

<b>Preface .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>To begin .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Eight Ways to Define a Topic .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Lexical Definitions .....	6
Stipulative Definitions .....	7
Explicative Definitions .....	8
Necessary and Sufficient definitions .....	9
Nominal, Real, Explicit and Contextual Definitions .....	10
<b>Three logics .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Deductive and Non-deductive Arguments .....	10
Inductive Logic .....	12
<b>Seven Case Strategies .....</b>	<b>13</b>
The Status Quo .....	13
Change .....	13
Goals and Needs .....	14
Criteria .....	14
Comparative benefits .....	14
The Status Quo and Patch and Repair .....	15
<b>Five Levels of Language: who is your audience? .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Descriptive .....	16
Ideological .....	16
Rhetorical .....	16
Literary .....	18
Meta-literary .....	18
<b>Fourteen Impromptu Development Methods .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Description .....	19
Narration .....	19
Example .....	19
Analogy .....	19
Classification .....	19
Induction/ Deduction .....	20
If then/If not then what .....	20
Process Analysis .....	20
Comparison and contrast .....	20
Cause and Effect .....	20
Definition .....	20
<b>Six Different Points of View .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Religious .....	21
Political .....	21
Philosophic .....	21
Psychological .....	21
Cultural .....	21
Character .....	21
<b>Four Different Contexts: When, Where, How and Why .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Time .....	22
Place .....	22
Manner .....	22
Condition .....	22

<b>Six Criteria for Judging Public Speaking and Debate .....</b>	<b>22</b>
The Room .....	22
The Flow of a Debate .....	24
The Ballot.....	24
Presentation.....	25
Material/Content .....	25
Analysis/Organization .....	26
Rebuttal .....	27
Cross-Examination .....	28
Parliamentary Procedure .....	29
Cross Examination Excellence .....	29
Parliamentary Procedure Excellence.....	30
<b>Thirty-Six Rules, functions and Fallacies .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Rules and Symbols for Logic In Argument .....	32
Fallacies of Irrelevance .....	33
Argument Ad Baculum .....	33
Argument Ad Hominem .....	33
Ad Ignorantiam .....	34
Ad misericordiam.....	34
Ad Populum.....	34
Ad verecundiam .....	34
Fallacies of Accident.....	34
Complex questions .....	35
Petitio Principii.....	35
Ignoratio Elenchi.....	35
Fallacies of Ambiguity .....	35
Equivocation.....	35
Composition and Division.....	35
Amphiboly.....	36
Accent .....	36
<b>16 Rules of Order .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Putting it all together .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Practice what you preach .....	38
<b>Facilitating the Seminar and Reaching Conclusions.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>40</b>
After-Dinner Speaking .....	40
Persuasive Speaking .....	41
Interpretive Reading .....	41
Dramatic Interpretation .....	42
Cross-Examination Debating .....	42
Sample Rules of Cross-Examination Debating.....	42
Parliamentary Debating .....	46
Sample Rules of Parliamentary Debate.....	47
Newscast .....	48
Extemporaneous Speaking.....	49
Impromptu Speaking.....	49
<b>A Guide to Hosting a Debate and Speaking Tournament.....</b>	<b>50</b>
One Year Before .....	50
Five Months Before .....	50

One month Before .....	51
Information You Will Need.....	51
Some advice concerning husbandry of judges and event quirks .....	52
Billets, schedules and the arrival package and procedures. ....	53
Operations Central .....	54
Boats and Trains and Planes: .....	54
Awards: .....	54
Budget: .....	55
Running the tournament: Moderators Instructions for all events and Room Allocations.....	56
Instructions: Impromptu.....	56
Extemporaneous Speaking .....	58
Instructions for Parliamentary debating.....	62
Instructions for After Dinner and Persuasive Speaking.....	66
Instructions: Dramatic Interpretation and Interpretive Reading .....	68
Instructions for Cross Examination Debate: .....	68

## Preface

This book examines the critical thinking and presentation skills that underlie effective public speaking. It is written primarily as a resource for teachers, public speakers, and facilitators.

Public speaking happens when individuals are at ease to speak their minds to a group, and when they feel they have something to say. In part, this book is about the analytic processes and rhetorical devices that a speaker can use to put an audience at ease and keep them involved.

It is also about impromptu analysis and describes the questions a speaker can ask themselves on the fly, to define, evolve and conclude any topic: the logic of impromptu idea development.

Some of the different and complimentary skills possessed by fine public speakers are used as criteria to evaluate the events that take place at public speaking tournaments. This book also examines those criteria. Together they, too, help to define more components of public speaking. The book and appendices provide judging criteria, event descriptions, the text of judges' briefings and advice for organizers and speakers for an exhaustive variety of speaking events.

This book is about teaching public speaking as a course and it is about public speaking as a method of teaching.

The material assembled in this book comes from a variety of sources. Twenty years of teaching Public Speaking, Debate, English, and History of Ideas have enabled me to bring together material that does not usually exist in one resource. While much of the material in this text is public domain, I have excerpted sections and consulted truth tables, fallacies and other material on formal logic and definition from Albert E. Blumberg, Logic / A first Course (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc. 1976); some of the material on formal debate has been referenced to tactics discussed far more fully by Austin J. Freely, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making (Belmont California: Wadsworth Publishing Company 1986) while still other material, such as that in the sections on developing ideas, exists in many writing and exposition texts that are standbys for educators and readily available. The levels of language section discusses, in a cursory way, material developed comprehensively by Northrop Frye.

I have had the great good fortune to have many colleagues who have been stalwarts in the world of Public Speaking. I have collaborated with many of them in creating and documenting the rules, procedures and judges briefings for a wide variety of speaking

events. While there are many more than I could list, I would like particularly to acknowledge the contributions of Brian Casey, Past President of the CSDF; John Robinson, Past President of the IISPSL; John Batey, Past President of the Alberta Debate and Speech Association; Doug Peets, Past President of the Quebec Speech and Debate Association; Phil Hansen, formerly of The Roxbury Latin School and Past President of the IISPSL, Tom Lawson from Trinity College, Ian Smith from the DSABC, Linda Martin of Balmoral School and Rupert Ray from St. Andrews College. They have all worked tirelessly hammering out the rules and devising events and workshops for public speakers and much of the material I have presented here is indirectly attributable to their influence. I apologize for the omission of other names and acknowledge that there are a great many unsung heroes.

## To begin

Interpretative Reading is an event at public speaking tournaments, so is Impromptu Speaking. The Reading event is prepared months in advance, and the material is selected from published literature. The inherent quality of the piece is important, but the event is really about quality of voice, range, characterization, timing, mood, and the dramatic impact of the spoken word itself.

In the *Impromptu Speaking* event, random topics are selected from a hat; the contestants have 2 minutes to prepare and must then speak for up to 4 minutes. The same criteria as for the reading event apply, but there is also a content and development requirement that focuses upon the wit with which the topic is developed.

Impromptu speaking has, in part, to do with the character of the speaker, in the sense that an audience will always listen empathetically to speakers who are genuinely interesting and interestingly genuine. Audiences hate a pompous phony and they respect real knowledge. Public Speaking involves the genuine and the interesting. It also involves wit: *...nature to advantage dressed, What oft was thought but ne'er so well expressed*. Wit gives us the ability to express our 'natures', the real, the ideas that many people share; what we say is felt to be 'well observed' by the audience. Wit also dresses nature to 'advantage'. The effective speaker has wit in the sense of words used well, an aptness in the turn of phrase and inventiveness in the development of ideas. Wit engages an audience by delighting them as they learn.

*Persuasive Speaking* and *Debate* are two other public speaking events and they involve analytic, motivational, and strategic thinking skills. A persuasive speech is based upon the definition of some problem; a discussion of the reasons it really is a problem; a discussion of why our current attempts to deal with it are inadequate and a motivational

presentation of a solution. Persuasive Speaking adds skill with Definition, analysis, organization, and argumentation to the list of public speaking skills.

All these skills are needed in *Debate*, and it requires more. Debate requires teamwork and, in addition to presenting a persuasive case on a prepared topic, the speakers must have the impromptu ability to engage and clash with the arguments being presented by their opponents. They must be flexible enough to switch sides on the argument. They must have the endurance to debate a topic four times, twice on each side and against different opponents. In *cross-examination* debate they must also ask effective questions and defend their positions. In *Parliamentary* Debate they follow *rules of order* that are designed to provide efficiency, focus and decorum to the business of government. While often parodied by nerdy orators, the rules of order in the hands of a skilled speaker or chairman make government or business meetings worthwhile because all views are heard, everybody is treated with respect, one thing is dealt with at a time and actions are undertaken to make changes only if it is beneficial to do so.

