



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

INDORE INSTITUTE OF LAW

(Affiliated to D.A.V.V. & Bar Council of India, New Delhi)

THE INTERNATIONAL LAW FEST

“LEX BONANZA-2017”

STRIVING FOR LEGAL EXCELLENCE

CHAPTER-VI

24th, 25th & 26th NOVEMBER

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

A. THE FORMAT OF THE DEBATE

IIL hereby declares to follow the 3-on-3 Asian Parliamentary debating rules in the Parliamentary Debate Competition. Each debating match will consist of two teams; one to propose the motion and one to oppose it. The team proposing may be known as “The Proposition”, “The Affirmative” or “The Government”. The team opposing may be known as “The Opposition” or “The Negative”. Teams will be designated as the Proposition or the Opposition for each round of the competition. Each debate shall be adjudicated upon by a panel comprising of an odd number of adjudicators who will be participants indeed.

- I. The debate will consist of two teams of three participants each (participants will be known as "members")
- II. An adjudicator or panel of adjudicators shall be the participants of the competition.
- III. The team will comprise of 3+1 (Members + Adjudicator).

CONSTITUTION AND ORDER OF SPEECH

- 1) Prime Minister;
- 2) Opposition Leader;
- 3) Deputy Prime Minister;
- 4) Deputy Opposition Leader;
- 5) Government Whip;
- 6) Opposition Whip.

THE MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT SIDE ARE THE FOLLOWING:

1. Prime minister (PM) - Opens the debate, defines the motion and advances arguments;
2. Deputy Prime Minister (DPM) - Refute at first instance the case of the opposition, reestablish the government’s claim, and advances arguments;
3. Government whip (GW) - Makes an issue-based rebuttal of the opposition's case and summarizes the case of the government.



THE MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION SIDE ARE THE FOLLOWING:

1. Leader of the Opposition (LO) - Responds directly to the case of the government by giving a direct clash, and advances arguments. May challenge the motion if the definition is challengeable;
2. Deputy Leader of the Opposition (DPL) - Refutes the case of the DPM, re-establishes the case of the opposition, and advances an argument;
3. Opposition Whip (OW) - Makes an issues-based rebuttal of the government's and summarizes the case of the opposition.

B. For the Motion

- I. The motion should be unambiguously worded.
- II. The motion should reflect the standard rules of the Asian Style Parliamentary Debates.
- III. The members should debate the motion in the spirit of the motion and the tournament.

C. PREPARATION

- I. The debate should commence 30 minutes after the motion is announced.
- II. Teams should arrive at their debate within five minutes of the scheduled starting time for that debate.
- III. Members are permitted to use printed or written material during preparation and in the debate. Printed material includes books, journals, newspapers and other similar materials. The use of electronic equipment is not prohibited during preparation but in the debate.

D. POINTS OF INFORMATION

- I. Points of Information (questions directed to the member speaking) may be asked between first minute mark and the 6-minute mark of the members' speeches (speeches are of seven minutes duration).
- II. To ask a Point of Information, a member should stand, place one hand on his or her head and extend the other towards the member speaking. The member may announce that they would like to ask a "Point of Information" or use other words to this effect. The member who is speaking may accept or decline to answer the Point of Information.
- III. Points of Information should not exceed 15 seconds in length.



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

- IV. The member who is speaking may ask the person offering the Point of Information to sit down where the offer or has had a reasonable opportunity to be heard and understood.
- V. Members should attempt to answer at least two Points of Information during their speech. Members should also offer Points of Information.
- VI. Points of Information should be assessed in accordance with the rules.
- VII. Points of Order and Points of Personal Privilege are not permitted.

Debaters should not indulge in, and adjudicators should not entertain argumentation or cross-questioning, at the time of the open adjudication.

E. TIMING OF THE SPEECHES

- a. It is the duty of the timekeeper, or of a panellist or Chair (in absence of a timekeeper), to time all the speeches in each round.
- b. The timing of each speech starts at the moment that the member begins speaking.

Substantive Speeches

Preliminary Rounds : 6+1 minutes

Semi-final : 7 + 1 minutes

Grand-finals :8 + 1 minutes

Reply Speeches: 3+1 minutes in all Rounds, and 4+1minutes in the Grand finals.

