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**Foley Committee Chair, Mr. Tyler Ormsby**: tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com

# **Contact Person: David Smith**

Dear Fellow Educator

We take great pleasure in inviting your school to the annual ***Thomas S. Foley Memorial Forensics Tournament,*** which we will be hosting during the weekend of **January, 31 through February 2, 2019**, at **University High School in Spokane**, Washington. As the name suggests, this tournament is held in recognition and in honor of Tom Foley's many years of service to Washington and the United States as a representative from the 5th District, as Speaker of The House of Representatives, and as Ambassador to Japan. **The tournament features a student congress with four levels of competition, international diplomacy, five traditional debate activities, eighteen IE/speech events in two patterns and SPAR or Duet Acting as “extra bonus” events on Thursday evening. We are a TOC Bid Tournament in Congress and a NITOC bid tournament in individual events**. It is our sincere hope you and your students will have an enjoyable weekend of competition.

A complimentary **Judges’ Appreciation Breakfast** will be hosted **Saturday morning**. The tournament will conclude with the ***Closing Awards Ceremony on Saturday evening***. The presentation of the ***Thomas S. Foley Speaker's Award***to the best individual speaker in the tournament, the ***Thomas S. Foley Ambassador’s Award for Outstanding Forensics Education****, and the* ***Anita Sue Spirit of Debate Award.* [Please see criteria below.]**

**Registration** (<https://www.tabroom.com/> )

**A Flat Rate per Student**

 All programs are experiencing financial hardship. Since *Foley* is a non-profit tournament, we can afford to provide the low price of ***$30.00 per competitior.***, Each student may enter congressional debate or International Diplomacy; **AND** one of five traditional debate events; **AND** up to four IE/speech events, **AND** SPAR or Duet Acting as a bonus event. Furthermore, coaches do not need to pay for, or enter, multiple squads.

We would **appreciate early registration** to ensure space and coordinate contest officiating. Although our goal is to avoid limiting entries, we reserve the right to do so and/or to collapse divisions if necessary for the efficient management of the tournament.

**Registration Deadline: TUESDAY January 30, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. Changes in school registrations: Adds will not be accepted after this date**. **No additions will be allowed after this time. Drops after this time will not affect fee calculations.**

**Please register online** at [https://www.tabroom.com](https://www.tabroom.com/index/index.mhtml)

Fees will be assessed as of **5:15 p.m. on Tuesday, January 29, 2019. After 5:15 PM** on **Wednesday,** all drops or other concerns must be emailed to the tournament director at dsmithy@cvsd.org.

**Please notify us of any last minute “emergency” drops as soon as possible, preferably prior to your arrival at the tournament. Drops are the main reason tournaments get off to a slow start.**

**IMPORTANT: Students wishing to be considered for the *Thomas S. Foley Speakers Award* must be registered as such on the registration website.**

**Sweepstakes**

**Two Levels of Sweepstakes** We will be providing 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place sweepstakes awards in two divisions (Small Squad and Large Squad).

Sweepstakes Calculations Policy—1st-30; 2nd-20; 3rd-15; Qtrs.-10

 LD—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5

 Public Forum—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5

Parli—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5

Big Question—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5

 Congressional Debate—1st-12; 2nd-8; 3rd-5; Finalist-1; Outstanding PO-5

International Diplomacy—1st-12; 2nd-8; 3rd-5; Finalist-1

 IE’s—1st-10; 2nd-7; 3rd-5; Finalist-3

Elimination of Squad Limits We have eliminated all maximum team and squad limits. **Each competitor on a team may enter as many events as s/he wishes to enter, up to the per competitor limits.** Each competitor may enter:

1. Either Congressional Debate or International Diplomacy **AND**
2. One Non-Congressional Debate [Policy, LD, Public Forum, Parli, or Big Questions] **AND**
3. **Two** Pattern “A” events **and Two** Pattern “B” events **AND**
4. Either SPAR or Duet Acting as an extra bonus event [**Note:** Neither SPAR nor Duet Acting count toward either the Foley Speakers Award or Sweepstakes Awards.

### General Tournament Rules

1. NO STUDENT IS TO ENTER A CLASSROOM FOR ANY REASON WITHOUT A JUDGE PRESENT! Judges will be notified that students who violate this rule will be disqualified. **Please warn your students about this rule.**
2. In order to stay on schedule, judges will be instructed to call the round in the event a competitor fails to show up. Competitors more than **15 minutes late to their debate rounds will forfeit to their opponents**. **Double entered IE competitors should let the judge in the “other” event know they are double entered.**
3. Judges are the heart of any successful tournament. We will require a complete judging list from each school by the Registration Deadline, Tuesday, January 29, 2019. Please email any judge substitutions ASAP. It is imperative that every school meets its judging commitment. That means judges must be present and pick up ballots. Any school which fails to meet its judging obligation, may be charged $25.00 per missed round unless exceptional circumstances warrant excusal. **Note:** Teams which have to travel long distances or which are experiencing difficulties obtaining the necessary judges should contact the tournament director with respect to the judging requirement. We will have tournament judges available and will work with any team to assure that all students can enjoy the tournament.

# ***Special Awards***

***Thomas S. Foley Speaker’s Award*:** Presented to the best individual speaker in the tournament on the basis of the student’s overall performance in all of his/her events. To be eligible for consideration for this award, **a competitor’s coach must register** the student as competing for the award on the registration website (so that we may “track” the applicable student), and the competitor must meet the following criteria:

1. The competitor must compete at the open/varsity or champ level of all events;
2. The competitor must compete in Student Congress or International Diplomacy;
3. The competitor must compete in another form of debate in addition to Student Congress/Legislative Debate or International Diplomacy (**Note:** *SPAR does not fulfill this requirement*); and
4. The competitor must compete in at least one individual event in both Pattern A and Pattern B.

**Note:** Out-rounds do not count toward the Speaker’s Award. Neither SPAR nor Duet Acting count toward the speaker’s award.

***Thomas S. Foley Ambassador’s Award for Outstanding Contributions to Forensics Education*:** Throughout his many years of service, Tom Foley was a steadfast supporter of education. It is, therefore, only fitting that this award be presented in his name to an adult who has made outstanding contributions to the field of forensics education. Please nominate a person who you believe is deserving of this award. Nominations should be submitted in writing and explain why your nominee should be selected to receive this honor. All submissions will be judged by an independent panel of community leaders. ***Note:*** *This trophy may only be awarded to a person once in a lifetime. Previous nominees who have not received the award are eligible to be re-nominated. Nominations may be made by any appropriate person including teachers, administrators, coaches, parents, students, former students etc.*

**Please email your nominations to Mr. Tyler Ormsby, Foley Forensics Tournament Committee Chair, at** **tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com** **Nominations must be received by the regular registration deadline.**

***The Anita Sue Spirit of Debate Award:***

Anita was a student who loved her debate team and her interschool debate community. Although she did not always win, she was always steadfast about attending practice and doing her best at tournaments. Perhaps most importantly, she was known as a “good sport” Anita would happily walk out of a round with her former competitors/new friends irrespective of whether she had won or lost the round. Anita was instrumental in helping to encourage and train new novice debaters and for adding fun and smiles to any debate outing. **We are asking coaches to nominate seniors for this award.**

**Please email a letter nomination to the Foley Forensics Tournament Committee Chair, Mr. Tyler Ormsby at** **tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com**The letter should include why your nominee reflects the positive spirit of debate. His or her debate and speech win loss record is not necessary. This award is to be presented to the person who best represents the comradery, sportsmanship, and pure joy of forensic competition irrespective of one’s win/loss record.

**Nominations must be received by the registration deadline.**

# ***Events***

# **Tournament of Champions (TOC) BID Tournament: The Foley Committee is pleased to announce that The Thomas S. Foley Memorial Tournament has been selected as a Congressional Debate TOP SIX bid tournament. Students interested in seeking a TOC bid in congress must enter the championship division (see below).**

**Student Congress:** We will host four levels of congress, novice, junior varsity, open, and champ. Awards will be presented to the top five speakers in each level. All Super Congress Finalists in the Champ Division will be recognized and receive an award. To be eligible for the *Foley Speaker’s Award*, a student must be entered in either the open or the champ division. The number of chambers will depend on the number of students entered in the tournament.

Students will deliberate the merits of bills and resolutions using Robert's Rules of Order. The State of Washington follows the so-called “Kansas rule.” As such, bills have been submitted to the appropriate WSFA committee for approval. Only approved bills may be considered in any division. Copies of these bills are on Tabroom.com. NFL, WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of the Washington State approved legislation, applicable WSFA, NFL, and GSL rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. ***Note: Student congress does not conflict with any other event except International Diplomacy.***

**Super Congress Reserved Legislation:** Pursuant to WSFA guidelines, only accepted Super Congress legislation may be used at any level of Super Congress. WSFA Reserved Super Congress Legislation is included in the WSFA Spring Legislation packet on the website.

**Congress Divisions:**

**Champ: Limited to Competitors who meet one of the following:**

**(1)** Any student desirous of winning one of the six Tournament of Championship **(TOC) bids** available at this tournament **MUST** enter the championship division and is automatically qualified for this division;

**(2)** Any student who has qualified for/and or attended the NFL, CNFL, or TOC, National Competition in Student Congress/Legislative Debate should enter this division; **OR**

**(3)** Any student who has qualified for/and or attended the competitor’s applicable State Student Congress/Legislative Debate Tournament should enter this division;

 **(4)** Any student who has broken to super congress or placed in the top third of a student congress tournament which does not hold a super congress at least three times in the last two years at the open or varsity level may enter this division (**NOTE**: At least one such super congress/top third standing must have occurred within the current debate season).

**Open:**  This division is open to all competitors regardless of experience, except for students seeking a TOC bid, who must enter the champ division.

**JV:** This division is open to

1. Any student who has limited student congress experience (individual coach’s preference) may enter this division.
2. First year students who have broken to super congress at two or more tournaments or who have placed in the top third at two or more tournaments which have not held a super congress **MUST enter JV or Open Congressional Debate**.

**Novice:** This division is limited to first year novice student congress competitors **who have not broken to super congress in two or more tournaments** (**or twice placed in the top third of tournaments which do not offer super congress).**

**Policy Debate:** We will provide ***junior varsity and open divisions*** in policy/CX debate. Three and four person teams are allowed. However, only two students may compete at any one time. We will use the **2018/2019 National Forensics League policy topic.** WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request.

**Lincoln Douglas Debate:** We will provide ***novice, junior varsity, and open*** divisions in LincolnDouglas debate. We will be using the **2019 January/February *National Forensics League* topic**. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded upon request.

**Public Forum:** We will provide ***novice and open divisions*** in Public Forum Debate. Three and four person teams are allowed. However, only two students may compete at any one time. NFL rules will apply (which are available online at <http://www.nflonline.org>). The **2019 February** ***National Forensics League* topic** will be used, which will be available on the NFL website.

