

# CONTENTS

editorial/ <i>sashi balaraman</i>	3
FEATURE ARTICLE	5
nick rowley on the politics of climate change/ <i>sashi balaraman</i>	6
BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY STRATEGY	13
how to tackle worlds/ <i>joanna nairn &amp; michael kortly</i>	14
the role of a whip speaker/ <i>anna garsia</i>	22
DEBATING DISCOURSE	29
new arguments for new epistimologies/ <i>leloy claudio &amp; sharmila parmanand</i>	30
the substance of style/ <i>jess moir</i>	36
GLOBAL DEBATING STYLES	43
debating: kiwi-style/ <i>christopher bishop</i>	44
an eye on debating in Africa/ <i>justice motlhabani</i>	49
gifted and talented education programmes: for better or worse?/ <i>matt kwan</i>	52
RESULTS	59

# MONASH DEBATING R e v i e w

## **EDITOR IN CHIEF**

Sashi Balaraman

## **SUB-EDITORS**

Amit Golder

Claire Lindsey

## **CONTRIBUTING EDITORS**

Ravi Dutta

Maryam Jahanshahi

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Vice-Chancellor's Office, Monash University

Faculty of Law, Monash University

Monash Association of Debaters

## **Please address all correspondence to:**

Monash Debating Review

PO BOX 10

Monash University

VIC 3800

Australia

Email:

[monashdebatingreview@gmail.com](mailto:monashdebatingreview@gmail.com)

Website:

<http://www.monashdebaters.com/mdr>

# EDITORIAL

Welcome to the 6<sup>th</sup> edition of the Monash Debating Review. We are pleased that more than a thousand copies of previous editions are now with debaters across the globe. We hope they have provided both aspiring and experienced debaters worldwide with a wealth of information, and helped to continue the development of debating globally.

This year's volume sees the return of the feature article, which aims to provide an insight into a highly topical issue by interviewing leading academics and commentators. The editorial committee was extremely privileged to interview Nick Rowley on the highly topical issue of climate change. Nick Rowley is one of the leading policy advisors and commentators on how to tackle climate change, and has extensive experience with the government of the United Kingdom, assisting policy development on climate change and sustainability.

The MDR's commitment to highlighting issues in debating and generating discussion continues in this edition. This year, our contributors are some of the most distinguished in the debating community. Former World Champions Joanna Nairn and Michael Kortly draw on their successes and provide a rare insight into the preparation necessary to succeed at the World Championships. Current World Champion Anna Garsia provides a thorough analysis of the role of the whip speaker in British Parliamentary debating, highlighting the importance it plays in a debate.

Christopher Bishop, the current president of the Australasian Intersvarsity Debating Association, gives us a unique insight into New Zealand's debating styles, and the benefits that can be gained from practicing them. We also have the pleasure of presenting a piece by Justice Motlhabani, the driving force behind Botswana's recent bid to host the World University Debating Championships.

We trust this edition will be a valuable resource for improving your debating preparation and performance. Most importantly, we hope it continues to promote the importance of debating in our community today.

Best wishes,

Sashi Balaraman  
Editor-in-Chief



# FEATURE ARTICLE

MONASH  
DEBATING  
R e v i e w

# Nick Rowley on the Politics of Climate Change

**About the authors:** Sashi Balaraman is currently a Bachelor of Laws student at Monash University, having recently completed a Bachelor of Accounting degree. Sashi has represented the Monash Association of Debaters at many national and international intervarsities, including the World University Debating Championships, and has broken as an adjudicator at the Australasian Intersvarsity Debating Championships.

Nick Rowley has worked at the centre of government on sustainability, climate change and broader policy and political strategy in Australia and the UK. His understanding of government process, policy and action has led him to advise corporates, industry associations and governments around the world on how they can tackle the climate problem. From March 2004 to December 2005, Nick worked at 10 Downing Street as Senior Advisor to Prime Minister Tony Blair. Nick worked across Whitehall with relevant Ministers and senior officials including Sir David King (the Prime Minister's Chief Scientific Advisor) on policy to promote sustainability and tackle climate change. He synthesised expert briefings for the Prime Minister on climate change policy, science and carbon management, leading to new domestic and international policy. He was instrumental in establishing the Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change, including chief executives from some of Britain's leading companies, which continues to provide advice directly to the Prime Minister on climate policy. For the 2005 UK Presidency of the G8, Nick wrote two of the Prime Minister's major speeches on the case for international action on climate change and was part of the Prime Minister's team at the Gleneagles summit.

---

Climate change has slowly but surely begun to dominate the political agendas of nations across the globe. A science often depicted as fear mongering and without scientific basis has now become one of the most pressing crises of our generation. In the media, Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth* captured the attention of audiences with its powerful message about the need to take an active stance to prevent future environmental catastrophes. Politically, we've seen two major reports released on climate change, continuing to emphasize the need for change, and stressing that inactivity will cost us dearly.

This article highlights the important issues associated with the phenomena of climate change, and seeks to address the key questions we as a global community must confront. Mr Nick Rowley – an expert on sustainability, climate change and broader policy and political strategy – spoke to the editorial committee, putting forward his views on the controversies. Hopefully, this article will help to promote the importance of climate change and the need for change, and provide some of the background information necessary to understand both Mr. Rowley's views and the global debate currently taking place.

## Background

On October 30, 2006, *The Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change* was released, with a primary focus on discussing the consequences that global warming and climate change would have on the global economy. Responses to the report were varied, with Pia Hansen, a European Commission spokesperson remarking, "it clearly makes a case for action, and climate change is not a problem that Europe can afford to put into the 'too

## NICK ROWLEY ON THE POLITICS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

difficult' pile. It is not an option to wait and see, and we must act now.”<sup>1</sup> Simon Retallack of the Institute for Public Policy research, a UK think tank, stated, “it removes the last refuge of the "do-nothing" approach on climate change, particularly in the US.”<sup>2</sup> Bjorn Lomborg, author of *The Sceptical Environmentalist*, took a negative view of the report, arguing that report was “selective and its conclusion flawed. Its fear-mongering arguments have been sensationalized, which is ultimately only likely to make the world worse off.”<sup>3</sup> Commentary on the report has been extensive, and Mr Rowley sees its very publication as a step in the right direction. It is “the first comprehensive analysis of the *economics* of the problem; not just as an environmental problem.”

The Stern report is significant, as it is the first report of its kind to instigate wide ranging discussion on the issue. Stern’s report predicts a dire future for the planet: a failure to invest at least one percent of GDP per year would lead to the widest ranging market collapses the world has ever seen, with the cataclysmic effects being most acutely felt in developing countries. However, this is not to suggest that developed nations would be secure from the economic effects. On the contrary, with the continued moves toward globalisation, Stern argues that “actions over the coming few decades could create risks of major disruption to economic and social activity, later in this century and in the next, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and the economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.”<sup>4</sup> Key points in the report are:

- Average temperatures across the globe could rise by a minimum of 5 degrees celcius from pre-industrial levels if climate change is kept unchecked;
- The future increases in temperature will result in 200 million people being permanently displaced due to rising sea levels, heavier floods and drought;
- The increase in temperature could seriously affect food production globally; and
- Failure to take action could result in a wide-ranging market failure, one that may prove irrecoverable.<sup>5</sup>

Whilst the Stern Report has generated significant discussion, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report served to reinforce the science of the issue. It reported that “warming of the climate system in unequivocal” and that “most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations.”<sup>6</sup> As Mr Rowley observes, the IPCC report serves to provide an effective analysis that global warming is indeed occurring, and that there are tangible links between the polar ice caps melting and human activity. The report, produced by approximately 600 authors from 40

---

<sup>1</sup> BBC News ‘Expert reaction to Stern Review’ 30/10/2006 accessible at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/6098612.stm>

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> “Stern Review” *The Wall Street Journal*, November 2 2006

<sup>4</sup> BBC News ‘Report’s stark warming on climate’ 29/10/2006 accessible at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/6096594.stm>

<sup>5</sup> “Stern Report: the key points” *The Guardian*, October 30 2006

<sup>6</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change *Working Group I Fourth Assessment Report* accessible at <http://www.ipcc.ch/SPM2feb07.pdf>

countries, and reviewed and accepted by over 620 experts and governments, contains detailed analysis of the physical scientific basis for proving climate change, and the results it forecast are parallel to those of the Stern Report. Moreover, as Mr Rowley notes, both reports agree that there is a degree of uncertainty associated with acting on an issue that is, by its nature, unstable. However, the clear impacts detailed in both reports are far too grave for anyone, be it governments or corporation, to ignore. The cost of governments continuing to pursue high emitting carbon based economic growth is no longer a burden their own economies can bear.

### **The first steps**

Mr Rowley suggests that any solution to the climate change crisis requires a transformation of the global economy. This is not something that is entirely unprecedented, rather history suggests that the global economy is well suited to adapting to change. Examples include the industrial revolution and most recently, the technology based revolution – both of which stimulated and irrevocably changed the economic and political landscape. However, what has to be kept at the forefront of our thoughts is the need for urgent and imminent change, as the effects cannot simply be contained to one geographical location – rather, the effects, as the Stern Report suggests, will be felt globally. What is needed, and we are slowly seeing occur, is a robust understanding of the science behind climate change. For there can be no denial that there is indeed a problem – we need only look at the social and economic damage caused by Hurricane Katrina in 2005 to be given an indication of the price of inactivity.

The Stern Report suggests that actions taken to prevent further damage to the planet must be viewed as “an investment, a cost incurred now and in the coming few decades to avoid the risks of very severe consequences in the future. If these investments are made wisely, the costs will be manageable, and there will be a wide range of opportunities for growth and development along the way.” Hence the question becomes how does one promote such investment? Do we take a policy-based approach or a market based approach. Unsurprisingly, Mr Rowley suggests the answer is a combination of the two. Governments globally must, by necessity, take action on re-energizing the carbon credits trading market. Most importantly, a thorough policy discussion is essential to understand the very steps that need to be taken.

### **What do the reports mean?**

Governments need to summon the courage to tackle economic growth independent of energy growth. The traditional view, Mr Rowley notes, is that systems such as carbon trading inherently have an impact on economic growth. As a result of the political marriage of the two, we often see governmental inflexibility in creating a policy-based approach. However the times are changing. President Bush recently noted the need for economies such as the US to reduce their reliance on oil, and that this could be driven by

## NICK ROWLEY ON THE POLITICS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

technological research.<sup>7</sup> More recently, the European Union effectively launched a “green revolution” by passing policy on installing legally binding targets. David Miliband, the Environment Minister for the UK, perhaps best encapsulated the shift in the political landscape, remarking that “the time is right to look at what it would mean for the UK over the period of 15 to 20 years to create a post-oil economy - a declaration less of “oil independence and more the end of oil dependence.”<sup>8</sup> This change has been reflected in industry, with car manufacturers investing large amount of money into creating cleaner cars, an example of this process being the *Toyota Prius*.

What this political rhetoric demonstrates is, Mr Rowley notes, that key to the success of tackling the problem is the need for symbolic leadership from developed nations, demonstrating that low carbon emission growth is not a pipedream but a reality. Fundamentally, political rhetoric must be matched by government action. However, it must be noted that policy development is intertwined with both markets adapting and change being actively tackled in both the corporate and scientific spheres. The first obvious concern is if economic growth is dictated by the needs of the environment, with all other factors deemed secondary, what does this mean for the global free trade project? If anything, Mr Rowley suggests, the two are compatible. Peter Mandelson, Europe’s trade commissioner, has himself remarked that free trade is key to fighting climate change, as one of the best mechanisms to cut carbon emissions was to “open markets for investment in environmental technology”<sup>9</sup>. Ultimately, the issue has to be viewed not in a vacuum, but by incorporating all possible avenues. As Mr Rowley states, the key is a multi-faceted dynamic approach, one based on incorporating every method of energy production and reaching the best possible outcome, both for the economy and the environment.

### What about carbon trading schemes?

The nature of the modern global economy has made markets much more efficient at determining optimal levels of output and production, and thus global markets are able to react quickly to changes. One of the most popular methods for combating climate change has been the use of emissions trading schemes; whereby the market is used to determine the most effective and efficient way of reducing emissions. Essentially, credits for emissions are distributed to various firms on some sort of per-capita basis. These credits allow the holder to emit up to the amount specified on the credits. What makes these credits so effective is that they are tradeable – thus, a firm that can reduce its emissions cheaply is encouraged to do so, as it can then sell the remaining credits to other firms, who may not be able to reduce their emissions as cheaply. This sort of system creates incentives for firms to reduce their emissions, and it encourages them to do so in a way that is simultaneously economically efficient.

Indeed such schemes are quite prevalent – the largest and arguably the most prominent is the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS), which forms a part of the

---

<sup>7</sup> BBC News ‘Renewable energy close, Bush says’ 01/02/2006 accessible at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4672216.stm>

<sup>8</sup> “UK plans to cut CO<sub>2</sub> doomed to fail – scientists” *The Guardian*, March 5 2007

<sup>9</sup> “Mandelson urges free trade to fight climate change” *The Guardian*, December 19 2006

EU's overall energy strategy. In the first phase, which runs from 2005 to 2007, the EU incorporated a number of power stations as well as other large emitters, which in total represented approximately 45% of the EU's carbon dioxide emissions<sup>10</sup>. The system will be expanded in the second phase (2008 to 2012) to include more countries that are not members of the EU, more types of emissions and more sectors of the EU economy, such as the aviation industry.

The scheme *has* been met with criticism – many environmental groups have argued that the emission targets were too lax, evidenced by the fact that the price of credits rose steadily, then crashed as the market realized that very few firms would actually need credits.<sup>11</sup> Some groups have even suggested that in some countries, the emissions allowed were actually slightly higher than the economy was currently producing.<sup>12</sup> Despite these setbacks, Mr Rowley notes that the ETS is ultimately a positive thing. It is still in its infancy and it will only get stronger – the second phase of the ETS is designed to have stricter emissions targets than the first, and just recently the EU voted to legally bind itself to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 20% by the year 2020<sup>13</sup>. Further, more and more governments have been creating emissions trading schemes, such as the government of the US state of California. The United States is also the home of the world's first voluntary, legally binding, emission trading scheme, the Chicago Climate Exchange. The growth of these schemes, as well as increasing interest from government, indicates that these systems will only become more robust and developed as time goes on.

