

Thomas S. Foley
Memorial Forensics
Tournament

Invitation and
Information Packet

February 4, 5, and 6, 2016

Thomas S. Foley Memorial Forensics Tournament
Invitation and Information Packet

Table of Contents

Invitation	4
Registration Information	4
Sweepstakes	5
General Tournament Rules	6
Special Awards	6
Congressional Debate	7
Debate	9
International Diplomacy (See also Appendix B)	11
Individual Events Pattern A	11
[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 and Radio Speaking/Editorial Commentary. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.]	
Individual Events Pattern B	13
[This pattern contains the standard pattern B events. (Oratory, Humorous Interpretation, Impromptu and Interpretive Reading), Prepared Storytelling, Political Impromptu, Oratorical Analysis, Dual Improvisation, and Original Performance. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.]	
SPARFEST	15
Judging Requirements	17
Tournament Food Options	17
Tournament Lodging	17
Schedule	18

Suggestions for Competing in John Clark Legal Argument	19
John Clark Legal Argument Rules	21
State vs. Rundlet (This year's John Clark Legal Argument Case)	21
Pertinent Washington Statutory Law	28
International Diplomacy Rules and Legislation	32

2016 Thomas S. Foley Memorial Forensics Tournament

Titan Debate - University High School – 12420 East 32nd Ave. – Spokane Valley, WA. 99216

Cell Phone 509-993-7751 - Fax 509-228-5249 – Email dsmithy@cvsd.org

Registration website address: <https://www.tabroom.com/register>

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 **February 4-6, 2016**, at **University High School and the WSU Spokane Center in Spokane**, Washington. As the name suggests, this tournament is being held in recognition and in honor of Tom Foley's many years of service to Washington State 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, four traditional debate activities, seventeen IE/speech events in two patterns and SPAR as an “extra bonus Thursday” event for those who are in town and wish to participate. (See SPAR rules and schedule).** It is our sincere hope that this tournament will provide you and your students with 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

A Flat Rate per Student

All programs are experiencing financial hardship. Since *Foley* is a non-profit tournament, we can afford to provide the **one low price of \$25.00 per student**, each student may enter congressional debate or International Diplomacy; **AND** one of four traditional debate events; **AND** up to four IE/speech events, **AND** SPAR 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, February 2, 2016 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/register/>. Fees will be assessed as of **5:15 p.m. on Tuesday, February 2, 2016. After 5:15 PM on Tuesday**, 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 that 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 School and Large School).

Sweepstakes Calculations	Policy—1st-30; 2nd-20; 3rd-15; Qtrs.-10 LD—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5 Public Forum—1st-12; 2nd-8; 3rd-5; Qtrs.-3 Parli—1st-12; 2nd-8; 3rd-5; Qtrs.-3 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. I.e. a competitor may enter:

- A) Either Congressional Debate or International Diplomacy **AND**
- B) One Non-Congressional Debate [Policy, LD, Public Forum, or Parli] **AND**
- C) Two Pattern “A” events and two Pattern “B” events **AND**
- D) SPAR as an extra bonus event.

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 that 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 Regular Registration Deadline, Tuesday, February 2, 2016. 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 will 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. SPAR does not 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 submit your nominations to Ms. Sally Jackson, Thomas S. Foley Ambassador's Award Selection Committee Chair. Although any nominations should be addressed to Ms. Jackson, the same should be emailed to the tournament director as an attachment at dsmithy@cvsd.org 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 send a letter nomination to the Foley Forensics Tournament Committee Chair, Ms. Sally Jackson. 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.

Please submit your nominations to Ms. Sally Jackson, Anita Sue Spirit of Debate Award Selection Committee Chair. Although any nominations should be addressed to Ms. Jackson, the same should be emailed to the tournament director as an attachment at dsmithy@cvsd.org Nominations must be received by the regular registration deadline.

Events

Student Congress: We will host four levels of congress, novice, junior varsity, open, and champ. **Awards will be presented to the top seven speakers in each level.** 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.

Tournament of Champions (TOC) 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).

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 **2015/2016 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 Lincoln Douglas debate. We will be using the **2016 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 **2016 February National Forensics League topic** will be used, which will be available on the NFL website.

Parliamentary (Parli) Debate: We will provide *junior and open divisions* 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. The junior division is open to any team with debaters, neither of whom has competed at ten (10) or more tournaments.

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 Rules:

National Parliamentary Debate Association Rules
<http://www.parlidebate.org/npda-rules/>

NPDA Rules of Debating (Modified June, 2008)

RULES OF DEBATING AND JUDGING

1. Resolutions

A. A different resolution for each round will be presented to the debaters at a specified time prior to the beginning of each debate. The specified time will be determined by adding fifteen minutes to the amount of time needed to walk to the most distant building in which debates are to occur.

B. The topic of each round will be about current affairs or philosophy. The resolutions will be general enough that a well-educated college student can debate them. They may be phrased in literal or metaphorical language.

2. Objective of the debate

The proposition team must affirm the resolution by presenting and defending a sufficient case for that resolution. The opposition team must oppose the resolution and/or the proposition team's case.