Public Speaking involves quality of voice, range in characterization, timing, accent and mood: the dramatic impact of the reader's voice. It also involves wit in the development of ideas, the ability to engage an audience and to develop content fluently. It requires skill with definition, logic, analysis, organization and argumentation. It requires teamwork and the impromptu ability to engage and clash with other ideas, flexibly and to effect. Public speakers can ask effective questions and defend their positions and as leaders they ensure that all views are heard, everybody is treated with respect, one thing is dealt with at a time and actions are undertaken only if they are beneficial.

## **Eight Ways to Define a Topic**

The process of developing ideas begins with definitions. The preceding section in this presentation on public speaking has started to develop the topic of Public Speaking by seeking to define it. All essays, discussions, presentations, debates and business meetings need to begin with definitions. Unless all the parties involved in discussion understand the terms in the same way you really cannot proceed. And yet most speakers miss a real opportunity for developing their presentations by failing to use definitions at all or doing so in a most unsophisticated way. Too often judges at speaking competitions will hear debaters read a list of dictionary definitions of words, assume that the audience understands their relevance to the topic, and then say something editorial like: "I will now proceed with my constructive argument."—as if definition were not related to argument. This is not the case at all. Some definitions are 'right' or 'wrong'; most are 'useful' or 'good' or 'weak' depending upon how well meanings are made clear and relevant.

### **Lexical Definitions**

The first type of definition is called a **Lexical** definition. It is the simple dictionary meaning of a word. In its simplest form it can be simply “right” or “wrong.” Lexical definitions *without* context are of limited value and are used most often to settle disputes about usage. Someone learning a language looks up the meanings of words in a dictionary. They are more useful when they are used contextually. For example a dictionary meaning of the word “free” such as “at no cost” while it explains the word in a very general sense does not really capture the meaning of the word as it is used to describe the rather complex trade agreement between the US and Canada. While the real agreement itself is named “Free Trade” (the name of a thing is ‘**nominal**’ but the thing itself is ‘**real**’); the words “free” and “trade” themselves do not have dictionary meanings that together mean the US/Canada trade agreement. Only in the context of the acronym NAFTA does “free trade” have a meaning that is at all useful. So: Definitions depend upon context for meaning.

The nuances of the meanings of individual words are compiled in comprehensive dictionaries like the OED. The many alternate meanings are distinguished by context. Who is recorded with using them first and in what sense; when they reappear, with changed meaning, that usage is cited as well. Our understanding of a word is usually selected from several definitions in the dictionary and the selection depends upon the context. Lexical definitions contain the assumption that some specific group or language community is using them. To be useful, lexical definitions usually take the logical form:

“In context X, when “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” is used correctly it means the same as “\*\*\*\*\*.”

So from amongst the definitions of the word “free” (in the dictionary) and assuming that we are continuing with “Free Trade” the one that applies to institutions appears to be the most appropriate. Our lexical definition now looks like this: In the context of institutions like governments, when the word “Free” is used it means the same as “not controlled by a foreign or despotic government, having representative government, having private rights which are respected.” This is a good start and while this definition could be used to great effect to provide insights into what the Free Trade Agreement should be, it still is not really adequate. The contexts provided in the dictionary do not really apply to a specific contemporary political agreement like NAFTA. We need another type of definition.

## Stipulative Definitions

Stipulative definitions are useful to fix the meaning of a new word or to assign a new use to an old one. A stipulative definition follows the form:

“In context X, I (we) propose that “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” mean the same as “\*\*\*\*\*.”

A stipulative definition does not make a statement of fact, which is either true or false, as does a lexical definition, rather it is used to make a proposal and it is judged to be more or less useful depending upon its own merits. (see non-deductive logic) A

stipulative definition of free trade would look like this: “I propose that, for the purposes of discussing the NAFTA agreement, the term Free Trade means “subject to existing US and Canadian Trade Law.” If I were speaking about some aspect of the free trade agreement, or debating it, I would use a stipulative definition like this to control the subject and enable myself to build a case.

Having control of the definitions gives the speaker tremendous persuasive power and subsequently ethical responsibility. You must be careful not to let speakers manipulate you by controlling definitions that misrepresent the issues that you wish to discuss.

In a debate, in business meetings and in speaking generally, the first job of a speaker who introduces a topic is to define it. In debate it is also the first job of the negative or opposition side to make sure that the definitions are acceptable. In the example above the opposition would be quite right to question the appropriateness of simply stipulating a new, limited and arbitrary meaning of free trade. If the issue is to be discussed intelligently then it needs a more comprehensive definition.

## Explicative Definitions

An **explicative definition** is used when there is a need to define the meaning of a word beyond the level of ordinary correct usage (a lexical definition) or when the stipulated meaning appears inadequate for some specific reason. In this case the opposition could argue that “free trade” is not simply a question of trade law, but that it implies a notion of good will between trading partners and that trade law itself should be subject to that good will.

Explicative definitions have three elements rather than two:

- 1) The term being considered
- 2) The imprecise or common usage of the term
- 3) The proposed more precise amended use of the term.

An explicative definition ‘explicates’ or draws out new meaning from the common meaning. Like stipulative definitions, explicative **definitions are expressed in sentences** that develop an argument. For example Free Trade might be defined like this:

We propose that “free” which in western society means the same as “having private rights which are respected” be refined to mean “respecting the rights of and distinctions between Canada and the US and at the same time easing those trade laws which are inconsistent with mutual economic prosperity”.

Explication does not create a wholly new usage; it transforms an old imprecise use into a more exact one. Explicative definitions resemble lexical definitions because they contain a clause stating correct usage. They also resemble stipulative definitions



because they propose an amended use. The part that states the correct usage is to be judged on its truth or falsity; the definition as a whole on its merits as a proposal.

It should be clear at this point that considerable care should be taken defining terms at the outset of a presentation whether it is in the boardroom, in a debate or in writing. Be wary of speakers who leave no room for discussion by the limited scope of their definitions. In the example above for example it would be difficult to oppose free trade legislation that was **defined** as “consistent with mutual economic prosperity.” In a debate the opposition would be quite right to argue that it is yet to be proven whether free trade would foster mutual economic prosperity. The definition should be further challenged because it omits important issues: cultural sovereignty for one.

The process of defining is very useful in understanding issues and is a group activity that can involve large numbers of people profitably at the outset of business meetings and seminars. Start with a “straw dog” definition, which you know will not stand for long, but that will get the ball rolling. Use lexical, stipulative and explicative techniques to elicit audience participation in evolving topics that both you and your audience better understand.

Ostensive definition.

**Definition by pointing is ostensive.** In a discussion that concerned free trade, for example, one could produce the complete text of the free trade legislation currently being considered in the national legislature and insist that defining free trade in any other way is evasive. You would argue that the discussion of free trade should focus entirely upon the free trade document itself: “this one right here.” You could point, more subtly, not just to the document itself but to the reality of its imposition on the street.

Good speakers are effective because they appear to know what they are talking about. They do not use weak definitions to limit the topic and evade important issues; good speakers use the analytic process of defining to home in on crucial issues. They can also teach the process of defining at the same time as they introduce their topics. It is the right of all parties to a discussion however to demand that topics are clearly and reasonably defined.

Necessary and Sufficient definitions

In precise logical terms a definition is only ‘good’ if it is ‘necessary’ and ‘sufficient’. The new definition (the definiens) must indicate *all and only* the characteristics that the term being defined (the definiendum) possesses. In the explicative definition of free trade that was developed above, for example, one could well argue that free trade is about more than economic prosperity. Because cultural sovereignty has been omitted, the definition is *not sufficient*: the definiens does not include all the characteristics of the definiendum.

## Nominal, Real, Explicit and Contextual Definitions

In the discussion of different types of definition outlined above, an important distinction is revealed. Are speakers concerned with the words “free trade” or with the thing “free trade?” When speakers deal with the words in the resolution without dealing with the reality of the thing itself they are providing a **Nominal** definition. When they employ an ostensive definition by pointing to the thing itself they are providing a **Real** definition.

When speakers provide synonyms for the words in a topic to help explain them they are using an **explicit** definition.

When they define topics in terms of sentences that develop relationships between ideas they are creating a **contextual** definition.

## Three logics

### Deductive and Non-deductive Arguments

Good speakers are interesting because they understand the mathematical format, theoretical nature and relentless conclusiveness of *deductive* argument. They can also speak in non-deductive sentences that capture the ‘more or less the case’ nature of real experience. Good speakers understand the logic and the expectations implicit in different levels of language.

