

## Table of Contents

The British Parliamentary Format.....	5
Roles of Speakers in the BP Format.....	7
Speech and Argument Structure.....	8
A Guide for Opening Teams.....	9
Prime Minister.....	9
Leader Of Opposition.....	11
Deputies.....	12
Rebuttal.....	14
Other Strategies.....	14
Closing Teams Strategies.....	16
Member of government.....	16
Government Whip.....	16
Member of Opposition.....	16
Opposition Whip.....	17
Extensions: Member Speeches.....	17
Summaries: The Whip speeches.....	19
Points of Information.....	20
Rebuttals.....	20
The Role of Manner.....	21
References and Acknowledgements.....	22

## The British Parliamentary Format

The British Parliamentary academic debating format is the official format of the World Universities Debating Championships. As the name suggests, the format has its roots in the British House of Commons, an institution of government that served as a model for academic debating in British universities. Since its adoption by the WUDC, the format has spread around the world and is now the most widely practiced format of intercollegiate debating.

Like other formats of academic debating, British Parliamentary (BP) debating involves teams who argue for or against a motion before a panel of expert adjudicators. The teams' assignments (for or against the motion), like the motion itself, are provided to the teams by the tournament organizers.

Most formats of academic debating involve only two teams: those arguing for the topic and those arguing against the topic. The outcome of this format of debating is binary: the team representing one side of the motion wins and the team representing the other side of the motion loses. Unlike binary formats of debating, BP involves four independent teams per round: two who argue in favor of the motion (known as the Proposition or Government teams) and two who argue against the motion (known as the Opposition teams). Rather than competing for a simple win or loss, each of the teams competes against the others for a ranking at the end of the round. Though the two teams on the Proposition are assigned the task of arguing the same side of the topic, they are actually in competition with each other for the higher rank in the round. Similarly, the first and second teams on the Opposition also compete against one another.

This approach to debating—that competing teams could share a position of advocacy—may be initially confusing to those familiar with binary forms of academic debating. The explanation for this approach to competition may be found in a version of parliamentary government on which the BP format is modeled. Binary forms of debating (that is, typical two-team, affirmative/negative formats) are rooted in a judicial model of competing advocacy, with parties assigned the task of arguing for or against a proposition (as in a criminal court where the accused is argued to be guilty by the prosecution and not guilty by the defense).

The BP format, on the other hand, employs a legislative model of advocacy, in which parties with various interests cooperate to advance the same proposition. This model is grounded in those parliamentary systems of government that utilize a proportionally representational electoral system, in which various parties must form coalitions to establish a governing majority. In these systems, a Green party may cooperate with a Labor party to form a government and pass legislation. The Green party's motives are concern for the environment and the Labor party's motives are concerns for the workers, but both cooperate to advocate for change.

The teams in a BP round cooperate using a very similar approach. Two teams, known as the Opening Proposition and Closing Proposition are responsible for arguing on behalf of the topic, known as a motion in BP debating. Two more teams—the Opening Opposition and Closing Opposition—are responsible for arguing against the motion.

- Truism or ideological
- Place set
- Time set
- Don't understand

Opening Half	Opening Proposition		Opening Opposition
	1. Prime Minister 3. Deputy Prime Minister		2. Leader Opposition 4. Deputy Leader Opposition
Closing Half	Closing Proposition	Proposition bench	Closing Opposition
	5. Member Proposition 7. Proposition Whip		6. Member Opposition 8. Opposition Whip
			Opposition bench

Each of these teams is comprised of two debaters, each of whom will give one seven-minute speech beginning with the first speaker for the Opening Proposition (known as the Prime Minister) and alternating between the Proposition and Opposition until each debater has spoken.

