of this tournament. The one that lost will be 2nd place. The two teams that lost in the semifinals will share the 3rd place prize. There will be no 3rd place play-off.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

\*From the 10th tournament, this rule was changed concerning how to determine the Affirmative and Negative side. If the Janken takes place, the winner will automatically be the Affirmative (The winner cannot pick the sides.)

**1.2.2 Prohibition of forfeiting the finals**

Forfeiting the finals intentionally is prohibited. After the announcement of the 8 qualified teams, if, exceptionally for any reason, a team is unable to partake in its assigned round, that team will be considered forfeited and may not continue. In such case, the match assignment will not be changed, and no additional team will be qualified to take the absent team’s place. The assigned opposing team will just be declared the winner and the tournament procedure will proceed without any other change.

\*To watch each round in the finals is a very beneficial chance to study debate. Thus, abandoning the finals is not allowed, unless something unexpected like sickness made it impossible for a team to participate in the debate.

## 1.3 Awards

In this tournament, the 1st prize, 2nd prize, and 3rd prizes (two teams) are awarded to the top teams decided by the above tournament procedures. Beside team awards, Best Debater/ Best Speaker awards and others are given to excellent individuals.

**1.3.1 Excellent Debater / Excellent Speaker Awards**

As for Individual awards: The “Most Excellent Debater” award, “Excellent Debater” awards will be presented. Also “Most Excellent Speaker” award, and “Excellent Speaker” awards will be presented to the best speakers of each of the four speech types.

In every preliminary and the final rounds, each judge must (independently, without discussing with other judges) vote for one debater as the candidate of the best debater award in that specific round. Judges may choose from either the winning or losing team. Judges should pick a debater that has contributed most to her/his team, not the lone player type who just shows off without contributing to the team. The excellent debater awards are awarded to the debaters with the highest number of accumulated votes from the judges. All votes from the preliminaries to the Final round are counted. If the votes are equal, the debater from the team with better final result will be awarded.

The excellent speaker awards will be decided after the 6th preliminary round. Recommendations from the main judges are collected, and the most recommended speakers from each speech type will be awarded. If the votes are equal, the debater from the team with better preliminary rounds’ result will be awarded.

\*Revised (2019: prelim. rounds)

**1.3.2 Special prizes**

Judging Committee and the Tournament Organizer may decide to offer special prizes to teams/individuals. Some special prizes may be awarded regardless of the results of the tournament. In such case, reasons for the special prize will be announced.

## 1.4 Team and its Members

The unit of competition of this tournament’s preliminary and the final rounds should be a team which consists of the students who belong to the same high school or high technical college in Japan, ranging from 1st to 3rd graders. Only one team is allowed to participate from a school. Plural team entry from one school will be allowed only exceptionally (on conditions that the total team number may be odd), and will be decided by the HEnDA committee.

All members of the team and its coaches should read the “HEnDA Make Friends” Pledge beforehand, and obey the Pledge.

**1.4.1 Team member lineup and restrictions**

A team should consist of 4 or 6 enrolled members. A team with only 3 members is not allowed. (Only for unavoidable accidental reason, such as enrolled member’s sickness, the tournament organizer may allow a 3 member team, but only very exceptionally).

Each team member should meet the condition below.

- English native speakers are not allowed to participate in this tournament.

- To whom one or more of the following conditions apply, only two members are allowed to participate in each team. (Only one such member in a round)

(1) A student with more than 12 months experience staying in a country where the first language is English. (If the stay is before entering primary school, the stay need not be counted)

(2) A student from countries where English is not the mother language, but is one of the official languages. (If the student left the country before entering primary school, the stay need not be counted)

(3) A student who mainly uses English at home.

\* The tournament basically does not allow a team with only 3 members. Exchange students would be allowed to participate in the debate if he/she doesn’t come from an English speaking country.

**1.4.2 Team members of each round and restrictions**

4 members out of the enrolled members should attend each round. (Exceptionally, only when the tournament organizer allowed a 3 member team, the number of members in each round will be 3). The teams are allowed to change its members in each round. But members cannot switch to the substitute member after the round has started.

To whom one or more of the following conditions apply, *only one member* can participate in each *round*.

(1) A student with more than 12 months experience staying in a country where the first language is English. (If the stay is before entering primary school, the stay need not be counted)

(2) A student from countries where English is not the mother language, but is one of the official languages. (If the student left the country before entering primary school, the stay need not be counted)

(3) A student who mainly uses English at home.

**1.4.3 The prohibition of changing members or teams**

Basically, each team is not allowed to change its members after the preliminary round enrollment. Even if a school has more than one team, there should be no change in the membership among the teams.

\*After the tournament starts, even between the teams that are from the same school, teams cannot add the members of the already forfeited teams.

**1.4.4 Penalty against noncooperation or forged enrollment**

Teams and their coaches (or accompanying judges) are required to cooperate to the instructions of the tournament organizer. If the team or its coaches (or its accompanying judge) violate the instructions, or if any violation of the rules 1.4.1 ~ 1.4.3 were found during the tournament, the team will be penalized. If the violation was judged as malignant, such as intentionally sabotaging the instructions or forging the information, all matches that the team partook will be considered as being defeated, and further participation to the rounds will not be permitted and lose the chance to be qualified to the finals. If violations were found after the tournament, any awards given will be cancelled and prizes must be returned.

# 2. Procedure of the Rounds

In each round in the preliminaries and the finals, each team should debate on the tournament debate topic, using the following debate format.

\*Each team must refer to the document that defines this year’s debate topic.