**Deductive Arguments** use a rigid logic focused upon the truth of premises, the validity of the logic and the soundness of the argument. Deductive arguments deal with absolutes where the conclusion follows from the premises in the sense that it is **impossible** for the conclusion to be false if the premises are all true. If the premises are true the conclusion must be true. A simple example would be: *All people die. David is a person. Therefore David will die.* The conclusion is inescapable. A deductive argument is said to be **valid** if, like the example above, it is impossible for the conclusion to be false if the premises are true.

But while the **logic** can be **valid**, for an argument to be **sound**, the premises, the facts themselves, must be true too. A **sound** argument is one in which the logic is valid *and* the premises are true. Questioning the soundness of premises is different from asking the question: “If the premises are true, does the conclusion necessarily follow?” Advertising often causes us to give tacit assent to invalid premises from which we cannot help but infer valid conclusions. If it were true that we could only be happy driving Mercedes then it would be quite valid to reach the conclusion that we should purchase one. The argument would be **valid** because the conclusion follows on from

the premise without error; it would not, however, be **sound** because the premise the happiness is only possible with Mercedes is false.

**Non-Deductive arguments** are the ‘more or less’ arguments that capture the subtlety and detail of real experience. In non-deductive logic the conclusion follows from the premises in the sense that it is **improbable** that the conclusion is false given that the premises are all true. If the premises are true then the conclusion **is likely** to be true. A simple example would be: *People tend to be depressed when it rains. It is raining today. Therefore people will be depressed today.* The conclusion is likely to be true. There is no claim that the premises, if true, make it impossible for the conclusion to be false.

The difference between deductive and non-deductive arguments hinges upon degree. Deductive arguments are concerned with the *truth* of the premises and the conclusions. Non-deductive arguments are concerned with the *relationship* between the premises and the conclusion. When we agree with a deductive argument, we agree that it is *absolutely* true; when we agree with a non-deductive argument we agree that it is *more-or-less* true.

In spoken languages and in prose we use sentences, not arguments. Our declarative sentences are, for the most part, *true or false*. Arguments on the other hand are said to be *sound, valid or invalid*. While we can use sentences to create arguments, the arguments themselves do not need sentences, as a necessary component, and may be represented with mathematical or logical symbols. *Strict deductive logic* has rules and operations that apply to the validity and soundness of arguments, inferences and conclusions.

Non-deductive logic makes a different claim: it is “more or less the case”. Just because one exception can be found does not mean that *non-deductive* conclusions are still not more or less true. A *single* exception invalidates a *deductive* argument absolutely. The two logics make different claims and in that difference lies a subtlety of concept that is important.

When a debater attacks an argument to test if it is sound by questioning the truth of the premises we move from the deductive validity/invalidity world of argument into the truth/falsity world of declarative sentences. How do we prove that a premise is true? How true does a premise need to be? In the more or less world of real experience sentences are what we use to approximate truths. Take, for example the sentence: “The man who is in love is happy.” Most of the time most people would say that this is more or less true. Intuitively we know its truth, but if we were pressed to question for soundness an argument that used “The man who is in love is happy” as a premise what would we do?

Deductive arguments often begin with premises to which we give **tacit assent**; we hold them to be true without feeling the necessity or having the capacity to prove them to be true. Religions take premises on faith. We undertake charitable ventures because we give tacit assent to the assumption that there is something 'good' about looking after those who can't look after themselves. Ethics, belief systems and morality are fields that affect us profoundly and yet these moral and religious systems are often based upon assumptions that we cannot prove.

## Inductive Logic

Questioning the soundness of premises is the business of science and of **inductive logic**. Inductive logic gathers evidence from a multiplicity of specific examples until the force of the argument is so strong that the audience makes the **inductive leap** and admits that what is true for the examples is likely to be generally true. It is useful both in the non-deductive world of likelihoods and in the more rigorous deductive world of sound and valid arguments. As you might imagine the notion that we can question premises poses something of a threat to power. The assumptions of humanism, that we can learn about, and improve the world by asking questions of it, places self-determinism and the capacity to learn into the place previously occupied by faith and obedience: the medieval catholic church and the feudal system came tumbling down at the feet of Inductive logic. It is primarily the logic used by science.

(In *strict deductive* logic examples cannot be used to prove a premise *absolutely* unless one can assemble the set of *all* possible examples. On the other hand you only need one example to disprove a case. It would be false for example to say that all actresses have red hair because Lucille Ball has red hair and she is an actress. On the other hand it would be quite right to challenge the premise that all actresses are blondes with the question "What about Lucy?")

Good speakers are effective because they present definitions that clarify issues and contribute to better understanding. Involving the audience in the evolution of a good definition by moving through the different types of definition is a good way for a teacher to arrive at clearer understanding of a topic. It is also a great way for a teacher to teach students the questions that they must ask of themselves as they develop their own topics more thoroughly. The activity of using different definitions is in and of itself interesting. Definition is a facilitator's primary tool in creating focused and effective seminars. Learn to develop ideas through lexical, stipulative, explicative, ostensive, nominal, real, explicit and contextual approaches and to provide necessary and sufficient definitions and you will learn a great deal about a topic and subsequently you will speak and write far more effectively.

## Seven Case Strategies

### The Status Quo

We all speak more confidently when we have something specific to say and a very good place to begin to develop a case is to start with the way things are, the status quo. Only when we deal specifically with the details of the status quo can we take action to achieve goals, satisfy needs, provide minor repairs or work to continue as we are. The notion of acknowledging the status quo as a starting point began with the Greeks' attempts to sort out property ownership claims after the Peloponnesian Wars. The country was in chaos and people were at each others' throats regarding land ownership. The Greeks very wisely decided that the place to begin was with an acknowledgement of who occupied the land now. Having established the Status Quo, they were then in a position to entertain claims as to who *ought* to have possession of the land or who ought to receive compensation for the loss of land.

Establishing the status quo is an essential part of the public speaking process too. Contextual definitions enable us to understand and express more clearly what we really want to discuss and the status quo provides an important context. Acknowledging and describing the status quo gives us a place to start because we can then speak for change: we can recommend actions to achieve goals, to satisfy needs, to find comparative benefits from new approaches, to satisfy measurement criteria or simply to patch and repair the status quo itself. In business meetings, speakers who recommend a specific course of action to achieve a specific goal or benefit based upon clear definition of a real issue will be perceived by their peers and superiors to be effective. While style helps, a good speaker's real tools are relevant content and sound reasoning.

### Change

The businessman wants his audience to take some course of action to save or make money. The counselor seeks to give piece of mind to an audience confused by their life experiences. Anybody speaking to a group needs to answer a simple series of questions to develop any topic, motion, discussion or idea. Can you advocate action:

- to achieve a desirable **goal**,
- to satisfy an existing **need**,
- to create and employ **criteria** by which the success or failure of a plan can be adjudicated,
- to **compare the benefits** of one strategy with another to make recommendation about which to pursue.

- to acknowledge that nothing at all needs to be done to change the **status quo**, which is demonstrably working fine,
- or at least would be fine with **minor repairs**.

**Goals, needs, criteria, comparative benefits, status quo and minor repairs** are useful strategies to learn.

## Goals and Needs

A goal is a specific objective that is demonstrably desirable. A need is a shortcoming in the status quo that must be remedied. In discussing free trade for example we might well argue that a goal of the free trade agreement should be trade laws and tariffs that apply equally to all parties. Another goal could be to evolve trade practices that are consistent with both the American Constitution and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In business meetings motions will very often be moved to achieve goals related to profit.

A *needs* strategy could well argue that the free trade agreement needs to provide relief (a change from the status quo) for unemployed workers in one country who are the victims of discriminatory and protectionist trade laws in another country (the status quo). In business a needs strategy would acknowledge that a current strategy, product or location is losing money and that a particular course of action will satisfy the company's need to stop the loss.

## Criteria

Another way to develop a case is to start by establishing criteria that can be used to measure benefits and to recommend a course of action that can be measured by those criteria. One could well argue that one measure of good economic policy would be a fall in the unemployment rate: that unemployment rates are a good criteria for measuring the effects of free trade legislation for example. The criteria case would then develop by discussing the specifics of free trade legislation with a focus on unemployment rates. If analysis can prove that unemployment rates will drop due to free trade legislation, assuming that unemployment rates are a measurable criteria that reveal good policy when they fall, then one can argue persuasively to enact free trade policies that reduce unemployment. A speaker can make a very strong case for a course of action by assembling any number of measurable criteria and demonstrating how they can be satisfied. Criteria strategies very often compliment goals and needs strategies in developing a case.