**Parliamentary (Parli) Debate:** We will provide an ***open division only*** in Parli Debate. Three and four person teams are allowed. However, only two students may compete at any one time. The Open division is available to all teams.

**NOTE WELL: This year, we have adopted the NPDA rules for parliamentary debate with the following exception. Students are not allowed to bring a copy of the NPDA “Rules of Debating and Judging” with them into their rounds and the provisions for appealing a judge’s decision have been eliminated. High school tournaments are not set up to facilitate such appeals.**

**Parli Debate Rules at Foley**

We will follow NPDA Rules with an adjustment to Speech times in order to double flight the round and the removal of point of orders (POIs).

**Foley Parli Format of the debate**

**Pre-Round Prep Time: 15 minutes**

**First Proposition Constructive Speaker:  5 minutes**

**First Opposition Constructive Speaker: 6 minutes**

**Second Proposition Constructive Speaker: 6 minutes**

**Second Opposition Constructive Speaker: 6 minutes**

**Opposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 3 minutes**

**Proposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 4 minutes**

There is no cross-ex/crossfire period in Parli but Points of Information can be asked during the constructive speeches. A POI is when the opposite team raises their hand or stands. The Speaker will then recognize them for a question. **The first and last minute of constructive are protected time in which no question may be asked. The judge will knock on the table to indicate when a minute has passed and when there is one left.**  A speaker should take between 1-3 questions during a constructive speech. **We will not be utilizing Points of Order which are traditionally used during the rebuttals.**

**Topic Announcement** for Parli will take place in a centralized location where it will be verbally announced and posted.

Prep time will start immediately after the topic is announced/posted. Students will have a two minute grace period to be in the room ready to debate after the prep time is announced. Being late for the round = an automatic drop.

Group prep is allowed as in consulting outside information. This means students may use any files, news sources, coaches etc that they have access to.  Any files, documents, websites, etc. which may have been consulted before the debate, cannot be brought into the debating chambers for use during the debate. The debaters may bring in the handwritten notes they have prepared during preparation time.

**Resolutions will be a mix of policy, value and metaphors.**

Examples: The United States should raise the federal minimum wage.  In politics, pragmatism should be favored over idealism. This House would share the sandbox.

**Schedule for topic announcement (if everything is running on time)**

**Round 1**

**A:  Topic Announce @ 3:15, Round Starts @ 3:30**

**B: Topic Announce @ 3:55 , Round Starts @ 4:10**

**Round 2**

**A: Topic Announce @ 5:00, Round Starts @ 5:15**

**B: Topic Announce @ 5:40, Round Starts @ 5:55**

**Round 3**

**A: Topic Announce @ 3:30, Round Starts @ 3:45**

**B: Topic Announce @4:10 , Round Starts @ 4:35**

**Round 4**

**A: Topic Announce @ 8:30, Round Starts @ 8:45**

**B: Topic Announce @ 9:10, Round Starts @ 9:25**

**Round 5**

**A: Topic Announce @ 7:30, Round Starts @ 7:45**

**B: Topic Annnounce @ 7:50, Round Starts @ 8:05**

**Laptops** MAY NOT be usedduring parli debates unless a specific competitor has an ADA reason to do so and has so notified the tournament director. Laptops may be used to help research during the before round prep, but for fairness for all competitors, laptops **may not be used** during the round. **Handwritten notes, prepared during the prep time, may be taken into the round.**"

**Big Questions Debate:** We will provide an ***Open* division only of Big Questions Debate.**

**The rules for the event are as follows:**

**Structure of the Debate**

Each debater will make an opening presentation, laying out the arguments and reasons to prefer their side of the resolution. These are called the Constructive speeches, and they are five minutes long. The Affirmative side will always speak first. Following these speeches, there is a three-­minute question segment. During the questioning segment, the Affirmative side will ask the first question. Following the first question, the questioning period is a free-­flowing question and answer period where both speakers may ask each other questions.

***Affirmative Constructive – 5 minutes***

***Negative Constructive – 5 minutes***

***Question Segment – 3 minutes***

Following the Constructive speeches and the first question segment, each debater will deliver a speech addressing the key claims and contentions of their opponents. This speech will address where there are weaknesses or opposing evidence, identify main areas of clash and how arguments interact with one another, rebuild their own contentions, and offer additional evidence for their position. These speeches are known as the Rebuttal speeches, though their content may not be entirely made up of rebuttal. The Rebuttal speeches are four minutes long and followed by a second question segment, which is identical in form to the first.

***Affirmative Rebuttal – 4 minutes***

***Negative Rebuttal – 4 minutes***

***Question Segment – 3 minutes***

The Rebuttals and question segment is followed by the Consolidation speeches. These speeches are three minutes long and serve to reduce the debate to its core elements. Debaters will focus on identifying the areas they are garnering the best advantage and strengthening the analysis and argumentation in those areas; the form will not resemble a strict “line-­by-­line” treatment of the debate. Additional evidence or analysis on existing points of contention will be given, but new arguments are discouraged.

***Affirmative Consolidation – 3 minutes***

***Negative Consolidation – 3 minutes***

Debaters will give a Rationale speech – a three-­minute summation of the central argument(s) that prove their side and the reasons they have proven them in this debate. No new arguments are offered in the Rationale speech;; the speeches focus entirely on the activity that has taken place earlier in the debate.

***Affirmative Rationale – 3 minutes***

***Negative Rationale – 3 minutes***

Both teams will receive a three minute period of prep time to be used at any time (excepting in the middle of a speech which has begun) to prepare their speeches.

***Prep Time – 3 minutes / side***

**The Negative and the Inverse Resolution**

Big Questions is designed to pit opposing worldviews against each other in an effort to lead students to explore levels of argumentation that are rarely reached in other debate formats. For that reason, the Negative is expected to present arguments that the resolution is actively false. Negative speaker(s) should view themselves as the Affirmative on the inverse resolution – *exemplum gratia*, the Negative on “Resolved: Socrates is a man” should view themselves as the affirmative on “Resolved: Socrates is not a man.” Any *prima facie* burdens on the Affirmative debater(s) apply equally to the Negative debater(s). Negatives must do more than refute the Affirmative case.

**We will be using the The 2018-2019 topic:**

**Resolved: Humans are primarily driven by self-interest.**

Note: For more information on Big Questions Debate, please see: <https://www.speechanddebate.org/big-questions/>

**National Individual Events (NITOC) BID Tournament**

We are pleased to announce that this year’s ***Thomas S. Foley Memorial Forensics Tournament*** is a **bid tournament for the 2019 National Individual Events Tournament of Champions**. The NIETOC National Tournament 2019 will be held at Millard North HS, Omaha Nebraska, May 10-12, 2019! If you have any questions about the qualification process or the tournament, please go to http://nietoc.com/ for more information.

**Bids may be earned in the open divisions of Dramatic Interpretation, Humorous Interpretation, Duo Interpretation, Original Oratory, and in our bonus event, Duet Acting.** The number of bids we may award in each event will be based on the number of participants in each event. Those students who secure a bid will be honored on stage during the awards ceremony.

**Individual Events Pattern A *This pattern contains the standard Pattern A events (Expository, Dramatic Interpretation, Extemp and Dual Interpretation), along with, After Dinner speaking, John Clark Legal Argument, Tall Tales, Radio Speaking, and Editorial Commentary. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.***

**Expository Speech**: The student shall deliver a speech, the purpose of which is to describe, clarify, explain and/or define an idea, concept or process. Audio or visual aids may be used, but are optional. The tournament will not provide special facilities or aids for the students. Notes are permitted. A maximum of 150 words may be quoted. The time limit for this event is 8 minutes with a 30 second grace period. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Dramatic Interpretation:** The speaker shall interpret one or more selections, serious in nature, from published prose, poetry, drama, radio, television, or recordings. The presentation must be memorized. Students may not use props, makeup, or costumes. Physical movement is permitted insofar as it suggests characterization and limited singing is permissible. Title and authors must be presented. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.) [NITOC BID at Open Level]**

**Extemporaneous Speech:** Competitors are given 30 minutes to prepare a 7 minute speech with a 30 second grace period. Topic areas are selected from current events. Students may use published books, magazines, newspapers, journals, and/or copies of articles to help them prepare their speeches. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Dual Interpretation:** Two students shall interpret one or more selections, serious or comedic in nature, from published prose, poetry, drama**,** radio, television or recordings. Presentations must be memorized and students must maintain off stage focus. Students may not use props, makeup, or costumes. Physical movement is permitted insofar as it suggests characterization and limited singing is permissible. Title and authors must be presented. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.) [NITOC BID at Open Level]**

**After Dinner Speaking**

Time: 4 - 6 minutes Time signals: not provided.

This event should imitate a banquet situation. The group (real or fictional) being addressed should be clear. The intent of ADS is to entertain, but the speaker must also develop an idea. Material presented must be original. Delivery may be through memorization or use of notes on one side of a 4 x 6 card, but a text may not be used. Emphasis should be placed on the concept of “speech.” While humorous quips and jokes are appropriate, they must have purpose and fit the occasion. **(Open division only.)**

**John Clark Legal Argument:** Although the event is called “legal argument,” ***it encompasses both opening statements,*** which are expository in nature, ***and closing arguments***, which are akin to persuasive oratories. The purpose of an opening statement is to preview what the evidence will show in a manner supportive of the proponent’s position – but in a non-argumentative fashion. This is usually done in a story fashion with introductory phrases such as “the evidence will show.” Closing argument “marshals the evidence” and argues it in a manner consistent with the proponent’s position. ***Visual aides may be used in both opening statements and closing arguments***. Competitors may choose to deliver either an opening statement or a closing argument for either the prosecution or the defense. Speeches must be based on the facts stated in the hypothetical fact pattern. Washington State law applies and students are encouraged to research applicable legal issues. The hypothetical fact pattern is attached to this invitation along with copies of the applicable criminal statutes. (See Appendix) The time limit for this event is 8 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Judges will be given access to the hypothetical fact pattern. To the extent possible, the event will be judged by attorneys. Further information may be found on the website. **(Open division only.)**

**Tall Tales:** This event should be fun. The competitors and audience should enjoy themselves. The competitor who can tell the tallest tale utilizing all three given words, should win the round. Each speaker will be given three words to incorporate into his/her speech. The competitor will then have six (6) minutes to prepare and speak. If the speaker goes over a 30 second grace period, that contestant may not be awarded first place in the round. No minimum time limit. If a speaker does not incorporate all three words in his/her speech, the speaker will be ranked fifth.  **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Radio Speaking:** Time: 5:30-6:00 Time signals: not provided A radio speech is a prepared event that includes news stories, an original commercial of no fewer than 30 seconds, and a commentary about a subject covered in the news stories. The news stories presented must have taken place 30 days or less, prior to the tournament date. The commentary, which shall be an original editorial, reflecting the opinion of the contestant, should consume 1- 2 minutes of the total speech and be presented last. A hard copy of the original news story, including source citations must be available upon request. Speakers may time themselves, but may not have another person assist with timing. **(Open division only.)**