## 2.1 Speeches

Each round should have the following twelve speeches, using the following debate format. Each team member must follow the speech role defined in the below guidance, and should try to clash her/his arguments with the opponent’s arguments, by making speeches that are easy to follow.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Speech | Time |
| (1) Affirmative Constructive Speech | 4min |
| Preparation Time | 1 min |
| (2) Questions from the Negative | 2 min |
| (3) Negative Constructive Speech | 4 min |
| Preparation Time | 1 min |
| (4) Questions from the Affirmative | 2 min |
| Preparation Time | 2 min |
| (5) Negative Attack | 3 min |
| (6) Questions from the Affirmative | 2 min |
| (7) Affirmative Attack | 3 min |
| (8) Questions from the Negative | 2 min |
| Preparation Time | 2 min |
| (9) Affirmative Defense | 3 min |
| (10) Negative Defense | 3 min |
| Preparation Time | 2 min |
| (11) Affirmative Summary | 3 min |
| (12) Negative Summary | 3 min |
| Total | 42 min |

**\*** The speech time was revised on the last 9th tournament: Attack/Defense speeches were extended and Questions for the constructive speeches were shorten.

The guidance below may not cover all aspects of debate. The debaters should try to make clear, convincing, and creative arguments that are adequate for a high school student.

**2.1.1 Affirmative Constructive Speech (1)**

In the Affirmative Constructive Speech**,** the Affirmative team should clearly state their basic standpoints on why the debate topic should be affirmed; clearly defining the topic by showing a *plan*, and showing evidence to prove the Advantages of the plan.

**2.1.1.1 Affirmative Plan**

A “Plan” is what the Affirmative side proposes as their definition of the topic and their concrete policy. The Affirmative team may propose a Plan at the beginning of the Affirmative Constructive speech, as long as the official definition of the tournament debate topic allows.

To add or change the plan after the Constructive speech is forbidden.

If in any case, the Affirmative side did not propose any plans in the Affirmative Constructive speech, the judges will assume that the Affirmative side is supporting a vague standpoint with a minimum Plan action related to the tournament topic.

**\*** If you have a plan, please propose that at the beginning of the Affirmative Constructive speech. By clearly explaining the Plan, it will help the judges and the Negative team clearly understand the standpoints of the Affirmative team. This will make the Affirmative side easier to prove why the Advantages will be gained.

**2.1.1.2 Prohibition of presenting Plans that are irrelevant to the topic**

The Affirmative side is not allowed to propose Plans that are irrelevant to the tournament topic. Apparently irrelevant plans will be ignored by the judges, and so will be the Advantages that stem from them.

**\*** Each team must refer to the document that defines this year’s debate topic.

**2.1.1.3 Limits of the number of Advantages. Proving an Advantage**

The number of the Advantages that can be presented is, at the most two.

To prove that the Plan has a certain Advantage, the following three sub points should be provided objectively with evidence.

A) “Present situation”: Why the present situation, without the plan, is undesirable.

B) “Effect”: Why the Advantage will be gained by the effect of the plan.

C) “Importance”: How much value this Advantage will bring.

If two independent issues are within the seemingly one Advantage, the issues should be divided and treated individually as separate Advantages. Even if a team presents seemingly only two Advantages in their Constructive speech, but actually there are more than two implicit Advantages, the judges will ignore all except the two main Advantages mentioned in the Constructive speech.

**\*** This limit aims to help debaters omit trivial issues, and focus their debate on the most probable issues.

Alternative English expressions for the analysis of the A) “Present situation” are “inherency” or “necessity”. For B) “Effect”, expressions such as “solvency” or causal “process” are also used. For C) “Importance”, expressions such as “significance” or “impact” are also used. In any case, to prove all three sub points are strongly recommended.

**2.1.2. Negative Constructive Speech (3)**

In the Negative Constructive Speech**,** the Negative team’s main task is to clarify their basic standpoints on why the debate topic should be negated; clearly proving the Disadvantages of the Affirmative plan.

**2.1.2.1 Limits of the number of Disadvantages. Proving a Disadvantage**

The number of the Disadvantages that can be presented is, at the most two.

To prove that the Affirmative Plan has a certain Disadvantage, the following three sub points should be provided objectively with evidence.

A) “Present situation”: Why the present situation, without the plan, is desirable.

B) “Effect”: Why the Disadvantage will be caused by the effect of the plan.

C) “Importance”: How much (negative) value this Disadvantage has.

If two independent issues are within the seemingly one Disadvantage, the issues should be divided and treated individually as separate Disadvantages. Even if a team presents seemingly only two Disadvantages in their Constructive speech, but actually there are more than two implicit Disadvantages, the judges will ignore all except the two main Disadvantages mentioned in the Constructive speech.

**\*** This limit aims to help debaters omit trivial issues, and focus their debate on the most probable issues.

Alternative English expression for the analysis of the A) “Present situation” is “uniqueness”. For B) “Effect”, expressions such as “link” or causal “process” are also used. For “Importance”, expressions such as “significance” or “impact” are also used. In any case, to prove all three sub points are strongly recommended.

**2.1.2.2 Division of labor between the Negative Constructive and the Negative Attack speeches.**

In the Negative Constructive speech, the Negative side should spend their time proving the Disadvantages which will come from the Affirmative plan. Only if the Negative side has so much extra time in their Constructive speech, they may attack the defects of the Affirmative proofs of Advantages.

**\***Arguments such as, ‘The Plan will not meet the Advantage” or “The Plan is not necessary,” are basically issues that the Negative Attack speaker should raise. The Constructive Speech is the only chance the team can add a Disadvantage. Strategically it is better to present the Disadvantages properly, and leave the attacks to the Attack speaker.