Time signals will be given in the following manner:

1. Preliminary Rounds

End of first minute- buzzer

End of Fifth minute – buzzer

End of sixth minute –buzzer

2. Semi-finals

End of first minute - buzzer

End of seventh minute- buzzer

End of eighth minute- buzzer



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

3. Grand Finals:

End of first minute – buzzer

End of eighth minute - buzzer

End of ninth minute - buzzer

4. Reply Speeches:

End of third minute - buzzer

End of fourth minute – buzzer

5. Reply Speeches in the Grand Final:

End of fourth minute - buzzer

End of fifth minute - buzzer

F. MARKING THE DEBATE

1. At the end of every debate, each adjudicator will complete their adjudication forms.
2. There are no draws in competitive debating.
3. Teams failing to turn up for the debate on time will lose the debate by the widest possible margin. The other team will then face-off against a stand-by swing team [non-competitive for the purposes of the competition] constituted by the host University. Failure to turn up for two rounds in the preliminary phase will result in automatic disqualification from the tournament.
4. An “average” speech shall be awarded
Matter: 30/40
Manner: 30/40
Method: 15/20
Total: 75/100
5. A speaker may not under any circumstance be awarded less than 28/40 in Matter and Manner, and less than 13/20 in Method. Therefore, the worst speech in the history of debating would still get 69/100
6. A speaker may not under any circumstance be awarded more than 32/40 in Matter and Manner, and more than 17/20 in Method. Therefore, the best speech in the history of the world would get no more than 81/100.



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

Criteria	Range
Matter	(28-32)/40
Manner	(28-32)/40
Method	(13-17)/20
Total	(69-81)/100

7. For reply speeches, marks shall be awarded to speakers based on the following.

8. An “average” reply speech shall be awarded

Manner	:	15/20
Effectiveness	:	22/30
Total	:	37/50

9. A speaker may not under any circumstance be awarded less than 14/20 in Manner, and less than 20/30 in Effectiveness. Therefore, the worst reply speech in the history of debating would still get 34/50.

10. A speaker may not under any circumstance be awarded more than 17/20 in Manner and more than 25/30 in Effectiveness. Therefore, the best reply speech in the history of debating would get no more than 42/50.

Criteria	Range
Effectiveness	(20-25)/30
Manner	(14-17)/20
Total	(34-42)/50

- Adjudicators will determine, at the conclusion of a debate whether the overall margin of win/loss separating the teams was (independently of speaker scores) close, clear or a thrashing margin on a scale of 1 to 12.
- Close win = 1 to 4 points.
- Clear win = 4 to 8 points.
- Thrashing = 8 to 12 points.

G. FOR ADJUDICATION

I. The debate should be adjudicated by a panel of at least three adjudicators, where this is possible.

II. The adjudicators may confer and discuss the debate and their feedback (in no event for more than 20 minutes) before announcing the results before the teams. In all of these rounds (except for the finals), there will be an open adjudication after decision for each debate is announced, where adjudicators will give reasons for their decision and other feedback to the teams. However, the adjudication sheets will not be shown to debaters or other participants.



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

- III. All the debaters must leave the chambers following the completion of all speeches. Debaters should not indulge in, and adjudicators should not entertain, argumentation or cross questioning at the time of the open adjudication.
- IV. At the conclusion of the debate, the adjudicators should confer and rank the teams.

H. THE DEFINITION

- I. The definition should state the issue (or issues) for debate arising out of the motion and state the meaning of any terms in the motion which require interpretation.
- II. The Prime Minister should provide the definition at the beginning of his or her speech.
- III. The definition must:
 - i. have a clear and logical link to the motion - this means that an average reasonable person would accept the link made by the member between the motion and the definition (where there is no such link the definition is sometimes referred to as a "squirrel")
 - ii. Not be self-proving - a definition is self-proving when the case is that something should or should not be done and there is no reasonable rebuttal.
 - iii. A definition may also be self-proving when the case is that a certain state of affairs exists or does not exist and there is no reasonable rebuttal (these definitions are sometimes referred to as "truisms").
 - iv. Not be time set - this means that the debate must take place in the present and that the definition cannot set the debate in the past or the future.
 - v. Not be place set unfairly - this means that the definition cannot restrict the debate so narrowly to a particular geographical or political location that a participant of the tournament could not reasonably be expected to have knowledge of the place.

