SJIS-DE DEBATE CHALLENGE

DATE: 22 & 23 September 2018
VENUE: ST. JOHN’S INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL
ORGANISER: ST. JOHN’S INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL & DIRECT ENGLISH

Asian Parliamentary Debate (General Rules)

a) Teams

There two opposing teams in an Asians format of debate:

1. Government side- proposes and defends the motion;
2. Opposition side- refutes and negates the motion.

Each side is composed of three members.

b) The Members of the government side are the following:

1. Prime minister (PM)- opens the debate, defines the motion and advances arguments;
2. Deputy prime Minister (DPM)- refute at first instance the case of the opposition, re-establish the government's claim, and advances arguments;
3. Government whip (GW)- makes an issue-based rebuttal of the opposition's case and summarizes the case of the government.

c) The Members of the Opposition side are the following:

1. Leader of the Opposition (LO) - responds directly to the case of the government by giving a direct clash, and advances arguments. May challenge the motion if the definition is challengeable;
2. **Deputy Leader of the Opposition (DPL)** - refutes the case of the DPM, re-establishes the case of the opposition, and advances an argument;

3. **Opposition Whip (OW)** - makes an issues-based rebuttal of the government's and summarizes the case of the opposition.

d) **Time of Speeches:**

Each speaker is allocated seven minutes to deliver their constructive speeches. One speaker from each side *(For the Government: PM/DPM, for Opposition: LO/DLO)* is given four minutes to deliver a reply speech. The speakers will be speaking in the following order:

1. Prime Minister (7 min)
2. Leader of the opposition (7 min)
3. Deputy Prime Minister (7 min)
4. Deputy Leader of the Opposition (7 min)
5. Government Whip (7 min)
6. Opposition Whip (7 min)
7. Opposition Reply (4 min)
8. Government Reply (4 min)

e) **POI:**

During the constructive speeches, **Point of Information (POI)** may be raised by the opposing side *after the first minute up to the sixth minute*. POI may be refused or accepted by the speaker. **During reply speeches, no POI may be raised.**

f) **Reply Speech:**

**Reply speech** is a comparative analysis of the strength and weaknesses of the case of both sides. The aim of the speech is to **give a bias judgment as to why should the people support the team's claim**. The speech is **first delivered by the opposition side** and followed by the government side that will close the debate.
g) **Matter, Manner, Method:**

Asian Parliamentary Debate is assessed by an Adjudicator Panel composed of an odd number according to the following criteria:

1. **Matter (40)** - substance of the debate, the arguments and evidence presented, and the logical reasoning and presentation of said arguments.

2. **Manner (40)** - the style of delivery, the persuasion skills, and the conduct of the debaters.


h) **Speaker Roles in Asian Parliamentary Debate**

i) **Government:**

**Prime Minister (PM)**

- Define context and parameters of debate. For example, in an open motion like "This House Would Support Musicians", the debate could be contextualized into whether music should be a commodity for trade, or it should be available gratis (i.e. free music download and transfer)
- Provide concise background or history leading to the issue
- Give framework of government bench's case. I.e. mechanisms (if any), argumentation flow (what the government's first argument is and what the Deputy Prime Minister will talk about)
- Introduce 1st argument ; Assert Government stand

**Deputy Prime Minister (DPM)**

- Rebut first argument from Leader of Opposition
- Rebut rebuttals to PM's argument
- Introduce 2nd and 3rd argument
- Reassert Government stand and case
Government Whip

- Rebut Deputy Leader of Opposition, and Leader of Opposition
- Rebut rebuttals to DPM and PM arguments
- Provide a deeper level of analysis for previous arguments and rebuttals
- No new arguments, but new angles of arguments should be given
- Brief summary of entire case of Government
- Reassert Government stand and case

ii) Opposition:

Leader of Opposition

- Agree or disagree with context/ parameters of debate (any definitional challenges, accusations of squirreling, or unfair set up should be made from the LO speech and no later)
- Rebut Prime Minister's argument
- Give framework for Opposition case (if Opp. agrees to problem, then their case should provide solution, or at least effectively highlight how Government proposal will worsen the situation)
- Introduce First Opposition argument
- Assert Opposition stand

Deputy Leader of Opposition:

- Rebut DPM and PM arguments
- Rebut rebuttals to LO arguments
- Introduce 1st and 2nd (if any) argument
- Reassert Opposition stand and case

Opposition Whip:

- Rebut DPM and PM arguments
- Rebut rebuttals to LO & DLO arguments
- Provide a deeper level of analysis for previous arguments and rebuttals
• No new arguments, but new angles of arguments should be given
• Reassert Opposition stand and case

Reply Speech:

• Can only be done by either 1st or 2nd speaker from each bench
• Provide a biased 'oral adjudication' of why the debate should go to own bench
• Highlight issues you think your side won, carefully tip-toe around issues you think you lost
• New examples to expand on discussed examples is usually allowed and makes the reply speech sound fresh as opposed to verbal regurgitation
• Reassert stand