**2.1.3 Negative Attack (5)**

The role of the Negative Attack speech is to attack the fallacies in the Affirmative team’s proofs of the Advantages. For example,

(1) Even without the plan, the claimed Advantage can be gained, so the Plan is *not necessary.* (Attack to the analysis of the *present situation*)

(2) The Advantage can not be expected to be caused by the Plan’s effect. The Plan will not *solve* the present problem. (“No effect”: attack to the *effect* of the plan)

(3) The Advantage doesn’t have any objective value. (“Not important”: Attack to the *importance*)

The Negative side is not allowed to introduce new Disadvantages in this speech. If a new Disadvantage (or Disadvantage disguised as attacks) was introduced in the Attack speech, Judges should ignore the newly added Disadvantage.

\*In some cases it is difficult to draw a clear line between “attacks” and “Disadvantages”. For example, arguments like “It costs a lot to carry out their plan” are in fact Disadvantages, so it shouldn’t be mentioned in the Attack speech. However, “The Plan cannot solve the problem effectively, because the Government is technically unable to spend the cost that much” may be a valid attack on the Advantage.

Arguments to counter a specific Affirmative Advantage mentioning “Things mentioned will rather be worse” (Some time called “Case Flip” arguments, or just “Flip” arguments) should be presented in the Constructive Speech. However, to attack and *turn* only the “importance” of the Affirmative Advantage by arguments showing that “the value mentioned is not good, rather it is bad” is a valid attack (called “Value Turn”).

**2.1.4 Affirmative Attack (7)**

The role of the Affirmative Attack speech is to attack the fallacies in the Negative team’s proofs of the Disadvantages. For example,

(1) Even without the plan, the situation similar to the Disadvantage will happen, so the Disadvantage is *not unique* to the plan*.* (Attack to the analysis of the *present situation*)

(2) The Disadvantage can not be expected to be caused by the Plan’s effect. (“No effect” or “No link”. Attack to the *effect* of the plan)

(3) The Disadvantage does not have any objective negative value. (“Not important”: Attack to the *importance*)

The Affirmative Attack speaker is *not allowed* *to refute the attacks of Negative Attack* speech. Such rebuttal should be done in the Defense speech. If such hasty rebuttals are apparently seen, Judges should ignore them. Only when the Negative Constructive speech contains attacks to the Affirmative Advantages, the Affirmative Attack speaker is allowed to refute to the attacks in the Constructive speech.

The Affirmative side is not allowed to introduce new Advantages in this speech. If a new Advantage (or Advantage disguised as attacks) was introduced in the Attack speech, Judges should ignore the newly added Advantage.

\*Arguments to counter a specific Negative Disadvantage mentioning “Things mentioned will rather be better” (Some time called “link turn” arguments) should have been presented in the Constructive Speech. However, to attack and turn only the “importance” of the Negative Disadvantage by arguments showing that “the value mentioned is not bad, rather it is good” is a valid attack (called “Value Turn”).

**2.1.5 Affirmative Defense (9)**

The role of the Affirmative Defense is to defend (counter-refute) against the Negative Attack’s refutations, and at the same time, re-prove (“reconstruct”) the Affirmative Advantages that they will surely be gained from the Plan proposed in the Constructive Speech.

The Defense speech should concentrate on being defensive: Basically the Defense should only nullify the Negative Attacks provided against the Advantages in the Affirmative Constructive speech. However, needless to say, if the opponent did *not* attack the Advantages, the Affirmative side may explain and emphasize their issues again.

In this speech, it is not allowed to add new Plans or arguments equivalent to new Advantages. Also, it is not allowed to add new attacks against the Negative Constructive speech. Such new Plans, Advantages, or attacks should be ignored by the judges as “New Arguments”.

Unless it is a new direct attack, the Defense speech can add some points concerning the comparison of already presented arguments.

\*For example, it is permitted to refute like “The importance of Advantages presented in the Constructive speech, outweighs that of the Disadvantages presented in the Negative Constructive speech”, because this is not itself an attack to the importance of Disadvantages. Moreover, such defense provides an effective comparison. This is, so to say, an indirect attack, and will contribute to the final Summary speech, hence rather recommended.

**2.1.6 Negative Defense (10)**

The role of the Negative Defense is to defend (counter-refute) against the Affirmative Attack’s refutations, and at the same time, re-prove (“reconstruct”) the Negative Disadvantages that were presented in the Constructive Speech, that they will surely be caused by the Affirmative Plan.

The Defense speech should concentrate on being defensive: Basically the Defense should only nullify the Affirmative Attacks provided against the Disadvantages in the Negative Constructive speech. However, needless to say, if the opponent did *not* attack the Disadvantages, the Negative side may explain and emphasize their issues again.

In this speech, it is not allowed to add arguments equivalent to new Disadvantages. Also, it is not allowed to add new attacks against the Negative Constructive speech. Moreover, it is *not allowed to re-counter-refute against the Affirmative Defense speech* which comes directly before this speech. Such new Disadvantages, attacks, or re-counter-refutations should be ignored by the judges as “New Arguments”.

Unless it is a new direct attack, the Defense speech can add some points concerning the comparison of already presented arguments.

\* Re-counter-refutations against the Affirmative Defense speech should be done in the Negative Summary speech if necessary.

It is permitted, for example, to refute like “The importance of Disadvantages presented in the Constructive speech, outweighs that of the Advantages presented in the Affirmative Constructive speech”, because this is not itself an attack to the importance of Advantages. Moreover, such defense provides an effective comparison. This is, so to say, an indirect attack, and will contribute to the final Summary speech, hence rather recommended.