Fundamentally, it is governments that must drive the process and act as facilitators and regulators of any sort of system, and emissions trading schemes are the best example of this. Whilst the market can be more effective at determining how and where to reduce emissions, ultimately an emissions trading scheme needs the government to determine the level of emissions that are acceptable, facilitate the initial allocation of credits, as well as ensuring that the system is adhered to so that groups who flout the credits system are heavily penalised. In this way, the emissions trading schemes show an effective example of how policy and market forces can be combined to achieve a better result than arguably either alone could achieve.

### **But back to energy**

Not all of the proposed solutions are necessarily as forward looking as solar or geothermal energy or any manner of renewable energies currently advocated. There has been much discussion around the future and use of coal, and the possibility of so-called “clean coal” being used in widescale production. Coal generates more electricity than any other fuel source, and is the predominant source of electricity for many key developing

---

<sup>10</sup> European Commission ‘Emissions Trading Scheme’ accessed at <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/climat/emission.htm>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.emissierechten.nl/marktanalyse.htm>

<sup>12</sup> Climate Action Network Europe, *National Allocation Plans 2005-7: Do they deliver?* accessed at [http://www.climnet.org/EUenergy/ET/NAPsReport\\_Summary0306.pdf](http://www.climnet.org/EUenergy/ET/NAPsReport_Summary0306.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> EU Observer ‘EU sticks out neck in global climate change battle’ 9/3/2007 accessed at <http://euobserver.com/9/23665>

## NICK ROWLEY ON THE POLITICS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

economies, such as China and India – indeed coal is seen as having contributed significantly to climate change. The fact that coal is so widespread and such a cheap and easy energy source means that it is a common choice for developing economies. For example, Mr. Rowley points out that even with China creating dozens of new nuclear power plants, these will still only generate less than ten percent of the base load power requirements, meaning that coal will likely form a key part of China's energy generation well into the future.

What this ultimately means is that more emphasis must be put on reforming the coal industry, and ways of making the extraction, processing and consumption of coal more efficient and less polluting. Coal may have been part of the problem, but it must be made part of the solution if the solution is to have any effect. A great deal of technological progress has occurred in developing cleaner methods for processing coal, especially in countries like Australia. Significantly, Mr Rowley notes that in some cases, all that is required is the political will to enforce the changes in technology on the industry, and bring it up to standard. Things like mandating the retro-fitting of old power stations with new technologies, as well as global treaties that promote technology transfers in these fields are needed if clean coal is to work.

### Dealing with the sceptics

As noted previously, the science of climate change is by its nature uncertain. Much like predicting the weather, there is an element of risk that has to be undertaken when considering the issue. As such, climate change has been reported as being a “left-wing, anti-American, anti-west ideology.”<sup>14</sup> Even the popular media has its sceptics, with the bestselling American novelist Michael Crichton portraying climate change as being an evil plot perpetrated by environmental extremists in his book, *State of Fear*. However, what both sides agree on is that human activity does influence the planet's environment. What is apparent though, upon closer examination, is that such scepticism is often funded and driven by industry itself. In the United States, the Intermountain Rural Electric Association (IREA) was found to have funded prominent climate change sceptic Pat Michaels<sup>15</sup>. The question though is what does this money buy? First and foremost, it gives sceptics the ability to voice their concerns about reports such as the IPCC report to a larger audience. Secondly, if anything, it demonstrates the opportunism present in industry, whereby maintaining the bottom line is seen as more important than conserving the future.

Whilst this clash between what is slowly but surely becoming a relative minority and the majority may seem trivial, it is unfortunately an issue in need of resolution. This schism between the two sides on the issue is perhaps best demonstrated in a US context. Prior to the shift in power in the houses of US government, the former chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public works, James Inhofe, remarked in July 2003, “could it be that man-made global warming is the greatest hoax perpetrated on the

---

<sup>14</sup> “Climate change: Menace or myth?” *New Scientist*, 12 February 2005

<sup>15</sup> “Climate change special: state of denial” *New Scientist*, 4 November 2006

American people? It sure sounds like it.”<sup>16</sup> Clearly internal resolution and consensus is necessary within governments in power for action to be taken. At the height of the Bush presidency, Inhofe’s remarks were seen as being the leading political commentary on the issue. In hindsight, they are now seen as folly. What is becoming less contentious is the validity of the science. The issue is now how to deal with it.

## Conclusion

The crucial question at the end of the day is the mechanisms that can be put in place to deal with climate change. Our global environment is facing one of the greatest crisis of our times – and the need for change is now. As Mr Rowley notes, we can either sit back and watch the world pass us by, or we can take action and make a difference. In fifty years from now, the world’s future citizens might just thank us.

*This article was compiled by Sashi Balaraman based on an interview with Nick Rowley. Thanks are extended to Ravi Dutta for assistance with the compilation.*

---

<sup>16</sup> United States Senator James M. Inhofe as quoted at [inhofe.senate.gov/pressreleases/climateupdate.htm](http://inhofe.senate.gov/pressreleases/climateupdate.htm)

**BRITISH  
PARLIAMENTARY  
STRATEGY**

MONASH  
DEBATING  
R e v i e w

## How to tackle Worlds: “preparing for the unpredictable”

**About the authors:** Michael Kotrly completed a Honours Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics at the University of British Columbia in 2003, and a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Toronto Faculty of Law in 2006. In 2005, he reached the Grand Final of the World University Debating Championships, and won the Canadian National Debating Championship. In 2006, Michael won the World Championships held in Dublin. He is a Past President of the University of British Columbia Debating Society, and served as National Ombudsperson for the Canadian University Society of Intercollegiate Debate in 2005-2006. Michael is currently working at a law firm in Toronto, and will clerk for the Canadian Federal Court of Appeal in 2007.

Joanna Nairn completed an Honours Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science at the University of Toronto in 2006. In 2005, she won the North American Debating Championship and reached the Grand Final of the World University Debating Championships. In 2006, Joanna won the World Championships held in Dublin, and was 10th speaker at the tournament. She is a Past President of the Hart House Debating Club, and served as the Equity Officer for the 2007 World Championships in Vancouver. She will also be one of the Deputy Chief Adjudicators for the 2008 World Championships in Thailand. Joanna is currently a student at Harvard Law School.

---

It seems that every year, someone writes *the* authoritative piece on how to prepare in order to win a World Championships. Typically, these guides will focus on the minute aspects of British Parliamentary debating. While those strategies are important, there are other aspects to Worlds that seem to be ignored in many people’s preparation. It is these issues that we attempt to address. For us, preparing for Worlds was a multi-year process. Some of you may not be willing to spend as much time, but whatever commitment you do make to debating, the following issues should be considered in order to maximize your success and enjoyment at any debating tournament.

### Teamwork

#### Choosing a Partner

The first and most important consideration in order to succeed at (or at the very least enjoy) Worlds is choosing the right partner. The last two World Championships (Malaysia and Dublin) were won by teams whose debaters were roommates at the time, and many of the highly ranked teams have members who are good friends outside of debating. That’s not to say that you need live with your debating partner, but it does suggest that knowing each other and getting along well can give teams an edge. Worlds is much longer than most debating tournaments, much less predictable, and typically much more stressful. Many people seem to approach Worlds with the idea of choosing the best debater they can as their partner, assuming that two good individuals will add up to a good team. While this has definitely worked in some cases, it is by no means a sure thing. Indeed, where team consistency is such a predominant consideration in British Parliamentary, getting along with your partner is crucial. If the two of you have any issues, it’s a lot more likely that when something goes wrong at Worlds (an adjudication you disagree with, a

## HOW TO TACKLE WORLDS

topic you don't know, etc.) you will turn your frustration on one another, resulting in a worse performance and a less fun experience.

Besides personal considerations, you should choose a partner whose debating style complements your own. This can involve a variety of factors, such as preferring different speaking positions (extensions vs. whips, etc.), or having complementary knowledge bases (one is good at international relations, one at social policy and first principles). Although it is often helpful if you and your partner have quite different areas of expertise (allowing you to cover more of the topics that may come up), it is important that you do not diverge too much in the types of arguments that you understand and can present convincingly. If one of you uses exclusively practical arguments and the other only theoretical ones, you are setting yourself up for rounds in which you are incapable of having a coherent team position. You must rebuild your partner's arguments, summary speeches need to be framed through the lens of the extension given, and front half teams should have a single identifiable stance. If the two of you are unwilling or unable to find common ground on how you approach issues, you are better off debating with someone else.

Finally, you should choose someone who has similar goals and a similar commitment to debating. One of the quickest ways to create tension in a partnership is if one partner wants to do a lot of research and preparation because they take the competition very seriously, while the other views Worlds as a week of drinking and socializing. In discussing potential partnerships, it's important that you each have a clear idea of how many practice rounds and prep tournaments the other hopes to attend, what amount of research you would each be expected to do, and how well you expect (and wish) to do at Worlds. Debaters with wildly different expectations or work ethic will end up frustrated with one another.

### *Teambuilding*

Once you've chosen a partner you think is suitable, there are a variety of things that you can do to improve your ability to work together as a team and to handle problems when they crop up later. While the value of practice rounds and prep tournaments will be discussed more broadly later in this article, there are a few things to keep in mind about their particular benefits for building team cohesion. One of the most important things you can do as a team is to learn how one another think, and to learn how easy it is for you to understand your partner's arguments. There will be many rounds in which one of you will know more about the topic, or will think of an important argument in the middle of the round. You need to know whether you think alike and can quickly whisper the gist of it to them, or whether you will need to write out clearly and in full something you think is really important. For example, we discovered early on in debating together that we think almost exactly the same way. At Worlds in Dublin, there were two rounds in which one of us wrote out in point form the other person's entire speech, and they had under a minute to look it over before delivering it. That type of teamwork can be incredibly helpful at times, but Worlds is not the time to be experimenting with it if you don't already know it will work for you.

You may also want to try switching positions with your partner, even if you usually speak in a certain order. In most rounds, it's better for you each to speak in the position you are more comfortable with, and the person speaking second can simply explain the topic to their partner if they know more about it. However, sometimes things take an unexpected turn in rounds, and teams in the back half may find themselves with a whip speaker who is coming up with the team's arguments and an extension speaker who has very little idea what is going on. That can be particularly problematic if you have discovered, as discussed above, that you and your partner are not very good at quickly exchanging information. If you have practiced reversing positions in the lead up to Worlds, then you should each be comfortable enough to simply switch roles. Without that practice, particularly for extension speakers who may not have tried summarizing a round for years, it's likely that switching will do more harm than good.

You can also use your practice time to figure out what your partner's weaknesses are, which will allow the two of you to help one another avoid those pitfalls at Worlds. If you know your partner has difficulty with their timing, you can time their speech for them and give them cues to move on when they're dwelling too long on a subject. Similarly, if your partner knows that you have a pet topic that you often digress into when it is so much as mentioned by another speaker in the round, they can remind you to stay on track. Being familiar enough to correct each other's common faults is one way to get the most out of your partnership.

Finally, it's important to stress one last time the value of having a good relationship with your partner. You don't have to be best friends with them, but spend some time together outside of rounds. Go get coffee together once in a while, and discuss debating or current events. You will be seeing a lot of each other at Worlds, so you may as well get comfortable ahead of time and avoid the awkwardness that will result otherwise. This is especially important because you will be working under very tight time constraints (if you're lucky, 15 minutes before rounds); being overly formal and polite will only waste time. The better you know and get along with your partner, the more you will be able to discuss in prep time, instead of arguing.

## Research

Some debaters at their first Worlds are shocked to see teams with binders and binders full of paper. The "case-book method" of research accumulation remains the norm. There's a reason for this: you don't have to memorize the material. However, the material does have to be accessible and useful. Thus, whatever material you bring to Worlds, make sure you can access its contents in a quick and efficient manner. Tables of contents, tabs, and the like are all good ideas.

### *...to not sound stupid*

When most debaters prepare for worlds, it's out of fear. Most debaters who decide to take Worlds seriously fear the idea of a resolution concerning a topic, country, or event that they know absolutely nothing about. This sort of "reactionary approach" to research

## HOW TO TACKLE WORLDS

has its uses, but unless such topics come up, the approach taken renders the information inapplicable to other contexts. That is, this research concerns learning things like names, dates and the like, so that one can claim to know what they are talking about. However, it leads to no advantage in terms of argumentative depth.

Research in an attempt to not be blindsided by a resolution is crucial, but needs to be employed only to a minimal extent. That is, information should be learned on topics that are (a) incredibly topical and (b) beyond the general comprehension of the debater. Thus, for instance, when Colm Flynn posted on his website 106 different topics to research, this is an overly ambitious approach. Rather, the most important issues of the year should be covered in depth first. For instance, this year (and likely in the years to come), the question of Iraq was a *sine qua non* for debaters everywhere. Similarly, Israel should also be on everyone's list. Topics of regional interest to the host country are also worth considering. Some Worlds have done this in the past; both Manila and Kuala Lumpur Worlds had a resolution about ASEAN. This is not a sure bet, however: our research of Irish politics, for instance, was of little use in Dublin Worlds.<sup>1</sup>

The easiest way to research defensively is to get a survey understanding through websites like wikipedia (en.wikipedia.org). While the veracity of wikipedia is certainly dubious, for a debater, it is usually sufficient. We printed out various articles on certain hot-spots and tabbed them accordingly, creating a binder that covered 8 or 9 countries, conflicts, and theoretical areas relatively quickly. Textbooks are also useful to provide for a survey background on a particular part of the world (a history of a particular country or conflict, etc). Update the topics by reading current newspapers and/or news magazines.