I. CHALLENGING THE DEFINITION

- J. The Leader of the Opposition may challenge the definition if it deems to violate the above mentioned rules. The Leader of the Opposition should clearly state that he or she is challenging the definition.
- II. The Leader of the Opposition should substitute an alternative definition after challenging the definition of the Prime Minister.



J. GAUGING THE DEFINITIONAL CHALLENGE

- I. The adjudicator shall determine the definition to be ‘unreasonable’ where it violates the rules.
- II. The onus to establish that the definition is unreasonable is on the members asserting that the definition is unreasonable.
- III. Where the definition is unreasonable; the opposition should substitute an alternative definition that should be accepted by the adjudicator provided it is not unreasonable.
- IV. Where the definition of the Opening Government is unreasonable and an alternative definition is substituted by the Opening Opposition, the Closing Government may introduce matter which is inconsistent with the matter presented by the Opening Government and consistent with the definition of the Opening Opposition.
- V. If the Opening Opposition has substituted a definition that is also unreasonable, the Closing Government may challenge the definition of the Opening Opposition and substitute an alternative definition.
- VI. If the Closing Government has substituted a definition that is also unreasonable (in addition to the unreasonable definitions of the Opening Government and Opening Opposition,) the Closing Opposition may challenge the definition of the Closing Government and substitute an alternative definition.

K. THE DEFINITION OF MATTER

- I. Matter is the content of the speech. It is the arguments a debater uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience.
- II. Matter includes arguments and reasoning, examples, case studies, facts and any other material that attempts to further the case.
- III. Matter includes positive (or substantive) material and rebuttal (arguments specifically aimed to refute the arguments of the opposing team(s)). Matter includes Points of Information.

L. THE ELEMENTS OF MATTER

- I. Matter should be relevant, logical and consistent.
- II. Matter should be relevant. It should relate to the issues of the debate: positive material should support the case being presented and rebuttal should refute the



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

- material being presented by the opposing team(s). The Member should appropriately prioritize and apportion time to the dynamic issues of the debate.
- III. Matter should be logical. Arguments should be developed logically in order to be clear and well reasoned and therefore plausible. The conclusion of all arguments should support the member's case.
 - IV. Matter should be consistent. Members should ensure that the matter they present is consistent within their speech, their team and the remainder of the members on their side of the debate.
 - V. All Members should present positive matter (except the final two members in the debate) and all members should present rebuttal (except the first member in the debate). The Government Whip may choose to present positive matter.
 - VI. All Members should attempt to answer at least two points of information during their own speech and offer points of information during opposing speeches.

M. ASSESSING MATTER

- I. The adjudicator should determine the definition to be 'unreasonable' where it violates the provided rules.
- II. The onus to establish that the definition is unreasonable is on the members asserting that the definition is unreasonable.
- III. The matter presented should be persuasive. 'The elements of matter' should assist an adjudicator to assess the persuasiveness and credibility of the matter presented.
- IV. Matter should be assessed from the viewpoint of the average reasonable person. Adjudicators should analyse the matter presented and assess its persuasiveness, while disregarding any specialist knowledge they may have on the issue of the debate.
- V. Points of information should be assessed according to the effect they have on the persuasiveness of the cases of both the member answering the point of information and the member offering the point of information.
- VI. Adjudicators should not allow bias to influence their assessment. Debaters should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, colour, nationality, sexual preference, age, social status or disability.



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

N. THE DEFINITION OF MANNER

- I. Manner is the presentation of the speech. It is the style and structure a member uses to further his or her case and persuade the audience.
- II. Manner is comprised of many separate elements. Some, but not all, of these elements are listed below.