## Comparative benefits

A comparative benefits analysis enables a speaker to examine the details and outcomes of two or more plans, very often the status quo and a new proposal. One strength of this type of analysis is that while it may not provide the best course of action, it will provide a plan that is better than the status quo or of another plan under discussion. Comparative benefits very often combine with criteria cases to establish measurement practices for benefits. In discussing the pros and cons of Free Trade for example one could examine the specific economic outcomes of Free Trade policy on a sector by sector basis and compare those results with comparable performances in the same sectors of businesses unaffected by Free Trade, in other jurisdictions or in areas affected by different trade laws.

## The Status Quo and Patch and Repair

In Government, the opposition will often compare the apparent benefits of proposed legislation with the status quo to argue against change. In fact one of the best middle of the road strategies that politicians and business people often employ is called "Patch and Repair." The argument proceeds rather like this: Current practices are more than acceptable; they are, after all, the result of years of refinement, so rather than trying something new, unproven and expensive we should continue to refine the status quo with minor repairs. We don't need a new road; we need to fill some potholes and straighten a couple of corners.

## Five Levels of Language: who is your audience?

"Its just business" is a phrase we often hear. It means that evaluation criteria regarding business performance take preference over personal feelings. The apologetic and perhaps even wearily resigned overtone of "Its just" adds richness to the meaning. There is a even a glib confidence that the audience will admit "they've heard it before and there're going to hear it again because it happens". In this line the *descriptive* level of language breaks form and apologizes for itself to the *ideological* level. Language works of five levels: the descriptive, the ideological, the rhetorical, the literary and the meta-literary. In terms of language usage "Its just business" means that we must only use *descriptive* language in appraising business performance. *Descriptive* language is the level of language used in accounting and engineering. Bridge designs and actuarial tables are not concerned with the way things ought to be; they do not try to persuade; they make no references to shared artistic or literary knowledge and they do not allude to spiritual concepts.

The **descriptive** level of language is like the skeleton: it provides the rigid formal structure of deductive logic where sound arguments lead to unavoidable conclusions. The public speaker needs to understand the rules for this level and when to use them.

In our 'real' non-deductive world, where things are more or less true, **ideological** usage enables us to express our selves and our ideologies. It is the flesh on the skeleton. For the Public Speaker this is the strategic level where definitions are evolved, cases analyzed, motions made and arguments developed. It is the language of shared experiences, facts and memories.

The clothes, which make the public speaker charismatic, are provided by **Rhetoric**. It can be aggressive, covert and illogical. Rhetoric dresses the human body of ideological language with the clothes of individual personality. Rhetoric is the flair that distinguishes one speaker from the next (content being equal). Public speakers need to know the tricks of rhetoric. While rhetoric itself is neither good nor evil, it is the means that justifies the ends as far as public speaking is concerned.

## Descriptive

Descriptive language describes the apparent facts in experience. It is a level of usage that does not endorse any beliefs, consider how things ought to be, employ any figurative usages or allude to anything transcendent. It is the language of computers, mathematics, accounting and engineering. It employs a rigorous formal logic that is impersonal.

## Ideological

Ideological language expresses an ideology: what we believe, *want* or *need* to be true. Ideological language is personal. The ideology can be that of an individual or a group. It is ethical. It is an expression of the way we think things ought to be. Love exists. We ought to look after the weak. There is a sanctity to life. In fact, in psychological terms, our individualism, our character, is expressed through our ideological usage. Our ideologies are the expression of our personalities. They are formed as we try to fill the void between the cold facts we perceive as true in the world around us and the ideals that we try to hold. In the descriptive world we are a small sack of chemicals with a limited lifespan living in an infinitely large and chaotic universe. In an ideological world we can behave like gods who can love and who try to bring order to chaos. Our personal ideologies lie somewhere between facts and ideals; they vary from individual to individual and from culture to culture and they express themselves in our beliefs. The logic of ideological expression is less formal and more personal than the logic of descriptive language. It is non-deductive rather than deductive. When there are ideological differences it will be apparent in definitions, the premises, logic and conclusions. Ideological usage seldom happens on its' own. In addition to argument and analysis skills the public speaker needs the flair provided by rhetoric.

## Rhetorical



Rhetorical usage is a means of persuasion. In renaissance art, grammar, (the structure of language), is represented by the open palm, while rhetoric is represented by the closed fist. The rhetorical speaker's bag of tricks includes a complex variety of persuasive tools. Rhetoric influences the outcome of arguments. Some speakers are more effective than others even though their 'content' may be weaker. The "plain folks" style of the politician who wins converts by wrapping himself in the flag, kissing babies, recalling advice his mother used to give him and endorsing values "as good as apple pie" is using rhetoric. Rhetoric is the punch in language that makes it persuasive by appealing not just to our logic but to our other emotions. Mobs are roused to riot more often through rhetoric than through reason. Rhetoric is often the tool of ideological language and it is an appropriate tool to use in a world that is not strictly or simply *rational*.

Rhetoric is a vast subject whose principals were first and most exhaustively listed by the classical Greeks. In prose and oratory, Ciceronian, Senecan, isocratic, gorgiastic and Euphuistic are terms used to describe various rhetorical styles. George Williamson's *Senecan Amble* and Morris Croll's *The Plain Style* are useful resources for understanding the range of classical prose styles better. Rhetoric includes strategies for increasing the effectiveness of arguments by using structures and repetitions in sounds, rhythms, syllable counts and grammatical syntax. Parisons, Paramoeons, Isocolons, alliterations, repetitions in threes, Chiasmus and Zeugmas are all structural rhetorical devices. An exordium argument is a whole series of changes in points of view and lines of attack designed specifically for its rhetorical effect. Mark Anthony's "honourable men" speech in Julius Caesar is rhetorical, so is the exordium structure of Jonathon Swift's "A Modest Proposal." Other more commonly used rhetorical devices involve saying more (hyperbole), less (understatement) or the opposite (verbal irony) than a situation warrants for dramatic effect. The effective speaker can be more persuasive by employing classical rhetorical skills and while it is beyond the scope of this book to deal with rhetoric in great detail, the purpose of this section is to give the reader some food for thought and some references for further research.

From a practical rather than theoretical point of view, the flair in public speaking is provided by rhetorical skills concerned with charisma. Familiarity with the logic of developing ideas enables the public speaker to do so fluently, with ease. Fluent presentation of interesting and developing content is engaging.

It is the fluency of the presentation rather than the validity of the premises that engages, entertains and educates. Wit that delights in "nature to advantage dress'd". Wit that is infectious because it is imaginative. The unstated compliment the public speaker pays the audience by appearing to be genuine is rhetorical, so is the device of loosening a tie or removing a jacket: it has no bearing on the validity of the content. Just as rhetorical is the turn of phrase or insight that is particularly well timed or interestingly expressed. Humor is often rhetorical; so to are all the dramatic devices of movement and voice. When we pause dramatically, raise or lower our volume, speak more quickly or slowly, rhyme, walk towards or away from our audience, mutter to ourselves, hide our palms in

our armpits or run into our audience and embrace them... all these actions are rhetorical, they are our style... they have nothing to do with the validity of our content, but they have everything to do with the success of our presentation. Logical fallacies (see pg 33 ff) are rhetorical. Mark Anthony's "Friends, Romans Countrymen" speech is a study in rhetoric used to stir the mob.

## Literary

Literary usage is language that alludes to turns of phrase that writers or speakers in the past have used. It is based upon the assumption that the audience has read or is familiar with the original work. When we say someone has a "lean and hungry look" we are alluding to Julius Caesar's description of Cassius in Shakespeare's play. Someone with a lean and hungry look may well be a conspirator, not just thin or hungry. But unless the audience has read the play, the allusion is lost. We have to be careful with literary usage because assumptions about what an audience may or may not have read are tenuous. Contemporary society is often regarded as "post literate." This means that we can no longer allude to the words of any historical characters, writers, philosophers or artists (unless we explain their context thoroughly) because literacy in this sense has become increasingly unfashionable. The level of usage is quite simply inaccessible to the audience if they haven't read the original material. Literary usage can be effective if it draws from the language of popular culture however and while a contemporary audience will not understand the allusion to Milton's *L'Allegro* in the line "trip the light fantastic," they may well get the allusion to Homer Simpson when we say "Doh!"

## Meta-literary

Meta-literary language employs the words we use to describe concepts that can best, and only, be understood metaphorically. That is, there is no objective correlative, no corresponding 'real' form, for a concept described by a metaphor. When we say: "come in to the light" we mean come in to a metaphorical place that is characterized by the ability to see things more clearly, perhaps. There is no such place in reality; light is only metaphorically related to greater understanding and the transcendent glow of religious deities is at best an ephemeral reference. Many words have meta-literary levels of meaning and if we are aware of their implications we may be able to use them to effect. They tend, however, to be the domain of theologians, messiahs and politicians. The light at the end of the tunnel, the stairway to heaven, the cave of despair and the crystal fountains from which healing streams do flow are all meta-literary concepts whose implications may be profound but whose meanings are at best obscure.