### ...to sound smart

There are theoretical areas that tend to be useful every year, and having some understanding of them will go a long way at Worlds. One topic that individuals ought to always research is law. More often than not, lawyers or law students will be on Adjudication Teams, and many successful debaters study law as well. Given that in mind, debaters should have an adequate understanding of international law (at least international humanitarian – or criminal – law, international human rights law, and the law of conflict), as well as domestic principles in areas of law like criminal law and constitutional law.<sup>2</sup> Other typically useful areas include basic development and trade theory, and perhaps some feminist thought. There may be specific motions on these topics (such as the international law Octo-Final at Dublin Worlds), but they also help your team to stand out in other rounds. For example, being able to intelligently discuss some aspects of

---

<sup>1</sup> This was probably a good thing, as Michael's inability to distinguish the two main sides in the conflict was more than slightly problematic.

<sup>2</sup> In this particular case American teams ought to be wary. Their approaches to equality in constitutional law is much more limited than, say, the Supreme Court of Canada or the European Court of Human Rights. Moreover, in some circles, there are rather restricted approaches to international law which are in conflict with the prevailing views in Britain. See Philippe Sands' critique of American approaches to International Law in *Lawless World*.

development theory as they apply to oil revenue in Iraq will put you in another league from teams who know only the basic facts about that country.

Case studies can be extremely helpful in giving your arguments more credence than those merely asserted without proof by other teams in the round. This is particularly true of first principle motions, but they also work in rounds about focused topics when used by analogy. Two recommended sources are news articles and textbooks. If you read textbooks – especially those that make arguments<sup>3</sup> - the work is done for you. These books will contain case studies given in the context of the argument being made, ensuring you have a supply of them for later use. In the case of news articles, more work on your part may be required. Print them out, and jot down some notes on why the article is important. At the very least, think about events in context. Does a recent event fit a pattern? Does it prove or disprove a policy argument? We actually brought most of our Economists to Worlds with us. We had at least skimmed most of the important parts of these magazines ahead of time, and were then able to go back and reference things that we thought were relevant as case studies in rounds.

The Economist remains the most important debating resource, and the average standard of knowledge. However, it ought to be read correctly. One tip here is to save news in batches and read it as such. For instance, current events made more sense for us when we read each region's coverage in the Economist for the whole month of November at one time and saw the development of different events over time. That type of reading forces you to focus on broad patterns rather than minute details that are rarely helpful in rounds. Also, do not feel a need to read every article. For instance, the British and US sections are often too in depth; read the first major article and perhaps the editorials. Use your judgment - if it's about a local planning board, move on. Finally, use the entire Economist. Do not simply focus on the politics sections. A lot of important issues are included in the Business and Science sections.

### **Predicting Resolutions: A Caveat<sup>4</sup>**

Firstly, use this strategy with extreme caution. You will never succeed, and it's a dangerous way to prepare for Worlds if you use it to justify less thorough preparation elsewhere. That being said, there are some things to consider. Some members of the Adjudication Team have been known to use resolutions at the World Championships that have been used at other tournaments. For example, this year both Dublin Worlds and Canada's BP Championships featured a resolution on independent Kurdistan. Although in that case the motions were set by different people, the best way to predict a particular Adjudication Team's motions is to find the motions they have set for other tournaments in the year or two preceding Worlds (Colm Flynn's site is a great resource for this, [www.debating.net/Flynn](http://www.debating.net/Flynn)).

---

<sup>3</sup> For some trite examples, Naomi Klein's *No Logo*, Amartya Sen's *Development as Freedom*, Amy Chua's *World on Fire etc. etc. etc.*

<sup>4</sup> This section has been written entirely by Michael Kotrly. Despite Joanna Nairn's co-authoring of this paper, nothing in this section should be read as any sort of hint regarding the contents of the resolutions for the World Championships of the next two years.

## HOW TO TACKLE WORLDS

There is also the possibility of adjudication teams blatantly attempting to not only surprise people, but to render the case-book system useless. This hasn't happened as of yet at Worlds, but it's possible. For instance, this year at the Oxford Intervarsity the resolutions covered such topics as mandatory condom use in pornography and salary caps for European football. We never even opened up our casebook at that tournament.

### Practice Rounds and Prep Tournaments

#### *What to Practice*

Every year, you hear of a debater who has reached one of the late elimination rounds after having been coaxed out of their debating retirement and not having done any tournaments or concentrated practice in years. They are the exception rather than the rule and we have no idea how they do it. It's difficult to overstate the importance of practice in improving as debaters and as a team. Set up as many practice rounds as you can in your club, and with neighbouring schools (designate a day one weekend where nearby schools get together and do a number of practice rounds back to back; this can be a good way of mixing things up if your teams get too used to one another). Vary the rounds: practice all of the positions, and particularly practice the ones you aren't as good at. Practice different types of motions, mixing up topical international relations (both country specific, and more general security or law issues) with social policy and first principle topics.

Most importantly, take your practice rounds seriously. Particularly if you practice with the same teams every week, you may get too comfortable with them and be too casual for practice to be effective. Agree to treat them as if they are tournament rounds (no excessive heckling, laughing, etc), and always find someone to adjudicate and rank the round for you. Even if the adjudicators are much less experienced than you, their feedback will be helpful; if they don't understand an argument, or think your presentation is distracting, it's likely a panelist at Worlds will as well. Discuss the round with the other debaters as well, as they will also be able to give you feedback and evaluate different strategies.

The area that the greatest number of teams seem to struggle with is how to deal with difficult motions from First Proposition. You and your partner can work on this outside of practice rounds, which is particularly helpful if your school has difficulty consistently getting together enough teams for rounds. Find old resolutions online (again, Colm Flynn's site is an excellent resource for this), and spend 5 or 10 minutes with each one that you don't know how you would run at first glance. Decide whether you need a model and if so, what the model would be, whether you would set it somewhere, your team stance, and even sketch out a few arguments. Not only will this make First Proposition much easier to handle, it will also help you and your partner to figure out how to most efficiently prepare for rounds together.

*Prep Tournaments*

Although practice rounds are extremely important, it is invaluable to attend at least one tournament with your partner before Worlds, and more if you can. Even properly run practice rounds cannot match the atmosphere of a competitive tournament, where you will face pressure, long days, and unfamiliar judges. Although any tournament can be valuable for those reasons, there are some that may be more helpful to you than others. Most regions of the world now have at least one or two large British Parliamentary tournaments with judges who have Worlds experience and an adjudication team that has Worlds break experience. If you or your school can afford to travel, Oxford and Cambridge's tournaments on back to back weekends in November are an excellent way to gain BP experience in the lead up to Worlds. Alternatively, North America now features Hart House and Yale's tournaments on back-to-back weekends in October.

One area that many teams struggle with at tournaments is how to best use the 15 minute prep time allotted to them before rounds. Given that you have to walk to a room that you may not know how to find, which can often take 10 minutes or more, you and your partner need to be extremely efficient in how you use that time. As silly as it may sound, always use the washroom before the motion is announced. Begin walking to your room immediately after the pairings and motion are given, as it will probably take longer than you think to find it. If you are First Proposition, decide what you want the debate to be about (while clearly following the intent of the motion), and then construct a model (if necessary) to preclude as many other issues as you can; spend no more than 7 or 8 minutes on the model to make sure that you have enough time to outline arguments. If you are First Opposition, decide what stance you will take (and what your arguments will be) for each of the possible models and stances that you think First Proposition may run. Back half teams should discuss the debate more generally, writing down the obvious arguments on the topic in case your front half team misses one, as well as thinking up several possible extensions and their arguments.

One of the most valuable features of attending prep tournaments is the adjudicator feedback you receive in open adjudications. Incorporating this adjudicator feedback, especially when it comes from judges who have themselves been successful at Worlds as either debaters or judges, is an excellent way to improve. However, it can also significantly detract from your performance if you try to make big changes too quickly. If a judge suggests you make relatively small adjustments to the way you organize your speech, your presentation, or the way that you approached a topic or a debating position, take that feedback into consideration in future rounds and gauge for yourself its effectiveness. If a judge you respect suggests a major change, by all means incorporate it into your debating, but do so in practice rounds after the current tournament; it is likely that it will take some time to adjust to a big change, and your performance may suffer during that period. Finally, if an adjudicator suggests that you make significant changes to your speaking style, and you do not feel comfortable doing so (i.e. a judge tells you that you must be more forceful but you are a quiet person, or something of that nature), don't feel that you must. Those types of issues are usually matters of personal preference with judges, and you will never be able to please everyone. As long as your manner does not

## HOW TO TACKLE WORLDS

distract from the content of your speeches, speak however you feel most comfortable as it will look most natural and will not distract you from the material you are delivering.

Finally, we would offer one additional piece of advice to keep in mind at prep tournament and at Worlds. Every time you enter a round, treat each team in it as a serious threat, and address their material accordingly. This doesn't mean that you need to spend equal time on each team, but you do need to make sure that you defeat their arguments (however long that takes) and do not simply dismiss them. Teams that are "worse" than you can and will beat you if you do not make sure that you beat them. Even if their arguments seem silly to you, there will be some judges that may buy them; and even if judges do not, you will certainly lose to other teams in the round that are thorough in their treatment of their opposition.

Each year at Worlds, unforeseen circumstances arise. Competitors get sick, judges make decisions you don't understand, and topics come up that you could have never predicted. Whether you are able to win Worlds, or break, or bubble, depends almost as much on those circumstances as it does on how talented a debater you are. However, there are things you can do before the tournament that will improve both your debating and your ability to cope with the challenges that will arise during the competition. This guide outlines some of the preparation that we have found to be the most valuable in our own experiences with Worlds. The final piece of advice that we would offer is that debating is about having the right attitude. Be prepared, take each round seriously, and manage your expectations – you have to earn those three points each round.

## The Role of a Whip Speaker

**About the author:** Anna Garsia has a Bachelor of Science degree with honours in Biochemistry from the University of Sydney and is currently completing Graduate Law also at the University of Sydney. Representing the University of Sydney, Anna has been a octo-finalist at the 2005 World Debating Championships as well as a semi-finalist at the 2005 Australian Intersvarsity Novice Debating Championships. In 2007, Anna won the World University Debating Championships.

---

### **“The role of the whip speaker is to summarise the debate.”**

It is with such pearls of wisdom we tend to send a novice whip speaker to take the floor in a British Parliamentary (BP) debate. What they soon discover is that this task is not quite as simple as it may sound. Presenting a clear and analytical summary is no easy task when there are four teams in a debate, extensions to be dealt with and often significant shifts in debate focus and dynamic between halves. Moreover, adjudicators tend to be of little help. For obvious reasons feedback to the closing half teams usually focuses on the substance of the extension as well as the more structurally and technically difficult member speeches. By the time adjudicators get around to feedback for the second speaker, they tend to classify whip speeches into those which work and those that do not - the “good whip speech” and the “bad whip speech” - without going into any greater detail.

This article aims to offer a more detailed explanation as to what is required of the whip speech in BP style, in particular examining how the introduction of the extension, which is often absent in three on three debating, has an impact upon the structure and delivery of the summary. The whip speech also proves to be a useful tool for analysing a number of the tactical issues that arise in the closing half of a BP debate. Much of what appears in this article will seem somewhat self evident or be things that are subconsciously done by experienced BP speakers and adjudicators. The ideas discussed may prove a useful springboard for such experienced debaters to consider their own tactics and opinions about the summary speech. However, the primary focus of the article is to provide guidance to speakers who are new to the BP style and speakers who are still gaining experience who want to improve their “good whip speech” to “bad whip speech ratio”.

### **“Taking issue” with British Parliamentary...**

The speech structure is the whip speaker’s major tool for analysing the arguments of a debate and bringing together often quite disparate parts of the debate. That said, there is actually very little complexity to the broader structure of the whip speech. Like the third speaker’s summary speech in Australs style, the whip speech is usually structured around the two to four themes or “issues” that the speaker identifies as running throughout the debate. Under each heading the speaker analyses the range of arguments that have occurred in the debate. Each issue itself is also usually quite self-contained. Thus, whilst there can be logical and tactical considerations as to how the issues are ordered, the whip speech does not present the structural complexities in either role fulfillment or logical case

## THE ROLE OF A WHIP SPEAKER

presentation, that can be of concern in earlier speaking positions, particularly the member's speech. Rather the challenge and complexity of the whip speech is actually identifying the issues of the debate to form the structural and analytical basis of the summary.

In British Parliamentary style, the primary focus when identifying and selecting the issues of the debate for the summary must be getting their own team's extension to win the debate. Whereas the Australs style third speaker needs to present an analytical summary which systematically demonstrates that their side wins the logic and arguments of the debate. The whip speech needs to be an analytical summary of the debate *in light of their team's extension*. There is more than nuance in this distinction. The BP summary speech has a specific tactical agenda born out of the concept of "role fulfillment" and the fact that not all arguments on one side of the debate necessarily "belong" to the team presenting the summary speech. This agenda is convincing the adjudicator that the arguments brought to the table by the closing team were the most important in the debate and the major issues of the debate must be presented with this agenda in mind. The whip speaker must remember that, even if they identify the issues in the debate in a way which allows them to beat the major opposition arguments and present a fantastic analysis of the debate's logic, they will not win the debate if this analysis leaves their extension high and dry. In fact, with the increasing emphasis being placed in high level competitions on role fulfillment, having little emphasis on the extension in the whip speech can result in clear fourth places in a number of adjudicator's minds.

To those approaching BP for the first time the change in summary emphasis may seem a little daunting, perhaps even frustratingly artificial for the well drilled puritan Australs third speaker. Hopefully participation in a few good BP debates will change this opinion. While the third speaker role in Australs style is a great chance to show one's rebuttal and logic skills in a thorough, methodical manner with somewhat machine gun like efficiency. The BP whip speech contrastingly provides a chance to take advantage of the tactical and intellectual intricacies of BP debating at its best. With this in mind whip speeches can be extremely "fun" speeches to write and deliver.

