

Tab 1

Entertaining Cases Tournament 2024

Competitor sign up form:	Due on Friday, November 29th	link
Judging only sign up form:	Due on Saturday, November 30th	link
Case submission form:	Due on Saturday, November 30th	link
Add your paradigm:	Due on Saturday, November 30th	link
Case review form:	Due on Sunday, December 1st	link
Strikes:	Due on Sunday, December 1st	link

Cases: [Cases for Entertaining Cases Tournament 2024](#)

Paradigms: [link](#)

Full pairings: [link](#)

Welcome to the 3rd LD debate entertaining cases tournament!

Information

This will be what we're doing for the last two weeks of in-person practice for the year.

This is meant to be fun, not serious. You can participate no matter how experienced or inexperienced you are. At this tournament, times are cut in half, cases are written to be insane, and you never run your own cases. It is designed for chaos.

Most prelim rounds will be on **Monday, December 2nd** and **Thursday, December 5th**. Elim rounds will be at our last practice of the year on **Monday, December 9th**.

There will be prizes for people who make it to elims, the best cases, and the people with the highest speaker points. There will also be a raffle for judges where each round you judge gets your name entered once.

Example cases from last two years: [Cases for Entertaining Tournament](#)

[Cases for Entertaining Cases Tournament 2023](#)

Example paradigms from last year:

[Entertaining Cases Tournament Judge Paradigms 2023](#)

Deadlines

I don't like deadlines, but I really do need time to plan things out and make pairings work, so I need advance notice. If for whatever reason you can't meet a deadline, try to let me know

beforehand. I understand that shit happens, but for my sanity, try to meet the deadlines, please.

Friday, 11/29/24 by midnight: Signup deadline, but please sign up as early as you can.

Saturday, 11/30/24 by midnight:

- Case submission deadline (BOTH SIDES)
- Judge paradigm deadline

Sunday, 12/1/24 by midnight:

- Peer case review deadline
- Judge strikes deadline

Participating

Availability for prelims

You can participate if you can only attend on Monday the 2nd or on Thursday the 5th. If you can only attend one, it may be helpful if you could do a round outside of normal practice times.

You can also participate in the prelim rounds if you cannot attend the last practice on the 9th; you just would not be able to go to elim rounds.

Partial participation

- If you cannot attend the last practice on the 9th, you can still compete in prelims and just not go to elims.
- If you can't fully participate, you can sign up to only judge.
- You can also participate without writing cases (although I wouldn't recommend it).
- You can submit a case if you are only judging.

Schedule

Prelims

- **12/2/24** (Monday; in person) 6–9: prelims
- **12/5/24** (Thursday; virtual) 6–9: prelims
- **12/9/24** (Monday; in person): elim rounds

*Rounds outside of practice as necessary

Notes on the schedule

- I'll do my best to make it so that everyone can get enough prelim rounds in.
- You will also be judging rounds (novices included), so you need to be available for more than 4 rounds.
- If you cannot make virtual practice on Thursday, it would be helpful if you could do a prelim round or two outside of practice.
- It's okay to participate if you can't make the elim rounds.

Rules

Tournament Rules

Format

- There will be **4** prelim rounds.
- I guarantee nothing when it comes to the number of aff rounds/neg rounds.
- Each round, you will have a choice between 2 or 3 cases (not yours).
- Rounds will not be power matched because I'm making the pairings beforehand or chaos will ensue.
- We will break to partial or full quarterfinals—no one with below a 3–1 record will break. If there are 8 or fewer people with 3–1 or better, all will break and we will have partial quarters. If there are more than 8 people with winning records, not all 3–1s will break.

Seeding

1. # of wins
2. # of times your cases win
3. # of times your cases *lose*
4. Speaker points, drop high/low

Cases

- Each round, you will have a choice of 2–3 cases to run. These will not be your cases and will not be your opponent's or your judge's.
- Everyone's cases will be given as an option to other debaters approximately an equal number of times. Seeding is then based on number of times your cases win and then number of times they lose (popularity is important).