K) Roles of Speakers in Asian Parliamentary Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Prime Minister</strong></td>
<td>1. Define and Set-Up the Debate</td>
<td>1. Respond to Definition and Set-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Present Position &amp; Case</td>
<td>2. Present Position &amp; Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Make 1 or 2 Arguments</td>
<td>3. Rebut Government Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Make 1 or 2 Arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPM Deputy Prime Minister</strong></td>
<td>1. Defend Your Case</td>
<td>1. Defend Your Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Attack LO’s Case</td>
<td>2. Attack DPM and PM’s Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Make 1 or 2 Arguments</td>
<td>3. Make 1 or 2 Arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LO Leader of Opposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DLO Deputy Leader of Opposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GW Government Whip | 1. Briefly Summarize Your Team’s Case  
2. Summarize and Prioritize the main issues in the debate  
3. Rebut and Analyze main issues  
*Be sure to respond to new arguments delivered by DLO. You can do this separately (as part of 3) or include them in your summary of main issues (part of 2) | 1. Briefly Summarize Your Team’s Case  
2. Summarize and Prioritize the main issues in the debate  
3. Rebut and Analyze main issues  
*Remember, you cannot bring new arguments into the debate. You can respond to the GW speaker if you choose to. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OW Opposition Whip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GR Government Reply | 1. Briefly Summarize the Debate  
2. Summarize the Position of your team and your Opponent  
3. Compare and show why your team is better | 4. Briefly Summarize the Debate  
5. Summarize the Position of your team and your Opponent  
6. Compare and show why your team is better |
| OR Opposition Reply |  |  |

The speaking order is PM > LO > DPM > DLO > GW > OW > OR > GR The PM, LO, DPM, DLO, GW, OW:
- Speak for 7 minutes
- Can accept Points of Information between the 1st and 6th minute  
  Can present rebuttals, examples and new analysis
- Can make new arguments (except Whips GW ann OW) The OR, GR:
  - Speak for 4 minutes
  - Cannot accept Points of Information
• Cannot make new arguments, rebuttals, examples or analysis. Must only compare and analyze things that have already been said in the debate.

I) Asian Parliamentary Debate Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>Points should never drop below 20 even if a debater was particularly bad. Lower points often exclude a team from elimination rounds so if you give points below 20, you are in effect saying that a debater has no chance of recovery.</td>
<td>Mumbles and rarely makes eye contact. Is clearly distracted by opponents’ interjections. Is clearly nervous while speaking. Rarely if ever makes interjections, and disengages from debate after their speech.</td>
<td>Speech is poorly structured and difficult to follow. Does not tie in with previous speeches. Does not fully make use of allotted time, or uses full time but does so ineffectively (with lots of “fluff”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>Scores of 23 and below should be reserved for people who are unsuccessful as debaters as well as obnoxious, disruptive, or mean-spirited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>Offers assertions with little reasoning or evidence. Demonstrates fallacious reasoning. Repeats previous arguments instead of adequately responding to opponents’ points.</td>
<td>Speech is somewhat structured, but this structure is not adhered to throughout the speech. Attempts to reference previous speeches. Loses some clarity integrating opposing arguments into speech. Makes good use of allotted time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Consistently delivers complete arguments, though reasoning and evidence may be weak or insufficient at times. Identifies obvious issues, but misses complexities and nuances. Refutes opponent arguments but does so inconsistently at times.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and understandably, with little or poor body language (shifting, avoiding eye contact, etc.). Clearly makes speech errors, but none serious enough to undermine argument. Makes interjections, but does not actively and consistently interact with teammates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>Effective delivery of arguments, using convincing reasoning and evidence throughout. Demonstrates a solid knowledge base. Demonstrates ability to evaluate and find weaknesses in opposing arguments. Speaks animatedly and remains engaged throughout debate. Demonstrates a degree of confidence and gives general impression of credibility. Effectively interjects and responds to opponents’ interjections. Presents a structured, organized speech. Points are coherent and easy to follow. Ties in speech with previous speeches, advancing teammates’ arguments and responding to opponents’ arguments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>Demonstrates thorough grounding in subject and has a clear grasp of the complexities and nuances involved. Delivers arguments backed with solid reasoning and thorough evidence. Critiques underlying assumptions and strategies in opposing arguments. Demonstrates ability to improvise effective arguments in response to opponents. Clear mastery of rhetorical devices like humor, pausing for emphasis, and vocal inflection to add depth and character to speech. Speaks passionately and convincingly. Actively engages the audience, maintaining interest throughout the speech. Interjects when necessary, and responds to opponents’ interjections thoroughly. Uses a stable structure, organized in a clear, logical, and easy to follow manner. Effectively integrates teammates’ and opponents’ arguments into speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A score of 30 is considered flawless and perfect. This score should only be given to one who has demonstrated true and complete mastery, exceeding all expectations. Giving a score of thirty is essentially saying that you have no suggestions for improvement. Perfect scores should be given out very rarely, for only the most exceptional of speeches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>