Order	Team	Speaker	Speaking Time
1	Opening Proposition	Prime Minister	7 minutes
2	Opening Opposition	Leader Opposition	7 minutes
3	Opening Proposition	Deputy Prime Minister	7 minutes
4	Opening Opposition	Deputy Leader Opposition	7 minutes
5	Closing Proposition	Member Proposition	7 minutes
6	Closing Opposition	Member Opposition	7 minutes
7	Closing Proposition	Proposition Whip	7 minutes
8	Closing Opposition	Opposition Whip	7 minutes

During each of these speeches, debaters from the opposite side may ask for the opportunity to interrupt the speaker holding the floor. Known as Points of Information (or POIs), these interjections are short questions or statements taken at the discretion of the debater holding the floor. A debater may request the opportunity to present a Point of Information (either verbally or by rising) from a speaker on the opposite side of the motion at any time after the first minute, and before the last minute, of any speech. The debater holding the floor may accept or refuse POIs at his or her sole discretion. If accepted, the debater asking the POI has approximately fifteen seconds to make a statement or ask a question. During the Point of Information, the speaking time continues to run. Following the POI, the primary speaker resumes her speech and is expected to integrate her response to the POI into her speech material. Debaters are

judged both on their efforts (successful or not) to offer POIs and to respond to POIs.

Topics for each debate are announced 15 minutes prior to the round. The topics are varied in nature, but typically focus on some current policy issue of international significance. There will be one topic for each debate. At the World Universities Debating Championships, all teams debate a minimum of 9 rounds and during these rounds will rotate between all 4 positions as fairly as possible

## Roles Of Speakers In The BP Format

<i>Prime Minister (PM)</i>	<i>Leader of Opposition (LO)</i>
Define and Set Up the Debate Provide Argumentation in Support of the Motion	Provide the Opposition Approach Rebut the Prime Minister's Case and Speech Provide Argumentation to Oppose the Motion
<i>Deputy Prime Minister (DPM)</i>	<i>Deputy Leader of Opposition (DLO)</i>
Defend the Prime Minister Rebut the Leader of Opposition Provide New Arguments	Defend the Leader of Opposition Rebut the Deputy Prime Minister Provide New Arguments
<i>Member of Government (MG)</i>	<i>Member of Opposition (MO)</i>
Provide Extension to Government Case Rebut Opening Opposition, with special attention to the the Deputy Leader of Opposition	Provide Extension to Opposition Case Rebut Opening and Closing Proposition, with special attention to Extension of Closing Proposition
<i>Government Whip (GW)</i>	<i>Opposition Whip (OW)</i>
Rebut Extension of Closing Opposition Defend your Extension Identify and Analyze Major Clashes in the debate and show why your team and bench wins	Defend your Extension Identify and Analyze Major Clashes in the debate and show why your team and bench wins

### All Speakers should

- Offer Points of Information
- Take at least 1, but preferably 2 Points of Information (from the Opening and Closing Halves)
- Defend their teammates (or bench-mates)
- Engage the Previous Speaker(s)

Note that the above are not Rules of BP debate, but rather what each speaker should do in order to be a responsible debater. This means

- (a) being as responsive as possible
- (b) working as a team and defend the integrity of your case
- (c) to contribute equally to the debate

### On New Matter

The Government Whip speaker is technically allowed to bring new arguments into the debate but usually doesn't as arguments this late in the debate rarely has a strong impact on the debate. His or her time is better spent analyzing what happened in the debate. The Opposition Whip is not allowed to bring new arguments into the debate. This is called New Matter. New Matter is a wholly new line of argumentation and does not include new rebuttals, new evidence or development of previously mentioned arguments.

## Speech And Argument Structure

How speakers organize their speech and arguments greatly affects how audiences understand them. The structure of speech and argument provided below is one that ensures speakers use their time most effectively and is reflective of trends at Worlds

### Simple Speech Structure

1. Opening – attention grabbing, set the tone for your speech
2. Outline – a preview of your content, also called signposting
3. Content – the good stuff
4. Summary – highlight your contributions, useful in dynamic speeches
5. Closing – final impact, never end weak