**Editorial Commentary:** A scripted speech, which offers an analysis of, and commentary on, a contemporary news event. Speakers must read from manuscript and deliver from a sitting position. The time limit for this event is between 1:45 and 2:00 minutes. Students going under or over the time limit will be ranked one position lower than they would have been ranked had they been on time. **(Open and Novice divisions.)**

**Individual Events Pattern B *This pattern contains the standard WSFA pattern***

***B events (Oratory, Humorous Interpretation, Impromptu and Program Oral Interpretation), Prepared Storytelling, Political Impromptu, Oratorical Analysis, Dual Improvisation, Original Performance, and Sales Speaking. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.***

**Original Oratory:** The speaker shall deliver from memory a persuasive speech, the purpose of most oratories is to convince, stimulate, or move the audience to change beliefs or actions. However, the speaker may simply alert the audience to a danger, strengthen its devotion to an accepted cause or eulogize a person. The speech must not contain more than I50 words of quoted and/or paraphrased material. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.) [NITOC BID at Open Level]**

**Humorous Interpretation:** This event is the same as Dramatic Interpretation except that comedic materials should be used. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.) [NITOC BID at Open Level]**

**Impromptu:** The speaker will be given a choice of three topics in each round and will pick one on which to speak. The time limit for this event, including preparation and presentation, shall not exceed 6 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Time signals must be given. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Program Oral Interpretation:** The purpose of POI is a program of oral interpretation of thematically-linked selections chosen from two or three genres: prose, poetry, drama (plays). At least two pieces of literature that represent at least two separate genres must be used. Unlike the other interpretation events, Program Oral Interpretation may use multiple sources for the program. The title and author of all selections must be verbally identified in either the introduction and/or transitional phrases. Competitors are encouraged to devote approximately equal times to each of the genres used in the program. This distinction pertains to these two or three genres as a whole, not types of literature within a genre (such as fiction/nonfiction). Prose expresses thought through language recorded in sentences and paragraphs: fiction (short stories, novels) and non-fiction (articles, essays, journals, biographies). Poetry is writing which expresses ideas, experience, or emotion through the creative arrangement of words according to their sound, their rhythm, their meaning. Poetry may rely on verse and stanza form.

1. The use of a manuscript during the performance is required. Common practices include the use of a binder or folder. Reading from a book or magazine is not permitted. The intact manuscript may be used by the contestant as a prop, so long as it remains in the contestant's control at all times. No costumes or props other than the manuscript are permitted. Pictures, graphics, and/or illustrations are considered a visual aid, even if included in the original manuscript, and may not be displayed. The contestant must address the script; however, introduction and transitional material may be memorized.
2. The time limit is 10 minutes with a 30-second “grace period.” If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge’s discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.
3. All literature performed must meet the publication rules of the Association. All online material must first be vetted and approved through the NSDA national office. Approved material and/or sites will be listed on the NSDA website. Song lyrics may be used if the performer has an original, hard copy of the lyrics such as sheet music or a CD jacket. Lyrics may only be used from online sources that appear on the approved websites list.
4. Adaptations may be used only for the purpose of transition. Any word changes (to eliminate profane language) and/or additions (for transition) must be indicated clearly in ink. Failure to clearly indicate the addition of words will be subject to disqualification. Changes to the script may only be used for the purpose of transition or to eliminate profane language. Transitions may be used to clarify the logical sequence of ideas. They are not to be used for the purpose of embellishing the humorous or dramatic effect of the literature.

WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Prepared Story Telling**: A single story, anecdote, myth, legend, or incident will be retold without script, books, or props. The time limit for this event is 6 minutes. If a speaker goes over a 30 second grace period, he/she may not be awarded 1st place. There is no minimum time limit. The story may be delivered standing up or sitting down. Gestures or pantomime may be used but the focus must be on the narrative. The retelling must be true to the original tale. The contestant may not add original material or change the content of the story. The contestant is allowed one note card. (**Open division only.)**

**Political Impromptu:** This event is modeled after real political debate/press conferences. In the words of the event’s creator, Mr. Sam Normington, “*Candidates in a political election, have a general idea on what they will be speaking about, and have time to prepare evidence and notes for the topics that may come up, but they don't know what will actually be asked.*” As in impromptu and extemp, in this event, each speaker will be given three possible topics. The topics will be given to the speaker in the preparation room. Students may prepare on the topics using the same types of materials as are allowed in extemp and may prepare one note card on each topic. Unlike traditional impromptu or extemp, the speaker will not know which topic will be used until s/he is called to speak. At that time, the judge will select one of the three topics and the competitor must speak on that topic. Thus, the competitor must be prepared to speak on any of the three topics. After the judge has selected the topic, the competitor will have one minute to review his/her notes. Topic areas are selected from current events and will involve political issues. The competitor may use his/her note card during the speech. The time limit for the speech is 7 minutes, including the one minute of preparation time. Time signals must be given. **(Open division only.)**

**Oratorical Analysis**

Time: 10 min. maximum Time signals: not provided. The contestant will present a non-original speech, portions thereof, or cuttings of various speeches by one “real life” speaker. The intent of this event should be the analysis (not interpretation) of the oratory or speech. The speech should not be from fiction, but from an actual address by a person of significance either past or present. The contestant will analyze the oratory selection(s) for approximately 50% of the presentation. The speech may be presented from memory or by use of a text. **(Open division only.)**

**Dual Improvisation:** Two students will be given a choice of three topics and then act out or pantomime an improvisational story which must adhere to the chosen topic. The time limit for this event, including preparation and delivery, shall be limited to 5 minutes. **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Original Performance:** Competitors in this event are to present material of their own creation. Poetry, prose, drama, humor, mystery, spoken word, or any other form of literature is acceptable so long as it is original work and is appropriate to present in a school environment. The presentation must be between 5 and 10 minutes in length. There is no grace period. Students who fail to meet the minimum speaking requirement cannot take first place in the round. Students who exceed the maximum time limit should be cut off by the judge, and they additionally cannot take first place in the round. There is a one-step rule in this event, and students may present sitting or standing. The focus in this event is the presentation of original work, not the physical interpretation of literature. No props are allowed, though sitting on a chair or stool is permitted. Time signals will not be provided. (**Open division only.)**

**Sales Speaking:** The purpose of this event is to sell a singular, legitimate product and may include variations of that product. Contestant must identify brand. “Services” are not considered legitimate products. The **actual** product (not a model) must be displayed and/or demonstrated. Presentation may be memorized. Notes on one side of a 4 x 6 card may be used, but texts are not permitted. Video /audio aids are optional. In order to demonstrate the function of a product, that product may be put on as the demonstration begins and then removed following the demonstration. The contestant may not wear the product into the room, nor leave it on once the demonstration of that product is concluded. Additional items of clothing that might serve to enhance the visual effect of the product are considered costuming and are prohibited.

Time: 3-7 minutes + 2 min. Questioning by judge only

Time signals: not provided. (**Open division only.)**

**Bonus Events – SPAR and Duet Acting**

**Students may enter either SPAR or Duet Acting. Neither Duet Acting nor SPAR count toward either the Foley Award or Sweepstakes Awards. Duet Acting may, however, earn a NITOC bid.**

**SPARFEST**

***Open to any competitor who is not entered in Duet Acting. The judging burden for this event is one judge for each two competitors. High School students may judge. We will be seeking community judges to help out. The extra judges will be used to defray the judging impact on out of area schools first and then local schools.***

**Spontaneous Argumentation (also known as SPAR):** A brief, ten-minute debate performed without advanced preparation on a subject of interest. At this tournament, the format will be as follows: The affirmative and the negative will be given two topics. At the end of a one minute preparation period, the affirmative will begin to debate on one of the two topics. The affirmative is allotted a two minute constructive speech followed by a one minute cross-examination. The negative will then have one minute toprepare a two minute constructive speech which will be followed by a one minute cross examination. Both speakers will then be allowed one minute for rebuttal without preparation time. **(Novice and open divisions.)**

**Special SPAR Rules:**

1. SPAR is being offered as a bonus event on Thursday from **7:20 to 9:00 PM.**
2. There are NO judge strikes in this event.
3. There are NO judge conflicts in this event. That means that a judge can judge a person from his/her own school.
4. There is NO one year out rule for judges in this event.
5. Varsity debaters who are not competing in SPAR may judge Novice SPAR.
6. Each SPAR competitor will be issued a ballot with eight debate result lines. The debater will take that ballot with him/her to each round. Each judge will initial either a win or a loss on each ballot and award speaker points to each debater.
7. There will be eight preliminary rounds.
8. All rounds will be held in one large area. Debaters will start at a numbered judge and move eight times in a positive order (e.g. if a competitor started with judge 5, she would go to judge 6 in her second round and judge 7 in her third round etc. The judge’s table will be marked with the judge’s number).
9. Time limits will be strictly enforced.
10. The 8th round judge will collect the ballots from the two competitors that s/he has judged in the 8th round and turn them in to TAB.
11. Judges are NOT permitted to give critiques or write comments on the ballots. Sorry, but we have to maintain strict time limits to make this work!
12. The top four competitors from Thursday will advance to a semifinals round on Saturday afternoon which will be held against out rounds in debate. If one or more of the top competitors in SPAR also breaks in debate, that person will NOT be eligible for SPAR out rounds. Instead, the next highest competitor(s) who did not advance to the out rounds in regular debate will be “pulled up” to the SPAR semifinals.
13. The top two Open division SPAR competitors will appear on stage at the beginning of the Awards Ceremony. The winner will be determined by audience preference.

**Duet Acting**

**Duet Acting is a bonus event. Although it is a bonus event, entry in Duet Acting can still earn bids to the National Individual Events Tournament (NITOC). Duet acting conflicts with SPAR. Students who enter Duet Acting may not enter SPAR.**

 **(Open Level Only) [NITOC BID]**

**Duet Acting Rules**

**Duet Acting**

a. SELECTION -- Selections used in Duet Acting shall be cuttings from a single source from a published printed novel, short story, play, poem or screenplay. No contestant may use the same literary work that s/he used in previous competitive years. No contestant may enter the same selection in two events. The material may be humorous or dramatic, or combine both tones depending on the selected work. Contestants may not combine two or more pieces of literature. A piece of literature shall be defined as one piece of writing which was written with the intent to be published as one work. Each of the two performers may play one or more characters so long as performance responsibility in the cutting remains as balanced as possible. Introductory and/or transitional material may be presented by either or both contestants.

b. PUBLICATION -- All contestants must use published materials. "Published" as used in these rules means materials for which the coach is able to provide proof of publication using either of the following methods: -- Originating in print form (book, photocopy of the book, or a manuscript) -- Originating in digital form (a printed copy of an online transcript) Unpublished material used for introductions and transitions of interpretations shall be the original work of either or both of the contestants. Transitions and other added material must not change the author's intent.

c. MANUSCRIPT - An original or photocopy of the original selection must be submitted at registration. Script check is the last step in the registration process. Schools that do not complete the registration process are not eligible to compete in the tournament. The portion(s) of the author's work being used in the interpretation must be highlighted. All introductory and transitional phrases shall be clearly indicated as such on the manuscript. Transitions and other added material must not exceed 150 words and must not change the author's intent. Contestants must adhere to the material as submitted when performing during rounds.

d. TIME -- Interpretations shall be no more than **ten (10) minutes** in performance including introductory and transitional materials. There is no minimum time limit. **Speakers exceeding this time limit by more than 30 seconds shall not be ranked firs**t. For each final round, a tournament official, or designee shall serve as the official timer, and will have the discretion of waiving time violations for contestants exceeding the time limit due to audience reactions.

e. **PERFORMANCE** -- The interpretation must be delivered from memory; no notes, prompting or scripts shall be permitted. No costumes or props shall be permitted. During the performance, on-stage focus (meaning contestants MAY look directly at each other) may and/or should be employed by both contestants. Contestants are encouraged to touch and make eye contact during any part of the performance. Two chairs will be allowed for use as props or to facilitate blocking and to create levels, atmosphere and environment. Two standard classroom chairs will be provided. If the performers deem it necessary, they may provide their own chairs.