If, at the end of the debate, the judge believes that the proposition team has supported and successfully defended the resolution, they will be declared the winner, otherwise the opposition will be declared the winner.

3. Before the debate

The proposition team, if they wish, may use the room assigned for debate for their preparation. If the proposition team uses the debating room for preparation, both the judge and the opposition must vacate the room until the time for the debate to begin.

4. During the debate

A. Any published information (dictionaries, magazines, etc.), which may have been consulted before the debate, cannot be brought into the debating chambers for use during the debate. Except for **handwritten** notes that the debaters themselves have prepared during preparation time ~~and a copy of the NPDA "Rules of Debating and Judging,"~~ no published materials, prepared arguments, or resources for the debaters' use in the debate may be brought into the debating chambers.

B. Debaters may refer to any information that is within the realm of knowledge of liberally educated and informed citizens. If they believe some cited information to be too specific, debaters may request that their opponent explain specific information with which they are unfamiliar. In the event further explanation of specific information is requested, the debater should provide details sufficient to allow the debater to understand the connection between the information and the claim. Judges will disallow specific information only in the event that no reasonable person could have access to the information: e.g., information that is from the debater's personal family history.

C. Format of the debate

First Proposition Constructive Speaker: 7 minutes

First Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Second Proposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Second Opposition Constructive Speaker: 8 minutes

Opposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 4 minutes

Proposition Rebuttal by First Speaker: 5 minutes

D. Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches

Introduction of new arguments is appropriate during all constructive speeches. However, debaters may not introduce new arguments in rebuttal speeches except that the proposition rebuttalist may introduce new arguments in his or her rebuttal to refute arguments that were first raised in the Second Opposition Constructive. New examples, analysis, analogies, etc. that support previously introduced arguments are permitted in rebuttal speeches.

E. Points of Information

A debater may request a point of information—either verbally or by rising—at any time after the first minute and before the last minute of any constructive speech. The debater holding the floor has the discretion to accept or refuse points of information. If accepted, the debater requesting the point of information has a maximum of fifteen seconds to make a statement or ask a question. The speaking time of the debater with the floor continues during the point of information.

F. Points of Order

Points of order can be raised for no reason other than those specified in these Rules of Debating and Judging. If at any time during the debate, a debater believes that his or her opponent has violated one of these Rules of Debating and Judging, he or she may address the Speaker of the House with a point of order. Once recognized by the Speaker of the House, the debater must state, but may not argue for, the point of order. At the discretion of the Speaker of the House, the accused may briefly respond to the point of order. The Speaker of the House will then rule immediately on the point of order in one of three ways: point well taken, point not well taken, or point taken under consideration. The time used to state and address a point of order will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor. A point of order is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor violations.

G. Points of Personal Privilege

At any time during the debate, a debater may rise to a point of personal privilege when he or she believes that an opponent has personally insulted one of the debaters, has made an offensive or tasteless comment, or has grievously misconstrued another's words or arguments. The Speaker will then rule on whether or not the comments were acceptable. The time used to state and address a point of personal privilege will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor. Like a point of order, a point of personal privilege is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor transgressions. Debaters may be penalized for raising spurious points of personal privilege.

Laptops MAY NOT be used during 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 research section of the debate, but for fairness for all competitors, laptops **may not be used** during the round. As stated above, handwritten notes may be taken into the round.

International Diplomacy: This event is designed to foster the study of world languages and international diplomacy. In the preliminary rounds, students are divided up by target language (French, German, Spanish, or Chinese). Top students from each target language will advance to the Final/UN Security Council Round. This event competes with congressional debate. **Rules and issues are attached in Appendix B. (Open division only.)**

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 and Radio Speaking/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.)**

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.)**

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

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 150 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.)**

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.)**

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.)**

Interpretive Reading: The art of interpretation is to be regarded as recreating the characters and/or mood in the material presented and making them seem real to the audience. Presentation shall NOT be from memory, and the reader's script should be presented. Cuttings from prose and poetry must be given and the student should prepare meaningful introductions and transitions. Selections should be judged for their appropriateness as contest material and their suitability to the particular contestants using them. The judge should note favorably the student's use of good literature in a balanced program. The contestant should be judged on poise, quality and use of voice inflections, emphasis, enunciation, pronunciation and, especially, the ability to interpret characters and/or mood correctly and consistently. The use of full bodily movement (bending, kneeling or turning) is not permitted in interpretive reading. Bodily movement should be limited to a one step radius.

1. The format will be a thematically integrated program of two or more selections in which the contestant will use a balanced program of both published prose (NO DRAMA) and poetry as a presentation requirement; the speaker will use an introduction in which the authors, titles and theme will be stated. This program may not have been used in forensic competition by the student prior to the current competitive season.
2. The authors of the prose and poetry portions must be different. The same author may be used more than once within the prose or poetry portion of the program.
3. A manuscript is required. There will be no penalty for eye contact as long as the illusion of reading is maintained. No costumes, makeup, or props.
4. Students may not present the same selection(s) in Humorous Interpretation and Dramatic Interpretation, Dual Interpretation or Interpretive Reading.
5. The art of interpretation is regarded as recreating the characters and/or mood in the material presented and making them seem real to the audience. No penalty for using humor.
6. Time limit: Maximum of eight (8) minutes. 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.