### Argument Structure

1. Assertion (or label of your argument)
  - A strong statement of your argument (not a question, should not be descriptive)
  - Should be memorably and catchy – your goal is for judges to remember it and for other debaters to use your labels
2. Reasoning
  - Logical explanation of your assertion. Strong reasoning is reasoning that is logically developed and especially relevant to your case
3. Evidence
  - Real-World information to support your reasoning

# A Guide For Opening Teams

## Prime Minister

### Basic duty

- provide a clear and reasonable definition
- establish the issues and scope of the debate
- advance a substantive case

### Mindset

Team members should focus on the PM's case for at least HALF of the total prep time because the important questions in the debate should ideally be present in the PM speech. As a PM, you will not be rebutting. Work on generating momentum during your speech and make sure to not sound lethargic and forgettable. Structure is very important. Before the third minute, you should be done setting up the debate and ready to move on to your part of the split.

### Definitions

#### Each definition MUST:

- Have a direct link to the motion
- Be fair and debatable
- Qualify the key terms in the motion
- Identify the issues to be debated and the scope of the debate (criteria or standard)
- Include parameters when necessary

#### Unfair definitions

- Tuisims
- "Squirrels"
- Time/Place Sets
- Tautologies

*debate if it's possible!*

### ***Things to remember during prep/Important questions that should be answered in the PM speech***

#### **Nature of the Debate**

- There are no strictly proposal or value-judgment debates. All debates are a combination of both. However, some debates require you to discuss more extensively certain policy mechanisms compared to others (ex. THW grant citizenship to illegal immigrants vs. THBT cosmetic surgery hurts the women's movement).
- Therefore, it has to be clear whether you are proposing anything new in the debate, rejecting status quo, or assessing some broad, commonly understood policy. Note that the level of abstraction of the policy affects your case – and adjust accordingly.
- Imagine if you insisted on debating THW grant affirmative action for women in parliament as a strictly value-judgment debate!

#### **Framing the Debate**

- Set the tone of the debate AND preempt the other side
- Debates are never about 'just the individual arguments' – don't forget the bigger picture!
- Angling the debate (if applicable); ex. from whose POV is the debate taking place? THW

intervene in Myanmar: Who is the house?

- Setting a context and 'painting a picture' of the world in which the debate is taking place
- These backgrounds/views of the world are called frames. Of course, the frames change depending on what stance you're taking. It's all about marketing your view of the world.
- Ex. If you're discussing Pakistan's viability as a partner in the US War on Terror:
  - - pro: focus on the developments of human rights and (IMPORTANTLY) say why the trends of democratization are sustainable
  - - con: talk about why the developments are tokenistic (on the surface) and PROVE this by using examples

### **Avoid Absolutes**

- What are ABSOLUTES? Basically, BLACK and WHITE debating. (i.e. President Bush – you're with us or against us). Argumentation USUALLY operates on EXTENTS rather than absolutes.
- Focus on sustainable trends that are favorable for your side. Include important details like recent events, agreements reached, etc.
- Ex. THBT genetically modified food is safe
  - Extreme argumentation: Safe means no harm will come to all who eat it
  - Reasonably gray argumentation: Safe does not mean absolutely no harm, but that relatively very small proportion of those who eat GMOs will be NOT all right. This definition on "Safe" applies to things like extreme sports or seatbelts – not 100% certain, but reasonably certain that precautions have been taken to inform people of all possible risks and that the risks have been mitigated
- While absolutes are bad, troubleshoot contradictions too. A contradiction is when one of your arguments/premises refutes another one of your own arguments/premises.
  - Ex. In defending affirmative action for women in parliament:
    - First Speaker: argues there should be AA because women are talented enough, they just don't get what they deserve because they are cheated by the system
    - Second Speaker: You should have AA bec the most talented are men and, as such, women have no chance of getting in unless you impose a quota for women

