

## Evidence Violation Procedures

Evidence read in a round must be available to the opposing team and judge to verify its content, accuracy, etc. Debaters must, at a minimum, read the author and date when introducing evidence but must have a complete citation available upon request. From time to time, debaters might make an allegation of a violation of the WDCA evidence guidelines. This guide's purpose is to help the judge navigate those allegations in accordance with the WDCA Standing Rules. Judges, coaches, and debaters are encouraged to read the entire rule at WDCA.org.

The team making the allegation needs to identify which type of violation they are alleging (distortion, non-existent evidence, clipping, straw argument). Judges are permitted to list the types of allegations.

- a. Distortion occurs when the evidence contains added and/or deleted words that substantially alter the original conclusions of the author(s).
- b. Non-existent evidence is one or more of the following:
  - i. The debater citing the evidence is unable to produce it when requested by the opposing team, judge, or tournament official.
  - ii. The source provided does not contain the evidence cited.
  - iii. The evidence is referenced parenthetically but lacks an original source to verify the information. This happens frequently in LD and PF where a debater paraphrases evidence without reading a direct quote.
  - iv. The debater has the original source but refuses to provide it to their opponent, the judge, or a tournament official, in a timely fashion.
  - v. The debater fails to present a full citation when requested.
- c. Clipping. When a debater claims to have read more of a piece of evidence than was actually read in the round.
- d. Straw Argument. Intentionally reading evidence that argues a position that the primary author(s) presents for the purpose of refuting it, while, in fact, advocating for a different position.

Here are the procedures to follow: (A flow chart to help is on the back)

When a team makes an allegation, stop and ask them if they are making a formal allegation (Yes, you get to talk to the team). If they say they are, stop the round. There won't be any more speeches. Listen to the allegation and be certain you know which piece of evidence is in question and what kind of allegation is being alleged. If they aren't, evaluate their assessment of the evidence the same way you evaluate any other argument in the round.

Evaluate the allegation. It's your job to either uphold the allegation or not. If you uphold the allegation, the accusing team wins the round. If you do not uphold the allegation the accused team wins the round. Tell the debaters your decision and come to the tabroom and tell them about the allegation and your decision. If you are balloting online, don't complete your ballot. The tab staff will do that. You and/or the debaters are allowed to go online to check an online source, e.g. a web page.