**2.1.7 Affirmative Summary (11)**

The role of the Affirmative Summary is to show that the Affirmative issues outweigh those of the Negative, by summarizing the issues, with the refutations and re-refutations on them, considering both the 1) Negative Disadvantages and 2) Affirmative Advantages, and then 3) finally to compare both arguments in sum.

Here again, it is not allowed to add new Plans or equivalents of Advantages. Also, it is not allowed to add new attacks against the Negative Constructive speech. Such new Plans, Advantages, or attacks should be ignored by the judges as “New Arguments”.

However, it is permitted to show microscopic comparison of conflicting evidence (for example, re-counter-refutations against the Negative Defense), or macroscopic comparison concerning the whole debate.

\*For example, it is very crucial and strongly recommended to show some value criteria to resolve that the Advantages outweigh the Disadvantages.

It is not permitted to attack the Disadvantages that were not attacked in the Affirmative Attack. But macroscopic comparison is still allowed, such as “Even if we grant on their Disadvantage argument, it still would never outweigh our Advantages.”

**2.1.8 Negative Summary (12)**

The role of the Negative Summary is to show that the Negative issues outweigh those of the Affirmative, by summarizing the issues, with the refutations and re-refutations on them, considering both the 1) Affirmative Advantages and 2) Negative Disadvantages, and then 3) finally to compare both arguments in sum.

Here again, it is not allowed to add new equivalents of Disadvantages. Also, it is not allowed to add new attacks against the Affirmative Constructive speech. Such new Disadvantages or attacks should be ignored by the judges as “New Arguments”.

However, it is permitted to show microscopic comparison of conflicting evidence (for example, re-counter-refutations against the Affirmative Defense), or macroscopic comparison concerning the whole debate.

\*For example, it is very crucial and strongly recommended to show some value criteria to resolve that the Disadvantages outweigh the Advantages.

It is not permitted to attack the Advantages that were not attacked in the Negative Attack. But macroscopic comparison is still allowed, such as “Even if we grant on their Advantage argument, it still would never outweigh our Disadvantages.”

**2.1.9 Questions and Answers (2) (4) (6) (8)**

In the Questions and Answers sections, the questioner directly converse with the answerer. The questioner must ask questions on the opponent’s last speech, using interrogative sentences. The questions can either be 1) confirmations on ambiguous point, or 2) examinations of arguments or evidence. The answerer is expected to give speedy and precise answers. In the Questions and Answers section, the *questioner team* has the right to proceed. Which means, the questioner can move on to the next question if the answerer is taking too much time to answer, or the answers does not correspond to the question.

In the Q & A sessions (6) and (8) after the Attack speeches, basically the questions should be against the opponent’s Attack speech. However if, for example, some contradiction between the Attack and the Constructive speeches are found, questions regarding the Constructive speech are allowed.

\*In case the questioner has to interrupt the opponent’s answer and move on to the next question, it is required for the questioner to be polite and making proper excuses to the answerer.. For example, if the opponent is still answering, the questioner should say politely, “Thank you for your answer, but I must ask another question now.” Also, in case the answerer remains silent, the questioner should ask politely, “Excuse me, but I must move on to the next question”

**2.1.10 Speed and comprehensiveness of Speeches**

Debaters should make speeches that is easy to follow for the judges: they should speak loud enough, care for the intonations, slow down and pause adequately. Especially, debaters should speak in an easy to follow speed. The speech speed in average should not exceed 150 words per minute. Thus the Constructive speeches should be maximum 600 words long. Debaters should observe the judges’ gestures and facial expression to check whether the judges are following their speeches.

**2.1.11 Prohibition of Cell-phone etc. and PC usage**

Debaters should not use cell-phones, smartphones, tablets, PCs during the debate round.

\*Revised since 11th: The prohibition of communication devices has always been a de facto rule, but to prevent future trouble, the rule is clarified here. Debaters can use electronic dictionaries without communicational functions. But, debaters should not use smartphones for time keeping purposes.

## 2.2 Management of each Round

Each debater must follow the cues of the time keeper, and make their speech for certain duration designated in the table below. Each speech must be done by one debater alone, who takes the speech role. (In the table, A1 to A4 represent each debater of the Affirmative side, and N1 to N4, the Negative side.) Speech roles are different if a team has only three members, and not four.

If the wrong person starts speaking, questioning or answering, the main judge must ask the speaker to stop and the speech must start over with the correct speaker. If a mistake is found, for example, after the next speech, the mistake will be regarded a violation and the team will lose the round with no points gained.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AFF  3 debaters-  team | AFF  4 debaters-  team | Speech | NEG  3 debaters-  team | NEG  4 debaters-  team |
| A1 | A1 | (1)Affirmative Constructive Speech | - | - |
| A1 | A1 | (2)Questions from the Negative | N2 | N4 |
| - | - | (3)Negative Constructive Speech | N1 | N1 |
| A2 | A4 | (4)Questions from the Affirmative | N1 | N1 |
| - | - | (5)Negative Attack | N2 | N2 |
| A3 | A3 | (6)Questions from the Affirmative | N2 | N2 |
| A2 | A2 | (7)Affirmative Attack | - | - |
| A2 | A2 | (8)Questions from the Negative | N3 | N3 |
| A3 | A3 | (9)Affirmative Defense | - | - |
| - | - | (10)Negative Defense | N3 | N3 |
| A1 | A4 | (11)Affirmative Summary | - | - |
| - | - | (12)Negative Summary | N1 | N4 |

\*For example, if there are four members on the Affirmative team, the first person (A1) takes charge of (1) and (2). If the Negative team has three members, the first person (N2) asks the questions and takes charge of (5) and (6).