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.)**

SPARFEST (Bonus Event)

All students may enter SPAR. However, the judging burden for this event is one judge to two competitors. 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 to prepare 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) SPAR does not count toward either the Foley Award or sweepstakes.
- 3) There are NO judge strikes in this event.
- 4) There are NO judge conflicts in this event. That means that a judge can judge a person from his/her own school.
- 5) There is NO one year out rule for judges in this event.
- 6) Varsity debaters who are not competing in SPAR may judge Novice SPAR.
- 7) 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.
- 8) There will be eight preliminary rounds.
- 9) 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).
- 10) Time limits will be strictly enforced.
- 11) 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.
- 12) 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!
- 13) 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.
- 14) 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.

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, or 2 Public Forum, 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 student congress and 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. The Spokane County Democratic Party supplies some volunteer judges to offset the need of increased judging requirements. Also, a limited number of judges will be available for hire through the tournament.

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 the WSU Center. We are sorry, but we can no longer afford to provide a complimentary lunch at the tournament.

Lodging: Special tournament rates are available

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

Mirabeau Park Hotel – (509)924-9000 or (866)-584-4674 for individual reservations... or for Mirabeau Park Hotel - (509)924-9000 or (866)-584-4674 for individual reservations... or for group blocks Call Jason Perry at (509) 922-6229 or email him at jperry@mirabeauparkhotel.com for further information. \$85.00 for the Executive room type, (up to 4 people per room) - includes breakfast, heated outside pool, patio and hot tub, on site restaurant, plenty of bus parking.

La Quinta Inn & Suites Spokane - (509) 893-0955 – No special Foley Rate is being offered this year. Competitors are simply asked to contact the hotel for more information. The hotel, which provides a full breakfast, was updated in 2013, 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. Call or e-mail Michelle Lin for group blocks. michellelin@hour88.com / (517) 980-2682 cell.

Quality Inn Valley Suites –509-928-5218-\$85.00 per room (up to 4 people per room) includes full hot breakfast, indoor pool and hot tub, exercise room, cookies and milk at night. Complimentary meeting spaces for teams. Contact Sarai Fesler at the above phone numbers or by e-mail at sfesler@impressguest.com

2016 Foley Forensics Tournament Schedule

Thursday, February 4, 2016

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 winners.]
- 9:00** **End of Thursday Activities**

Friday, February 5, 2016

AM WSU Spokane Campus

- 7:00** **Congress Session 1** [All Divisions]
- 7:15** **International Diplomacy Session 1**
- 9:00** **Break**
- 9:15** **Congress & International Diplomacy Session 2** [All Divisions]
- 11:15** **Lunch (UHS DECA will be offering pizza at \$1.50 per slice plus drinks etc. at WSU. We are sorry, but increasing prices have forced us to discontinue the complimentary lunches.)**
- 12:00** **Champ Division Super Congress Convenes**
- 12:00** **Super Congress** [Open, JV, and Novice Divisions]
- 12:15** **International Diplomacy Final UN Security Council Session**
- 1:50** **All Events other than Champ Level Congress Travel to University HS for the remainder of the Tournament**[\[1\]](#)
- 2:45** **Champ Level Super Congress Concludes.**
- 2:50** **Champ Level Congress Travel to University HS for the remainder of the tournament.**

Friday Late Afternoon and Evening at University HS

- 3:00** **Debate Round 3**
- 5:00** **IE Pattern A Round 1**
- 6:45** **IE Pattern B Round 1**

8:30 Debate Round 4

Saturday, February 6, 2016

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 2016

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

1

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.

State vs. Rundlet

Introduction

This case arises out of a police shooting which occurred on or about the 23rd of October, 2015 in the City of Someplace, Washington at approximately 16:47 hours. The prosecution alleges that, while responding to a 911 call about a young Arabian looking man waiving a gun, the defendant Lorna C. Rundlet, shot and killed fourteen year old Syrian refugee, Yohanna Tammuz. Officer Rundlet faces charges of first degree murder and lesser included offenses.

Erica Brooker

Police Sargent Erica Brooker is a 47 year old white female police officer who was born and raised in Heart Mountain, Idaho. She attended Panhandle University, where she obtained a BA and a Master’s Degree in Police Science. She went on to study for a year at the Someplace Police Academy, where she graduated with honors. Ms. Brooker joined the Someplace Police Department in October of 1992. She currently holds the rank of Patrol Sargent. She has been assigned to supervise the new rookie, Lorna C. Rundlet.

Ms. Brooker states:

We came on shift at 1400 hours. We were initially assigned to patrol the quiet Northwest quadrant. Chief Staufern (Sam Staufern) wanted me to keep the kid out of trouble. He told me, “I don’t know what it is, but something bothers me about that kid.” The Northwest quadrant is a quiet middle class residential neighborhood. It seemed the perfect place for a rookie to slowly learn the ropes. Unfortunately, “slow” was not in the cards for us.