O. THE ELEMENTS OF STYLE

- I. The elements of style include eye contact, voice modulation, hand gestures, language, the use of notes and any other element which may affect the effectiveness of the presentation of the member.
- II. Eye contact will generally assist a member to persuade an audience as it allows the member to appear more sincere.
- III. Voice modulation will generally assist a member to persuade an audience as the debater may emphasise important arguments and keep the attention of the audience. This includes the pitch, tone, and volume of the member's voice and the use of pauses.
- IV. Hand gestures will generally assist a member to emphasise important arguments. Excessive hand movements may however be distracting and reduce the attentiveness of the audience to the arguments.
- V. Language should be clear and simple. Members who use language which is too verbose or confusing may detract from the argument if they lose the attention of the audience.
- VI. The use of notes is permitted, but members should be careful that they do not rely on their notes too much and detract from the other elements of manner.

P. THE ELEMENTS OF STRUCTURE

- I. The elements of structure include the structure of the speech of the member and the structure of the speech of the team.
- II. The matter of the speech of each member must be structured. The member should organise his or her matter to improve the effectiveness of their presentation.
- III. The matter of the team must be structured. The team should organise their matter to improve the effectiveness of their presentation. The team should:



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

- i. contain a consistent approach to the issues being debated; and
- ii. Allocate positive matter to each member where both members of the team are introducing positive matter; and
- iii. include: an introduction, conclusion and a series of arguments; and
- iv. be well-timed in accordance with the time limitations and the need to prioritize and apportion time to matter.

Q. ASSESSING MANNER

- I. Adjudicators should assess the elements of manner together in order to determine the overall effectiveness of the member's presentation. Adjudicators should assess whether the member's presentation is assisted or diminished by their manner.
- II. Adjudicators should be aware that at a World Championship, there are many styles which are appropriate, and that they should not discriminate against a member simply because the manner would be deemed 'inappropriate Parliamentary debating' in their own country.
- III. Adjudicators should not allow bias to influence their assessment. Members should not be discriminated against on the basis of religion, sex, race, colour, nationality, language, sexual preference, age, social status or disability.

R. THE ADJUDICATION

- I. All the rounds will be knock outs.
- II. The adjudicators will announce the decision of the debate at the debate venue.
- III. The decision of the judges will be final and cannot be challenged.
- IV. Marks will not be disclosed.

MARKING ADJUDICATORS –

After each debate adjudicators will be marked on the scale of 1 to 5 by teams on the basis of feedback given by them and their analysis

S. VERBAL ADJUDICATION

- I. The members may approach an adjudicator for further clarification following the adjudication; these inquiries must at all times be polite and non-confrontational.
 - i. identify the order in which the teams were ranked
 - ii. Explain the reasons for the rankings of team, ensuring that each team is referred to in this explanation; and
 - iii. Provide constructive comments to individual members where the adjudication panel believes this is necessary.



Asian Style Parliamentary Debate

II. The verbal adjudication should not exceed 10 minutes.

III. The members must not harass the adjudicators following the verbal adjudication. The members may approach an adjudicator for further clarification following the verbal adjudication; these inquiries must at all times be polite and non-confrontational.

PRIZES & CERTIFICATES

- Winning Team: **Cash Prize Rs. 5000, Trophy and Certificate.**
- Runner up Team: **Cash Prize Rs.2500, Trophy and Certificate.**
- Best Adjudicator: **Cash Prize Rs.1100 , Trophy and Certificate**
- Best Speaker: **Cash Prize Rs. 1100, Trophy and Certificate.**

Note :

1. All the participating team members shall be issued Certificate of Participation.
2. Evaluation of adjudicators is subjected to the discretion of organizers.
3. Certificate of participation will be provided to the adjudicators.
4. At any point of conflict the decision of the administration will be final & binding.
5. Any or all of the above rules, regulations, and guidelines are subject to change at the discretion of the organizers.

Faculty Coordinators

- ✓ Mr. Bhanu Saxena
- ✓ Dr. Kavita Dive
- ✓ Ms. Anita Parmar
- ✓ Dr. Vivek Singh

STUDENT COORDINATORS

- | | |
|-------------------|------------|
| 1. Shubham Shukla | 8962910644 |
| 2. Shivani Saxena | 9926417667 |
| 3. Tripti Meghani | 9993633346 |