### **Core of the Debate**

- Identifying the 'core debate' and what the other side is expected to argue (if applicable). When you hear a motion or a topic to be discussed (for papers, projects, etc.) the first thing to ask is: WHAT IS THE CORE DEBATE? What is the meat of the "conflict" in the motion?
- There can be many "Core Debates" – an issue can have more than one crucial clashes (points of difference). However, it is important to isolate one or two of the biggest ones to start the thinking process
- Ex. THBT abortion should be legalized
  - CD: Right of the Woman over her body vs. the child's right to life (or the Church/state's right to protect the unborn child's life)
- EXERCISE:
  - THBT there should be a news blackout in times of war
  - THBT hate speech against racial minorities should be allowed
  - THBT Outsourcing is good for first world economies
  - THBT marijuana should be legalized
- What is the debate about and what is it NOT about? Set the standards and/or the



important goals in the debate. What do we mean by nationalism? Democracy? What are the interests of the parties involved?

### **Constructing Policies**

- WHO, WHERE, HOW, WHEN?
- Feasibility defense: are there resources and political will for the policy; regardless, SHOULD there be?
- SOMETIMES: If it's an extreme policy, frame it as a last resort: "First, we'll ask for the following things... if these aren't met, then..."
- We've done many things in the past but they have not worked and the current situation is grave
- EXERCISE: Construct policies for the following motions:
  - THBT the state should fund heroin-shooting centers for addicts
  - THW legalize the sale of opium

### **Leader Of Opposition**

#### **Basic Duty:**

- examine the definition of PM
- reframe the debate
- rebut the arguments of PM
- advance a substantive case

#### **Mindset**

Team members should focus on anticipating the PM's case and preparing the LO's case for at least HALF of the total prep time. During prep, identify the arguments that have to be tweaked/changed depending on how the definition can vary. Structure and time management are crucial. Do not over-rebut. Negative has a converse burden to prove their case as well.

#### **ALWAYS COMPARE.**

#### **Reframing the Debate**

- What is the debate about and NOT about?
- Do you accept that the debate is a VJ or a proposal?
- Do you have questions/clarifications about the policy? Are you left to assume certain things?
- Do you agree with government's standards and goals?
- Do you agree with their characterization of the problem and the status quo?
- What are you defending?
- OUTLINE these things to forward a clear clash

#### **Model Diagnosis**

- Step 1: Check for feasibility. Be wary of too-good-to-be-true models. There's a catch somewhere.
- Step 2: Examine the parties that get affected.
- Step 3: Based on your assessment of the model's strengths and weaknesses, formulate a line of CLASH. State the clash explicitly.

### Clashes

- Clash can either reject the Aff's model and defend the status quo OR it can reject both the SQ and model - in which case, a counter proposal must be forwarded.

### Counter-proposals

- Setting up CPs requires the same rigor as setting up original props.
- CPs are not there for decoration. They must be defended.
- Question: How can someone set-up a CP, rebut, and construct fresh arguments in 7 minutes? Cop-out answer: use efficient language and time management

### Instant Cases (this applies to Deputies as well)

- Don't force prep into a debate if it doesn't match. Come up with something entirely new if needed.
- Just because you're making an instant case, doesn't mean you stop listening to the PM.
- Make sure you're able to rebut. You'll probably be able to turn it into constructive.
- This is where teammates should be helping each other out and passing notes.
- Activities:
  - The facilitator gives an open motion and encourages the Government team to set the motion to a specific context. Opposition will have to respond accordingly.

### Deputies

#### A good Deputy:

- Actively participates in helping his/her 1st speaker.
- Willingly gives up argument that he/she thought of.
- Has faith in the inexhaustibility of arguments for a given debate.
- Is responsive:
- Knows when and how to sacrifice his/her prepared case. Too many second speakers try to stick with their prepared arguments, regardless of their relevance to the discussion. It is always better to be spontaneous and responsive than prepared but irrelevant.
- If a previous speaker spent a great deal of time asking for something, GIVE IT TO THEM.
  - Ex. "They never proved political will."-previous speaker; THEN, prove political will
  - Danger: make sure it doesn't look like you're covering for the deficiencies of your first speaker. Make it seem as if you are giving the next, natural part of the case.