At 16:27, we received a call from dispatch that a young Muslim looking man was waiving a gun near the Big Red Wagon in City Center Park. The caller had apparently relayed that she did not know whether it was a real gun or not.

Kids are often playing paintball in the area, even though they are not supposed to do so due to possible danger to passersby and the risk of causing paint damage to the Red Wagon or other park sculptures.

“I was surprised by Rundlet’s response. She let out a slew of profanities that would have made a sailor blush.”

I told her I did not put up with such nonsense on my watch. She apologized and told me she’s just never forgiven those (expletive deleted) Muslim A-RABS for killing her fiancé in Iraq. I was going to write her up for the unprofessional conduct, but at this point what’s the use.

We arrived at the scene at 16:40. I pulled the car up parallel to the Big Red Wagon along Someplace Boulevard. I told Officer Rundlet that I thought I recognized one of the boys over by the cement blocks across from the wagon. I told her to stay in the car while I investigated the situation. As I approached the wagon from the car, I observed Chief Staufern’s ne’er do well kid, Mikey and his loser sidekick, Bobby Logan. In the distance, I could see the decedent, Yohanna Tammuz, off in the distance. They had obviously been playing paintball.

I shouted out to the boys to come to me. They started to run. Bobby fell and started choking. Mikey kept running. Tammuz just stood there watching Bobby. He had a glazed look on his face, like he was in shock. He was holding his paintball gun in his hands.

I jogged north toward the Red Wagon over to where Bobby was lying. While doing so, I heard two explosions that sounded like loud firecrackers and then the two gun shots. Tammuz dropped to the ground.

Bobby started getting up. (He later told me he had choked on a paper clip, but it dislodged when he fell.) I approached the decedent. He had been shot once in the head and once in the upper abdomen. I felt for a pulse and was unable to find one. I was about to try and break the news to the boys that their friend was dead, when I looked over and saw Mikey going through the victim’s pockets. Mikey just looked at me and said, “What? It’s my money. He was holding it for me.”

I called in the shooting on my hand radio. Someone must have called 911 because the paramedics arrived within just a couple of minutes.

After the paramedics arrived, I walked back up to the patrol car. Officer Rundlet was smiling like the Cheshire Cat. She said, “One less A-RAB. That’s what you call good shootin’.” I know it’s unprofessional, but I slugged her in the face and she dropped like a rock.

Mikey Staufern states:

We wuz hangin out down by the Red Wagon. It's a great place to play paintball as long as that witch, Sargent Goody Two Shoes, isn't around. Most of the cops just let us go ahead and play. They know it's pretty dumb to mess around with the chief's kid; if you know what I mean. You'd think she's on some type of vendetta. She's always snooping around to try and find stuff on me. I hate her and wish my dad would can her ass. No wonder that other cop started firing. The way she was yelling at us, you'd think some serious stuff was going down.

I didn't see much. Miss In Your Face was yelling at us. Bobby fell and was choking. Probably because he was frightened by you know who; then I heard a couple of shots and Tammuz dropped dead. I went to look and he was obviously dead, so I grabbed the money he owed me – which he had in his pocket. He told me he'd hand it over when we were done hanging out. Well; he was dead. We were done.

Bobby Logan states:

Mikey and I have been friends since grade school. Tammuz moved into the neighborhood during the summer. He's a refugee from Syria. My church, Someplace Christian, took him and his family in and we've been trying to help them out. His dad got killed over in Syria. Somebody killed his dad, just because Tammuz and his family is Christian. Weird people over there; that's all I can say.

Mikey makes too much of Officer Brooker. She means well. He's always making fun of her and he pushes her buttons when she's around. Once, he saw her wearing her high school varsity letterman's jacket at the store. Officer Brooker lettered in debate, but the gavel on her letter looks like a croquet mallet, so he calls her croquet chick.

We were playing paintball down by the Red Wagon in the park. We usually play there. Ms. Brooker has told us several times that we're not allowed to play down there, but none of the other cops seem to care. When we saw her walking over to us, we tried to run. I was scared because she'd told us if she caught us playing down there again, there'd be real trouble to pay. I had a paperclip in my mouth. I always have a paperclip in my mouth. It's my thing; you know. Somehow, when I turned to run, I started to swallow the clip and was choking. I fell to the ground and the clip got dislodged. I could have died. While I was lying on the ground, I saw Mikey throw two cherry bombs behind Officer Brooker. I tried to get up, and all of a sudden, I heard two rapid gunshots. They were so loud; my ears hurt. I'll never forget that sound. I was looking right at Caesar... er Tammuz. We call him Caesar because Tammuz is Syrian for July and July is Caesar's month.

Anyway, Caesar was just standing looking down at me. He had his paintball rifle perched over his shoulder. I remember thinking he looked like a real soldier. Yohanna seemed really worried about me. He's always telling me not to chew on those paperclips.