**Supervision:** WSFA/WIAA requires that a certified coach/staff member from the school or school district supervise competitors at all times.

**Judging Requirements: Each school must either bring a sufficient number of qualified judges to cover its entry or contact the tournament director for special circumstances.**  Teams will be charged for any uncovered rounds. One judge covers 2 CX teams, 2 Parli Debate teams, 2 Public Forum teams, 2 Big Questions teams, or 4 LD student entries. One judge is required for every 8 student congress entries. One judge is required for every 6 IE entries (calculated based on the team’s total IE entries). All international diplomacy judges will be supplied by the tournament. Therefore, international diplomacy entries do not count toward a school’s judging requirements. Schools which only supply the minimum number of judges should warn their judges that they will be expected to judge every round. Any school which fails to meet its judging obligation, or contact the tournament director to discuss special circumstances, may be charged $25.00 per missed round unless exceptional circumstances warrant excusal. [Note special SPAR judging rules above.]

**Coaches facing difficulties obtaining judges should contact the tournament director**. A limited number of judges will be available for hire through the tournament. Some volunteer judges are also available to help teams in need.

**Food:** Lattes etc, baked goods, candy etc. will be for sale at University High School by Key Club. DECA will be selling pizza etc. at lunch on Friday.

**Lodging: Special tournament rates are available**

*Please indicate that you are with the Foley Debate tournament* when registering.

**Mirabeau Park Hotel** – **$95.00 without breakfast/$105.00 with breakfast**. The hotel has been fully remodeled with all executive rooms (up to 4 people per room) - includes heated outside pool, patio and hot tub, on site restaurant, and plenty of bus parking. Call (509) 924-9000 for individual reservations or for **group blocks Call Jason Perry at** **(509) 922-6229** or email him at jperry@mirabeauparkhotel.com for further information.

**La Quinta Inn & Suites Spokane -** (509) 893-0955 – A special rate of $80.00 per night per room is being offered. The hotel, which provides a full breakfast, was updated in 2018, and includes a 24 hour indoor pool/hot tub, fitness center, business center, and high-speed Internet.  Microwaves & Fridges can be found in all rooms.  A sundry shop is available on the premises. Email Riane Franklin for group blocks. rianefranklin@waytomanage.com

**Fairfield Inn & Suites by Marriott** – **$99.00** per room (up to 4 people per room) includes full hot breakfast, exercise room, cookies and milk at night. Complimentary meeting spaces for teams. **Contact Jaylene Clifford** at **509-928-5218** or by e-mail at jclifford@impressguest.com

**2019 Foley Forensics Tournament Schedule**

**Thursday, January 31, 2019**

**Sessions at University HS**

**2:30 Registration/Check In [Please check your school into the tournament at the table by the TAB room entrance. i.e. the counseling office entry.]**

**3:15 Debate Round 1 [All styles of debate other than congress]**

**5:00                 Debate Round 2**

**7:20                 SPAR Preliminary Rounds 1-8 [NOTE: SPAR does not count toward either the *Foley Speakers Award* OR *Sweepstakes*. However, it is fun for the kids and prizes are presented to the**

**7:20                 DUET ACTING – “Tripleplex Preliminary Rounds” 1-3 [NOTE: Duet Acting does not count toward either the *Foley Speakers Award* OR *Sweepstakes*. However, it could earn your students a NITIOC bid! It is fun for the kids and prizes are presented to the winners.]**

**9:00                 End of Thursday Activities**

**Postings on line (Tabroom) and posted at UHS on Thursday evening!**

**Friday, February 1, 2019**

**AM              Location TBD**

**6:45                 Rooms unlocked. Students may enter**

**7:00                 Congress Session 1 [All Divisions]**

**7:15                International Diplomacy Session 1**

**9:15                Break**

**9:15                 Congress & International Diplomacy Session 2 [All Divisions]**

**9:30                 Congress & International Diplomacy Session 2 [All Divisions]**

**11:30               Lunch – On Your Own (DECA will be selling pizza at $1.50 a slice, candy**

 **and drinks etc.)**

**12:30               Super Congress all divisions and International Diplomacy Final UN Security**

 **Council**

 **1:25** **Transportation for all students and judges who did not advance to, or who are not judging Super Congress / UN Security Council Round judges (CV School Busses will conduct transportation.)**

 **2:45                Super Congress/UN Security Council Concludes**

 **2:50                Transportation for all students and judges who DID advance to (or were**

**judging) Super Congress / UN Security Council Round. (CV School Busses will conduct transportation.)**

**Friday Late Afternoon and Evening at University HS**

**3:30                 Debate Round 3**

**5:15                 IE Pattern A Round 1**

**6:45                 IE Pattern B Round 1**

**8:30 Debate Round 4**

**Saturday, February 2, 2019**

**Sessions at University HS**

**7:00 Judge’s Appreciation Breakfast**

**7:30 Debate Round 5**

**9:15                 IE Pattern A Round 2**

**10:35               IE Pattern B Round 2**

**11:55               Debate Quarters [Qtr Finalist Awards presented in Round**

                        [SPAR Semifinals Postings will also be posted at this time.]

**1:40                 IE Pattern A Round 3**

**3:00                 IE Pattern B Round 4**

**4:20                 Debate Semifinals [Semi-finalist Awards presented in Round]**

**4:20                 SPAR Semifinals**

**6:05                 IE Pattern A Finals**

**7:25                 IE Pattern B Finals**

**8:45                 Debate Finals [No Disclosure Allowed]**

**10:30               Awards**

**John Clark Legal Argument 2019**

**Suggestions for Competing in John Clark Legal Argument**

From a debater standpoint, the beginning Legal Argument competitor should think of a modified oratory and or a modified expository. When lawyers present their opening statements or closing arguments in front of a jury or judge, they do not really argue with each other. In a legal drama, one might hear an objection raised during one of these presentations, but in reality such objections are extremely rare. For example, think how often you have ever heard the other side in an LD or CX debate shout out objection during the opponent’s affirmative case. It never happens does it! It should not happen in this Legal Argument event. Instead, the contestants simply present their opening statements or closing arguments as they would if they were presenting the case to a jury.

The first thing the Legal Argument competitor must do is read the fact pattern through to get a general flavor for the facts. The student should then decide whether he or she wants to be a prosecuting attorney or a defense attorney. Then the competitor should decide whether to present the opening statement or the closing argument. Although both are allowed, most debaters seem to pick closing arguments; although a few students, mostly those with experience in expository speech have chosen to do opening statements and have done very well. Sometimes, doing something different helps one to stand out.

After deciding what side of the argument the competitor wants to represent and whether to take the closing argument or opening statement, the competitor should go back to the fact pattern and carefully read it. The fact pattern is designed so that both sides (prosecution and defense) can win. Look for any discrepancies in the factual statements or the opinions of the experts. Look at timelines. When did things actually happen, and how exactly did the event occur. Carefully go over the law provided with the fact pattern. This is the basic law. A student may research other aspects of Washington law if s/he wishes to do so and add it to his/her argument. No facts stated in the official fact pattern may be changed. However, a student is free to draw any reasonable inferences from the facts (in closing argument) to argue his or her case.

Remember, opening statement is designed to show the jury what the evidence at trial will show. Like a good expository speaker, in a non-persuasive manner, the event will be “explained” in such a manner that the jury is convinced that the defendant is guilty (prosecutor) or not guilty (defense) just from the manner and clarity of the way the evidence is presented. In the closing argument, the contestant will argue how the evidence meets the legal criteria (law) to convict the defendant or how doubt exists such that the defendant could not possibly be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

When the competitor has written his/her argument, s/he may decide to create visual aids to help present his case. The use of visual aids is totally up to the competitor. I have seen students win this event with and without visual aids. Sometimes visual aids help and sometimes they detract from the presentation. Thus, their use is up to each individual competitor.

The time limit for legal argument is eight minutes with a 30 second grace period. Students will present their cases in a pattern consistent with any typical IE. Competitors do not actually cross examine each other. Students may use note cards.

One closing suggestion is that some competitors in the past have watched a courtroom drama or two (e.g. the movie*, The Verdict* or a similar TV drama) and modeled the manner in which they walk up and down in front of the jury or the way they speak after the movie/television lawyer(s). It sometimes helps, and at least the kids can enjoy a good courtroom drama.

I hope that everyone who attempts this event has a lot of fun with it.

Sincerely,

David Smith

***John Clark Legal Argument Rules***

Although the event is called “legal argument,” it encompasses both ***opening statements***, which are expository in nature, and ***closing arguments***, which are akin to persuasive oratories. The purpose of an opening statement is to preview what the evidence will show in a manner supportive of the proponent’s position – but in a non-argumentative fashion. This is usually done in a story fashion with introductory phrases such as “the evidence will show.” Closing argument “marshals the evidence” and argues it in a manner consistent with the proponent’s position. Visual aides may be used in both opening statements and closing arguments. **Competitors may choose to deliver either an opening statement or a closing argument for either the prosecution or the defense**. **Speeches must be based on the facts stated in the hypothetical fact pattern**. ***Washington State law applies and students are encouraged to research applicable legal issues***. The hypothetical fact pattern is attached to this invitation along with copies of the applicable criminal statutes. The **time limit for this event is 8 minutes**. Judges will be given access to the hypothetical fact pattern.

**John Clark Legal Argument 2019**

**State vs. Dolund**

**Note:***The following facts are entirely fictitious. Any similarities to actual facts or events are purely coincidental.*

### Introduction

The annual winter Aloysius University Croquet Tournament in Someplace, Washington is a picturesque storybook event. Unfortunately, the 2018 tournament had a killer ending.