Not only the debaters themselves but also the judges and Time Keepers, all involved, should be careful not to let mistakes happen in terms of the speech order.

**2.2.1 Where to make a speech**

The Affirmative team shall be seated on the left hand side of the judges and the Negative team to the right. The speakers should be seated in the designated seats in the order of Constructive, Attack, Defense, and Summary speaker. Both Constructive speaker should be seated in the closest seat to the opponent team (Near the room center, facing the judge).　Each speaker should stand up there (close to his/her seat, not at the podium, etc.) when making a speech. The debater should stand during the entire speech, including the Questions & Answers section, unless there is inevitable reason not to. In some rooms, the debaters should follow special instructions from the Tournament organizers, especially in larger rooms for the semi-final and final rounds.

Debaters are allowed to walk a little closer to the judges and opponents, in order to make gestures or presentation more effectively, as long as it is not too much.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A4 | A3 | A2 | A1 |  | N1 | N2 | N3 | N4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | JUDGE | | |  |  |  |

\*If the room does not allow the debaters to sit as above, due to reasons such as the desks are fixed, and the room is small, the debaters may sit as shown below, not facing the judges. The debaters must stand up and face the judges during her/his speech.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A2 | A1 |  | N1 | N2 |
| A4 | A3 |  | N3 | N4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | JUDGE | | |  |

**2.2.2 Measurement of speech time**

Each speech time will start counting, after the correct speaker has stood up and declared her/his name.

The duration of each speech will be kept track of by each room’s official Time Keeper’s timer, not the timers of the debaters. Only when there is some apparent accident in time measurement, such as when the Time Keeper’s timer broke down or the Time Keeper mishandled the timer, the main judge may refer to the debater’s timer. If it is not possible to refer even to the debater’s timer, the main judge must take appropriate measures to keep fairness for both teams, such as prolonging the speech time.

**2.2.3 The termination of speeches**

Even if the speaker finishes their speech before the designated speech duration, the official timer does not stop until the designated time. A speech terminates when the designated duration ends.

The debaters are allowed to finish the last sentence they have started uttering before the end of the designated duration. However, in that case, they must finish the sentence within 10 seconds, and should not speak more than that. Anything uttered after the official speech termination should be ignored by the judges.

\*This is the same in the Questions & Answers, too. After the Time keeper announces the end of the Q & A, debaters should not answer the question, and move on to the next speech.

**2.2.4 Prohibition of changing the speaker during a speech**

Each speech must be finished by the designated debater alone, who has enrolled before the round starts. In each speech, the designated debater may not change to another teammate and may not jointly make a speech with others.

**2.2.5 Teammate’s advice during the speech**

During the speech, the debaters are allowed to give some advice to a teammate as long as it is written down on a memo or spoken by word of mouth in as small a voice as possible so the judges and opponents can’t hear what the advice is being said. Teams will lose ‘communication points’ when the advice was in a loud voice.

Team members participating in the particular round are allowed to give advice. This means substitute members are not allowed to communicate with the team during a round which she/he is not actually participating. If any person in the audience gives advice, memos or scripts, to a team during the round, the team will lose the round with no points gained, regardless of the content of the advice and the arguments presented so far.

**2.2.6 Preparation time**

The debaters are not allowed to start a speech during the preparation time. Speeches should start only when the Time keeper makes a starting cue. During the preparation time, not only the next speaking team, but the other team can also have a discussion with the members.

**2.2.7 Prohibition of making complaints or protesting after the round**

The debaters are never allowed to make a complaint or protest against the judge’s decision after the debate is over. The same applies to, for example, new arguments in the final speech. If debaters or coaches do protest excessively, the team may be penalized, possibly losing the qualification for the finals, the best debater’s award, or even banned from future tournaments. (Before any punishment, the Judging committee will inquire and let the member or coach make some explanation. Verdicts will be announced publicly.)

Debate teams are allowed to make a protest to the *Judging Committee* only when

(1) There is certain ground to believe that the opponent team has forged the eligibility of application.

(2) There is certain ground to believe that the opponent’s team used distorted evidence. (Refer to 3.)

(3) The judges managed the round in an extraordinarily unfair manner.

\*In a debate round, what matters more is not what the debaters insisted, but what the judge had heard. If a round is lost, it simply means there was something wrong in communication. (In such case, the debaters should think humbly about what was *their* fault in the miscommunication.)

Debaters should never complain to the Judging Committee just that they can’t stand their defeat.

**2.2.8 Round Observer**

The tournament observer may place an official round observer in each round. The round observer should check and give advices to the judges on the management of each round. However, the observer should not intervene or influence the judges’ decision.

# 3. EVIDENCE

In this tournament, each debater is required to show appropriate evidence clearly when arguing. The debaters should not discuss each other’s subjective opinions. Needless to say, in a debate round, any distortion or forgery of evidence is strictly prohibited.

## 3.1 The definition of Evidence

To make an argument based on objective grounds, quoting pieces of evidence is extremely effective. Thus, in this tournament, the debaters are required to use appropriate pieces of evidence, especially in the Constructive speech.

Of course, the winner of the debate is not directly decided by whether evidence is used or not. To prove an argument effectively, showing concrete examples without any quotations may sometimes be enough. Even if there were quotations, if only low quality evidence were quoted, it would not affect the round.

\*For example, articles in a tabloid weekly magazine, blogs or net articles that a layperson wrote, irresponsible criticism by some critic, and opinions of an expert outside her/his field of his interest, are just subjective (selfish) opinions. Thus, those subjective opinions will not count as objective evidence.

Internet resources, such as Wikipedia are not banned, however it will not necessarily counted as being persuasive.