#### Swiss Knife (if you're desperate, these might help):

- Draw out important themes. There are recurring themes in debates. The key is to identify these themes, then nuance them to the issues at hand:
- Are there rights that are being violated/upheld (usually, sovereignty, self-determination, right to religion, culture, information, expression, privacy, etc.)?
  - Social contract
  - How do we balance rights?
  - Are there people/social groups that are being antagonized/marginalized? Are there risks of abuses?
  - What messages are sent/precedents are set?
  - What is the government's responsibility in the situation and how can it best be realized?

- What is a good mix of incentives and disincentives?
- Who are the liable actors in the situation, why do we say they are liable, and are the punishments we propose commensurate?
- What is the best interest of the actors involved (financial success? retribution? rehabilitation? security? catharsis?) and how do we achieve this – image-building, reinforcement of messages, etc.?
- Proactive vs. reactive policies
- “capitalize-on-the-transition”/“sway-the-moderates” arguments
- Social battering rams argument
- Social backlash argument
- Long-term vs. short-term

**Examples of cases of instantaneous second speaker responses:**

*The Debate: This house would legalize prostitution*

Suppose the PM has already argued that a) legalizing prostitution will lead to safer sex and healthier sex workers, through regulations, health checks and contraceptive provisions, b) it is a viable taxable industry, following the Netherlands example. You, as the DPM, have prepared this case during prep:

1. Legalizing prostitution will lessen abuse against sex workers because they now have security and legal recourse against abusive pimps or customers, rather than being grouped together with all criminal elements when prostitution is illegal
2. It encourages tourism from countries where prostitution is illegal

The LO then clashes against the PM by saying that instead of legalizing or banning prostitution, they want to simply decriminalize it! She further argues in her case that legalizing prostitution provides an easy cop-out to impoverished young people, especially girls, dissuading them from pursuing their education and more sustainable careers, and a decriminalization model provides all the health and legal protection benefits that legalization provides.

What should the DPM do?? ..... DROP both of your arguments!

The first argument is useless, because security and legal recourse is also present in decriminalization. The second argument, while still valid, is less relevant in the face of a larger issue: both policies' effects on young people.

You may discuss why prostitution itself is a legitimate occupation and deserves legal protection, or why legalization is required to properly regulate the industry.

Sometimes, arguments don't have to be murdered – just tweaked....

*The Debate: This house would ban junk food advertisements from children's TV shows.*

Suppose the PM has already argued the basic arguments such as how junk food ads prey on children's vulnerability and how the ads' content encourages over-consumption. The DPM, on the other hand has prepared to answer the following issues in his own case:

1. Why business interest has to give way to government interest
2. Why children have to be protected from their own insatiable desires

When the Leader of Opposition speaks, however, she argues that:

1. It is the parents' responsibility to look over their children's welfare, and not the government's
2. One can strike a balance between business and government interests, such as through placing surgeon general warnings at the end of ads.

What should the DPM do??.....TWEAK both arguments!

The DPM's first argument assumes that business and gov't interest are mutually exclusive (that you have to choose one over the other). Now that the LO has argued that they can strike a balance between both interests, the DPM has to show that either: a) this balance cannot exist (maybe the ad itself can overpower the warning) or b) that this balance is still detrimental and that the only to solve the problem is to CHOOSE gov't interest, wholly sacrificing business interest (be prepared, however, to answer arguments about rights of businesses).

The DPM's second argument just looks into why children have to be protected. It now has to specifically answer why they have to be protected through THIS SPECIFIC manner (gov't banning adverts), particularly since the LO also argued that children must be protected, albeit by their parents.

A nice new line of debate has also been opened up: the role of parents, why they may be inadequate, and the nuances of parentless households and latchkey children.

### Rebuttal

Main goal of rebuttal is to prove that the other side is WRONG. Take into account net benefit. Do not use phrases like:

"They do not solve the root cause of the problem, which is..."

"The model does not consider \_\_\_\_\_"

Why not?