Poor Norm Sampson, beloved president of the What State Croquet Association (WSCA), and head coach at Cold Lane HS, was killed while working in the tournament’s tabulation (TAB) room.

Apparently, Norm returned to TAB about two hours after the tournament ended Friday evening

with the intention of fixing his student’s rare Nimbus 2000 croquet mallet, and to tabulate the day’s results on his laptop computer. Resetting his laptop appears to have triggered a pipe-bomb hidden somewhere in the room.

Norm’s body was discovered at 1:00 AM Saturday morning by night janitor, Smitherman Birch while cleaning the TAB Room in “Old Remains” the Aloysius administration building.

This case comes to trial on charges of Second Degree Murder against noted croquet coach, Stan Dolund.

Witness Statements and evidence compiled by Captain J. K. Cobbler, are summarized below.

**Vinnie Jekyll**

Vinnie Jekyll is Norm Sampson’s longtime girlfriend. She states:

“Norm called me about 11:30 Friday evening. He said he would soon be on his way home, but he had to stop by TAB and fix some kid’s croquet mallet. Norm was handy that way. He would often fix the kids’ equipment. He was also going to try to get some of the day’s results tabulated before he left. I never saw or heard from him again. A police officer came to the house in the early hours of Saturday morning to tell me what happened. I really don’t know what time the police arrived. I just broke down crying.”

**Svad Spew**

Svad Spew is a college student, and assistant croquet coach at Close By High School (CBHS). He volunteered to serve as assistant tournament director under his long time friend and colleague, Dr. R. Krispies. Although Spew recognizes Krispies’ incipient dementia, he works tirelessly to protect her from embarrassment. Clearly, he is the power behind the throne. Spew, the last person to leave the tournament, states he locked up the building at 11:30 PM Friday night. Prior to leaving, he made a cursory building check and noticed that the Inland Empire Championship Croquet Trophy was on a shelf in the TAB Room. Finding no one in the building, he left for the evening.

On his way out of the tournament, Spew received a call on his cell phone from a close friend, Heather Ardorchum. Ardorchum, who had returned early from a business trip to Hawaii, was calling to surprise Spew with an invitation to stop for a nightcap. Although he does not specifically remember having done so, Spew believes he must have double-checked the lock before leaving, since it would have been his normal practice to do so.

**Dr. R. Krispies**

Dr. Krispies, long-time head croquet coach at Close By High School, currently serves as the “tournaments coordinator” for the WSCA. Due to slipping problems with her memory, she has begun to rely more and more on her assistant coach Svad Spew. Although her close friends and co-workers have never questioned her abilities, complaints from out-of-state coaches have reached the ears of university administrators. As such, Aloysius President, Father Sven Grappier, asked WSCA State President Norm Sampson to help with TAB Room duties and keep an eye on “Doc.” Despite their long friendship, Krispies deeply resents Sampson’s intrusion into “her” TAB Room. Krispies is also convinced that all complaints were politically based and probably resulted because of complaints she made against that idiot, Stan Dolund.

Against the wishes of her assistant coach and President Sampson, Krispies announced that all progressive style croquet kids could store their mallets, balls, precious timers (Progressive Style Croquet limits the time between hits) and their backpacks in the TAB Room. While leaving for the night, Krispies noticed that one of the backpacks looked suspicious and made a mental note to check the bag. Unfortunately, it slipped her mind to do so, and she went home without checking the bag or telling anyone of her suspicions.

**Dr. N. Wellington Cossetas III**

Graduated from the University of Quebec, famed forensics examiner Dr. N. Wellington Cossetas has resided in Someplace for twenty years. For the past ten years, he has worked part time as an assistant croquet coach at Mini-Aloysius Preparatory School. Dr. Cosettas, a devout supporter of revered president Sampson, wept bitterly upon learning of his death. He vowed he would hunt down every clue in pursuit of Sampson’s killer, unless of course doing so would necessitate additional weekend work.

Dr. Cossetas arrived at the TAB Room at 2:30 AM after having been called by Officer J.K Cobbler at 1:15 AM; Cobbler advised that the body was found by a maintenance worker, Smitherman Birch, at 1:00 AM.

Upon detailed examination, Dr. Cossetas determined that the victim died as a result of a direct blow to the head from the Inland Empire Croquet Trophy which was being stored for safekeeping in the croquet office (a.k.a. TAB Room) in the “Old Remains” administration building. Dr. Cossetas noted the room had been decimated by an explosion, which had apparently knocked the trophy off a shelf. Sampson’s body was found in a fetal position with the trophy imbedded in his skull.

**Sunnie Loverson**

Beautiful and charming Cold Lane High School senior traditional style (TS) croquet competitor, Sunnie Loverson is not, shall we say, known for her sunny disposition. Although she can be quite charming, she is also known to have a blistering temper when provoked.

Although her teammates find discussing the benefits of her new Nimbus 2000 Croquet Mallet (the rarest and most expensive mallet available) to be somewhat boring, they would never tell her to her face. Loverson has been counting on her Nimbus 2000 Croquet Mallet to hammer out a romance with hunky Spike Movern, a fellow traditional style “TS” croquet player from Marvelous High School. Movern, however, has the “hots” for Loverson’s best friend, Karla Smooth, a progressive style “PC” croquet player from Timcap High School.

At the request of Smooth, Movern watched one of Loverson’s croquet preliminary rounds. Loverson, who had been excited to see that Movern would watch her perform for the first time ever, was horrified when “rule Nazi” Stan Dolund, demanded to examine her Nimbus 2000 Croquet Mallet and its certificate of authenticity. Having forgotten to bring a copy of her certificate with the mallet’s specifications, Loverson was immediately disqualified.

Loverson did not wait for Dolund to leave before letting out a string of expletives, and angrily striking the side of a building with her new mallet. The mallet’s handle split from the force of the strike.

Dolund sneered, “Serves you right, you little witch,” and then laughed hysterically as he left the field.

As Dolund walked away, Loverson shouted, in front of the entire field of competitors, “I’ll get you Dolund—just wait; fear the day; you will pay.” She swore revenge on him for slashing any hopes of romance with Movern and for his negligence in destroying her mallet. Loverson then stormed off to berate her coach, Norm Sampson.

When she assessed the situation for her coach, Loverson explained, “Give me a break; after all, I’ve only been doing competitive croquet for four years, how am I supposed to remember every little rule? Clearly, the problem is that “nitpicky, overly uptight judge. Who lets head coaches judge anyway? They obviously don’t know anything of value! AND he had the nerve to laugh at my misfortune. It was his fault that the mallet broke.”

Loverson states, “I saw Normy and told him I’d been wronged. He had the nerve to tell me he’d specifically instructed me to bring the certificate. I told him I had no such memory. He was probably lying. I also said, he’d better wait. TAB would be hot in the morning, because I was going to make life unbearable for Dolund. I’d bring my mom if I had to.”

“Normy told me to cool down and he’d see what he could do to fix the mallet. Of course a used broken mallet is not the same as a new one. It is going to cost my parents a pretty penny to make up for Dolund’s wrecking my Nimbus 2000.

No one remembers seeing Loverson between the time she left the round at 8:30 PM and the time of the murder. Loverson claims she went for a walk and then called Sampson by cell phone to argue the disqualification. She said Normy gave her permission to walk back to the hotel. Loverson returned to the hotel at about 2:00 AM. She says she was upset that her coach didn’t stand up for her, so she just walked quietly along the river until she felt well enough to re-join the group.

Upon returning to the hotel, Loverson states she went right to her room and slept until morning. Her roommates were asleep when she arrived. She was not surprised to see her roommates in bed since the team maintains a strict 11:00 PM curfew.

**Spike Movern**

Spike Movern is an 18 year-old senior traditional style (TS) croquet player from Marvelous High School. He has known Karla Smooth and Sunnie Loverson the entire four years he has been in croquet. Although he has always thought Loverson was “kind of cute,” he’s also always found her to be a “bit scary.” “She’s like a stalker. She just doesn’t give up.” However, he was embarrassed for Sunnie when “Dolund jumped on her like that.” Spike believes Sunnie’s pride was hurt most of all. He knows she likes him, but he is hopelessly in love with the sweet soft-spoken Smooth. Despite her reputation as a “take-no-prisoners killer PC speed hitter, she has a sweet side.”

Movern heard Sunnie’s tantrum, but says, “It was just show. Sure, she said she’d get even…but she always says things like that when she gets mad. She is harmless. She’d never hurt anyone—especially her coach, whom she idolizes.”

Later in the evening, Spike was judged by Dolund in a varsity TS round against Andy Macs from Mini-Aloysius High School. Spike claims he was clearly winning the round when Macs started “speed hitting” just like a PC kid (progressive style). “Fortunately, Dolund stopped the round and gave me the win. But, boy did that ever tick off Macs. I thought he was going to explode. You should have seen him, and man what language he used under his breath to berate Dolund!"

Movern claims that Dolund wasn’t bothered by Macs in the least. Movern remembers Dolund telling Macs, “Why don’t you get yourself some metal croquet balls and a heavier mallet and just play PC?”

Spike claims he left the round just after Dolund. Macs was still in the room cleaning up his stuff when he left. Spike says he has been judged by Stan Dolund on several occasions. Dolund is his favorite judge. “He’s hard—but he’s really fair. He always gives me the win.”

When asked by Officer Cobbler if he had anything else to add, Spike said, “Yea. One thing really bothered me.” I saw Mr. Dolund hanging around the TAB room after Mr. Spew left the tournament. I don’t know what he was doing, but he had something in a bag and he looked like he was trying to hide it. He didn’t even seem happy to see me. Usually when he sees me, he wants to talk about how great I’ve been playing.”

**Stan Dolund**

Stan Dolund is the head croquet coach at Faraway High School. He has been coaching and judging croquet for eighteen years. He is well known in “croquet circles” for his proclivity toward favoring traditional style (TS), but he will judge progressive style croquet (PC) when asked to do so. However, he just hates kids who try to comingle the different types of croquet. Over the last couple of years, Dolund has made frequent remarks about the sad deterioration of TS. He blames local coaches and the judges they hire for allowing his favorite pastime to deteriorate into “mindless hitting and running.”

Dolund was at the tournament on the night of the “accident.” “I judged three straight rounds of croquet that night. The kids were awful. I was exhausted. I had worked all day on my car before the tournament. I even cut my arm doing so, and had to put up with blood seeping from Band-Aids. Then I come to a great tournament looking forward to watching some relaxing natural TS and all I see is PC run and gun!

“My last round went out just before 9:00 PM. It was a varsity round between that nice Movern kid and some new kid that used to do PC. This kid, Macs, is a real jerk. I no sooner gave him a long list of my accomplishments in the sport than he starts spouting off about how good he thinks he is! Believe me; I am not impressed with someone winning the state PC trophy. Real croquet kids do TS and they like it!