**3.1.1 Varieties of Evidence**

As for quotation of evidence, quotations of (1) objective factual data, like statistics and legal statutes, should primarily be recommended. Besides that, (2) testimony or analysis by authorized experts, (3) newspaper articles or news from dependable press can be used.

\*Using TV broadcasts or direct Interviews should be avoided basically, as they can not be verified on paper.

**3.1.2 Prohibition of distorting Evidence**

The debaters are strictly prohibited in any way of forging evidence, or distorting evidence when you translate Japanese into English. If any such violation is found during or after the round, the team in question will lose the round without gaining any points whatsoever. Moreover, the team may be disqualified for the finals, the best debater’s award, or any team award in the tournament.

If such malignant act were believed to be systematically conducted by the school itself, the school will receive further severe punishments, such as banning from the future tournaments. (Before inflicting the punishments, the judging committee will inquire the team or its coaches. Punishments will be announced publicly to all the participants.)

Above all, when the debaters quote expert testimony, it is strictly prohibited to purposely distort the expert’s original intentions.

\*For example, when you quoted that “A is B” from an expert testimony, however, actually the original source said “There is some opinion that A is B, but it’s wrong”, then such partial quotation is a distortion of evidence. Such omission or summary is prohibited.

\*Forgery of evidence means to make up some quotations from nowhere, and quotes as if it really exists. Distortion of evidence is to partly omit or rephrase the expert’s original message to suit the debater’s purpose. Needless to say, both acts are strictly prohibited in debate activity.

**3.1.2.1 Translation of Evidence**

When quoting from Japanese sources, the debaters should translate it into English beforehand. In such case, it should be carefully translated so that the original message should not be changed. This applies even more when quoting from a Japanese source in a summarized manner. Greatest possible attention should be given not to distort the authors’ conclusions or facts. If distortion or exaggeration of the original intentions were done during the translation or summary, it would be regarded as unfair usage and treated as violation of the rules.

**3.1.3 Requirement concerning the citation of Evidence and recommendations for its preservation**

When a team quotes evidence or showed figures or charts, the team is required to record (for example as footnotes) the source of the quotes or data: (1) Title of the books or magazines, (2) the date of the publishing, and (3) the page quoted.

Each team is strongly suggested to bring photo-copies (or, if the evidence source is internet, the printout) of each quotation, so that you can show the evidence source when the opponents or judges ask the team to show it. If a team is not able to show the source when requested, forgetting to bring the source, the team has to apologize to the opponent and the judges on the spot.

If internet is used as the source of evidence, it is necessary to record the internet URL and the date of access, as the files are rapidly renewed. Also as much as possible, the team should bring the printouts, to be able to show the opponent the printouts, if requested.

\*The above regulation is extremely important not only to improve the media literacy for evidence, but also to prevent the mistreatment of evidence.

Using TV broadcasts or direct Interviews should be avoided basically, as they can not be verified on paper. If you want to quote from these sources, the recording dates and the exact transcription of the broadcast/recording should be made and be brought to the tournament.

## 3.2 The Quotations of Evidence in the Debate

When a team quotes pieces of evidence, in each case, it is necessary to clarify their evidence source and the evidence content should be conveyed in a easy to understand manner. The team is also required to let the opponents freely examine their evidence.

\*One of the aims of this tournament is for debaters to improve their media literacy, the abilities to objectively and critically analyze information from various sources. In order to acquire these media literacy abilities properly, the debaters are required to obey the minimum rules below.

**3.2.1 Quoting pieces of evidence**

When quoting pieces of evidence in a speech, debaters must orally cite one of the following information sets, according to the type of evidence.

1. *Facts / statistics:* The following two pieces of information are necessary.
   1. Source of the statistics and facts (the name of the “white papers”, the name of the bureau, homepages, legal statutes, etc. )
   2. Publication dates of statistics and facts.
2. *Testimony or analysis by experts:* The following two pieces of information are necessary.
   1. Name of the expert
   2. Titles or authority (Why she/he is credible enough to be treated as an expert. Ex. “professor of economy, specializing in the … field”)

(3) *Newspaper articles or news:* The following two pieces of information are necessary.

a) The name of the newspaper or news agency

b) Date of the article or news.

When quoting from sources, it need not be a direct quotation; each and every word need not be pronounced line by line. As long as the original data are not distorted, or the intentions of the evidence original source are precisely conveyed, it is allowed for the debaters to summarize the original source when quoting.

\*However, in most cases, line by line direct quotations will make the argument more convincing. Obviously, if an omission of a phrase will totally change the meaning of the evidence, such omission is not granted. It will be regarded as distortion of evidence, and will be subject to penalties.

**3.2.2 Presentation of the graphs and tables**

This tournament, in principle, requires the debaters to convey their arguments orally, explaining everything by word of mouth. However, supplementary usage of visual information, e.g. to show evidence in the form of easy to understand graphs or tables, is allowed. In such case, debaters must make the graphs and tables large enough for *all the judges, opponents, and the audience* to see.

In such case also, it is basically required to read out substantially all of what is shown in the graphs or tables. Showing videos or running audio tapes is not permitted.

\*Especially in a larger room, the debaters should be careful to make the audience understand just with words, without the help of graphs or tables, considering the case that the audience is not able to see them.

**3.2.3 Inspection of the evidence by the opponent (Examination)**

The opponent team is allowed to inspect each quotation and chart used during the round (including the original Japanese source, if it was translated) by borrowing them during the preparation time for scrutiny (examination of evidence).

However, this borrowing should be done as long as it does not obstruct the user’s speech preparation; if the speech will start soon, it is not an appropriate time to borrow. The evidence borrowed should be returned right after the preparation time or speech has finished, being considerate not to hinder the user’s speech.