## Fourteen Impromptu Development Methods

The impromptu nature of public speaking means that, as long as we make the contexts clear, it is possible to develop ideas at some length and to great effect if we know what to do. When the speaker knows how to develop an idea in advance, then any topic can simply have the developmental process applied to it, without the speaker knowing the outcome, and the organic nature of thought and language will enable the speaker to reach conclusions spontaneously and creatively.

### Description

Use all of your senses and describe the appearance, smell, taste, sound, feel and impressions that any topic elicits. Remember that these descriptions can involve different levels of usage as well.

### Narration

Any topic can usually be developed by using narration. There are a variety of narrative techniques and styles from the detached and factual style of journalists to the confessional first person omniscient style of personal experience. Make up a story about your topic.

### Example

Most topics can also be developed by selecting examples from which it is possible to infer generalities, or which reveal the unique characteristics of the topic.

### Analogy

Analogies enable you to explain a complex topic by substituting a simpler one. The circulation of the blood, for example, is a topic that would profit from an analogy made to the plumbing system in a house: the two are not the same, but discussion of the plumbing system is more accessible to many audiences and understanding one can help your audience to understand the other.

### Classification

Many topics can be developed well by classification. Discussion of the categories or classes to which topics variously do and do not belong is a rich vein for developing ideas.

## Induction/ Deduction

Gather evidence by assembling examples is *inductive*. The goal is to make the inductive leap to conclude that what is true for the examples is in general true for all. You can then go on to *deduce* other conclusions from the general precept.

## If then/If not then what

Consider the implications of a topic being true or false.

## Process Analysis

Very often a topic involves, or can be seen as, a process; you should explain it.

## Comparison and contrast

Compare your topic and its implications with like topics or contrast it with unlike topics.

## Cause and Effect

What are the causes that result in the topic you are developing being the way it is and what are the effects of those causes.

## Definition

By moving from lexical to stipulative, to explicative, to ostensive and real definitions you will develop your audience's understanding of them.

## **Six Different Points of View**

Too often speakers limit their ability to develop topics imaginatively because they are concerned primarily with the topic itself rather than who is looking at it. An interesting exercise is to assign different points of view to a variety of speakers and have them speak on the same topic. The points of view listed below will give you a good idea about how to proceed. Remember that by varying points of view you are going to be using language on ideological, rhetorical or even meta-literary levels.

## Religious

How would a Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu develop a topic.

## Political

How would a Marxist, a republican, a nazi, a socialist, a communist or a democrat develop the topic.

## Philosophic

How would a platonic idealist, a romantic, an empiricist, an existentialist, a stoic, a behaviorist or an Augustinian develop their ideas.

## Psychological

It is amazing how differently topics can develop when the psychology of the speaker changes. A paranoid, a speaker obsessed with sex, a passive aggressive, a neurotic and an extrovert all speak with different styles and with different emphasis on the same topic.

## Cultural

Not only do topics lend themselves to development by varying the beliefs and attitudes of the speaker, but also the speaker's background, even within a culture. The style, content and emphasis of the plain folks country boy is very different from the cynical emphasis and vocabulary of the city slicker, the urban gang member or the preppy blond.

## Character

Specific characters themselves are distinguished by points of view and mannerisms that can be used to great effect in developing a topic. Imagine how Henry Ford, Hitler, the CEO of your company, Bush, Wayne Gretsky or Alexander the Great would talk about an issue.

## **Four Different Contexts: When, Where, How and Why**

Not only can topics be developed by deploying different logical arguments from different points of view and by using different levels of language; they can also be developed using 'adverbial' considerations. Adverbs are concerned with the activity, the action, and not the thing itself and fall into three categories: Time, Place, Manner and Condition.

## Time

Using chronology to develop ideas. How have they changed over time? How would they be developed in 500 BC? 1000 years in the future?

## Place

Use geography to describe the action or attitude: in Rome, Japan, on Mars, in places where it rains all the time or where the atmosphere is made of ammonia.

## Manner

Consider how activities could be performed or how they would apply to different users with different capabilities: left-handers, babies, grandmothers, technologists or ballet dancers.

## Condition

Vary conditions to develop your ideas. How would they apply in a world run by gangsters, in a world without electricity, in zero gravity or underwater.

There are a myriad of ways in which to develop ideas and it is the job of the public speaker to employ them themselves and also to show their audience specifically how to do so as well. The trick to public speaking is in part in knowing not what you want to say but rather how to develop your ideas so that you learn about them as you go. Good public speakers share in the delight of learning as they go and they impart that same delight and capacity to learn into their audiences.

## **Six Criteria for Judging Public Speaking and Debate**

To understand the skills that effective public speakers use, the reader should consider perhaps the most formal and demanding forum for public speaking: debate. Debate tournaments are judged formally. Judges are briefed beforehand and the briefing that follows is one that I have used many times at national and international debate tournaments.

### The Room

You will enter a room. There may well be spectators in the room. There should be at least two other judges. You will sit at a table that is not adjacent to any of the other judges. Your evaluation of the debate that will take place is your responsibility. Do not discuss the evaluation of the debate with the other judges until you have completed

your own adjudication. It is the job of the debaters to whom you are about to listen to persuade you that their case is stronger than that of their opponents.

At the head of the classroom, in the middle, there will be a desk occupied by a moderator or speaker. You should introduce yourself to them so that they can help you. It is their job to run the event in the room. They need to know you are there and who you are. They have a master list of rooms and judges and are responsible for seeing to it that the right judges are in the right rooms. Tournament organizers try to set up tournaments so that no speaker will be judged by the same person more than once.

On the moderator's right will sit the two (usually two but sometime more) members of the affirmative or government side; on the left will sit the two members of the negative or opposition side. On the blackboard behind them will be written a resolution or bill and the names of the debaters. The names will be labelled according to the order of speaking. In a cross-examination debate they will be the *first* and *second affirmative* speakers and the *first* and *second negative* speakers. In a parliamentary debate the government (affirmative) speakers (on the right) will be called the Prime Minister and the Minister of Something; the opposition speakers will be called the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition Critic of Something (he may simply be called the 2nd speaker of the opposition). There will be a timekeeper sitting in the room as well. The timekeeper's job is to give all the speakers the same amount of time to speak; to tell them when their time is up and to keep track of the time they use.

The judges will have a judge's ballot for evaluating the style, content, organization and clash of the presentations that will take place. You will have a flow chart showing who will be speaking when and scrap paper for taking notes. Each judge will evaluate the debate independently. The judge will evaluate each speaker individually and as a team member and they will do so using the criteria listed on the judge's ballot as a guideline.

Some debates are value debates. They do not concern a course of action to be taken so that some end may be achieved. Value debates concern a resolution that the affirmative wishes to maintain is valid in some way. The negative seeks to disprove the affirmative's case. There is no necessity for plans and counter-plans and the outcome of the debate is to be decided by evaluating the arguments that are presented and rebutted on either side.

Some debates are Policy debates. The affirmative or government advocates a course of action that should be taken so that some desirable end can be achieved. The Affirmative must have a plan: that is they must recommend a course of action to change the way things are; to change to status quo. The affirmative plan must be feasible and they must demonstrate the necessity of employing that plan. The "burden of proof" always rests with the affirmative or Government team and if they do not adequately demonstrate the necessity and feasibility of their plan they cannot win the debate.

The role of the negative or opposition team is simple: they need only to cast doubt upon the Government's case to win the debate. They do not have to have a plan of their own. They need merely demonstrate that the status quo is adequate, that the government plan is unworkable, that the goals of the government are undesirable, that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages or that the government itself is incompetent.

If the Opposition suggests a counter-plan, then the roles are reversed. The burden of responsibility falls upon them and the government need only cast doubt on the efficacy of the new plan.

## The Flow of a Debate

Each debater will have the opportunity to present a case and to react to the case presented by their opponents. Speakers will alternate until everyone has presented a case and has rebutted the case of the other side. In nearly all debates one speaker on each side will speak twice. This is to allow the first speaker (before whom nobody else will have spoken) to include a rebuttal in their presentation: to challenge the opposition case and to summarize their own. The Affirmative or Government team will always speak both first and last. The burden of responsibility is upon them to prove the resolution or bill and, as they have introduced it, it is their right to have the last word. Similarly one of the negative speakers will often have the opportunity to summarize their arguments. In all cases the speakers will have the same total speaking time so that a speaker who speaks twice will have a shorter initial speech so as to allow for his final summary rebuttal.