When Macs complained about his opponent’s lack of metal balls, I just lost it. I screamed at the kid and told him it was about time somebody did something to wake up the croquet community and let people know that PC is not TS and that we won’t put up with any PCTS in this town. I immediately signed my ballot for Movern – who we all know is the better croquet player anyway- and told Macs, in no uncertain terms, that he should get out of the room and get out of TS while he’s at it!

I guess I got a little hot. I stormed out of the room to take my ballot to TAB. I was so upset that I forgot to gather my things before I left. On the way to the TAB room, I realized I had forgotten my timer and water bottle. I have used the same water bottle for several years. It has a shark design on the top. Anyway, by the time I returned to the room, someone had taken off with both my timer and water bottle. I was really ticked off. However, there was a silver lining. I found an abandoned croquet mallet on the campus. I picked it up. Later, I gave it to one of my students.

My wife and daughter were gone that night, so when I arrived home I went straight to bed. I didn’t hear about the explosion until I arrived at the tournament on Saturday morning. Of course, everyone was talking about it.

It’s sad that a nice guy like Sampson had to die. Wouldn’t you know it, some PC kid is messing around with explosives (probably trying to make his metal balls fly) and something like this has to happen. Hopefully, somebody will do something about getting rid of PC now that this tragedy has shown the way those PC kids act!”

Upon further interrogation, Dolund admitted he had had “some minor experience” with explosives while in the army.” He also volunteered, “Anybody knows that mixing gas and bleach will cause an explosion.” When asked how he knew that gasoline and bleach had caused the explosion, he replied, “I’m sure I heard that somewhere.” When asked if he smoked, he flatly denied that he was now, or had ever been, a smoker. “Tobacco has NEVER touched my lips!”

When asked what he was wearing at the tournament, Dolund confirmed he had been wearing his Levis 501 jeans and a Faraway High Croquet Team sweatshirt/hoodie in the school colors, black and maroon.

**Captain J.K. Cobbler**

Captain J.K. Cobbler is the crime scene investigator for the forensics science division of the Someplace Police Department. Called to investigate an explosion at Aloysius University, Cobbler arrived at the scene at approximately 10 AM on Saturday morning. After a thorough investigation of the scene, she determined the explosion occurred at approximately 12:30 AM Saturday morning. She found a partly burned water bottle with a shark design on its top, and two *SixF Tunder* cigarette butts. Residue of bleach and gasoline was discovered in the bottle. She also found evidence to establish that the bottle had been penetrated with two electrical wires. A timer was discovered with the wires to the “beeper” scraped bare.

It is the professional opinion of Captain Cobbler that the explosion was set off by a timer with its wires cut and inserted into the water bottle. The bottle was filled with a mixture of gasoline and bleach. The sound of the beeper set off the explosion. The explosion knocked a trophy off a shelf. The falling trophy struck the victim in the skull causing instant death.

Captain Cobbler will testify that the explosion was much smaller than would have been expected in a murder or terrorism situation. “It really wasn’t that big of an explosion. Sure, there was a mess, but that could have been from kids just throwing their stuff on the floor. I don’t think that Sampson would have died had he not been right where he was at the time of the explosion. There would have been some minor property damage, but nothing serious.”

Cobbler will testify that Dolund’s fingerprints were found on both the water bottle and the timer. Dried blood, found on the timer, contained DNA samples that matched Dolund.

**Cass Vicwell**

Cass Vicwell is the assistant croquet coach at Uninteresting HS in Someplace, Washington. Vicwell, who was tabbing TS croquet for the tournament, stopped by the TAB room at “Old Remains” on her way home. As she approached the room, she saw Svad Spew getting in his car and driving off. Since she knew that Spew would never leave Dr. Krispies on “her own,” Vicwell went ahead and left the tournament. She says that as she left, she saw two kids whom she recognized as Karla Smooth and Andy Macs, making out in the bushes outside of “Old Remains.” She pulled both kids out of the bushes, telling them “I don’t like private displays of affection any more than public displays of affection.” She said it was disgusting to watch. Furthermore, when they spoke, they reeked of cigarette smoke. She claims to have been furious when both kids mocked her. Karla even turned to her and said, “Lady, you don’t even know the blast we’re going to have here tonight.” However, what really surprised her was when Karla’s PC partner, Griff Manocluo said, “Oh, please don’t get mad at them. They are doing this all for me. They are just showing me how people kiss so I will know how to be a good kisser when Sunnie and I are finally able to make our love known to the world. I know that it’s a lot to ask of them; but they often show me how to kiss as long as I reciprocate by doing them little favors, like run errands for them or give them my lunch when they don’t like there’s. You know little things like that.”

**James P Hotter**

James P Hotter is a freshman TS croquet player on the Faraway HS team. His father, Harrold Harrison Hotter is famous in local croquet circles as one of the best players ever to come out of Faraway High School. Harrold went on to play ten years of professional croquet for the *Sealth Smashers*. Sadly, James does not live up to his father’s pedigree and often harbors a deep closeted resentment toward his dad.

James has sincere affection for Coach Dolund, who has spent untold hours trying to help him improve his game. James has often said that Coach is like a father and is certainly the kind of man he always wanted as a dad, as his real father treats him like a slithering snake.

“After the tournament got out Friday night, I saw Coach Dolund coming across campus from the direction of Old Remains. I think it was about 12:30 AM Saturday morning to be exact. I had been sitting on the steps of the John Summers Memorial Building, just moping about how poorly I had done in the tournament so far. I had a miserable 0-3 record. Coach Dolund saw me sitting by myself and stopped to talk. He always tries to encourage me. He often tells me I don’t have to be as good as my dad. I just have to do my best.

Coach Dolund had a Nimbus 2000 Croquet Mallet. He just gave it to me! Sure, it was used. It had a repaired crack on the handle. But who cares! It’s a real Nimbus 2000! He told me not to tell anyone about the gift, but I think he was just talking about not telling other members of the team. I was pretty excited and I hugged him.

After Coach Dolund left, I didn’t see him until the next morning.”

**Natalie Woodworker**

Natalie Woodworker is the head coach of Lower Cloud HS in Someplace, Washington. She was not at the Aloysius Tournament because of prior engagements.

Woodworker recalls celebrating her return from the National Guard at a local watering hole with Dolund and their mutual friend Aemilia Gables about two weeks before the tournament. Natalie admits to having had a couple of beers or so. However, she certainly was not drunk. Dolund was “plowed,” but Gables wasn’t drinking at all. She remembers Dolund making strange comments about wishing that some type of violence or damage would happen at a big tournament to call attention to that “ridiculous” new style of croquet. Woodworker specifically remembers telling Dolund, “It’s just a game the kids like to play. Let them play it like they like to play it.” Dolund just went berserk. He started yelling about how those PC kids are now taking over TS, ‘the heavenly croquet.’ Then he said, ‘If I ever get a chance to really make a statement, I will; so help me, God.’ He then started laughing like a hyena and swore if he ever did get the chance to do something, he’d ‘stick it on a PC kid and let the little jerk pay the piper.’”

**Aemilia Gables**

Aemilia Gables is the head croquet coach at Big Timbers High School (BTHS) in Someplace, Washington. She is an old friend of Stan Dolund. In fact, they competed together for Close By High when they were in their teens and spent time in Germany when they were in the army. Aemilia had been an intelligence expert and Stan had worked in explosives and demolition.

Aemilia deposes and states that approximately two weeks before the Aloysius Tournament, she, Dolund, and a mutual friend, Lower Cloud High Coach Natalie Woodworker were at a Someplace “watering hole” celebrating Woodworker’s return from National Guard duty. Gables was the designated driver. She did not drink anything harder than diet cola all night.

Gables further states that Woodworker had a “bit too much to drink,” and that Dolund was “trashed.” She remembers a strange conversation between Woodworker and Dolund. Woodworker was complaining that PC kids never seem to listen to their coaches. Dolund said, “We need to just get rid of PC or make sure it changes for good. I would just love to see one of those pompous PC kids commit some real damage at a major tournament. Once that happened, the ‘powers that be’ would start taking this problem seriously.” He then started babbling on about how “funny it would be if all the damage was done by those obnoxious PCs themselves.”

Gables says she has known Dolund for many years and that Dolund has a “tendency to spout off about things, but he’s as harmless as a house cat.”

When asked further about Dolund’ experience with explosives, she replied. “Well, he’s always bragging about his work as an explosives expert in the army. You know of course that he was trained for anti-terrorist tactics. He says he can make a bomb out of anything.”

When asked whether she knew if Dolund was a smoker, Gables said, “He smoked a little when we were in the army; mostly, when we he was working with explosives. He said it calmed his nerves.”

**Griff Manocluo**

“Hot Fingers” Griff Manocluo is Andy Macs’ “sidekick.” They have been best friends since grade school. Although he admits that some of the kids at Majestic give him a bad time about being used by Macs, he states, “I know in my heart of hearts that Andy and I have always been best buds.”

This was Griff’s first tournament since returning to school after having been suspended for stealing four cartons of imported cigarettes from a local Import store. He was caught at school with a carton of the cigarettes, *SixF Tunders*.

Despite being “grilled” by the school’s resource officer, Deputy DC Arlson, who was trying to get him to “finger Macs” a known “smoker,” Manocluo insisted he was acting alone and just stealing the cigarettes to sell to other kids. When pressed about the other three cartons, he said he “couldn’t remember what he had done with them. He might have smoked them all by accident.” Despite the fact his statements did not have the “ring of truth” in that the theft had only occurred the night before he was arrested and that none of his frequent encounters with school discipline had ever involved smoking violations, Deputy Arlson could only charge him with the original theft.

Griff’s nickname, “Hot Fingers” grew out of his frequent arrests for theft ever since grade school and his constant bragging about being able to get into or out of anywhere or anything. He claims he could steal anything that wasn’t bolted down.

Manocluo is Karla Smooth’s PC croquet partner.

Manocluo states, “I heard about the way that awful Dolund treated Sunnie Loverson, the most beautiful woman in the world.” Manocluo believes he and Loverson have a “budding romance.” “Every time she sees me, she tries to avoid me. Obviously, she can’t yet control her feelings and must be awfully shy. I once told Sunnie I would do anything for her; and I meant it. She turned up her nose and told me “EWWW.” It was so cute. She was just trying to keep our love a secret.”

**Riggs Chadwick**

Riggs Chadwick is a groundskeeper at Aloysius College. Riggs was in a van making his nightly rounds sometime between midnight and 1:00 AM. He states, “I saw a guy running from Old Remains. The guy was wearing dark clothes and a dark stocking cap. I didn’t get a very good look at him.”

Later, during a picture line up at the Someplace Police Department, Riggs identified Stan Dolund.

Riggs stated, “I’m almost positive that’s the guy. I know I have seen that guy. Yea, it must be him.”

## Attachment “B”

**Applicable Revised Code of Washington Statutory Provisions**

**Regarding Assault**

*For More Information, See:* http://www.leg.wa.gov/rcw/index.cfm?fuseaction=title&title=9A

**RCW 9A.32.010
Homicide defined.**

Homicide is the killing of a human being by the act, procurement, or omission of another, death occurring at any time, and is either (1) murder, (2) homicide by abuse, (3) manslaughter, (4) excusable homicide, or (5) justifiable homicide.