Putting all concepts of debating fun aside, it is at this point we come to the obvious question for the inexperienced BP speaker – how does the extension actually have any impact upon the issues they identify as the basis of their summary? Before launching into the answer, it is worth briefly exploring two primary roles of the whip speaker in relation to the extension; firstly, the role of supporting the substantive aspects of the extension and secondly, the role of providing analysis which links the extension to the debate as a whole.

### Being the "Support Act"...

The first thing for the whip speaker to remember about the extension when they are writing their speech is that they are their first speaker's "support act", so to speak. Any second speaker in a BP team who has been out tabbed by their partner can take great comfort in the fact that this results indicates a job well done – a good whip speech should work subconsciously on the adjudicator to add several points to the members speech by

virtue of enhancing the value of the extension (or so we like to tell ourselves when the tab comes out).

Ideally the extension has been a joint effort at the table between both team members. However, even when this has been the case, the sub-points, emphasis and examples which flesh out the extension will usually have been the work of the member speaker. Of course in reality, time pressures can mean the extension was essentially the work of the member speaker who came up with it thirty seconds before standing up to deliver it. Thus, regardless of the circumstances, the whip speaker must always pay close attention to how the extension was presented by their partner so that they can stay consistent with the line of argument (which may require deviation from how they themselves may have envisaged or articulated the argument) while at the same time polishing up whatever material was put on the table. It is therefore the whip speaker's role to make the quick assessments as to what arguments were *actually* presented. The whip speaker must then work out what are the strongest arguments that need to be emphasized; what gaps in the extension may need to be plugged, whether subtle changes in emphasis and nuance are necessary and where carefully disguised expansion of points in the summary might be needed to strengthen the case. This checklist is no criticism of member speakers (who probably have one of the most technically difficult speeches to deliver), however even the perfectly delivered extension can be enhanced by the summary speaker. Of course, the job of the whip speaker significantly easier in such cases.

### **It's all about integrating...**

An extension needs to be new material, but to be a good extension it also needs to be material which is obviously pertinent to opening half and opposition arguments in the debate. Therefore the second factor that a whip speaker needs to remember about the extension is that the summary speech presents a significant opportunity to provide detailed analysis of the extension in the context of the debate as a whole or "integrating analysis"<sup>1</sup>.

What is meant by "integrating analysis"? Essentially it is analysis which draws links between the extension and other arguments in the debate. For example, using and reworking material from the extension as the basis for additional rebuttal to the major arguments of both opposition teams. Another example is demonstrating how the extension adds an extra and previously lacking dimension to any substantive arguments that was presented by the opening half of the bench. Integrating analysis could also covering drawing links between points of information (POIs) asked early in the debate and the extension, especially if the POIs were not intended to be flags of the extension and as such the links only occur to the team in retrospect. In short, the aim of this type of analysis is to make the extension seem much intelligent and more critical to the debate as a whole, than may have appeared when it was first delivered in purely substantive form, thus showing the adjudicators why it was a well chosen and debate winning extension.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is term the author has selected on purely descriptive grounds to label the type of analysis outlined in this paragraph and is not meant to be a technical term that may appear in other literature.

## THE ROLE OF A WHIP SPEAKER

In particular, integrating analysis allows a team to properly capitalise upon an essentially intuitively selected matter heavy extension, as the member speaker has a huge balancing act of rebuttal and substantive that has to be achieved in seven minutes. Teams often favour an approach whereby the member speaker only briefly and loosely provides the relationship between the extension and preceding debate before devoting most of their time to bringing out as much substantive material as possible. This leaves the whip speaker to bring the detailed analysis as to the importance of the extension to the debate the debate as a whole – the integrating analysis. The theory or tactic behind such an approach being that the more new substantive material brought out in the member’s speech, the more the whip speaker has to work with when integrating the extension into context of the whole debate. Moreover this approach takes advantage of the additional thinking time whip speakers have during and after the member speech to develop the extra level of ‘big picture’ analysis.

### **Back to having issues...**

By now there should be no prizes awarded for guessing that the primary impact of the extension upon identifying issues, is that it creates a need to frame the issues in a way that allows effective fulfillment of both the support and integrating roles discussed above.

The most basic approach to this requirement is for the whip speaker to remember that each of the issues they identify in their speech will need to have an aspect relating to their extension. Ideally the question the speaker should train themselves to be asking with every issue (and perhaps even every sub-point within each issue) they prepare is “How does this issue relate to my extension?” They should then articulate the answer to this question in their speech. It might be that the issue provides an opportunity to for integrating analysis or it might be that the issue is the appropriate heading under which to re-present substantive aspects of the extension with any supporting additions as deemed necessary.

If an issue or sub-point does not seem to relate to the extension it can be possible to bluff and fill the gap with rebuttal the speaker’s team added or draw attention to an early POI asked by their team – both of these tactics aim to demonstrate there was material in the debate on the issue which the team claims even if it did not strictly come under the heading of the extension. However such bluffing can only get one so far, a better approach to consider is whether a change in the framing of the issue might be necessary so that the extension can manipulated to be relevant to the heading. It is worth remembering that if there is nothing the team added to the issue as it is framed then it is not in the team’s interests to have identified as a major issue of the debate in the whip speech. No matter how well the speaker may be able to re-present the arguments of the opening team on their side.

### **Now taking issue with “our extension”...**

There is perhaps one final aspect to consider about how the extension has an impact upon the issues identified in the summary and that is the question of whether or not you should

re-use whatever buzz word, label or heading you have given to the extension as an issue of the debate.

As a general rule of thumb it is this author's opinion that letting the "extension" be a separate issue in the whip speech can be problematic. Particularly inexperienced speakers like to present three issues of the debate, with one of those issues being "our extension" More often than not such speaker will actually label the issue "our extension" and not even articulate what label their team chose to give to their case. The problem with this approach is that it often results in the whip speaker simply repeating the extension verbatim as presented by the member speaker, without developing the arguments or provide any integrating analysis. Framing the extension as a separate issue in the debate also makes it more likely to appear that extension did not fit into the rest of the debate and furthermore that the team did not contribute to the other issues of the debate.

Of course the idea that extensions do not make for good issues for whip speeches is by no means a hard and fast rule and many debaters may disagree this opinion. It should be remembered it is only a guide and more importantly, there are a several very specific contexts where major tactical gains can be made by framing an issue, particularly the first issue, of the summary speech as the label of the extension. Firstly, this tactic can help dramatically swing the debate to the closing half. Under the extension heading, the whip speaker can repeat the major arguments of the extension and more importantly address the counter arguments to the extension provided by the opposing closing team and perhaps even examine clash between the extensions. This structure sends a clear message to the adjudicators that the team's extension is now the central issue of the both the closing half and of the debate more generally. It also helps to ensure that the whip speaker engages well with opposing closing team and wins back any arguments if the extension has been hit with a strong response. All of which contribute to the impression that the closing half of the debate has dominated.

Secondly, it is worth considering framing the extension as the first issue of the debate. Especially when the extension is based on a major underlying principle or stakeholder that was missing entirely from the opening half analysis and yet, despite its importance, the extension seems to still be struggling to gain proper traction in the debate. This addresses the scenario where the intuitive reaction of the whip speaker is that the extension needs to be forced to the front and centre of the debate because the opposing teams have not reacted to the dynamic change the extension aimed to introduce. This tactic allows the whip speaker to show the issue of the extension provided rebuttal for a number of arguments points throughout the debate and moreover re-emphasise the substantive contribution their team has made, aiming to show up the rest of the teams for leaving this vital area out of their own substantive analysis.

There are no doubt other scenarios where framing the extension as an issue of the debate is a sensible way of structuring the whip speech, the above are simply two examples of where strong tactical considerations about the extension may alter the speech structure. However, it is worth remembering that whenever the whip speaker chooses to identify the extension material as a separate issue in the debate they need to pay particular attention to not undoing their member speaker's good work and still link the other issues they identify

## **THE ROLE OF A WHIP SPEAKER**

to their team's own material. Moreover, given the later issues of the speech will be framed more in terms of rebuttal to other team's arguments, a strong conclusion re-emphasising the extension can be of particular value.

### **Conclusion**

Finally, it is important to remember that although deconstructing the whip speaker's role can make it sound like a careful and well planned analytical jigsaw puzzle, the reality is quite different. The whip speaker is in a very responsive and time pressured speaking position. All decisions regarding the structure and analysis within the speech must be made within the context of the debate, often in very limited periods of time during which rapid dynamic changes in the debate may be occurring as the extensions are introduced. Framing of issues and creation of integrating analysis must become split second decisions. Nevertheless, thinking between debates about what the summary hopes to achieve and considerations surrounding the extension can help new BP speakers become more natural and intuitive about their tactical decision making in debates, ultimately increasing the number of "good whip speeches" delivered.



# DEBATING DISCOURSE

MONASH  
DEBATING  
R e v i e w

# New Arguments from New Epistemologies: Critical Theory for Parliamentary Debating<sup>1</sup>

**About the author:** Leloy Claudio holds an AB in Communication, Magna Cum Laude, from the Ateneo de Manila University. He has been a Quarter-finalist at the World University Debating Championships and is currently ranked 5<sup>th</sup> best speaker in Australasia.

Sharmila Parmanand holds an AB in Political Science, Cum Laude, from the Ateneo de Manila University. She is a 2-time best speaker in the Philippines.

Both are two-time Asian Champions, 2-time Philippine National Champions, and Australasian Debating Championships Finalists.

---

## Introduction

Competitive debating is, at its heart, an academic endeavor. Anybody who's ever sat through one of those boring welcoming remarks in championship dinners knows that people expect us to be at the cutting edge of critical thinking and knowledge production. Consequently, debaters constitute an epistemic community, where knowledge is generated and exchanged. Debating is not simply a benign, competitive sport, but one that forms discursive and normative agents. It is implicated in a broader struggle for social transformation.

As with any epistemic community, however, the dominance of certain theoretical orientations, methodological commitments, epistemologies, or academic disciplines, cannot be avoided. The challenge for any such community is not to completely rid itself of these dominances, but to be open to new ways of thinking.

Based on our experiences, competitive debating is dominated by the academic fields of law, orthodox international relations, social policy, and, at times, economics. These areas lend themselves well to “problem-solving” approaches: there is a problem, so we look at models in order to see which one best solves that problem. Admittedly, this is unavoidable given that competitive debating stems from the parliamentary tradition, which is legislative in nature. Nevertheless, since debating is about creating spaces for relevant discussion, we argue that debaters and adjudicators must be more open to more “theoretical” and critical topics and arguments.

## What are critical theories?

There is no way to pin down what critical theory is per se. In general, critical theory focuses on the processes involved in the constitution of meaning. As such, critical theories

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Resto Cruz I of the Ateneo de Manila School of Social Sciences for his indispensable comments and suggestions; Bobby Benedicto for his relentless poststructuralist influence. Thanks as well to members of the Ateneo Debate Society for their comments.

## NEW ARGUMENTS FROM NEW EPISTEMOLOGIES

are predisposed to linguistic analyses of broader social phenomena. We take as integral (if not, trite) the work of Michel Foucault.<sup>2</sup> A phase of Foucault's work is a genealogical examination of knowledge production in the context of contemporary political society. Knowledge and power for Foucault are synonymous and these are articulated within discourse (i.e., language and practice). Hence everything we do, say, and write is imbued with meaning and constitutes, reproduces, and/or subverts power structures.

Because this process of meaning-making is complex – because it occurs on different levels and various sites of power – new ways of knowing are required to understand it (new epistemologies). The political implication of this is the rejection of the conviction that, via science, we can establish fixed universal truths and meanings (for example, this accounts for an aversion to the certainties of territoriality and the nation-state).<sup>3</sup> If things sound a bit convoluted at this point, our examples below should clarify things.

### Knowledge Hierarchies

Motions like 'This house celebrates the rise of the lipstick lesbian' or 'This house believes that nationalism is the enemy of the anti-war movement' drive wedges within the debate community, eliciting different strong reactions. Some people think they are new and innovative while others think they are too specialized or have no material social significance. However, motions like 'This house should sanction Iran' are almost certainly better received.

Moreover, arguments that draw from critical theory are usually hit or miss. The emphasis on direct tangible benefits as the standard of a "good" argument alienates certain arguments in the eyes of adjudicators. For example<sup>4</sup>, in a debate assessing the 'crossed legs' strategy of women in Latin America ('This house believes the strategy of women of withholding sex to get the rebels to drop their arms hurts the feminist movement'), it is very easy for the Affirmative to forward concrete detriments; they just have to argue that the strategy invites physical retaliation of the emasculated men on the ground. Likewise, the Negative can just as well argue that the crossed legs policy increases the chances of ending the war, which is also a tangible benefit. However, an argument about how the strategy reconstitutes female sexuality from passivity to activity and disturbs and alters existing cultural dispositions, while equally legitimate when viewed in the context of the transformative logic of debate, is significantly harder to link to immediate consequences. As such, the argument is more likely to be dismissed or perceived as weak in relation to the previous arguments. Often, these argumentative standards are internalized, and critical

---

<sup>2</sup> See M. Foucault, *The history of sexuality volume I: An introduction*, Random House, New York, 1978.

<sup>3</sup> For a good international relations perspective on this, see BAYLIS, J. and Smith, S., *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001

<sup>4</sup> The examples we will be employing do not necessarily represent the mean when it comes to what types of motions are given in tournaments. They are simply being used because they allow for a solid illustration of our point.

arguments are avoided. This self-policing is transmitted through individual training programs of institutions and adjudicator feedback in tournaments.

Another example is the debate on the motion ‘This house believes the IMF and World Bank should attend the World Social Forum’<sup>5</sup> where the Affirmative can assert that IMF and World Bank are essential in giving the World Social Forum a semblance of institutional authority. In other words, it allows them access to official, state-based, policymaking channels. As with the example above, Negative is in an optimum position to launch critical arguments.