- A) There is almost never a root cause for a problem.
- B) A model can't be expected to solve everything.
- C) Push debating/burden-pushing is never enough.

In other words, proving that a model does not change particular things does not negate the NET BENEFIT that it can create.

Furthermore, Don't be a hypocrite! Debates are all about comparison. When you launch a rebuttal, make sure it doesn't apply to you. Don't be afraid to concede certain arguments. If you can't rebut an argument, just weigh its value against those of your arguments.

- Ex. Giving money/dole-outs to IPs: Of course you don't say money doesn't make them richer. You say, that's true, but it's not worth the trade-off. And the trade-off is reparations encourage right wing backlash; it makes it seem as if aborigines are being coddled. This backlash makes it harder for the government to create political will for more important reforms like, say, returning stolen land to aborigines.

### Other Strategies

- a) Cover all bases – explain key arguments and analyze key examples and actors (to make life harder for the closing teams)
- b) Activity: A motion is given and the facilitator randomly calls on members of the class to discuss an argument for two minutes (each). This carries on until the arguments have been

exhausted.

- c) Take credit for what you do/sell your case – explain why it is THE central issue in the debate
- d) Remain active throughout the debate through POIs to remind the judges of your contribution
- e) Be extra-responsive to the other side (don't wait for the Whips from the closing teams to refine and strengthen the rebuttals from your side).

## Closing Teams Strategies

### Member Of Government

#### Roles

- Offer extension
- Outline and fully develop team line, (explain how team line is different from extension).
- Show link with OG case, back up OG case
- Rebut the opposition
- Rebut DLO

#### Key pointers to remember

- evaluate government definition and opposition response, decided on the validity of the both definitions.
- follow government line even if they have a weak case-don't stab gov in the back
- present a debatable extension
- don't spend the bulk of time just on rebuttals as you may neglect your case

### Government Whip

#### Roles

- Summarize the debate
- Sum up entire government case
- Defend team extension
- Rebut opposition arguments
- Knock down closing opposition extension

#### Key pointers to remember

- sum up team case and rebut opposition as well
- allocate more time to summing up government case
- do cover defense for MG

### Member Of Opposition

#### Roles

- Offer extension
- Set out and fully develop team case
- Rebut MG
- Rebut 1<sup>st</sup> Gov

#### Key pointers to remember

- present arguments in such a way that they stand out from the rest of the teams
- make it a point to rebut government extension

## Opposition Whip

### Roles

- Sum up team line
- Sum up entire opposition case
- Rebut government case

### Key pointers to remember

- do not bring new information into the debate
- you may bring in new examples
- do not make the mistake of just rebutting and not summing up

## Extensions: Member Speeches

1. What is an extension?
2. What else goes in a member speech?
3. What is the structure of a member speech?
4. Policy and Argumentative Extensions
5. Strategies on dealing with Extensions

### 1. What is an extension?

The origin of the extension comes from the actual workings of a parliamentary government system. Often, when there are multiple parties forming a coalition government, there may be a particular piece of legislation that is supported by different parties, and for different reasons.

An extension represents additional support for legislation, but from a perspective not yet represented in the debate. An extension can take many forms:

- An additional line of argumentation
- An alternative philosophy
- A case study
- An examination of pragmatic considerations
- An examination of different groups affected

### Ways to position your extension:

- How you differ from the top half
- How you add to the top half
- What the top half was missing
- How you expand upon one point from the top half

### 2. What else goes in a member speech?

- Summary of where the debate stands
- Refutation from the top half
- You don't need to cover everything, just the issues that you think are important in the debate

- Don't just reiterate refutation, add something new to it
- Refutation of Gov Extension (if on the opposition)

### 3. Structure of a member speech

- Introduction
  - Preview of extension
  - Position of extension
  - Main arguments for refutation
- Extension
- Refutation
- Summary

### 4. Policy and Argumentative Extensions

- What is a Policy Extension
  - A **policy extension** is when the CG bases their extension on expanding details of the OG policy that have been insinuated but not fully developed.
- What is an argumentative Extension
  - An **argumentative extension** is when CG provides new argumentation or analysis to back up the implementation of the OG policy. Introducing new policy is not recommended.