**RCW 9A.32.020
Premeditation -- Limitations.**

(1) As used in this chapter, the premeditation required in order to support a conviction of the crime of murder in the first degree must involve more than a moment in point of time.

**RCW 9A.32.030
Murder in the first degree.**

(1) A person is guilty of murder in the first degree when:

     (a) With a premeditated intent to cause the death of another person, he or she causes the death of such person or of a third person; or

     (b) Under circumstances manifesting an extreme indifference to human life, he or she engages in conduct which creates a grave risk of death to any person, and thereby causes the death of a person; or

     (c) He or she commits or attempts to commit the crime of either (1) robbery in the first or second degree, (2) rape in the first or second degree, (3) burglary in the first degree, (4) arson in the first or second degree, or (5) kidnapping in the first or second degree, and in the course of or in furtherance of such crime or in immediate flight therefrom, he or she, or another participant, causes the death of a person other than one of the participants: Except that in any prosecution under this subdivision (1)(c) in which the defendant was not the only participant in the underlying crime, if established by the defendant by a preponderance of the evidence, it is a defense that the defendant:

     (i) Did not commit the homicidal act or in any way solicit, request, command, importune, cause, or aid the commission thereof; and
     (ii) Was not armed with a deadly weapon, or any instrument, article, or substance readily capable of causing death or serious physical injury; and
     (iii) Had no reasonable grounds to believe that any other participant was armed with such a weapon, instrument, article, or substance; and
     (iv) Had no reasonable grounds to believe that any other participant intended to engage in conduct likely to result in death or serious physical injury.

**RCW 9A.32.050
Murder in the second degree.**

(1) A person is guilty of murder in the second degree when:

     (a) With intent to cause the death of another person but without premeditation, he or she causes the death of such person or of a third person; or

     (b) He or she commits or attempts to commit any felony, including assault, other than those enumerated in RCW [9A.32.030](http://www.leg.wa.gov/RCW/index.cfm?section=9A.32.030&fuseaction=section)(1)(c), and, in the course of and in furtherance of such crime or in immediate flight therefrom, he or she, or another participant, causes the death of a person other than one of the participants; except that in any prosecution under this subdivision (1)(b) in which the defendant was not the only participant in the underlying crime, if established by the defendant by a preponderance of the evidence, it is a defense that the defendant:

     (i) Did not commit the homicidal act or in any way solicit, request, command, importune, cause, or aid the commission thereof; and
     (ii) Was not armed with a deadly weapon, or any instrument, article, or substance readily capable of causing death or serious physical injury; and
     (iii) Had no reasonable grounds to believe that any other participant was armed with such a weapon, instrument, article, or substance; and
     (iv) Had no reasonable grounds to believe that any other participant intended to engage in conduct likely to result in death or serious physical injury.

**RCW 9A.32.060
Manslaughter in the first degree.**

(1) A person is guilty of manslaughter in the first degree when:

     (a) He recklessly causes the death of another person;

**RCW 9A.32.070
Manslaughter in the second degree.**

(1) A person is guilty of manslaughter in the second degree when, with criminal negligence, he causes the death of another person.

***The 2019 Thomas S. Foley Memorial***

***International Diplomacy Competition***

***Purpose of Competition:***

We are proud that this event is continuing to grow. As many of you are aware, several top winners in the World Language category at the annual Spokane Scholars Awards have also been the winners of this event.

**The *Thomas S. Foley Memorial International Diplomacy Competition* was designed solely for fostering the mastery of international languages in Northwest High Schools. *Thus, schools without speech and debate programs are encouraged to participate in this competition and may do so at the reduced rate of $5.00 per student rather than the $30.00 per student fee charged of students entering the full Forensics Competition.***

Over the years, we have made changes to the rules to make International Diplomacy more “user friendly” for all competitors and hopefully make the event more rewarding for all involved. The event should be enjoyable for any student in his or her third or fourth year in a world language course. Students in their first or second year are encouraged to watch, and may participate if they desire to do so, but are unlikely to do well in the event as it is unlikely that such students will have mastered their target languages to the extent necessary to prevail in the competition.

International diplomacy will coincide with congressional debate. Competitors may enter **either** **congressional debate OR international diplomacy, but NOT both.**

**OBJECTIVES:**

The objective in this competition is to mimic diplomatic negotiations within a country. The countries represented are **Spain, Venezuela, Germany, and France**.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Each competitor must participate using the language of his/her chosen country and all procedures, speeches and resolutions must, to the extent possible, be written or spoken in the target language. Sporadic lapses into English will not disqualify a student, but will be counted against him or her in the final judging. Half of each competitor’s score is based on his/her mastery of the target language and half of the score is based on the student’s ability to negotiate solutions to the issues raised. (Spanish, German, and French)** **Dictionaries** in written or electronic form **are allowed**, but are the responsibility of the individual competitor (dictionaries will not be provided by the tournament).

Each competitor shall represent a political party of his/her chosen country and speak or vote according to the views of the chosen party. The goal is to settle each issue with a resolution that satisfies all or the majority of the competitors in each applicable chamber for the greater good of the applicable “nation.”

**Computers**

Students will be allowed to use computers in round for note taking, the reading of speeches and looking up prepared evidence. **Internet use will not be allowed**. Any competitor using the internet on a laptop, smart phone etc will be disqualified. The use of computers is at the risk of the individual competitor. Power strips will not be provided for competitors. Students are not allowed to use computers that are currently in the classroom. Competitors who unplug objects in a classroom will be disqualified from the tournament. The tournament will not be liable for any computer crashes or technological issues. Competitors are encouraged to bring paper copies of evidence and speeches so as to be prepared for computer malfunction.

**Legislation**

Three pieces of legislation and two questions for consideration and possible legislation have been provided for each of the three target languages. Each competitor may select one of the pieces of legislation and translate it into the competitor/student’s target language prior to the tournament. The translation will be graded equivalent to one “speech” and will be counted in the applicable competitor/student’s score. Any translations should be brought to the tournament. A student may if s/he desires, prepare a piece of legislation in his/her target legislation with respect to either of the questions for consideration and possible legislation and count that document as his/her “translation.”

**RULES OF THE CHAMBERS:**

**Preliminary Rounds:**

1. Each member of the chamber should be prepared to speak on the three preliminary resolutions and two questions for consideration and possible legislation that are posted on the tournament website and attached to these rules. **Note: the speeches and resolutions should reflect the views of the particular competitor’s chosen country and party, and be that contestant’s original work. The student is speaking as if s/he was an actual member of the chosen political party and a citizen/legislator from the chosen country.**

2. The chamber shall elect a student to act as chair to run the chamber for each hour. Competitors shall be nominated by other students in the chamber. Each chair will preside for approximately one hour. The chamber may have a different election each hour or hold all of the elections at one time. The Chair should control the chamber, order of speakers, debate and voting on resolutions. He or she should also time the speeches made in the chamber.

3. Each competitor will choose to represent a specific political party from the applicable nation (France, Germany, and Spain). The political parties are to be chosen from the list posted attached to these rules.

4. Speeches **may not exceed three minutes** in length. A **one minute questioning** time will be allowed following each speaker. Any member of the chamber may stand to obtain permission of the chair to ask the speaker one question during this time. **The chair will give time signals.**

5. At any time, any competitor may rise (stand) to ask the chair to go into informal conference. If the majority of the chamber wishes to do so, the competitors will informally discuss the legislation amongst themselves. When it appears to the chair that competitors have had sufficient time to discuss the issues in the informal setting, the chair shall call the chamber back into (normal) session.

6. An informal conference will be scored as a “speech” with each student receiving credit, and being scored for, one “speech” during the period of the informal conference.

7. Diplomacy consisting of discussions, arguments, proposals and counter proposals shall continue until a satisfactory compromise has been reached by a majority of competitors present or until time runs out. When the majority of the chamber believes a satisfactory resolution to the legislation may be reached, the chair will conduct a vote. Each competitor has one vote. Abstaining is permitted. Majority rule prevails. The chair may only vote in a tie.

8. The resolutions and questions for discussion may be discussed in any order preferred by the majority of contestants in the chamber. The contestants are not required to discuss all of the preliminary issues.

9. A chamber may, but need not, prepare a written piece of legislation resolving either or both of the questions for consideration and possible legislation.

**JUDGING:**

**In the preliminary session, there will be one judge (an applicable world language teacher or speaker) who will rank the top four (4) competitors in each applicable chamber at the conclusion of the entire preliminary competition Each judge’s ranking/scoring of students should be based on the following criteria.**

1. Students shall be judged on their ability to speak the language and upon the clarity of their speaking. This includes grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, etc. **Mastery of the target language should constitute fifty percent** of each competitor’s score/ranking.

2. Students will also be judged on the content of their speeches. Does a competitor’s speeches pertain to the topic? Are they in accordance with the views of the chosen political party? Competitors’ abilities to speak confidently and ably, including volume, eye contact, fluidity of speech, tempo etc. will be considered by the judge in making his or her ranking.

3. During a competitor’s time as chair, s/he shall be judged upon her/his ability to control the chamber and upon her/his ability to speak in the target language.

4. The judge shall also consider each competitor’s decorum, politeness, persuasiveness, and adherence to these rules.

6. Individual ballots will be completed for the purposes of helping students who may wish to compete in this event again in the future, and for the rewarding of National Forensics League points for National Forensics League members. The competitor ballots count one hour of diplomacy or one translated piece of legislation as equivalent to one congressional debate speech and shall be scored on a 1-6 point basis (although session one is just short of two hours, we ask judges to credit students for two full hours).

**Please Note:**

The individual ballots need not be considered by the judge(s) in ranking the chamber. ***Ranking of the chamber is at the discretion of the judge(s).*** The judge’s ranking, not the individual ballots, will determine which students advance to the Final or UN Session.

**At the end of the preliminary session, the four top competitors from each of the target languages will proceed to the Final or UN Session.**

**FINAL “UN SECURITY SESSION”**

1. The **top four competitors from each of the target** languages will meet for the final round which will be a mock UN Security Council Meeting.
2. A presiding chair will be provided to the session. The chair will speak in English simply for ease of facilitating the debate and negotiations.
3. The presiding chair will read a note to the Security Council. For the purposes of preparation, competitors will only be told the following prior to the final round.
	1. There will be a **request for economic sanctions against Saudi Arabia.** Competitors should be familiar with arguments both for and against the use of economic sanctions. **Note:** In opposing the use of sanctions, a competitor may propose any alternative(s) that s/he wishes to impose (e.g. peacekeepers etc.).
4. Each of the tjudges from the preliminary session will serve as judges in the final session.
5. Each competitor must speak to the extent possible in his/her target language.
6. Judging of competitors will be on the same criteria as the preliminary sessions.
7. When any competitor speaks, the judge of his/her target language will translate the speech into English for the benefit of the other competitors in the room.
8. The competitor should explain in English to the applicable target language judge what s/he is going to be arguing. This should be done to help the judge in the translation (i.e. to prevent contestant language errors from affecting the debate).
9. ***At the conclusion of the final session, all judges will meet to rank the winners. As opposed to other types of debate, the judges are instructed to talk with and work with each other to come up with a list of the five best competitors. Awards will be given for first place, second place, third place, and two finalists.***
10. Good luck and have fun!