First, the Negative, in the form of a rebuttal, can echo the mildly critical assertion of International Relations theorist James Rosenau<sup>6</sup> that views of governance must not be methodologically confined to the state and formal structures of government (i.e. international organizations) - a view that is gaining currency in the field of International Relations. NGOs and social movements are actors of governance. From this view, social activist networks in the World Social Forum are not useless just because they do not have direct access to Bretton Woods institutions. They are imbued with power because they can participate in transnational advocacy (which can condition state behavior) and engage in grassroots projects and initiate change at local levels. We find that arguments like these are easily accepted precisely because the material effects are still directly observable. Nevertheless, it can still be a source of discomfort because it challenges the long-standing assumption that change stems from formal state or inter-state policies.

Second, the Negative may take a markedly more critical approach by focusing on the need to preserve the discursive capital of the World Social Forum in the context of a broader ideational battle; radical critics of Empire are needed to capture frames of meaning and reshape popular discourses, thereby reconstituting preferences and subjectivities. Hence, we need radicals to constitute moderate positions. For example, the welfare state would not have existed if liberals did not have Marxism to react to. Once again, the effects of this argument are not very concrete, but we, nevertheless, find it compelling as we shall demonstrate below.

### Reevaluating the Critical

In order to assess the value of critical arguments, let us revisit the previous example. Critical arguments address the incremental, if not almost-invisible actors, processes, power relationships, and systems of domination and resistance that create or impede social change. Often, these are difficult to quantify and classify. In order to engage these arguments, we ought to be able to reframe our lenses and appreciate new ways of knowing.

---

<sup>5</sup> Admittedly, this is an original motion from an Ateneo training round, which hasn't been debated in any major tournament, but it illustrates our point quite well.

<sup>6</sup> J.N. Rosenau, *Along the domestic-foreign frontier: Exploring governance in a turbulent world*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

## NEW ARGUMENTS FROM NEW EPISTEMOLOGIES

It is for this reason that, as different branches of the academe have begun to accept less positivist epistemologies, so should debaters and our favorite average reasonable persons. Just because it isn't quantifiable, doesn't mean nothing important is happening. Following the previous example on the crossed legs strategy, the reconfiguration of sexual mores it creates cannot be reduced to statistics and quantifiable indicators of change. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that dispositions and cultural attitudes change and that these are important.

Moreover, it is a huge irony for motions and arguments that cater to micro-political realities to be dismissed as 'too specialized' precisely because they speak more authentically to common personal experiences. For example, individuals are less likely to be present in elite policy circles than to experience violence and power imbalances on an everyday level, such as in sexual relations, international travel, and other forms of specific social interactions; this is why a debate on sado-masochism is an equally valid, if not more important topic than U.N. reform.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps these motions and arguments seem specialized because we reproduce their exclusion. We are also too accepting of what mainstream media classify as relevant. But let's admit it, we know there's more to life and politics than the Economist.

It is precisely this "more," this underside of the world, that critical theory seeks to investigate. Critical theory is critical of established ways of thinking. It is anti-foundational because it asks us to pose new questions, challenging what seems to be natural, commonsensical, and true. This profoundly agrees with the debating ideal of dropping preconceived assumptions and what is right and true and being open to a pluralism of alternatives. If debating is truly about getting people to think out of the box, critical theory and it are a perfect combination.

### Conclusion

Lest we be accused of seeking to drastically overhaul the status quo in debating, we are not suggesting that traditional policy debates are no longer important. 'High' politics is still fun and we enjoy the occasional invade/sanction Iraq/Iran debate. We're also open to aid debates and arguing about the next hot socio-legal issue that divides Republicans and Democrats, Tories and Labor. All we are asking is that we should collectively engage broader theoretical debates and be more accepting of critical lines of argumentation.

Maybe the transition can be enhanced by greater efforts on the part of those launching these arguments to use language that is more accessible and to engage as well the other frameworks operative in the debate.<sup>8</sup> After all critical theorists, even those with postmodernist dispositions, are not as esoteric as people think, which is, at the end of the day, all we wanted to say.

### References:

---

<sup>7</sup> Certainly not everyone practices S/M, but most people have experienced personal relationships with intimate systems of power and domination.

FOUCAULT, M. *The history of sexuality volume I: An introduction*, Random House: New York, 1978.

ROSENAU, J.N. *Along the domestic-foreign frontier*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

SCHOLTE, J.A. The globalization of world politics. BAYLIS, J. and SMITH, S., *The globalization of world politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

# VISIT THE MDR ONLINE

read articles from previous editions  
view supplementary articles and updates  
purchase MDRs using our secure "Paypal" system  
access our back catalogue  
give us your feedback, results and comments

VOL. 1 FEBRUARY 2002

## MONASH DEBATING REVIEW

A YEARLY PUBLICATION OF THE  
MONASH ASSOCIATION OF DEBATERS

### IN THIS ISSUE

PETER SINGER ON EUTHANASIA  
*ANGELA BALLANTYNE*

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S DEBATING ESSAY PRIZE:  
GLOBAL MEDIA CENSORSHIP AND INTERNA-  
TIONAL CONFLICT  
*SHOBA RAO*

AMERICAN ADJUDICATION ADVICE  
*IAN LISING*

PLUS: STEM CELLS · PORNOGRAPHY, SECURITY  
IN NORTH ASIA · TRENDS IN AUSTRALASIAN  
DEBATING · GUIDE TO TOURNAMENTS 2002

**MONASH**  
UNIVERSITY

VOL. 2 FEBRUARY 2003

## MONASH DEBATING REVIEW

AN ANNUAL PUBLICATION OF THE  
MONASH ASSOCIATION OF DEBATERS

### IN THIS ISSUE

AN INTERVIEW WITH  
ONE MAN'S TERROR  
ANOTHER MAN'S FREEDOM  
*ANGELA BALLANTYNE*

SECURING CORPORATE  
INTEGRITY  
*CHRISTOPHER RUANE*

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATING IN RUSSIA  
*SERGEY GOLUBOK*

PLUS: CULTURAL IMPERIALISM · UNITED  
NATIONS · AFRICAN UNION · ADJUDICATION:  
REASON VERSUS RHETORIC · ALL-ASIANS

**MONASH**  
UNIVERSITY

<http://www.monashdebatingreview.com>

## The Substance of Style

**About the author:** Jess completed a Bachelor of Arts (Media and Communications) and a Bachelor of Laws (Honours) at Melbourne University in 2006. In 2006, she reached the Grand Final of the Australasian Intersvarsity Debating Championships and also ranked as the third best speaker at that tournament. She also won both the Public Speaking Competition at Australs as well as winning the Comedy Competition at Dublin Worlds. Jess has reached the Victorian State Final of Triple J's Raw Comedy Competition and is currently completing her Articled Clerkship at a Melbourne law firm.

---

Good manner is about control.

You should never feel that you are the victim of your own speaking style. The way that you speak is not an accident, neither is it fixed nor pre-determined. Manner is the result of a series of small choices; choices about the pace at which you speak, when you pause, how you breathe, the pitch of your voice, your gestures and movements.

The challenge is that these decisions must be made while you wrestle with difficult concepts, respond to your opposition and struggle to put complex ideas into words. Because there is so much going on, many debaters slip their manner into autopilot and surrender control to instinct and chance. For the most gifted speakers, this is a successful strategy. For the rest of us, the results can be painful.

Speaking style has a profound impact on the way that content is received. Poor manner can prevent audiences and adjudicators from understanding good ideas. Conversely, compelling manner enriches and solidifies arguments. Only a fraction of what you communicate is contained in the language that you choose; to neglect style is to neglect content.

Putting function to one side, it is equally important to emphasize the aesthetic value of manner. Speaking style is precisely that: style. Why should debaters brutishly pelt out matter without grace or gravitas? Every speaker should aim for their audience (however large or small) to take pleasure in the way that they speak. The best debaters are those who deliver powerful ideas with an equally powerful sense of style; those who make argument elegant.

### Casting judgments about manner

Everybody has a unique natural speaking style that reflects their personality and life experience. The way that someone speaks is informed by a range of factors, including gender, education and cultural background. In turn, individual audience members and adjudicators have diverging preferences when it comes to style. For this reason, people often comment that “manner is a very subjective thing”.

Unfortunately, the fact that manner is personal and unique often gives rise to a feeling that it would be inappropriate to openly express opinions about another person's speaking style; “it's okay to criticize someone's case, but it's a bit harsh to have a go at the way they

## THE SUBSTANCE OF STYLE

speak”. Because we feel uncomfortable giving feedback about something ‘personal,’ these judgments frequently remain unarticulated.

There is a subjective element in the way that we respond to manner. However, there *are* relatively objective criteria against which speakers can be judged. The more we use and discuss these criteria, the more comfortable we will feel talking about manner, and the more adept we will become at helping speakers improve.

Manner does influence the way that adjudicators respond to debaters, despite the fact that most adjudications focus heavily on content and structure. Adjudicators and audiences constantly make judgments about the way that people talk. We should aim for maximum honesty and accountability in the way that debates are judged. To facilitate this, we need the skill and confidence to speak openly about style.

Importantly, my argument that we should openly discuss manner is not a license to be rude. Manner *is* unique and personal. No adjudicator should ever deride someone’s style, or attack someone for the way that they speak. Telling a person that they are a bad speaker or that they “sound funny” is obviously unhelpful. However, telling someone to speak more softly, and have more variation in their pitch is likely to be very useful. Giving constructive advice about manner is challenging – it requires tact and sensitivity.

Using defined criteria may also help adjudicators separate personal preferences from more objective measures of success. As always, the focus must be on what the average, reasonable person would find persuasive. And the average, reasonable person is open to being persuaded in a range of ways.

### Take it slow

In terms of manner, some of the most common feedback given by adjudicators is that a speaker needs to slow down. There are two reasons to speak at a moderate pace. The first (and most obvious) is that audiences and adjudicators will be able to process the words that you are saying. The ideal speed is between 100 and 130 words per minute.<sup>1</sup>

The second reason to speak more slowly is that it gives you time to think. This, in turn, means that you are able to choose your words more carefully, articulate your ideas more clearly, and make conscious choices about style. Paradoxically, good debaters who speak slowly are usually able to say more, because their speeches are so densely packed with ideas.

So, if you do speak too quickly, how exactly do you go about slowing down? Before you start a speech, take a few moments to breathe deeply and calm down. Needless to say, you have to actively concentrate on speaking at a less frantic pace. Write ‘slow down’ at regular points in your notes. The more speeches you give, the more control you will develop over pace (and other elements of speaking style).

---

<sup>1</sup> If you want to get a feeling for what this actually means, the first two paragraphs in this section on pace amount to 126 words.

## Light and shade

Whatever your approach, it is important that you vary your speaking style within a given speech. This serves several of functions. First, even effective styles can become irritating or tedious after several minutes without a break. For example, a very energetic speaker can exhaust an audience with an onslaught of unbroken intensity. On the other hand, a very calm speaker may become dull if they don't inject a few moments of passion into a speech. Secondly your style should move with the content of your speech. A strong reason to vary your manner is that this is an effective way of emphasizing particular points, and signaling a shift in argument.

It is also important to vary your speaking style between debates. Think about who you are speaking with and who you are speaking against. Try to use your manner strategically. For example, if you speak directly after someone who has been overly aggressive, make a point of speaking calmly.

Your manner must also adapt to reflect the topic; the subject-matter that you are dealing with should have bearing on your style. In my first year at university, I spoke in a debate about the Middle East. Hamas had recently claimed responsibility for a suicide attack on a bus in Jerusalem. The attack had killed 11 people, about half of whom were children. During my speech, I made an off-hand comment about terrorists 'blowing up bus-loads of kids'. Overall, the tone of my speech was light and sarcastic. The adjudicator took me aside after the debate, and gave me a strong (and much-needed) warning about being too flippant when dealing with serious topics.

## Humor

Audiences usually respond well to jokes, and humor can be an excellent way of keeping people engaged. On the other hand, an ill-timed or irrelevant joke can be incredibly distracting, and a joke that is in bad taste can alienate your audience. Misjudged humor severely damages credibility, and will undermine material that might otherwise be well received.

As a speaker, if you decide to make a joke, it is vital that you understand *why* you are telling the joke. Is it because it will enhance the point that you are trying to make? Or is it because you want people to think that you are funny? It is very gratifying to have a room full of people laugh at your jokes. However, if your chief intention is gratification, the content of your speech will suffer.

Of course, there are people who would rather give a funny speech than win a debate. And there is something mesmerizing about a speaker (especially in finals) who stops trying to persuade their audience, and devotes themselves instead to the goal of entertainment. This approach is mesmerizing precisely because it is reckless; the speaker is jeopardizing their position the debate purely to win the audience's affections.

Jokes are not compulsory; outside a comedy debate, no speaker will be punished on the grounds that their speech was 'not funny'. But a speech will be harmed by inappropriate

## THE SUBSTANCE OF STYLE

or irrelevant humor. This leads me to the somewhat tragic conclusion that there should be a presumption *against* making a joke, unless it is warranted by the circumstances.

In deciding whether the circumstances call for humor, ask yourself these questions: Is it consistent with the general tone of the debate? Is it likely to alienate the audience? Will it distract from the point that I am trying to make?

The occasions when a joke really adds value to a speech are few and far between. But when those occasions arise, humor is quite powerful. A good joke can quickly and effectively communicate a complex idea, and can radically change someone's perspective on an issue. Some of the most charismatic, best-loved and successful speakers are those who use humor with precision and finesse.

One example of effective use of humor was in a debate on the topic 'that we should allow gay marriage' and my team was on the negative side. Instead of arguing against gay marriage specifically, we argued for the abolition of all marriage. Our opposition responded that the abolition of the institution of marriage would result in all sorts of unsavory behaviour. Specifically, they said that our model would permit polygamy, as well as sexual relationships with minors and animals. As the third speaker on our team, Liz Sheargold dealt with these suggestions with these sage words: "Abolishing marriage does not give me a license to have sex with four underage pigs, even if I wanted to. These things would remain illegal under the criminal law." This joke enhanced the point that Liz was making, and highlighted the absurdity of the opposition's argument.