In Oxford or Academic style debates each speaker will present their case and react to the case of their opponents, but there will be no opportunity for speakers to question each other.

In cross examination debate each debater will present their arguments and will also ask and answer cross examination questions in time that is specifically allocated for that purpose.

In Parliamentary debate there is no time formally allocated for the asking of questions but all debaters have the opportunity to do so if they raise their points formally following the rules of the House, which will be discussed in more detail later.

At the conclusion of the debate, the judges will have evaluated each debater using the criteria listed on the judge's ballot as a guideline and will be able to appraise the general standard of the debate overall and the relative placement of the individual speakers.

## The Ballot

The ballots for all debates are designed to enable the judges to evaluate the debaters by a set of criteria that highlights the important components of effective



speaking. Ballots for different styles of debate vary to take into account questions, answers and Parliamentary Procedures but in all cases the intent is the same. Each of the following subheadings (or one very like it) will appear on a typical judge's ballot.

## Presentation

In all debates it is the job of the debaters to persuade the judges that their cases are good and that those of their opponents are not. Accordingly, judges will have to distinguish *content* from *presentation*. Debaters should speak clearly, correctly and loudly enough to be easily heard. They should avoid reading their speeches. They should establish eye contact with the judges and with their opponents. They should modulate their delivery so as to achieve emphasis where it is appropriate. They should not speak so quickly that their arguments lose effect. They should appear confident and they should conduct themselves with dignity. Debaters who lower the tone of the debate through personal insults or through inappropriate levels of usage should be penalized. It is the debater's role to challenge the arguments of their opponents but not to criticize their opponents themselves. Sneering sarcasm has no place in debate. A debater's posture should be natural and his gestures should be appropriate to his emphasis. Debaters should appear to take pride in their appearance and in their arguments. They should stand up straight, support themselves without the aid of a wall and they should not have their hands in their pockets.

A good debater will engage the attention and the interest of the judges, the opposition and the spectators. If the presentation is good the judges will feel that they have been taken into the confidence of a dignified, knowledgeable, sensitive and persuasive individual. Good debaters engage their audience because they speak with them, not at them. A speaker who sounds affected is less effective than one who appears natural and at ease. A good presentation will be accessible; the arguments will be clearly distinguished and the material will be presented patiently and clearly. If at the conclusion of the debate you feel that you would like to take the debater out to lunch because you would enjoy their company and would like to talk to them further, about almost anything, because you are intrigued by their vivacity, humour and intelligence – then you have witnessed a fine presentation that you should have scored highly. A good presentation has flair!

## Material/Content

Be careful to distinguish presentation from content. Some very experienced debaters can make a very flimsy case sound plausible. They will score highly on presentation, but not on content. Content is also different from organization. A speaker can have much good material and try to develop some profound ideas but still be ineffective because of poor organization. It does not take much skill to organize one idea... it takes considerable skill to clearly define, articulate, substantiate and distinguish five ideas. A fine speaker's demeanour and style will compliment well observed content which is incorporated into a persuasive case.

In order to score a speaker well on the material/content category, you should feel that the debater knows the subject backwards and that they can prove everything through reference to inescapable logic or to authority.

But what is good content? As an adult judge you may well have expertise that makes you very knowledgeable about the debate topic: while you needn't forget your learning, you must understand that what happens in a debate occurs only in the context of that debate. Content is relative. If a debater appears to have more content than the other debaters in that round then he will score higher than the other debaters. However, if the overall standard is generally low, that debater will not get excellent results but will still receive the highest score in the room. Content measures how much material the debater presents, how relevant it is and how well it is backed up by authority, either through citation or logic. In some 'value' debates there is little opportunity to back up material with sources, so debaters should not be penalized if they have none. The topic: "A bath is better than a shower" for example would be difficult to debate from sources and in this case your content/material evaluation would be based upon the variety and strength of the various arguments presented. On the other hand, in a policy debate concerning Free Trade for example, you should expect the debaters to make explicit reference to any pending legislation, to books and articles on the subject and even, perhaps, to personal interviews with politicians and economists.

Use your common sense in evaluating content. As an adult if you are bored by the content and regard it as common knowledge that lacks detail and sources, you should not score it highly. If you hear material that would be appropriate to any reasonable discussion held by reasonably well-informed adults who are not experts in the area, then you should give average to good scores. If you hear content that changes the way you feel about a subject, which is well documented and which attacks the subject thoroughly then you should give the debater high marks. Remember that documentation is not all the same. Reference to primary sources: pending legislation, supreme court decisions, transcripts of court cases and scholarly works carry more weight than critical essays, editorials from local newspapers or hearsay from friends! Remember also that data itself is worthless unless it is incorporated into a logical and persuasive case. Citing pages of statistics is only useful if it contributes to the argument. Material by itself is useless; it must be used effectively.

## Analysis/Organization

When you listen to a good debate, you should feel that the material that is being presented participates in a case that is logical, relevant, insightful and conclusive. You should feel that the debater has given serious and thoughtful consideration to the subject and that appropriate weight has been given to the various arguments that are being presented. The best way evaluate analysis is to keep track of the arguments as they are being presented and try to write them down. If you are unable to do so, or if you find you write down the same argument several times or if you can't understand either what you have written or its relevance when you reread it after the debate, then

the analysis/organization is suspect and should be given a low score. If you can write down two clear arguments by one speaker then you are listening to a fairly good debate (most speakers ramble incoherently most of the time). If you are able to distinguish and understand more than three arguments then the content, organization and presentation should probably all score very highly.

Remember that debaters debate in teams, usually of two, and that the mark you give for organization will not just evaluate the effectiveness of the speaker's arguments by themselves but also the way the team as a whole organizes their material. If debaters on the same team present contradictory arguments or if they merely repeat the same ones over and over again - then their organization is suspect.

Organization cannot help but relate to analysis. You should give good marks to a debater who presents arguments that you feel break the case down into relevant and separate topics each of which contributes to the overall argument. Recognize imagination and originality of thought. Debaters who merely paraphrase commonly held opinions have not analysed an issue as thoughtfully as have those who seem really to get to the nub of an issue and to emphasize elements that they demonstrate to be critical. Good debaters show the judges how their analysis is relevant. Again, if you can plot the development of a debater's case on paper and can see the logic of their analysis - you are probably witnessing a well-organized presentation.

## Rebuttal

The essence of good debate is clash. Each debater must be seen to rebut the arguments of their opponents. If this does not happen you are not witnessing a debate at all but rather a series of unchallenged presentations. A good debate will grow in content as it proceeds. Each debater will take issue with preceding arguments, counter them with alternatives or demonstrate their inadequacy. If you have noted all the arguments of one side on paper, then you should be able to put a check mark beside each of them as the opposition deals with them. If you hear no rebuttal then you can give no score for it. If you hear all the arguments which you noted rebutted persuasively then you are listening to a good debate.

Good rebuttal is detailed, explicit and relevant. Debaters should take issue with what was actually stated, not with misleading paraphrase. They should demonstrate why arguments are wrong or inadequate and they should explain the relevance or implications of the arguments that they challenge. Rebuttal need not confine itself simply to the material that the opposition has stated but can also include reference to obvious oversights or omissions. To present a case for Free Trade, for example, and make no reference to equalization grants or to protective American trade law, would be to miss serious issues and a good rebuttal would quite rightly point out the error. A very good rebuttal will distinguish premises, logic and conclusions and it will take issue with all three! Listen for rebuttals - without them there is none of the clash that makes for good debate.

## Cross-Examination

In cross-examination debate each debater will both ask and answer questions. On most ballots there is one box for this score, perhaps out of ten marks. This means that you will have to give a mark out of five for questions, out of five for answers, and combine them for the final cross examination score.

Judges should listen for detailed leading questions whose implications are obviously damaging to the witness' case. Cross-examination is not the time to argue, to make speeches or to brow beat a witness. Good questions very often occur in a series and their intent is often obvious. Good questions are brief and clear. Good questions are often leading: that is they are based upon specifics and ask for assent: "In their 2004 company report ABC Co. claims that they spend 2% of their net revenues on environmental restoration don't they?" This question is specific and leading; it is damaging whether the witness answers it or not; it can really only be answered with a "yes" and it is obviously part of a greater argument that concerns environmental responsibility. Complex and confusing questions are ineffective. Good questions challenge facts that may be weak; they point out logical errors and they cast doubt upon conclusions that are not supported by the evidence. Questions need not be confined to material that has been presented and should be used to highlight serious omissions in an opponent's case.