The sound of the gunshots and Youhanna's body were like those synchronized swimmers. Everything just happened together. Caesar jolted back and fell to the ground on his back. I knew right away he was dead. I'll never forget how horrible that was. You're probably wondering about the money Mikey took from Caesar. Mikey sells weed to some friends. He feels if it's legal for stores to sell it in Washington, why shouldn't he make some cash. Plus, he figures that no cop, except maybe Brooker, would dare do anything to him. Mikey's motto is "take a trip without leaving the school." However, since school authorities are not afraid of his old man, Mikey makes Caesar hold the money. Caesar is such a straight arrow that no one would ever suspect him of anything.

Officer Lorna C. Rundlet

Officer Lorna C. Rundlet is a rookie cop on the Someplace Police Department. She graduated near the bottom of her class from the Indianapolis Police Academy in 2014. She was initially hired by the City of Indianapolis and put on night patrol duty. She lasted about six months before resigning and applying for a position with the City of Someplace. She was hired by the City of Someplace Police Department on September 1st of 2015.

Officer Lorna C. Rundlet states:

I've only been on the force for a few months. I didn't want to screw things up this time, so I've been making sure everything goes by the book. I did two tours in Iraq with the Washington State Guard. When you're in the Guard, the army puts you where they want you.... which is on patrol. Yea, there's no question that I hate A-Rabs. They killed the love of my life. However, I don't shoot people just because they're A-Rabs. I only fired to save the life of my partner and that kid on the ground.

When the Sargent left, she told me to stay in the car. However, I heard some shouting, so I grabbed my department issued 9mm and stepped out of the car to get a look at what was happening. I heard a shot; maybe even two shots. I'm positive I heard at least one shot. Sargent Brooker was running and this Muslim A-Rab terrorist wannabe was holding a gun on some white kid on the ground. It was obvious this was the guy the 911 lady called in about. I aimed carefully making sure to take the time to get a really good shot. I fired twice and hit him both times. I'm a good shot you know.

Afterwards, when Sargent Brooker returned to the car, she slugged me. I could've saved her life, and she slugged me. I know it turned out that the kid I shot was not a terrorist, but there was no way I could have known that. From where I was standing, it was an act of terrorism going down. I was the hero here...or at least I would've been.

Bea Esther Kline

Bea Esther Kline is a 97 year old widow who lives in the Park View Senior Living Apartments about a half block from City Center Park. From her balcony, Bea can see much of the park. She believes it is her duty to watch the park and advise the police of any problems. She is a frequent caller to the police department's crime check program, but only rarely uses 911. She gave her name and contact information to the 911 operator when she called.

Bea Esther Kline states:

I saw those boys with their guns down at the park. They looked like real guns to me, even though the young men seemed to be playing. Plus, they looked too old to be playing with toy guns. One of the boys looked just like one of them terrorists on the TV news. I figured this was far too important to just make a crime check call, so I called in and talked to the nice lady at the 911 place. I told her the boys might have been playing, but it sure did look like honest to goodness terrorism to me.

After I called 911, I went and got my spotter telescope out to spy on them kids. With my telescope, I could see they were just some of those darned paintballers. Those paintballers won't be happy until they've wrecked everything in the park.

I tried to call back to 911, but no one was answering. Later, my daughter showed me I had my phone upside down; so, I guess I was calling 116. It's funny how the same thing can look the same, but be used differently, just depending on how you look at it. Phones were better in the old days when they were on the wall and you cranked them. People wouldn't make mistakes if we still cranked our phones.

Juan Somers

Juan Somers is a 57 year old Lieutenant in the Internal Affairs Department of the Someplace Police Department. He has been with the department for about twenty years. Prior to arriving in Someplace, Somers was head of security at the Dallas Zoo. He lost that position for repeatedly turning a blind eye toward students who were ditching school to hang out at the zoo. For years, he was angry with the "old grey haired teacher" who turned him in; but eventually, Somers realized he'd been wrong and decided to go back to college to not just become a police officer, but to work in internal affairs to "ferret out" bad cops.

Juan Somers states:

I was called to the scene of the shooting at 1800 hours. There was no need for a forensics examination. All the witnesses were pretty much in agreement as to what happened. Their statements have been provided.

I advised Officer Rundlet she was on administrative leave until I concluded my investigation. I also advised her she might wish to obtain legal counsel.

As part of my examination, I interviewed Officer Rundlet, Officer Brooker, Mikey Staufern, Bobby Logan, Bea Esther Kline, and even the chief himself. Their statements have been provided and are incorporated into this report by reference.

I thought it strange that Rundlet only served for a short time in Indianapolis before resigning. I contacted a friend of mine who works in the internal affairs department of the Indianapolis police department. My friend, told me on the QT that Rundlet was "asked to resign." Indianapolis Internal affairs couldn't prove anything, but they felt she might suffer from PTSD from her time in Iraq. She was erratic and impulsive. However, the

department didn't have anything they could make stick. In essence, she was offered a deal. Resign and nothing goes in your file. She took the deal, so her file is as clean as a whistle.