### 5. Strategies on dealing with Extensions

Scenarios for second prop

a) First prop has put forward a good case and a good debate has followed

- How to still come up with a good extension in this scenario
- Avoiding rewording and repetition

b) Changing the focus of the debate

- Narrowing and broadening the debate to get an extension- For example, if the debate has been British specific extending the issue worldwide
- Avoiding non-relevant extensions

c) First prop have introduced a bad plan to solve a problem

- Adding new parameters to extensions
- Extending the debate onto an area that will benefit your team
- Clearly distinguishing your team from first prop – if their plan is bad you don't want to be dragged down with them

d) Dealing with bad definitions

- Bad first props in debating. (Example: encouraging child labour in the third world so that multinationals will invest there)

f solving third world



economic problems - debt relief)

- Picking first prop arguments and using this to justify extensions

e) What If 1st Prop does not provide a definition?

- Finding an extension from no definition
- stressing the importance of your material

## Summaries: The Whip Speeches

a) Structure of the whip speeches

- Introduction
- Preview of extension
- defend extensions
- Main arguments for refutation
- summary

b) Foundations

- Defend your extension – integral to survival of closing team
- Attack the speaker before you – you must destroy the other closing team

c) Breaking Deadlocks

- Identify and prioritize key clash points in the debate. Resist the temptation to talk about what is interesting to you. Focus on what your opening teams set up as the key areas of the debate, what your teammate has contributed to the debate and what issues have stayed strong throughout the debate.
- Make Strategic concessions. Concede less relevant parts of an argument in order to win more relevant parts.
- Shifting Goalposts. Argue what the debate is about, rather than rebuttal the key ideas in the debate.

d) Strategic Considerations

- Summarize the entire bench, but highlight the particular strength and relevance of your extension.
- Prioritize the ideas in the debate not chronologically, but based on the order that makes your case most relevant
- Force contradictions between the opening and closing teams through POIs and your extension speaker.
- Focus your attack based on how you want shape the debate
- Do not insult or negatively compare your opening team in Any Way.

## Points Of Information

### Objectives

- to understand the strategic role of POIs in a debate
- to learn and practice effective POI techniques

### Basic Definition of POIs

- Short, quick
- ask between 1st and 6th minute
- can be used to ask questions, make comments, statement, example etc

Not offering POIs indicates an implicit acceptance of what a speaker is saying or that your team is inactive or afraid. Not taking POIs indicates that you are afraid of something the speaker might have to say or are insecure about your arguments.

### Asking POIs

- When is a good time to ask questions?
- Some Strategies
  - Asking leading questions - Make speakers take positions
  - Making strong statements
  - Offering examples
  - Forcing speakers to engage with you (opening team staying in the debate)
  - Impacting the debate from closing (Guiding opening teams, giving away your extension)

### Answering POIs

- When to accept?
- Who to accept from
  - Take from weakest speaker – if you are unsure
  - Take from strongest speaker – to make a statement
- Some Strategies
  - Attacking a question – does a question answer a question?
  - Dealing with it as part of your development
  - Buying time – perception of damage almost as important as damage itself

## The Role Of Manner

### Objectives

- understand the role of manner in BP
- what is good manner and how do we get there

### A Dynamic Speaker

- Changes his or her style
- Changes for a reason
- Remains Natural

### Why is Manner important? In BP?

- Good to distinct yourself from other speakers
- Style of the tournament

### What is good/bad manner?

- Fluency
- Basic Non-verbal communication
- EFFECTIVE manner

### How do you develop and use your manner?

### References And Acknowledgements

1. IDEA BP Track Training Manual 2008, by Steven Johnson, Logandran Balavijendran & Chris Richter
2. WUDC Rules, edited by Ray D'Cruz
3. World Debating Website <http://worlddebating.blogspot.com/>