If debaters are really good you may have to change their marks for cross examination later in the debate when you see how admissions which have been gleaned in cross examination are later used to damage the witness' case. A witness may admit, for example, that he has not read some crucial document. Later the examiner may show how that document is critical to the case. A really good debater will not even need to point out that the witness has not even read it! Good examiners do not ask questions to which they do not already know the answers. Good questions are based upon fact and usually demand factual responses. A good cross-examination can be devastating.

Answering questions is perhaps the more difficult skill to evaluate. Good witnesses admit the truth graciously. They give brief answers which do not reveal more information than is demanded. They demonstrate mastery of facts. They listen carefully and do not stall. Good witnesses ask for clarification if it is needed and recognize that they can quite rightly request that complex questions be better phrased. A good witness may qualify their answer and they will do so effectively. A good witness will also be aware of any damaging admissions that they have made but will not waste time in the cross examination process seeking to redress the damage. Good debaters recover from damaging questions when they have the floor later in the debate. A good witness will not be seen to weasel out of questions or evade them.

Debaters very often lose their credibility with judges through emotional clash during cross-examination. A good cross-examination will always leave the judges with a favourable impression. Brow beating and weaselling are to be avoided. Good debaters maintain their dignity and credibility throughout the cross-examination process.

## Parliamentary Procedure

If you are judging a Parliamentary debate, you will not find a box on your ballot for Cross Examination, but you will find one for Parliamentary Procedure. In Parliamentary Debate debaters can increase the clash, elicit information, correct misrepresentations and maintain the dignity of proceedings by rising on Points of Order, Personal Privilege or Information. They may also heckle. A good Parliamentary debate is the most exciting of all debates to watch, unfortunately it is also the form of debate that is often handled badly. The role of the speaker is far greater in this type of debate. All remarks are addressed through the speaker. The speaker rules upon all points and the speaker keeps order and disciplines any debaters whose behaviour is inappropriate. While the specifics of Parliamentary Procedure may appear foreign to most people judges need not be experts to evaluate a parliamentary debate.

Judges will award points for parliamentary procedure to debaters who employ it. A debater who does not address the speaker, who does not point out breaches in the rules, who does not employ privilege to clarify any material that he has presented if it is misquoted or misrepresented by the opposition, who does not question doubtful assertions or facts with points of information, who does not heckle, who does not refer to the bill as a bill or to the other debaters as Honourable members or to the forum itself as 'the House' - cannot receive any marks for Parliamentary Procedures. The frequency with which debaters in different countries are expected to employ parliamentary procedures varies so if you are hosting an international tournament you should inform students and coaches well in advance of your expectations. All the other criteria for judging a Parliamentary Debate are the same as for any other style of debate and the best way novice judges can improve their skills is to listen to a couple of good parliamentary debates to get a feel for what happens. While the House of Commons or the Provincial Legislature should be fine places to start, the sad fact is that the high standards of content, presentation and analysis that characterize fine parliamentary debate seldom occurs in Parliament or the legislature.

## Cross Examination Excellence

An excellent cross examination is marked by brief, detailed and leading questions. Questions will be based upon the material which the opposition team has presented and also upon material which the opposition should have considered.

Questions will often be asked in series and will probe the premises underlying the opposition case as well as the logic they employ and the conclusions they reach. Particularly effective cross examinations will question and establish the logic of the witness first; then it will probe their premises. It will not deal with the conclusions at all, for having established the premises and logic, the excellent debater can reach any damaging conclusions himself later in the debate.

An excellent cross examination will be used to glean information which will re-appear later in the debate and which will contribute to effective rebuttal.

The excellent debater will know the answers to all the questions he asks. In most cases the phrasing of the question will make it obvious to both the judges and the witness what the appropriate answer should be.

An excellent cross examination is not repetitive. If information is not forthcoming from a witness, the excellent debater will move along quickly. He will use all his time and will ask many questions.

An excellent debater will not demand of his witness that he answer: "yes or no". The questions will be constructed so that an evasive answer will be seen to be so.

By the same token, excellent questions will not be constructed so as give the floor to the witness. An excellent cross examination will be seen to glean a great deal of information.

The excellent debater will always control the situation in a good cross examination.

When the excellent debater is a witness, he will answer the questions honestly and with dignity and authority. He will not be seen to 'weasel' evasively; he will not quibble or obfuscate. He will, however, listen carefully and will take every opportunity to show weaknesses in the opposition case by the answers that he makes.

Whether he has asked questions or been a witness, the excellent debater will analyse what happened in the cross examination process when he next speaks. He will explain what damaging admissions were gleaned and why they were damaging; if he is really good he can also explain why the questions themselves were damaging to the person who asked them.

## Parliamentary Procedure Excellence

The excellent debater understands that all the members of the house are present in an official capacity. They are not individuals who are motivated by self-interest. The "honourable Members" represent the constituents in their ridings. Their function is to see that legislation is responsible, workable, affordable, necessary and ethical. They use points of order, information and personal privilege to ensure that government policy is implemented justly.

The excellent debater, therefore, always raises the tone in parliamentary debate. He will insist that the rules of the house are obeyed and he will stand on points of order, not simply to quibble with procedures but to ensure that the legislative process is at all times above reproach.

The excellent debater will always bear the legislative context in mind. He will insist that remarks be addressed through the speaker, that appropriate decorum be observed, that whoever is speaking has the right to their opinion and that due process is always maintained. He will rise on points of order not simply to interrupt but because he obviously takes great pride in the parliamentary process. He realizes that if the good name of the house falls into disrepute because behavior is lax that the public will lose confidence in government and anarchy will result. He will subsequently be quick to point out any breach of the rules of conduct because they will be indicative of shoddy, dangerous or ill conceived legislation.

Excellent debaters will use points of information to ensure that any legislation is based upon responsible research, that all primary sources are authoritative, that the intent and context of evidence is consistent with its interpretation and that the implications of pending legislation are pursued thoroughly. Again the excellent debater will not merely quibble with sources, but will raise the tone of the debate by insisting that the only way that a responsible government can conduct its business with any authority is if it is seen to be exhaustive, honest, realistic, scholarly and ethical.

Similarly, the excellent debater will insist upon personal privilege to ensure that his own good name is above suspicion and that his arguments are fairly represented. He can choose no other course of action because his constituents must be fairly represented.

Good legislation can only be passed if the government demonstrates that the status quo is inadequate: that there is reason for change, either a need to which legislation must respond or a goal which is desirable.

An excellent parliamentary debate will pit a government that demonstrates the necessity for change against an opposition that demands that any change be feasible, affordable, responsible, unavoidable, ethical and more desirable than the status quo. Excellent opposition will cast doubt on the government case for all of these reasons.

A heckle is an impromptu stage whisper that anyone can utter at any time in a parliamentary debate. An excellent heckle is a thing of beauty. But it is seldom heard. It should be brief, witty, pertinent, spontaneous, well observed and damaging. It is not cynical or sarcastic and it does not lower the tone. An excellent heckle will cause the speaker, the members of the house, the pages, the press gallery and the janitor to smile.

## Thirty-Six Rules, functions and Fallacies

### Rules and Symbols for Logic In Argument

Logic in speech can be deductive, non-deductive or inductive. Premises may be proven true or false or assumed to be true. Arguments are sound if and only if the premises are true *and* the argument is valid (that is that the conclusion necessarily follows from the premises). The tables below list the symbols that are used in formal logic, and the rules for their usage, and the rules of deduction for sentence logic.