I walked the scene with both Officer Rundlet and Officer Brooker. I had Officer Rundlet show me exactly where she was when she fired the shots. She had a clean line of sight. I had an officer hold one of the paint guns at the point where the victim was standing. Standing at the point where Officer Rundlet fired, I could easily identify the gun in question as a paintball rifle. The officer should have been able to quickly ascertain that no one was in any real danger.

From her own statement, it is clear Rundlet was not rushed. She carefully and methodically lined up her shot. Her description of the incident reminded me more of an executioner at a firing squad than a trained patrol officer. At best, she acted if as she thought she was a Hollywood actor playing a SWAT agent. Her actions were far outside her standard of duty to the public. Furthermore, if she had simply done what her supervisor instructed her to do; i.e. stay in the patrol car, Mr. Tammuz would still be alive.

I turned over my findings to the county prosecutor.

Chief Sam N. Staufern

Chief Sam N. Staufern has been chief of police for the City of Someplace, Washington for seven years. He started as a patrol officer and worked himself up through the ranks. He received the rank of captain ten years ago and was appointed to the position of police chief by Someplace Mayor Daniel Conundrum in November of 2009. The chief has served with distinction.

Chief Sam N. Staufern states:

Mayor Conundrum, off the record, asked me to consider a friend of his family, Lorna C. Rundlet, for a position with the department when the next position came open. Although, the hiring of police officers is a matter of civil service, I have a certain amount of pull and felt I owed it to the mayor to at least look into the matter. When a position came open and Ms. Rundlet applied, I reviewed her civil service scores, and her personnel records from Indianapolis. Everything on paper looked acceptable, so I hired her.

However, she had only been here a couple of months when I started to feel uneasy about her. First of all, she shows an extreme degree of racism and hatred toward anyone from the Middle East – all of whom she considers to be Arabs and Muslims. She also seems to believe that everyone from the Middle East is a terrorist and is a danger. Things only got worse after the attack in Paris.

In addition to her racism, I felt she was impulsive and extremely quick to act. I can't give any specific facts or incidents to prove what I thought about her temper, it was just a "feeling I had." Somehow, I thought she was a "loose cannon." That's why I had her

working with Erica Brooker. Erica is solid and down to earth. I hoped Erica would be able to curb Lorna's tendency to act without thinking things through.

Dr. Wilma Brooker

Dr. Wilma Brooker is a 73 year old retired FBI agent. Her experience includes twenty years in the field and ten years teaching at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. For the last ten years, she has worked as an expert witness in matters of police procedures in both civil and criminal cases. Dr. Brooker charges \$150 an hour for investigatory work and \$250 an hour for courtroom testimony. Dr. Brooker is no relation to Erica Brooker.

Dr. Brooker has been called as an expert witness by the defense.

Dr. Wilma Brooker states:

I have reviewed the statements of the defendant, Officer Rundlet, Officer Brooker, Mikey Staufern, Bobby Logan, Bea Esther Kline, and Chief Sam Staufern, which were obtained by the City's internal affairs investigator, Juan Somers. I also visited the scene of the shooting.

It is my professional opinion, that although this was a tragic incident, Officer Rundlet's actions were both appropriate and warranted by the exigent circumstances presented at the scene.

Crimes are heat of the moment events. An officer must act fast and rely on her gut instincts. When Rundlet heard what she believed to be shots (the firecrackers), it would have been inexcusable for her to hide in her patrol car. Officer Rundlet's duty was to defend both her partner and the public. From Officer Rundlet's vantage point, once she exited her vehicle, she could see a young man holding what appeared to be a rifle over a young boy on the ground; she saw her partner running toward the scene. It was entirely reasonable, therefore, for her to use deadly force.

Dr. Amash Svengawl

Dr. Amash Svengawl is a practicing psychiatrist in the City of Someplace, Washington. He holds a Phd in Psychology and an MD with an emphasis in psychiatric medications from the University of Chicago. He has been practicing in Someplace for twenty-five years, but has never been called as an expert witness. Dr. Svengawl conducted his examination of the defendant at the request of the court.

Dr. Amash Svengawl states:

I examined Officer Rundlet for an hour. We discussed her experiences from her tour of duty in Iraq. She frequently referred to me as being Arabian and she commented on my supposed religion. She insisted I must be a Muslim. Obviously, I did not reveal my religious background. However, I asked her why my religion or ethnicity mattered. She replied that she could never trust a Muslim Arab. On that basis, Officer Rundlet refused to answer almost all of my questions on the grounds that, "I would lie about her."

The patient was fidgety throughout my interview. Although she frequently refused to respond to my comments or questions, she often wandered off into different stories about Iraq, and how the love of her life, her fiancé, had been murdered by Muslim Arabs. Try as I might, I could not get her to discuss her fiancé in other than very general terms. I could not state with any degree of professional certainty as to whether this fiancé ever in fact existed or whether he was simply a figment of her imagination.