### Female debaters and manner

There are certain people who genuinely believe that female debaters will never be as good as their male counterparts. Fortunately (in my experience) the majority of the debating community finds this position offensive and incorrect.

Nevertheless, ideas about gender continue to influence the way that female speakers are perceived. Strong female debaters are sometimes unjustifiably accused of being overly aggressive, shrill or 'shrewish'. Equally, demure female speakers occasionally complain that they do not get the same credit as others who adopt more 'masculine' styles.

Studies show that people with a lower pitch are perceived to be more authoritative.<sup>2</sup> Because of their physiology, women naturally have higher voices than men. The interesting question is how female debaters should behave in light of this information. Should women deliberately attempt to speak in a lower register? If a woman knows that her adjudicator doesn't like 'feminine' speakers, should she deliberately try to be more 'masculine'?

From one perspective, it is counter-productive for women to imitate men to get ahead; it only serves to entrench sexist views about what constitutes good manner. On the other

---

<sup>2</sup> For this reason, many prominent women (including Margaret Thatcher) have used voice coaching to lower their voices.

hand, women are entitled to adopt whatever style will best persuade their audience (and win debates). Ultimately, these sorts of questions must be resolved by women as individuals. Hopefully it is a dilemma that female debaters will not have to face in the future. Until then, adjudicators should be conscious of these issues and actively try to avoid gender bias.

**Debating as theatre**

In theory, a debater is judged according to what happens during the time allocated for their speech. In reality, the speech cannot be isolated from its context. As a result, teams should be aware of how they behave before, during and after debates. Really good debaters begin to perform for their audience and adjudicators from the moment that the topic is announced.

The aim is to project confidence. Speakers should not undermine themselves by commenting audibly that they are nervous or ill-prepared. Similarly, slouching at the table suggests defeat, as does a tragic facial expression. Begin your speech with poise. Make sure that you have the audience’s full attention before you begin speaking. Also ensure that the end of your speech is strong - do not pack up your things until you are finished (this makes speakers appear weak and harried).

On the other hand, debaters should not be rude or overly aggressive. Making other people feel bad does not score points, and is likely to alienate your audience. I have never walked away from a debate wishing that I had been more hostile or belligerent. However, I have sometimes regretted not being more polite to my opposition. It is always best to err on the side of caution.

**A proposed framework for analysing manner:**

<b>Voice</b>	<b>Aim for:</b>	<b>Common problems:</b>
<i>Volume</i>	Audibility	Shouting at the audience Speaking too softly
<i>Pace</i>	A speech delivered at a moderate pace	Speaking too quickly Unnatural pauses
<i>Intonation</i>	Varied intonation to maintain interest	A speech delivered in monotone

## THE SUBSTANCE OF STYLE

		<p>Upward intonation at the end of sentences; making statements sound like questions</p> <p>Unnatural intonation that makes the speaker sound disingenuous</p>
<b>Body language</b>		
<i>Eye-contact</i>	Measured eye-contact shared among the audience	<p>Over-reliance on notes</p> <p>Eyes darting around the room</p> <p>Staring at the adjudicator</p>
<i>Gesture</i>	Gesture used effectively to emphasize points	Distracting movements / nervous habits
<i>Movement</i>	Standing still / controlled movement where appropriate	Wandering around aimlessly while speaking



# GLOBAL DEBATING STYLES

MONASH  
DEBATING  
R e v i e w

## Debating: Kiwi-Style

**About the author:** Christopher Bishop is the current President of the Australasian Intersvarsity Debating Association and the Victoria University of Wellington Debating Society. He has been a quarter-finalist at the Australasian Debating Championships and an octo-finalist at World University Debating Championships. He is a former winner of five inter-varsity tournaments in New Zealand, including Easters and Joynt Scroll.

---

Every region in the world has a style of debating common to it. In Australia, the three speakers on three format with no replies is known as the "Australian" style, and is used (with the addition of replies) for the Australasian Intersvarsity Debating Championships. In the United Kingdom, the British Parliamentary format dominates, and is used for the World Universities Debating Championships. Around Asia, the "Asians" style of three speakers on three, with replies and points of information, is the prevailing format.

New Zealand speakers who attend international tournaments grapple with all of these interesting and varied styles: but back home, our domestic tournaments are out of step with the rest of the world. In April (at our "Easters") we do two on two speaker impromptu debating - with only three minutes preparation. Come late August, teams head off to compete at "Joynt Scroll" - with seven cases in their backpacks, for a prepared debating tournament with ten minute speeches.

Despite this (or perhaps because of it), New Zealand has a venerable international debating pedigree. Teams from Victoria University have won Australs three times, and Otago and Canterbury have reached the Grand Final. Auckland University won Worlds in 1982 and reached the final in 1994. New Zealand debaters often go onto success at UK universities: Caleb Ward won Worlds for Cambridge in 2003 and Ranald Clouston recently reached the final, again for Cambridge.

This article outlines the two debating styles used on the New Zealand domestic debating scene. The aim of doing so is two-fold. First, there appears to be a latent curiosity amongst debaters I and others run into on "the circuit" about the style of debating done in New Zealand. The article thus gives an overview of each style and explores their strengths and weaknesses. Secondly, flowing from that, I will suggest some ways in which both styles might be usefully employed by debating societies in their internal debating tournaments.

### **New Zealand Easters-style debating**

New Zealand Easters-style debating is fast and frenetic. Each team consists of two speakers. Speeches are four to six minutes long, with no points of information. Replies are given by the first speaker, with the negative going first. There are no points of information, but "short, sharp, witty, and to the point" interjections are tolerated (but never happen). Case/matter files are not allowed.

## DEBATING: KIWI-STYLE

The interesting twist is that the preparation time is only three minutes. A coin is tossed and the winner of the coin toss must choose "topic" or "side" (the losing side getting the other option). The team assigned the "topic" then has one minute to choose one motion (from two), on a sheet given to them by the adjudicator. It is not compulsory to use the full minute, but it is obviously advantageous to that team to do so. The side assigned "side" then has one minute to choose what side they want. There is then three minutes preparation time, after which the 1st affirmative speaker is called and the debate begins.

The topics at Easters are often framed more broadly than at other tournaments. In BP terminology, they tend towards being "open" motions than "closed" or "semi-closed" motions. This helps the affirmative by giving them greater scope to determine a policy proposal, and partly mitigates the inherent advantage the negative enjoys (see below).

### *Advantages*

- Easters-style is exciting and exhilarating. Debating after only three minutes preparation is a big adrenaline rush.
- It forces speakers to think on their feet and come up with arguments quickly. Argumentation around general principles and themes becomes instinctive and intuitive.
- It's quick. A typical debate takes under an hour, and you can get through lots of rounds in one day. At New Zealand Easters, we get through seven preliminary rounds in two days. More debating means a more accurate break and more development for inexperienced debaters.
- It teaches basic debating skills through repetition. It's particularly effective for 1st affirmative speakers.
- It's fun and easy for audiences, who can turn up at the same time as the debaters and see a debate underway in just over five minutes. Audiences also get a kick out of seeing teams frantically preparing and then standing up to speak.

### *Disadvantages*

- The style's biggest flaw is that it is inherently weighted to the negative team, which has more time to prepare. It's also easier to rebut than it is to defend arguments; particularly so in New Zealand, where we don't require counter-models from the negative. The negative also has the 2nd negative/negative summary combination ("the golden nine minutes") to hammer home their points. Often the affirmative can never recover. Anecdotal evidence in New Zealand suggests that negative teams win about 70 per cent of Easters debates.
- The debate often hinges entirely on the 1st affirmative, whose setup of the issues of the debate, the parameters, and model must be good. A poor first affirmative that is well attacked by the first negative can basically end the debate (much more so than in other styles).
- The arguments presented are often facile and underdeveloped, due to the very short preparation time and the prohibition on matter files. Poor debates descend into "debating by sound bite"; the worst Easters debates are painfully atrocious

and give debating a bad name.

- The style is tough on inexperienced speakers. Three minutes is not a lot of time to prepare often complex and tricky topics, and for those unused to public speaking and debating, it can be very scary.

## Joynt Scroll

Debating at Joynt Scroll is the polar opposite of debating at Easters. The topics are announced a month in advance of the tournament (including for the semi-finals and the final). The draw for the preliminary rounds is also pre-announced. Teams consist of three speakers. Speeches are ten minutes long, with points of information between the first and ninth minute. Replies are given by the first or second speaker of each team, with the negative going first.

Motions tend to be more specific than those at Easters, and there is a distinct New Zealand bias in the topic areas. International issues are debated, but by tradition the final topic is generally about a New Zealand-specific issue (for example “That the Maori Party is good for New Zealand politics”, “That the Treaty settlement process should include urban Maori”, etc). This reflects the fact that the Joynt Scroll is the most prestigious debating tournament in New Zealand. The Joynt Scroll itself is a massive shield, and was first awarded in 1902. It is one of the oldest sporting trophies in New Zealand.

### *Advantages*

- The debating at Joynt Scroll is usually of a high standard. This is because of the large amount of preparation that teams put into the tournament. The top teams will thoroughly prepare each topic in advance, especially for debates that they know will be crunch debates. It is not uncommon for practice debates to be held within each university squad. The longer speech times at the tournament also help for greater development of material and allow speakers to show depth of analysis.
- Prepared debating teaches useful debating research skills, particularly on the internet.
- Prepared debating also allows debaters to build real, instead of superficial, knowledge about particular topics.
- It's a far easier style for newer debaters, who may have spent much of their time at school doing prepared debates and who may be unnerved by the largely impromptu nature of much university debating.

### *Disadvantages*

- The heavy preparation before debates mean teams (particularly those on the negative) are often not as reactive as they should be, instead remaining wedded to the material they've prepared in advance. This can make for quite boring debates.
- Debates can also become “matter dumps”, where teams try and display how much research they've done about the topic to the audience and adjudicator, rather than focusing on the best arguments and tailoring their material to fit.

## DEBATING: KIWI-STYLE

- Prepared debating requires a lot of work in advance of the debate to be competitive. This tends to put off a lot of students, particularly at university level, who only want to research for essays and assignments, not debating!

### Using the Easters and Joynt Scroll styles in your university debating society

As I've shown above, both styles prominent in New Zealand have strengths and weaknesses. I believe both can be usefully employed by university debating societies for internal training and/or internal competitions. If nothing else, they do offer variety from the dominant styles of the region. Below I consider how the styles might be used.

#### *Easters*

Easters' greatest virtue is its speed. You can easily fit an Easters debate into an hour long lunch-time debating session. Alternatively many rounds can be fit into an evening debating session. The style would therefore be particularly useful for societies with a large amount of members. Quick debates mean more people can debate in an evening. Victoria has found this particularly useful at the start of the year, when we have a lot of new members keen to try out debating and see if they like it.

Victoria also uses Easters for our "Pro-Am" tournament, when we pair up experienced debaters (pros) with new debaters (ams), who debate together in a day-long competition against other pairs. At the start of the day the pros can take the heat off the novice debates by speaking first, with this hopefully reversing by the end of the day as speakers gain confidence.

Victoria has also found Easters debates useful as demonstration debates for new members. The very short preparation time means basically no waiting time for the audience, and we've found that people really enjoy good debaters presenting complex arguments after only three minutes preparation.

#### *Joynt Scroll*

While Easters debates can be somewhat superficial and facile, the greatest benefit of prepared debating like that done at Joynt Scroll is the in-depth knowledge that debaters learn about a certain issue. Doing intensive research and preparation on a topic and then doing a debate on it (and often practice debates too) is a fantastic way to really get on top of an issue. That knowledge can be deployed in different contexts long after the particular debate has ended. The same topic may come up again at a different tournament with only limited preparation time. A team that has already done a prepared debate on the topic starts with a huge advantage. Alternatively, a speaker might be able to do a seminar on the topic for other society members. Finally, all the work that the team did for the debate can be turned into an excellent cheat-sheet/matter file.

Prepared debating also teaches really useful research skills to debaters, who can then use that knowledge in the future when creating matter-files for other debates.

Many debating societies run internal tournaments throughout the year. If you've got the time, put a couple of prepared debating rounds in the draw. It'll build debaters knowledge and teach them some useful skills. Be strategic and pick motions that are topical and will likely come up in other competitions in the future.

### **Conclusion**

This article has outlined the two debating styles used at the two major New Zealand tournaments. The styles' benefits make them worth experimenting with by other societies. Easters is quick and exciting and great for fast-paced debating. Joynt Scroll produces good debates and knowledgeable speakers. Try them out, and let us know how you get on!

## An eye on debating in Africa

**About the author:** Justice Motlhabani is the Chair of the University of Botswana Debating Society. In addition, he is the Public Relations officer of the Botswana Debating Council. Justice was a participant at the World University Debating Championships in 2007, and was the driving force behind the Botswana bid for Worlds.

---

British Parliamentary (BP) debating is still in its infancy in the African continent. In some places in North, East and West Africa debating is almost non-existent. However, the formation of the South African National Debating Council in 1996 served as a catalyst for the development of debating in Southern Africa while the Horn of Africa still trailed behind. This growing interest in debating in Southern Africa has led to more nations in the region taking an active role in debating.

The formation of this first African debating body was instrumental to South Africa hosting the World Universities Debating Championships in 1997. At that time, six South African universities were gathered with the purpose of establishing and controlling a South African National Debating Championships for South African universities. Since then the Council has expanded to over 22 universities, technikons and colleges including over five universities and colleges outside South Africa.

The South Africa National Universities Debating Championships has now come to be known as a Southern African Championship. The event has also become recognized as the premier debating event on the African continent and is ranked amongst the world's foremost debating competitions. It is held annually in July and features top debating teams from Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Zambia and of late Lesotho.

The Stellenbosch Debating Society in South Africa is the oldest debating union in Africa and the home of African debating. Stellenbosch hosted the first National Universities tournament in 1996 followed by another one in 2000 and the most recent tournament in 2006 which heralded the participation of National University of Lesotho in its first BP debating competition.