\*One of the aims of debating is to nurture a critical attitude toward evidence. Thus, lending or borrowing evidence should mutually be promoted.

# 4. Judges and Judging

Judges should decide who the winner is, by rationally deciding whether the debate topic is finally affirmed or negated, comparing both teams’ arguments fairly and objectively.

Besides just deciding which team won, judges, especially the main judge, should take charge of the round procedures, if necessary, supervising the debate round.

## 4.1 Supervising the debate round speeches

Judges (especially the main judge) not only should take charge of the round procedures, but also should give some minimum instructions during round, for educational purposes, etc. Judges should even interrupt the speech and make necessary instructions in the following cases:

1. Obstructions concerning speech communication: Debaters’ speech is in too small voice, or in too much speed for high school students to understand, compared to normal average conversation speed.
2. Obstructions concerning the Questions & Answers section: Such cases as, debaters are just making long speeches instead of asking, or being too aggressive in their questioning. Furthermore, the answerer is apparently intentionally prolonging the answers, or not answering at all.
3. Obstructions concerning the room’s quietness: Such cases as; some students or audience are chattering or making noise (like pen clicks) during the speech; there is too much noise around the debate room
4. Emergency cases such as earthquakes, etc.

\* If debaters are making apparent mispronouncing basic terms, the judges should correct them gently during or between speeches.

During the Q & A, if the debaters are just making speeches instead of asking, judges should warn her/him by saying “You should ask questions” etc. If debaters are being too aggressive, judges should warn them, “Both of you, please calm down” etc.

**4.1.1 Time keeping exceptions in case of judge’s interruption during the speech**

When the above situation happens and the judge’s interruption takes place during the speeches, only in case (3) to cope with some noise occurring during the debate, the judge may order to stop counting the time accordingly, and may add some speech time for what she/he believes to be the fair compensation to the team that was being interrupted. (Otherwise, judges should not offer any speech time compensation if the interruption is due to the debaters’ own fault: For example, when a debater is warned that she/he is speaking too fast, or making irregular Q & As.)

**4.1.2 Restrictions of judge’s interventions**

Judges should avoid direct commenting or questioning to the argument contents during the speech. They should not make any refutations or questions on each issue, before the end of the whole round, including the preparation time.

Even if the judge thought the debaters’ arguments are incomprehensible or just ridiculous, don’t warn them on the spot and treat the arguments as being so weak (or in some cases ignorable) to be counted in making the round decision. The judges can and are encouraged to give the debaters some advice on such bad arguments *after* the round.

\*The basic rule is, judges should not intervene in the contents of the arguments. However, you don’t have to refrain from nodding when hearing good arguments, or laughing at good jokes. To nurture the students’ attentions toward the judge, judges should respond naturally.

**4.1.3 Judges’ Gestures when the speeches are not easy to follow**

Judges are allowed to make hand gestures to the debaters, when the debater’s speech is not easy to follow; when it is spoken too fast, not clearly pronounced. To achieve this, the following gesture is recommended as the common gesture: Raise one hand close to the shoulder, move the hand up and down with the fingers open, palm facing down. Whether and when this hand gesture should be used is left to the judge’s goodwill and discretion. It is not the duty for the judge to make hand gestures. Thus, even if no gestures were made by the judge, it should not be interpreted that the judge were having no problem following the debaters’ speeches.

## 4.2 Judging

Judges are expected to make a decision, judging rationally if the topic is affirmed or not, by fairly and objectively comparing the contents argued within the round, especially comparing the substantial *arguments*. In concrete, if you are more convinced by the debaters’ arguments that the policy that adopts the debate topic will give more Advantages than the Disadvantages, then you would vote for the Affirmative team. On the contrary, if you feel sure the Disadvantages outweigh Advantages then you would vote for the Negative team.

When the remaining Advantages and Disadvantages are close, Judges should not easily consider it as a “tie”, and should seek even for small differences and vote for one team. Only very exceptionally, when Judges can no other but consider that the Advantages and Disadvantages are perfectly equal, then the Judges should vote for the Negative team (on the majorly accepted policy debate decision rule presumption).

Each judge should consider their decision *individually* and vote for the team they believe is the winner.

\*A typical *bad* judgment is as follows, “I think the Negative Attack speech was excellent. I couldn’t find any big differences among the other speeches, so, the Negative wins,” Such decision is a very subjective judgment comparing just the *speeches*. (Even if part of a speech is excellent, if the final output of a team is not convincing, such decision doesn’t make any sense at all.)

**4.2.1 Limited number of Advantages and Disadvantages**

The debaters are allowed to present at the most two Advantages and two Disadvantages respectively in the Constructive speech. If more than two are mentioned during the whole round, judges are to disregard all but the two Advantages and the Disadvantages that they think the most important.

\*Please refer to 2.1 “Speeches.”

**4.2.2 Treating the “New Argument” which appears late in the game**

Judges should basically ignore and make little account of the “New Arguments” that appear for the first time in the latter half of the round, such as the Defense or Summary speeches, and should not include such arguments in his/her reason for decision. This should be done regardless of whether the opponent has refuted the argument or not.

Apparent “New Arguments” are new plans, new Advantages, new Disadvantages or their equivalents, which are first to appear in the Defense or Summary speeches. New attacks using evidence on the opponent’s Advantage or Disadvantage are also treated as “New Arguments”. Especially for instance, the judge should absolutely ignore “New Arguments” in the Summary speeches, which the opponents have unfairly limited opportunity to refute.