It was clear from my examination that the officer suffers from some type of personality disorder or a mental affliction of some type. Whether she has post-traumatic stress disorder, I cannot say. I cannot opine as to whether her conditions were exasperated or caused by her time in Iraq, or the severity of the same. It appears she may have troubles distinguishing reality from her own perceptions of reality. Resolution of these issues would take extensive testing and treatment (far beyond the scope of a one hour examination). Whatever her mental state was at the time of the shooting, she is at least competent to stand trial at this time.

Pertinent Washington Statutory Law

RCW 9A.08.010

General requirements of culpability.

(1) Kinds of Culpability Defined.

(a) **INTENT.** A person acts with intent or intentionally when he acts with the objective or purpose to accomplish a result which constitutes a crime.

(b) **KNOWLEDGE.** A person knows or acts knowingly or with knowledge when:

(i) he is aware of a fact, facts, or circumstances or result described by a statute defining an offense; or

(ii) he has information which would lead a reasonable man in the same situation to believe that facts exist which facts are described by a statute defining an offense.

(c) **RECKLESSNESS.** A person is reckless or acts recklessly when he knows of and disregards a substantial risk that a wrongful act may occur and his disregard of such substantial risk is a gross deviation from conduct that a reasonable man would exercise in the same situation.

(d) **CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE.** A person is criminally negligent or acts with criminal negligence when he fails to be aware of a substantial risk that a wrongful act may occur and his failure to be aware of such substantial risk constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable man would exercise in the same situation.

(2) Substitutes for Criminal Negligence, Recklessness, and Knowledge. When a statute provides that criminal negligence suffices to establish an element of an offense, such element also is established if a person acts intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly. When recklessness suffices to establish an element, such element also is established if a person acts intentionally or knowingly. When acting knowingly suffices to establish an element, such element also is established if a person acts intentionally.

(3) Culpability as Determinant of Grade of Offense. When the grade or degree of an offense depends on whether the offense is committed intentionally, knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence, its grade or degree shall be the lowest for which the determinative kind of culpability is established with respect to any material element of the offense.

(4) Requirement of Wilfulness Satisfied by Acting Knowingly. A requirement that an offense be committed wilfully is satisfied if a person acts knowingly with respect to the material elements of the offense, unless a purpose to impose further requirements plainly appears.

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

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

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; or

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.

RCW 9A.16.030

Homicide — When excusable.

Homicide is excusable when committed by accident or misfortune in doing any lawful act by lawful means, without criminal negligence, or without any unlawful intent.

RCW 9A.16.050

Homicide — By other person — When justifiable.

Homicide is also justifiable when committed either:

(1) In the lawful defense of the slayer, or his or her husband, wife, parent, child, brother, or sister, or of any other person in his presence or company, when there is reasonable ground to apprehend a design on the part of the person slain to commit a felony or to do some great personal injury to the slayer or to any such person, and there is imminent danger of such design being accomplished;

RCW 9A.12.010

Insanity.

To establish the defense of insanity, it must be shown that:

(1) At the time of the commission of the offense, as a result of mental disease or defect, the mind of the actor was affected to such an extent that:

- (a) He was unable to perceive the nature and quality of the act with which he is charged; or
- (b) He was unable to tell right from wrong with reference to the particular act charged.

(2) The defense of insanity must be established by a preponderance of the evidence.

RCW 9A.04.100

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

(1) Every person charged with the commission of a crime is presumed innocent unless proved guilty. No person may be convicted of a crime unless each element of such crime is proved by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

(2) When a crime has been proven against a person, and there exists a reasonable doubt as to which of two or more degrees he is guilty, he shall be convicted only of the lowest degree.

The 2016 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 the purpose of 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 without paying the \$25.00 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, Germany, and France.**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).**

¹ Over the years, we have received several requests to include 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.

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.
 - a. The note will involve a **request for Peace Keepers. The request will have some connection to Western Africa.** Competitors should be familiar with arguments both for and against the use of peacekeepers. **Note:** In opposing the use of peacekeepers a student competitor may propose any alternative(s) that s/he wishes to impose (e.g. economic sanctions etc.).
4. Each of the three judges 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. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, SPD (Social Democratic Party)
2. Christlich Demokratische Union, CDU (Christian Democratic Union)
3. Freie Demokratische Partei, FDP (Free Democratic Party)
4. Die Linke (The Left)
5. Die Gruenen (The Greens)
6. 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. Union pour la Démocratie Française, UDF (Union for a French Democracy)
4. Parti Communiste Français, PCF (French Communist Party)
5. Les Verts, VEC (The Greens)
6. Front national, FN (The National Front)
7. Mouvement pour la France, MPF (The Movement for France)

Spanish Political Parties

1. Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE (Spanish Socialist Workers' Party)
2. Partido Popular, PP (Popular Party)
3. Izquierda Unida, IU (United Left)
4. Convergència i Unió, CiU (Convergence and Unió)
5. Partido Nacionalista Vasco, PNV (Basque Nationalist Party)
6. Coalición Canaria, CC (Canarian Coalition)
7. Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya, ERC (Republican Left of Catalonia)

*International
Diplomacy
Legislation*

French Legislation

A Resolution to Preserve National Artistic Treasures

WHEREAS, many great works of art have been created throughout this country's history; and