Case Review

- You will review two cases from an assigned peer. You should be making sure that the case is the right length and follows evidence rules.

Judging and paradigms

- Everyone will be judging.
- You will create a paradigm in the paradigm document. These are meant to be fun.
- Your paradigm cannot significantly alter how the win/loss of a round is evaluated. You can make entertaining but reasonable requirements for arguments, but the round still needs to be judged based on merits of the arguments.
- Your paradigm should primarily have fun with speaker points.
- Try to make your paradigm fun and not meant to make the round unpleasant for the debaters.

- We will have **judge strikes** where you can strike up to 3 judges. This means that you won't be judged by them. I do not promise that strikes are anonymous.

Round Rules

Unless explicitly specified otherwise, normal rules apply—no new arguments in rebuttals, dropped arguments can't be re-extended, ex.

Speech times:

AC	3 min
CX	1.5 min
NC/1NR	3.5 min
CX	1.5 min
1AR	2 min
2NR	3 min
2AR	1.5 min

Prep time:

Varsity: no prep

Novices who have attended a tournament in varsity: no prep

Other novices:

- Attended 2+ tournaments: no prep
- Attended 1 tournament: 1 minute
- Attended 0 tournaments: 1.5 minutes

Case Rules

1. You should write weird/whacky/stupid cases for both sides.
2. Aff cases should be 3 minutes long, and neg cases should be 1.5–2 minutes.
3. Normal cases are not allowed.
4. You will not be reading your own cases. How well your cases do in the tournament will decide seeding, so you want your cases to do well.
5. Cases are due beforehand and will be reviewed for excess sanity and lack of quality.
6. Your cases should have evidence, and the evidence may not be made up. Highly recommend citing sources like the *Onion*. You just need to find someone else to say idiotic stuff for you.

Evidence Rules

Most cases will be based on true evidence pieced together in entertaining ways. Use real scientific articles, news articles, etc. True things can lead to really funny conclusions.

1. You need cards that follow normal evidence ethics rules—no misleading card cutting and no making up evidence.
2. All sources are equally credible
 - a. Pretend all articles are published by Harvard and news articles are from the Associated Press, and the authors are all experts in the field. Experts can be

wrong, so criticize sources in the same way you would if experts were the authors.

- b. Examples of legitimate sources: folktales, fictional stories, religious texts, satire, social media, quacks, government propaganda, weird philosophers, etc.
 - c. Getting people on the team or outside of the team to say what you want is *not* legitimate.
3. Like in normal LD, private sources cannot be used (ex. private conversations). All evidence must be accessible to the entire team.
- a. Note that our internal Slack or Google Drive are fair game as “public” sources.
4. Freeze on sources modifiable by the public or anyone on the team:
- a. Quotes on Slack or from any team-generated material must have been created on or before November 20th.
 - b. For sources like wikis or Urban Dictionary, it is forbidden to make changes to a page or to have someone else make changes to a page in order to cite it.

Examples of acceptable and unexceptionable evidence arguments:

ACCEPTABLE: Questioning methodology or “lack of evidence”

Ex. My opponent's point is supported by a singular example. My evidence is from Jack and the Beanstalk. This story has been around far longer than almost all scientific research. It has stood the test of time. This is the closest thing to historical consensus that we have. As such, we can clearly conclude that giants exist.

UNACCEPTABLE: Questioning the credibility of the source

Ex. Prefer my definition from Merriam Webster over my opponent's from Urban Dictionary because Urban Dictionary isn't credible.

ACCEPTABLE: Explaining why one source should be used over another

Ex. Empirically, cases on our team cite Merriam Webster far more frequently than Urban Dictionary. This indicates consensus on our team. As such, prefer my definition from Merriam Webster over the definition from Urban Dictionary.

UNACCEPTABLE: Discounting evidence based on the author

Ex. Don't believe my opponent's evidence from George Santos because he is a known liar.

ACCEPTABLE: Weighing evidence quality

Ex. I give you examples of this occurring while my opponent only has the words of one person.