**German Political Parties**

1. Christlich Demokratische Union, CDU (Christian Democratic Union)

2. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, SPD (Social Democratic Party)

3. Alternative für Deutschland, AfD, (Alternative for Germany)

4. Freie Demokratische Partei, FDP (Free Democratic Party)

5. Die Linke (The Left)

6. Die Gruenen (The Greens)

7. Christlich-Soziale Union, CSU (Christian Social Union)

**French Political Parties**

1. Parti Socialiste, PS (Socialist Party)

2. Union pour un Mouvement Populaire, UMP (Union for a Popular Movement)

3. Mouvement Démocratie, MoDem (Democratic Movement

4. Parti Communiste Français, PCF (French Communist Party)

5. Les Verts, VEC (The Greens)

6. Front national, FN (The National Front)

7. Nouveau Centre, NC (New Center)

8. La République en Marche (The Republic on the Move)

**Spanish Political Parties**

1. Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE (Spanish Socialist Workers' Party)

2. Partido Popular, PP (People’s Party)

3. Izquierda Unida, IU (United Left)

4. Convergència i Unión, CiU (Convergence and Unión)

5. Partido Nacionalista Vasco, PNV (Basque Nationalist Party)

6. Coalición Canaria, CC (Canarian Coalition)

7. Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya, ERC (Republican Left of Catalonia)

8. Union Progreso y Democracia, UPyD (Union, Progress and Demovracy)

9. Amaiur, AMAIUR

10. Eusko Alderdi Jeltzalea, EAJ (Basque Nationalist Party)

11. Bloque Nacionalista Galego, BNG (Galician Nationalist Bloc

Venezuelan Political Parties

1. United Socialist Party of Venezuela
2. Partido Socialista Unido de Venezuela
3. Justice First
4. Primero Justici
5. Democratic Action
6. Acción Democrática

1. A New Era
2. Un Nuevo Tiempo
3. Popular Will
4. Voluntad Popular
5. The Radical Cause
6. La Causa Radical
7. Progresist Movement of Venezuela(es)
8. Movimiento Progresista de Venezuela
9. Project Venezuela
10. Proyecto Venezuela
11. Communist Party of Venezuela
12. Partido Comunista de Venezuela
13. Progressive Advance
14. Avanzada Progresista
15. Clear Accounts(es)
16. Cuentas Claras
17. Fearless People's Alliance
18. Alianza Bravo Pueblo
19. Come Venezuela
20. Vente Venezuela
21. Emergent People(es)
22. Gente Emergente
23. Republican Bicentennial Vanguard
24. Vanguardia Bicentenaria Republicana

***International Diplomacy***

***Legislation***

***French***

***Legislation***

A Resolution to Veto Bike Registration

**WHEREAS**, The government is considering requiring French cyclists to register their bikes on a national database; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposal is part of a 25-point €350 million plan unveiled at the end of 2018 expected to come into effect in 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, There is no proof that the plan will decrease the number of cars on the road; and;

**WHEREAS**, the plan is expensive, ill conceived, poorly thought out and fails to address bicycle theft, while increasing bureaucracy, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Republic of France should veto bike registration.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to End Illegal Fish Poaching in Marseille

**WHEREAS**, Calanques National Park stretches across limestone cliffs, forest, sea and islands between Marseille and La Ciotat; and

**WHEREAS**, Mafia-style fish poachers are threatening national attempts to repopulate the overexploited waters of the Mediterranean; and

**WHEREAS**, Large quantities of endangered fish are poached to sell illegally to small restaurants in Marseille; and;

**WHEREAS**, Fines of more than €450,000 have had no impact on the poachers;

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Republic of France should take stronger action to end the illegal fish poaching in Marseille by introducing new measures.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Veto the Ban on Plastic Cups, Plates and Utensils

**WHEREAS**, The new ban is set to take effect in 2020 and will be part of France’s Energy Transition for Green Growth Act; and

**WHEREAS**, The country has already set a ban on disposable plastic bags; and

**WHEREAS**, The restriction on plastic products follow the global climate agreement reached in Paris in 2015; and

**WHEREAS**, Plastic cups, plates, utensils and similar implements are a necessary and vital part of the great French tradition of “Fun Outdoors,” and banning such items goes against generations of French culture and seeks to penalize French citizens from enjoying their traditional Sunday picnic now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Republic of France should veto the ban on plastic cups, plates and utensils.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

**France - Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation**

1. Should the French government do more to increase funding for natural disasters in the wake of 11 deaths due to a flash flood in the southwestern Aude region?
2. Should the French Soccer League do more to decrease racism and discrimination at the amateur level?

***German***

***Legislation***

A Resolution to Introduce Checks on the Medical Profession

**WHEREAS**, More than 130 patients died while under the care of a hospital burse in Oldenburg; and

**WHEREAS**, the nurse was allowed to kill with impunity for so long without hospital authorities or law enforcement intervening; and

**WHEREAS**, the hospital authorities had everything they needed to stop him, but didn’t; and;

**WHEREAS**, the fundamental right to receive care has been compromised, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Federal Republic of Germany should introduce checks on the medical profession.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Explore Options for Shipping and Transporting Goods

**WHEREAS**, The Rhine is the major river for transport; and

**WHEREAS**, One of the longest dry spells on record has left parts of the Rhine at record-low levels for months; and

**WHEREAS**, freighters have been forced to reduce their cargo or stop plying the river altogether; and

**WHEREAS**, as it stands, global warming is causing less snowfall in the Alps, which is an enormous long-term reserve for the river, therefore, making water transport unsustainable be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Federal Republic of Germany should explore other options for shipping and transporting goods.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Prevent a Hard Brexit

**WHEREAS**, German trade surplus with Britain amounts to €50 billion per year; and

**WHEREAS**, A hard Brexit would have a worse impact on the German economy than a trade war with the US; and

**WHEREAS**, the likelihood of a hard Brexit has increased dramatically in recent months; and;

**WHEREAS**, the border between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland has become an insurmountable obstacle in the negotiations, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Federal Republic of Germany should prevent a hard Brexit by compromising with the British government.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

**Germany Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation**

1. What measures should the German Republic take to combat the far right in the wake of Merkel’s departure?
2. What actions, if any, should the German Government take to shift to renewable energy and away from coal?

***Spanish***

***Legislation***A Resolution to Veto the Minimum Wage Hike

**WHEREAS**, the Spanish Government just authorized a 22.3 percent minimum wage hike; and

**WHEREAS**, Spain’s minimum wage jumped from €735 to €900 a month; and

**WHEREAS**, a small minimum wage increase would have little effect, but a large increase would be catastrophic; and;

**WHEREAS**, of the 19.5 million people registered as employed in Spain, the 22.3 percent wage hike will result in a loss of 150,000 jobs; and;

**WHEREAS**, the resulting rise in unemployment will have the most significant impact on young people and older unskilled workers, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Kingdom of Spain should veto the minimum wage hike.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Ban Prostitution

**WHEREAS**, prostitution is currently unregulated; and

**WHEREAS**, more than 50 Spanish cities have specific municipal rules to curb prostitution, some punishing the client and the prostitute and others only the client; and

**WHEREAS**, the regulations aim to protect women, keep residents happy, and clean up the streets, but instead end up hurting women who are victims of sex trafficking, and;

**WHEREAS**, women, especially in Madrid, have been persecuted by these laws, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Kingdom of Spain should ban prostitution all together.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Raise the Coalminer Early Retirement Age

**WHEREAS**, Spain is to shut down most of its coalmines by the end of the year in a €250 million deal that will be invested in mining regions over the next decade, and;

**WHEREAS**, the deal struck with unions and Spain’s privately owned pits mixes early retirement for miners over 48, with environmental restoration work in pit communities and re-skilling schemes for green industries; and

**WHEREAS**, more than a thousand miners and subcontractors will lose their jobs when 10 pits close at the end of 2018, and;

**WHEREAS**, 60% of miners will be able to opt for early retirement’ and;

**WHEREAS**, the cost of early retirement is great, and the workers should have more chances for re-skilling, and;

**WHEREAS**, 55 would be a better age for retirement, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Kingdom of Spain should agree to raising the coalminer early retirement age to 55.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

**Spanish Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation**

1. Would it be in Spain’s best interest to ensure the remains of Gen Francisco Franco are not reburied in Madrid’s Aludena Cathedral after exhumation from the dictator’s famous mausoleum?
2. Should Spain invest more in researching living longer, given Spain was recently ranked as having the longest average lifespan?

***Venezuelan***

***Legislation***

A Resolution to Curb Hyperinflation

**WHEREAS**, the Venezuelan government has raised the minimum wage four times this year; and

**WHEREAS**, the average person cannot afford to live; and

**WHEREAS**, Venezuela has almost run out of foreign reserves, lost access to foreign debt markets and is out of favor with other governments; and;

**WHEREAS**, the resulting lack of certainty has led to businesses paying workers in eggs rather than money, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Government of Venezuela should introduce price controls while working to restore stability through economic reforms and commitments to reduce the money supply.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Provide Welfare to Citizens

**WHEREAS**, 2.3 million Venezuelans- 7 percent of the population- have left Venezuela over the past few years; and

**WHEREAS**, the country’s economy has shrunk by half in just 5 years, and shortages of food and medicine have led to a crisis in public health; and

**WHEREAS**, the government should be doing more to help its citizens, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Government should take swift actions to provide welfare to its citizens.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

A Resolution to Ban Drones

**WHEREAS**, President Nicolás was nearly assassinated when drones exploded at a military parade, and;

**WHEREAS**, seven people were injured and six people were arrested over the incident; and

**WHEREAS**, the defense minister claimed that those behind the attack were aiming to decapitate the government’s top leadership along with Maduro and;

**WHEREAS**, no one has claimed responsibility for the alleged assassination attempt and;

**WHEREAS**, banning drones won’t end protest, but it will put an end to aerial invasions, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By this body here assembled that the Government of Venezuela should agree to ban all drones.

*Introduced by TSFFTID Committee*

**Venezuelan Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation**

* 1. What should Venezuela’s responsibility be to Ecuador for harboring refugees?
	2. How should Venezuela, which is in crisis, respond to natural disasters like its 7.3 magnitude earthquake?
1. Over the years, we have received several requests to include Russian, Chinese and / or Japanese. We would be happy to do so if sufficient students would enroll and teachers of these languages could be obtained to judge. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)