In 1997 as I have earlier alluded to, Stellenbosch won the bid to host the World Universities Debating Championships (Worlds), bringing the championships to Africa for the first time, this was also the first time a host nation came from outside the original seven Charter nations. South Africa became the first developing nation to host this major debating event. The decision of the World Universities Debating Council to allow South Africa to host this tournament encouraged other developing nation and marked a new era for the development of debating in Africa.

Stellenbosch '97 is widely regarded as the benchmark Worlds setting new standards against which all future years would be measured. This was in spite of a campaign by some American debaters to boycott the championships as they were being held in the birthplace of apartheid, and an outbreak of Ebola in Africa which had the world's media in

overdrive. The competition ran smoothly, however Stellenbosch struggled with the number of judges. As a result the council finally voted to enforce the N-1 rule for all future championships.

In 2003 Stellenbosch did it again and hosted worlds for the second time. The second Stellenbosch worlds saw a massive growth of debating in Southern Africa with more countries participating and bringing many teams. North Africa as usual lacked behind. Many people in debating circles cite lack of knowledge of BP as the reason for lack of participation from North Africa nations, while others cite the precarious political situation in the region as the cause. On the other hand, of late through the 'idea program' some debating tournaments have been held in North Africa, in countries like Rwanda, Burundi, Egypt, Morocco and Nigeria but these tournaments were not run in BP format.

In February 2007, the University of Botswana, the National University of Lesotho and the National University of Swaziland (BOLESWA) decided to include debating in BP in the annual BOLESWA games held on a rotational basis between these three universities. This year, the BOLESWA intervarsity games will be held in the city of Mbabane in Swaziland. It is expected that each of the three universities will bring four teams and four adjudicators and that there will be four preliminary rounds of debating with a break to finals.

There has been growth in debating in southern Africa in the past ten years, different countries have now gained the buoyancy to organise and host their own tournaments. At the last South African National Universities Debating Championships, Namibia pleasantly astonished many when they bid to host the competition. University of Namibia presented an incredibly fine bid, though they lost the bid to an equally impressive Rhodes University bid. Namibia remains optimistic and intends to bid for the event in July 2008.

In the last meeting of the South African National Debating Council, which comprised delegates from Botswana, Namibia and Lesotho delegates thrashed out at length the possibility of having a large debating event in Southern Africa comprising more southern African nations. The council then formed a committee representative of the different countries available to look into the matter and report at the next council meeting. The 2007 South African National Universities Debating Championships will be held in Rhodes University in the city of Grahamstown from the 15th to the 20th July 2007. Unlike the past eleven years, the 2007 tournament would have eight preliminary round of debating.

Over the years debating in Africa, Southern Africa in particular has seen phenomenal growth, both at tertiary and secondary levels. In the last worlds in Vancouver, Canada, Botswana put up a fierce campaign to host worlds in 2009. In a closely contest bid the Southern African country lost to Cork University of Ireland by a whisker. Botswana looks set to bid again at the next worlds in Thailand. Botswana also broke to the public speaking finals.

African debaters are beginning to become known across the globe for their remarkable debating and adjudicating prowess. In previous World Championships, African participants performed with tremendous success with Several South African teams

## GLOBAL DEBATING STYLES

breaking at worlds. South Africa proudly boasts having broken several times at worlds and having debaters in other universities who have done well at worlds as representatives of other universities. In the last worlds grand finals some of the top African debaters and adjudicators were present.

On the downside, the growth of debating in Africa has been mainly hampered by lack of support from the private sector, government and at times even universities. This culture has sometimes been a source of demotivation and demoralisation to some participants and potential debaters. This partly explains why the tradition of debating is growing at a snail's pace on the continent. Besides sponsorship not being forthcoming, the political environment in Africa does not create the most enabling environment for the youth to freely partake in debate.

In the last two years, Botswana Lesotho and Namibia have formed National debating councils and have set in motion running their own national championships. This has helped further the development of debate in Africa. In April 2006, for the first time in history both Botswana and Lesotho sent teams to the world schools debating championship in Cardiff Wales. Previously South Africa had been the only African representative at these championships.

The future of debating in Africa is not bleak, debating devotees and trainers all over the world have started taking an interest in nurturing and training African debaters. Several debate outreach programs are in the works to help spread debate where it is currently non-existent. If this significant support and the support given to the Southern African nation of Botswana in its last bid to host worlds is anything to go by then it stands to reason that the 30<sup>th</sup> Worlds in 2010 may well come to Africa.

## Gifted and Talented Education Programmes: for better or worse?

**About the author:** Matt Kwan is currently undertaking undergraduate studies at the University of New South Wales (UNSW). Matt has represented UNSW at several national and international debating tournaments, including the Australasian Intervarsity Debating Championships.

---

Not all men are equal. This is evident in the education system, where a multitude of ability and skill levels co-exist. However, should the education system reinforce the inequalities of biology through developing gifted children? There are obvious arguments to the implementation of gifted and talented programmes: that recognition and development of those with talent beyond the average is both academically and socially beneficial, and the intellectual stifling of such individuals that can occur in a regular school environment. However, the effectiveness of such programmes is not always evident after schooling, although poor application can be partially to blame. To determine whether gifted and talented education programmes are worthwhile, we must consider firstly, whether or not they should be implemented at all, and secondly, whether such programmes can have effective outcomes. A case study of the Australian education system will provide an insight into the arguments presented.

The status quo in Australia is somewhat conflicted. Private and public selective schools, as well as internal streaming programmes (opportunity classes and the like) operate alongside a general (political) policy of mixed-ability classes, minimum standards and the aim of equality of outcome. The equality of outcome concept is clearly outlined in *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century*.<sup>1</sup> This declaration leaves no provision for gifted and talented education, despite provisions for disabled children, yet a Senate report on *The Education of Gifted and Talented Children* recommends the inclusion of provisions for gifted children, particularly in the same manner as intellectually disabled children.<sup>2</sup> It seems that education policymakers are unable to reconcile the recognition of gifted children and the educational elitism that this necessarily inculcates, and the development of gifted children and the unequal outcomes that come as a result of such programmes.

In considering whether or not programmes should be implemented to recognise gifts, three arguments are often put forward – the ‘national resource’, ‘special education’ and ‘equality of opportunity’ arguments. All three arguments propose that there should be the recognition of gifts and additionally advocate subsequent attempts to develop gifts into

---

<sup>1</sup> Commonwealth of Australia, Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs, *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century – Preamble and Goals*, 1999. Available from: [http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school\\_education/policy\\_initiatives\\_reviews/national\\_goals\\_for\\_schooling\\_in\\_the\\_twenty\\_first\\_century.htm](http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/national_goals_for_schooling_in_the_twenty_first_century.htm)

<sup>2</sup> Commonwealth of Australia, Senate Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education Committee, *The Education of Gifted and Talented Children*, 2001, xiii-xiv

## GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION PROGRAMMES: FOR BETTER OR WORSE?

talents. The 'national resource' argument is broader and more entrenched in social policy, whereas the 'special education' argument is a more individualistic argument. The 'equality of opportunity' argument is linked with the 'special education' argument.

The 'national resource' philosophy is not specific to gifted education. Rather, it guides education as a whole. It treats children as natural assets, and gifted children as particularly valuable assets. This philosophy is rooted in the economic concept of human capital – education is a tool in which to develop the capital potential of children so as to enable them to be more useful and productive to the nation. To achieve maximum potential from natural resources (in this case, children), it follows that education must facilitate the development of gifted children.

The 'national resource' philosophy is a favourite of policymakers worldwide. Many countries, such as Russia and China, have programmes which provide for intensive instruction in particular fields for certain gifted children, such as the sciences and the performing arts.<sup>3</sup> This allows for gifted individuals to develop talents useful towards certain aims, for instance, research and development. In Australia, the *Adelaide Declaration* recognises the value of an educated populace to the national future, despite its lack of provision for gifted and talented education.<sup>4</sup> This philosophy particularly resonates with economists who believe effective intellectual development leads to higher productivity and growth in general. Education forms the basis for the development of skills, especially pertinent in first-world economies in which there is high demand for highly-skilled labour. Education allows individuals to achieve their potential, and contribute more to the national economy. Furthermore, education will lead to the development of new ideas, which, unlike skills, are not lost with retirement or death.<sup>5</sup> Aside from the economy, the same goes for other aspects of society, such as the performing arts. Education of those, for instance, gifted in painting, is essential in the development of the national visual arts scene. It thus follows that gifted children must be fully developed intellectually, through the use of specialist programmes, for them to be able to contribute to the nation to their fullest.

The 'special education' philosophy is rooted in exceptionality; whereby gifted children are considered to be similar to intellectually disabled children in terms of need. Both groups have special intellectual characteristics; hence both groups necessitate the implementation of different curriculum to allow them to achieve their full educational potential.<sup>6</sup> Intellectually disabled children are often taught at a slower pace, under a specialised curriculum to account for their shortcomings. The same would apply to those gifted children; they should be taught at a faster pace under a specialised curriculum.

Those in favour of 'special education' believe it is psychologically beneficial to the gifted student; both intellectually and socially. Gifted students have intellectual needs different

---

<sup>3</sup> M.U.M. Gross, *Inequity in Equity? Gifted Education in Australia*, Canberra, The Menzies Research Centre, 1999, p. 10

<sup>4</sup> MCEETYA, *Adelaide Declaration*

<sup>5</sup> R. Gittins, Education is the key to productivity, *The Age*, 25 March 2006

<sup>6</sup> Gross, *Inequity in Equity?*, p. 11

from the norm, in that they require a curriculum faster in pace and more intense in its application. In a regular learning environment, gifted students will become frustrated at their inability to work to their intellectual capacity.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, intellectually disabled students will be frustrated at their inability to cope with the curriculum. The ‘special education’ philosophy is individualistic in its application, with the ultimate goal is allowing students to work at their own appropriate pace. Gifted children would receive a curriculum that is faster than the standard curriculum, and those intellectually challenged would work to one that is slower. Proponents of this view argue that a special curriculum intellectually enlivens gifted students, motivating and challenging them to work to and achieve their potential, as opposed to being stifled in a regular school environment.<sup>8</sup>

The ‘special education’ philosophy also identifies the social incongruence of gifted children in regular classrooms. They are noticeably different, intellectually, from their peers, and this often leads to a lack of peer acceptance, or even self-acceptance. Many educators note that numerous gifted students deliberately underachieve in a regular classroom environment, so as to not appear conspicuous, and to gain peer-acceptance.<sup>9</sup> It is apparent that social pressures in a mixed-ability classroom mean gifted students are unwilling to display and utilise their intellectual talents.

The ‘equality of opportunity’ argument is used by those both for and against the implementation of gifted and talented education programmes, and is linked to ‘special education’ philosophy. Confusion over the definition of ‘equality’ is problematic. The two most readily applied to this context are equality of outcome and equality of process.<sup>10</sup> The latter is the definition taken by advocates of gifted and talented education. Equality of due process dictates that every child should be given the opportunity to educationally and intellectually develop his or herself to the fullest extent.<sup>11</sup> Obviously, gifted children will not be able to reach their potential ability through a curriculum meant for those less capable. This definition of equality recognises the different educational potentials of individuals. Yet, the implementation of programmes to assist the gifted does not take away from the development of those of average ability; they will be reaching their, albeit lower, potential through the regular curriculum.<sup>12</sup> To have all students of all levels develop to their potentials would be the ultimate justice.

However, those who argue for equality of outcome see it as unfair to further assist those who are already naturally endowed with higher intellect. It is perhaps unjust to provide for further assistance to those already more intelligent and knowledgeable when there are others who will never reach that current level.<sup>13</sup> Supporters of the equality of outcome ethos claim that because those that are naturally more intelligent will likely be more

---

<sup>7</sup> Gross, *Inequity in Equity?*, p. 11f

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11f

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 12

<sup>10</sup> T. Abbott, Justice, Social Justice and Educational Justice, in M. Goldsmith (ed.), *Social Justice. Fraud or Fair Go?*, Canberra, The Menzies Research Centre, 1998, p. 149f.

<sup>11</sup> Gross, *Inequity in Equity?*, p. 12f.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13f.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13

## GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION PROGRAMMES: FOR BETTER OR WORSE?

successful in future, they need no development whatsoever.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, they claim that the self-esteem of other children would be damaged as they would be labeled inferior. To this group, gifted and talented education programmes are elitist, and contravene principles of egalitarianism.<sup>15</sup>

The second dimension as to whether gifted and talented programmes should be implemented is the effectiveness of existing programmes, and the potential for student success. Success must be measured both within the realm of primary and secondary education, and beyond secondary education into tertiary education or the workforce. It seems success is not always assured for those who have gone through gifted and talented programmes. Certainly, in terms of high school performance, on a statistical level, those students in gifted and talented education programmes appear to perform better. In particular, those in wholly selective schools tend to far outperform those in non-selective schools. This in itself is unsurprising; students within such programmes are obviously selected due to their academic aptitude. Those within wholly selective school environments also tend to perform exceptionally well in exams such as the Higher School Certificate in New South Wales. In past years, eight or nine of the top ten schools in the state have been wholly selective.

However, studies in Australia appear to show that many students who have gone through such programmes fail to capitalise on the high school successes and perform no better, or even worse, than those who were less successful in high school, in university. This is especially true of students of private schools, who on average, gain higher university entrance scores, yet lower marks at university level, compared to those students from government schools.<sup>16</sup> The reversal of educational fortunes can be attributed to the poor application of enrichment programmes, which coach the gifted to perform well in exams, but offer little greater intellectual development.<sup>17</sup> This results in a gifted student's diminished ability to adjust and adapt to the different demands of university study.