WHEREAS, such works of art are national treasures; and

WHEREAS, the private ownership of such national treasures could result in such works of art
being exported from this country; and;

WHEREAS, such works of art should be available for all French citizens to enjoy, now,
therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that the Republic of France should nationalize all
works of art created within this country deemed to be historically, socially, and
culturally valuable to the people of France, and which reflect this country's
national heritage.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

A Resolution Pertaining to the French Fashion Industry

WHEREAS, a law recently passed by the French parliament requires models working in France to obtain a medical certificate proving they are healthy and not dangerously thin; and

WHEREAS, the terms “health” and “dangerously thin” are ambiguous; and

WHEREAS, a person’s health and body size are personal and private matters; and

WHEREAS, the French fashion industry is an important part of the French economy, and;

WHEREAS, the requiring of a medical certificate could have adverse effects upon the French fashion industry, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that The French Republic should repeal its recent law requiring models to obtain medical certificates pertaining to their health.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

A Resolution Regarding Increased Surveillance Powers

WHEREAS, Accurate and efficient surveillance methods could have prevented the recent terrorist attacks in Paris; and

WHEREAS, France's failure to prevent such attacks points to a dilapidated and inefficient system of government surveillance; and

WHEREAS, French lives are at stake; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that The French Republic should set up a new government surveillance agency to foster surveillance of both citizens and noncitizens so as to prevent further acts of terrorism aimed at the people of this country.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

France - Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation

- 1) Should natural born French Citizens who leave the French Republic to fight with ISIS forfeit their French Citizenship?
- 2) What measures should the French Republic take to fight the increase in crime pertaining to the truffle industry?

German Legislation

A Resolution Regarding Bavarian Independence

WHEREAS, the Bavarian region of Germany has significant religious and cultural differences with the main German Republic; and

WHEREAS, Bavarian defeat in the War of 1866 led to the annexation of the Kingdom of Bavaria into the Prussian dominated German Empire; and

WHEREAS, Bavarians still see themselves as a people apart from their country; and

WHEREAS, Other European peoples whose countries have been consolidated into larger empires, have been given the right to vote for independence, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that the Federal Republic of Germany should allow the people of Bavaria to hold a plebiscite on the issue of Bavarian independence.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

A Resolution Pertaining to Immigration

WHEREAS, The open door policies of Angela Merkel gave hope to millions of dispossessed Syrian people; and

WHEREAS, It is only right to give homes to those fleeing war and violence; and

WHEREAS, Angela Merkel has started to close the doors to further immigration; and;

WHEREAS, There are millions more in need of asylum, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that the Federal Republic of Germany should adopt a full open door policy on immigration.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

A Resolution Pertaining to Austerity Measures

WHEREAS, Germany has pushed strict austerity measures on a number of EU countries; and

WHEREAS, such austerity measures have caused human pain and suffering throughout the EU;

and

WHEREAS, German austerity measures have also caused the suffering of German citizens;

now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that Federal Republic of Germany should abandon

its economic austerity programs both at home and abroad.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

Germany Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation

- 3) Should natural born German Citizens who leave the Federal Republic of Germany to fight with ISIS forfeit their German Citizenship?
- 4) What actions, if any, should the German Government take relative to Forcing T-Mobile to Change its Sexual Harassment Policies?

Spanish Legislation

A Resolution to Preserve National Artistic Treasures

WHEREAS, many great works of art have been created throughout this country's history; and

WHEREAS, such works of art are national treasures; and

WHEREAS, the private ownership of such national treasures could result in such works of art
being exported from this country; and;

WHEREAS, such works of art should be available for all Spanish citizens to enjoy, now,
therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that the Kingdom of Spain should nationalize all
works of art created within this country deemed to be historically, socially, and
culturally valuable to the people of Spain, and which reflect this country's
national heritage.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

A Resolution Pertaining to the Olive Industry

WHEREAS; countless families rely for their very livelihoods upon farming the Extremaduran olive groves in central Spain, and

WHEREAS, organized crime as well as small time crime are stealing olive harvests even before the olives should be harvested; and

WHEREAS, olive oil producers could stop the problem by requiring proper authentication before buying olives; and;

WHEREAS, the Spanish government has an interest in fostering the growth of the olive industry in Spain, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that the Kingdom of Spain should enact strict criminal legislation aimed at producers of olive oil, who purchase olives found to have been knowingly stolen.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

A Resolution Pertaining to the Treatment of Bulls

WHEREAS, Bull fighting necessitates animal cruelty; and

WHEREAS, running with the bulls results in countless injuries both to Spanish citizens and to tourists; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By this body here assembled that the Kingdom of Spain should abolish the sport of bull fighting and the practice of running with the bulls.

Introduced by TSFFTID Committee

Spanish Questions for Consideration and Possible Legislation

- 1) Should natural born Spanish Citizens who leave the Kingdom of Spain to fight with ISIS forfeit their Spanish Citizenship?
- 2) What actions should be taken to help ease tensions which still exist from Spain's Civil War years?