However, if for instance a new piece of evidence is presented to make deeper comparison and to resolve the previous arguments of both teams, such new evidence is for fair comparison of former arguments, and should not be ignored as a “New Argument”.

\*Please refer to 2.1 “Speeches.” To restrict “New Arguments” to be presented later in the debate, is not just for the spirit of “fair play” but also for educational purposes to promote effective clashes of arguments.

**4.2.3 Prohibition of changing the decision, dealing with the protests against the decision**

Each judge may never change her/his decision after submitting the ‘Judge Sheet’ to the Judging Committee. The decision of the judges for the game is final. Protesting against the decision is strictly disallowed at all times. If the team do protest excessively the team may be penalized, possibly losing the chance at qualifying for the finals, getting the best debater’s award, or attending future tournaments. (As for the punishment, after the committee inquires an explanation from the team members or coach the decision will be made public via the media.)

\*If a violation, such as distortion of evidence were found after the debate round, only the Judging Committee may possibly overrule the round result.

**4.2.4 Deciding the winner of the round**

In the finals, the team that the majority of judges voted for will win the round. Each final round basically should have odd number of judges, but if the number should become the even number under an inevitable situation, and if the remaining votes were tied, the team who received the vote of the main judge should be the winner. In the preliminary rounds, the “winner” of each round may not exist, if the two judges’ votes split.

## 4.3 Rating the Communication Points

Each judge is asked to rate each team communication points, ranging from 5 as the maximum and 1 as the minimum. (No fractions, only integers) Judges should scale how well the debate team (not each debater) successfully communicated with the judges, opponents, and the audience during the round. The following scale should be used when rating the points, except in case (4.3.1) you found some violations of the rules: (3 should be the average. 5 and 1 are exceptional rates.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5  excellent | All the teams’ points in their speeches were easy to understand. ( proper speed, and good pretense) All members were able to communicate with the audience. ( proper eye-contact, good manner) |
| 4  good | Most of the speeches are easy to understand. Most of the members were able to communication with the audience. |
| 3  average | Slightly difficult to understand, but speech was basically easy to follow. Over half of the members can have good communication skills without serious problems. |
| 2  below average | Often seemed difficult to understand and had little success at communicating during the debate. |
| 1  poor | Most of the speech is difficult to understand, most of the members do not have good communication skills. |

**4.3.1 Penalty subtraction of Communication Points**

The Judge can decrease the Communication Points for penalty under the following conditions. The amount of subtraction should be decided by the judge, depending on how bad the violations are:

1. The attitudes of team members are bad (Obstructing the speeches by chattering or making noise, not obeying the judges’ instructions, or suggesting to the partners too loudly during speeches, Bad manners against the opponent during the questions & answers session. etc.)
2. Not cooperative against the opponent’s request for evidence investigation

Even if the points are subtracted for penalty, 1 point is the minimum. The judge may not give zero point.

**Appendix**

Revised: Nov 28th, 2019

Major change for this year’s tournament is that be there will be 6 preliminary rounds, and the finals will start from the Semi-finals. Revisions were made accordingly to Articles. 1., 1.1，1.1.1，1.1.2，1.1.5，1.1.6，1.2，1.2.1，1.3.1

There is no other revision this year.

Note: Nov 28th, 2018

Added mention on the Excellent Speakers awards 1.3/1.3.1.

Added explanations on 2.2.1 Speakers seats.

There is no other revision this year.

Note: Nov 11th, 2017

There is no revision this year.

Revised on Nov 22th, 2016.

Article 1 (Tournament: Total team number), 1.3.1 Best debater prizes, 2.1.11 Prohibition of Cell-phone etc. and PC usage

Revised on Oct 11th, 2015.

Article 1 (Tournament: Total team number), 1.2.1 (Finals: Aff. Neg.) were revised. There are no substantial revision other than these, this year. Minor changes are made on wordings concerning 1.1.1 (Prelims) and 2.1.

Revised on Nov 23rd, 2014.

Article 2.1 (speech time) was revised. 2.1.10 (Speed), 4.1.3 (judge’s gesture) were added.

Note: Nov 26th, 2013

There is no revision this year.

Revised on Dec 4th, 2012.

Article 4.2.4 contained unnecessary notions on the winner.

Revised on Nov 22nd, 2012.

Articles in section 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 were modified as the preliminary rounds will have two judges. Article 1.4.4 was modified to clarify the responsibility of the team. Other articles are not substantially changed other than some minor wording changes.

Revised on Nov 15th, 2011.

Articles in section 1.1 and 1.2 were modified to correspond to the increase of finalist teams. Article 1.4.1 was modified for the change of entry requirement. Article 2.1 Speech times (summaries) are changed. Other articles are not substantially changed other than some minor wording changes.

Revised on Nov 11th, 2010.

Articles in section 1.1 and 1.2 were modified to correspond to the increase of preliminary rounds in the 5th tournaments. Article 1.4.1 was modified for the change of entry requirement. Article 2.2.8 was added. Other articles are not substantially changed other than some minor wording changes.

Revised on Nov 16th, 2009.

Articles 1.1.6, 1.4, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2 were modified to correspond to the 4th tournaments entry requirement.

Revised on Dec 2nd, 2008.

There is no substantial modification from the rules of the 2nd All Japan Tournament, enacted on Dec 8th, 2007; other than the correction of English phrases, the articles 1.1.2 on the criteria for deciding the finalists, and 1.4 entry requirements.

Revised on Dec 8th, 2007.

There is no substantial modification from the rules of the 1st All Japan Tournament, enacted on Nov 30th, 2006.

To make it easier to understand, article 1.4 has been added and chapter 4 was given an independently heading.