There may be a monetary motivation for schools and teachers to churn out students with high test scores with little regard for actual intellectual development. Many parents choose schools, particularly independent schools, for the sole purpose of giving their children a high university entrance score.<sup>18</sup> Schools are thus tempted to become the educational equivalent of factories, producing strong results to remain competitive. Similarly, teachers are often rewarded on results – better scores equals more money. This incentive is used primarily for the purposes of teacher retention and recruitment, which is not in itself detrimental.<sup>19</sup> However, many teachers will be tempted by the dollar to 'spoon-feed' students so as to assist them in achieving high marks, but not necessarily

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2, 13

<sup>16</sup> R. Gittins, Debunking myths of elite learning, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 November 2004

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Gittins, Debunking myths of elite learning

<sup>19</sup> J. Buckingham, School Education, in J. Buckingham (ed.), *State of the Nation: An Agenda for Change*, Sydney, The Centre for Independent Studies, 2004

intellectual development.<sup>20</sup> In any case, gifted and talented programmes, when poorly applied, at best do not work well and can ultimately be to the detriment of the student.

However, out-of-school programs seem to meet with greater success. Gifted education programmes conducted by Johns Hopkins University have shown that targeted acceleration of mathematically gifted individuals outside of the school environment provides the basis for future academic success. In fact, they purport that acceleration is the most effective of all academic enrichment programmes available.<sup>21</sup> Similar such programmes exist in Australia, although no studies have been conducted on their effectiveness. The efficacy of acceleration lies in the compatibility of subject matter with the intellectual development of the child. The child is studying at a level appropriate to their intellectual capabilities, rather than studying material far too simple for his or her intellect.<sup>22</sup> The result is a revived interest in that particular field of study, rather than growing boredom and disinterest.<sup>23</sup> Yet there is recognition that only targeted acceleration would be useful. Clearly, for a ‘mathematically precocious’ child, there is little relevance in placing equal emphasis on mathematics as well as French, or computing studies, for instance. Enrichment in these areas was discovered to be of no use. The focus must purely lie with the specific gift to achieve full potential.<sup>24</sup>

However, this effectiveness may not be achieved without human cost. The Johns Hopkins programmes were conducted during summer holidays, or on weekends.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, it seems as many gifted education programmes occur outside of the regular school environment as within it. For instance, many schools in the United Kingdom cherry-pick their brightest students and place them in extension classes outside of school hours, and send such students off to holiday adventures in summer schools discovering, for instance, the joys of the British political system.<sup>26</sup> What an imaginative punishment for talent! Similarly, programmes in Australia, such as annual Mathematics Camps and Science Olympiads, allow bright students to spend their holidays enraptured with the many intricacies of calculus, or molecular bonding. Surely, gifted children have other interests they desire to pursue in their spare time. It is not implausible to reason that intellectual effectiveness may be diluted by the social pitfalls of extensive and intensive gifted education programmes.

Some argue that a gifted and talented education programmes can occur within a mixed-ability classroom. Teachers can utilise the ‘special education’ philosophy by adapting to each individual student’s scholastic requirements, whether they be acceleration or academic assistance.<sup>27</sup> This model is one that is used in both primary and secondary

---

<sup>20</sup> J. Krupa, Fayetteville Speaker: Reward teachers on results, *The Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, October 28 2006

<sup>21</sup> J.C. Stanley, On Educating the Gifted, *Educational Researcher*, 9(3): March 1980: p. 9

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid* and Gross, *Inequity in Equity?*, p. 12

<sup>24</sup> Stanley, On Educating the Gifted, p. 10

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* p. 10f.

<sup>26</sup> S. McCormack, Cambridge school sets students thinking, *The Guardian*, 8 November 2005

<sup>27</sup> J. Bourne, A. Sturgess, If anyone can, Kiwis can: Every teacher a teacher of gifted learners, *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 15(1): June 2006: p. 44

## GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION PROGRAMMES: FOR BETTER OR WORSE?

schools in Australia, as well as New Zealand. Socially, as this model does not require students to be removed from ordinary classes, it does not have the same potential pitfalls as the out-of-school programmes. It also pleases those who argue against the elitism of gifted education, as this model is less visible, and keeps gifted children within the realm of the regular, mixed-ability classroom.<sup>28</sup> It also allows flexibility in the learning process, as students' gifts may emerge at any time during the scholastic year, not only at the arbitrary time programme placements are made.<sup>29</sup> Arguably, due to the broad range of gifts in existence, having all gifted children in the same classroom is far more efficient than the tedious task of identifying every single gift and forming many separate programmes.<sup>30</sup> Yet even this programme has its drawbacks as it requires each and every teacher to be sufficiently skilled to be able to identify gifted children. This, even for skilled teachers, is not easy, and identifying gifts would be incredibly difficult for those without training. Hence, this model would only be successful if extensive professional development programmes were established to train teachers.<sup>31</sup> Its scholastic effectiveness may also be diminished in that the student will not be able to have a dedicated teacher on hand to deliver the accelerated programme; the classroom teacher having to divide his or her time. This is a problem that is not faced with the other models.

Gifted and talented education programmes do provide benefits to society as a whole, as they develop children who will potentially be future high achievers. This, of course, is beneficial on an individual level to the children themselves. However, application of such programmes is important. Intellectual development, rather than high marks, is the key. With regard to application, out-of-school programmes work best, yet these are socially problematic; those that are perhaps less socially problematic are not as effective academically. Although gifted and talented programmes appear necessary for intellectual development, they are difficult to implement effectively.

### Bibliography

ABBOTT, T., Justice, Social Justice and Educational Justice, in GOLDSMITH, M. (ed.), *Social Justice: Fraud or Fair Go*, Canberra, The Menzies Research Centre, 1998

BOURNE, J., STURGESS, A., If anyone can, Kiwis can: Every teacher a teacher of gifted learners, *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 15(1): June 2006: 44-50

BUCKINGHAM, J., School Education, in BUCKINGHAM, J. (ed.), *State of the Nation: An Agenda for Change*, Sydney, The Centre for Independent Studies, 2004

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA, MINISTERIAL COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND YOUTH AFFAIRS, *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century – Preamble and Goals*, 1999. Available from:

---

<sup>28</sup> Bourne, Sturgess, Every teacher, a teacher of gifted education, p. 44f

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* p. 45

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

## GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION PROGRAMMES: FOR BETTER OR WORSE

[http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school\\_education/policy\\_initiatives\\_reviews/national\\_goals\\_for\\_schooling\\_in\\_the\\_twenty\\_first\\_century.htm](http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/policy_initiatives_reviews/national_goals_for_schooling_in_the_twenty_first_century.htm)

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA, SENATE EMPLOYMENT, WORKPLACE RELATIONS, SMALL BUSINESS AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE, *The Education of Gifted and Talented Children*, 2001

GITTINS, R., Debunking myths of elite learning, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 November 2004

GITTINS, R., Education is the key to productivity, *The Age*, 25 March 2006

GROSS, M.U.M., *Inequity in Equity? Gifted Education in Australia*, Canberra, The Menzies Research Centre, 1999

KRUPA, J., Fayetteville Speaker: Reward teachers on results, *The Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, October 28 2006

McCORMACK, S., Cambridge school sets students thinking, *The Guardian*, 8 November 2005

STANLEY, J.C., On Educating the Gifted, *Educational Researcher*, 9(3): March 1980: 8-12

## RESULTS

The MDR would like to congratulate:

### **World University Debating Championships**

- Host: University of British Columbia, Canada  
Champions: University of Sydney G (Julia Bowes & Anna Garsia)  
Runners Up: University of Cambridge C (Ranald Clouston & Robert Nimmo)  
University of Oxford D (James Dray & Will Jones)  
University of Queensland (Evan Goldman & Erin O'Brien)  
Best Speaker: Jess Prince (University of Oxford)  
ESL Champions: International Islamic University Malaysia A (Tasniem Ahmab Elyass & Syed Suhaib Hassan)  
ESL Runners Up: Hebrew University B (Ranaan Eichler & Elchanan Miller)  
National Law School of India University A (V. Niranjan & Parag Satya)  
Stockholm School of Economics Riga A (Paulius Ramanauskas & Jurji Romanenkov)  
ESL Best Speaker: Syed Suhaib Hassan (International Islamic University Malaysia)  
EFL Champions: Tsinghua University A (Duan Nam & Guo Yan)  
EFL Runners Up: International Christian University B (Chiharu Mishima & Hisashi Okuda)  
Seikei University A (Reiko Higashi & Yusuke Mizuno)  
Tsuda College A (Yuka Sagayuchi & Yuka Sekiguchi)  
EFL Best Speaker: Masako Suzuki (Keio University)  
Masters Champions: Quebec, Canada (Ali Dewji & Matthew Sinclair)  
Public Speaking Champion: Michael Imeson (Seattle University)  
Comedy Champion: William Foxtton (Honourable Society of the Middle Temple)

### **AustralAsian Intersivity Debating Championships**

- Host: Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand  
Champions: Monash University A (Tom Chapman, Jacob Clifton & Roland Dillon)  
Runners Up: University of Melbourne A (Lucia Pietropaoli, Jess Moir & Elizabeth Sheargold)  
Best Speaker: Elizabeth Sheargold (University of Melbourne)  
ESL Champions: International Islamic University Malaysia B (Jan Aidonna, Jun Aidonna & Adam Ho Chee Choong)  
ESL Runners Up: University of Indonesia (Siti Astrid Kusumawardhani, Astrid Fina Nurshinta & Melany Tedja)

### **Northeast Asian Open Debate Championships**

- Host: Korea University, Korea  
Champions: Ewha University A (Kim Soo-Min, Han Seung-Yeon, Suh Ah-Hyun)  
Runners Up: Tokyo University A (Chihiro Nakagawa, Yoshihiro Kobayashi, Kimi Suzuki)  
Best Speaker: Kim Ah-Young (Ewha University)  
Best Novice Speaker: Lee Joo-Yuen (Ewha University)

**North American Debating Championships**

Host: Bates College, University of Toronto, Canada  
 Champions: Yale University (Dylan Gadek & Matt Wansley)  
 Runners Up: University of British Columbia (Teddy Harrison & Ashish Sinha)  
 Best Speaker: Ian Freeman (Carleton University)  
 Best Novice Speaker: Daniel Rauch (Princeton University)

**Melbourne Invitationals**

Host: University of Melbourne, Australia  
 Champions: Monash University (Tom Chapman & Jacob Clifton)  
 Runners Up: Monash University (Kim Little & Tim Sonnreich)  
 University of Melbourne (Bobby Benedicto & Elizabeth Sheargold)  
 University of Sydney (Brad Lancken & Phil Senior)  
 Best Speaker: Kim Little (Independent) and Elizabeth Sheargold (University of Melbourne)

**Australian British Parliamentary Championships**

Host: University of Sydney, Australia  
 Champions: Monash University/University of Melbourne (Amit Golder & Elizabeth Sheargold)  
 Runners Up: Australian National University (Toby Halligan & James Robertson)  
 Canberra Institute of Technology (Andrew Chapman & David Cramsie)  
 Monash University (Fiona Prowse & Tim Jeffrie)  
 Best Speaker: Phillip Senior (University of Sydney)

**The 9th JPDU Tournament**

Hosts: International Christian University, Japan  
 Champions: Joint A (Jonathan Borock, Yoshihiro Kobayashi & Go Nakanishi)  
 Runners Up: International Christian University A (Dai Oba, Manabu Igusa & Hisashi Okuda)  
 International Christian University D (Akira Kobara, Yuka Haino & Tomohisa Ishikawa)  
 University of Tokyo (Chihiro Nakagawa, Shunsuke Ishimoto & Hirofumi Jinno)  
 Best Speaker: Jonathan Borock (Joint A)

**The 10th JPDU Tournament**

Hosts: Nihon University, Japan  
 Champion: International Christian University B (Akira Kohbara & Hisashi Okuda)  
 Runners Up: International Christian University D (Toshiaki Ikehara & Satomi Hemmi)  
 Kitakyushu Municipal University A (Chihiro Kato & Tomfumi Terano)  
 Kobe University B (Kenta Yamada & Mika Shiomi)  
 Best Speaker: Reiko Higashi (Seikei University)

## RESULTS

### **The 11th JPDU Tournament**

Hosts: International Christian University & Seikei University, Japan  
Champion: Keio University A (Masako Suzuki & Keiko Shindo)  
Runners Up: International Christian University A (Chika Urashima & Arata Okuyama)  
Seikei University A (Yusuke Mizuno & Rieko Higashi)  
Sophia University A (Jonathan Borock & Akiko Ikeda)  
Best Speaker: Masako Suzuki (Keio University)

### **The 1st JPDU Supernova Cup**

Hosts: International Christian University & Yokohama City University, Japan  
Champion: International Christian University C (Satomi Hemmi & Takuma Sasaki)  
Runners Up: International Christian University B (Keigo Okada & Tomohisa  
Ishikawa)  
Kitakyushu Municipal University A (Chihiro Kato & Tomofumi Terano)  
Osaka University (Yusuke Kawaguchi & Yuki Honda)  
Best Speaker: Chihiro Kato (Kitakyushu Municipal University)

### **Joynt Scroll, New Zealand Prepared Debating Championships**

Host: University of Auckland, New Zealand  
Winners: Victoria University of Wellington C (Hugh McCaffrey, Polly Higbee &  
Lewis Holden)  
Runners Up: Otago University A (Dan Connor, Jesse Wall & Laura Fraser)  
Best Speaker: Polly Higbee (Victoria University of Wellington)  
Best Novice Speaker: David Dewar (University of Canterbury)

### **New Zealand British Parliamentary Open Debating Championships**

Host: Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand  
Champions: University of Auckland (James Little & Jordan Ward)  
Runners Up: Composite A (Sayeqa Islam & Matt Sanders)  
University of Otago A (Renee Heal & Laura Fraser)  
Victoria University of Wellington A (Christopher Bishop & Kevin Moar)  
Best Speaker: Sayeqa Islam (Composite A) & Kevin Moar (Victoria University of  
Wellington)  
Best Novice: James Little (University of Auckland)

### **South African National Debating Championships**

Host: University of Stellenbosch, South Africa  
Champions: University of Cape Town (Nick Friedman & David Simonsz)  
Best Speaker: David Simonsz (University of Cape Town)  
ESL Champions: University of Stellenbosch (Izelle Coetzee & Dirk Volschenk)