Truth function connectives and compounds					
name of connective	symbol	name of symbol	connective patterned on	compound	rule for use of symbol
negation	~	tilde	not'	~P'	compound is T iff the compound is F; it is F iff the component is T
conjunction	&	ampersand	and'	P & Q'	Compound is T iff both compents are T; other wise it is F
disjunction	v	wedge	or' (non-exclusive)	P v Q'	Compound is F iff both components are F; otherwise it is T
conditional	->'	arrow	if - then'	P>Q'	Compound is F iff the antecedent is true and the consquent is flase; otherwise it is T
biconditional	< - >	double arrow	if and only if' ('iff')	P <-> Q	Compound is T iff the two components have the same truth value (TT or FF) otherwise it is F

### Natural Deduction rules for sentence logic

Group A		
Rule #	Name	Explanation
1	Modus Ponens	from A -> B and A, to infer B
2	Modus Tollens	from A -> B and ~B, to infer ~A
3	Hypothetical syllogism	from A -> B and B -> C, to infer A -> C
4	Disjunctive Syllogism	from A v B and ~ A, to infer B
5	Addition	from A, to infer A v B



6	Simplification	from A & B, to infer A
7	adjunction	from A and B, to infer A & B
8	Constructive Dilemma	for (A -> B) & (C -> D) and A v C, to infer B v D
<b>Group B</b>		
9	Double Negation	A is interchangeable with $\sim\sim A$
10	Transposition	A -> B is interchangeable with $\sim B \rightarrow \sim A$
11	Commutation	A v B is interchangeable with B v A
		A & B is interchangeable with B & A
12	Association	A v (B v C) is interchangeable with (A v B) v C
		A & (B & C) is interchangeable with (A & B) & C
13	Distribution	A & (B v C) is interchangeable with (A & B) v (A & C)
		A v (B & C) is interchangeable with (A v B) & (A v C)
14	De Morgan's Laws	$\sim(A \& B)$ is interchangeable with $\sim A \vee \sim B$
		$\sim(A \vee B)$ is interchangeable with $\sim A \& \sim B$
15	The Conditional	A -> B is interchangeable with $\sim A \vee B$
16	The Biconditional	A <-> B is interchangeable with (A -> B) & (B -> A)
17	Exportation	(A & B) -> C is interchangeable with A -> (B -> C)
18	Absorbtion	A -> B is interchangeable with A -> (A & B)
19	Tautology	A is interchangeable with A v A
		A is interchangeable with A & A

## Fallacies of Irrelevance

### Argument Ad Baculum

(appeal to the stick)

“The boss will fire you if you don’t agree with him, therefore the boss is always right”.  
This argument reaches a conclusion not because the logic is valid but because the logic has been abandoned to the threat of force!

### Argument Ad Hominem

(to the man)

The *abusive* form makes the character of the person an issue. “David’s argument about poor government funding for education is wrong; look how much alcohol he drinks.” He may be a drunk but his arguments about government funding should be judged on their merits.

The *circumstantial* form makes the circumstances of the person the issue. “David’s argument about poor government funding for education is wrong; look at the great teaching job he has.”

In both cases the fallacy attacks the man not the argument.

## **Ad Ignorantiam**

(from Ignorance)

This fallacy argues that a premise should be rejected because it has not been proved or that it should be accepted because it has not been disproved. “Aliens don’t exist because no one has proved that they do.” Or “Aliens exist because no one has proved that they don’t”

## **Ad misericordiam**

(appeal to pity)

This fallacy tries to gain acceptance of a conclusion by appealing to our sympathy. The defense attorney who argues that their client should be acquitted because they had an unhappy childhood is a good example.

## **Ad Populum**

(to the people)

This fallacy achieves assent to its conclusions by appealing to the emotions, sentiments or prejudices of the crowd.

## **Ad verecundiam**

(appeal to authority)

This fallacy argues that we should agree with the conclusions about a first area when reached by a person of noted authority in different area. Tiger woods can endorse golf balls with some authority, but when he endorses a breakfast cereal he is outside his area of confidence.

## **Fallacies of Accident**

This fallacy argues from the exception to prove the rule, or from the rule to prove the exception. For example we could argue that David never studies and yet he gets straight “A’s”. Therefore we don’t need to study. The fact is that David is brilliant and most people are not. Most people still need to study. The converse would be: Everybody needs to study. Therefore David should study. Here the fact remains that David is the exception: he is still brilliant and doesn’t need to study.

## **Complex questions**

This fallacy consists of asking two questions as if they were one and often on insisting on a yes or no answer. “Will students ever stop behaving irresponsibly?” needs to be broken into two questions: “Are students irresponsible?” and if some are “will the irresponsible students stop behaving that way?”

## **Petitio Principii**

Begging the question

This is a fallacious argument in which the conclusion is also one of the premises. It is also called a circular argument. In part it is committed when we ask complex questions in which the conclusion is in the premise. It can be subtle, however, in the instance of tests and surveys in which the results are predetermined by the questions.

## **Ignoratio Elenchi**

Arguing beside the point

When counting your change to see if you can take a bus, you could reach the conclusion that you cannot take a taxi, but it would be beside the point; you still want to know if you can pay to take a bus.

## **Fallacies of Ambiguity**

A word or expression is ambiguous in a particular context if 1) it has more than one meaning; 2) the meanings are easily confused and 3) it is not clear in that context which of the meanings is intended. Ambiguous terms cause problems when they occur in arguments.

## **Equivocation**

This fallacy is committed when the ambiguous term shifts senses within the same argument. What has been established with respect to one sense of the term is then wrongly regarded as having been proved with respect to another. “happiness is the end of life; the end of life is death therefore happiness is death” is an example where the ambiguous term “end” is used with different senses,

## **Composition and Division**

This is a specific type of equivocation that occurs when terms that correctly apply to the whole or to groups are applied to the individuals who make up the group. “The average

American family has two and one half children” is an example. The fallacy of Division occurs when a person argues that what is collectively true for the whole or the class is equally true for the individual members. The fallacy of composition occurs when the opposite happens; when a person argues that what is true for the individuals is true for the group or the whole: because an orchestra (distributively) consists of first rate musicians does not mean the orchestra (collectively) is first rate.

## **Amphiboly**

This fallacy occurs when entire sentences are ambiguous because of ambiguous usage within them. “Can you spell backwards?” is amphibolous because it is not clear whether backwards is a word to be spelled or a direction in which to spell.

## **Accent**

This ambiguity occurs simply through the use of accent or stress in emphasis on different words. “The best of all possible worlds” is an example of ambiguity that depends upon the emphasis the speaker gives to “best” or “possible”.

## **16 Rules of Order**

A good way to begin a speaking course is to get random suggestions for topics to discuss from the floor. Collect about ten, listening for good ones. Then ask the person who suggested each idea to speak briefly about it. Cut them off if they go on too long, help them get to the point and summarize. Then ask if anyone else thinks the issue is important enough to consider spending more time developing. Introduce the notion of **seconding a motion**. Explain that a topic cannot even be incorporated into discussion unless at least two people, the mover and the seconder, think it is important enough to discuss. Now you suggest that the student who suggested the topic **move** that “idea 1 be discussed in greater detail”; ask for a seconder; record the mover and seconder; ask if there is further discussion before you **‘call the question’** and pause to make some explanations:

Explain that when a motion is on the floor and you agree with the motion, you do not have to speak to the motion if others have already voiced your feelings unless you hear so much negative criticism that you fear the motion may not pass, in which case you come to its defense.

Explain that when a motion is on the floor then that motion is the sole topic of discussion. Anybody may speak once to the motion and may get additional clarification

following on from their initial speech. The **mover** speaks twice: they introduce and conclude.

Governments and businesses move forward by **passing motions: motions are the units of action.**

Explain that if there is no discussion of a seconded motion, then the moderator will **call the question**, you will vote and the motion will pass or fail. Explain further that the process can happen very quickly when motions are not contentious. The rules of order make for efficiency and your challenge in teaching public speaking is to make sure that you use time well.

Now return to the motion, which has been seconded: Clarify the specific wording of the motion: repeat it formally and ask if there is any discussion. Coordinate the discussion, if there is any. Use your discretion in letting discussion develop until it becomes either repetitive or banal. Rule repetitive or off-topic discussion: **out of order**. Explain this to your group. You may have to have a time limit for discussion so that you can get on with the meeting, but as a teaching strategy it is wise to let animated discussions continue and to draw in non-participants. The rules mean that everybody has the right to speak but not the right to dominate the meeting, be repetitive or ramble on. Students acquire confidence by speaking publicly so it is wise to let them. You'll either get more good discussion, or not: then say: "There being no further discussion I am going to call the question: Those in favour of putting the motion (repeat the motion here) on the agenda for further serious discussion please so signify by saying "Yay", those opposed say "Nay" , abstentions : ? The motion is therefore carried (or defeated)".

Next topic: now do the same thing with all ten of your topics for discussion. You can make this fun to do and encourage participants to play up the Yays and Nays. Your challenge at this stage is to keep people involved in analyzing and speaking to different topics, staying on topic, not wasting time and generally in breaking down the audiences inhibitions such that they become participants rather than witnesses. Remember too that at this stage you are not discussing or developing any particular topic in any depth but rather allowing the group to create topics and then select the most pertinent one. You are going to develop some sophisticated strategies as the seminar progresses so it is important to keep the very basic rules for an oral meeting clear at the outset and to use the process outlined above to winnow out several topics (you won't need many) that justify further development and discussion.

Once you've decided upon the topics you are going to discuss it is a good time to give a brief overview of Definitions. When you return to your list of topics you are going to redefine them using what you have learned about definitions.

## **Redefining Topics for Discussion**

Having presented strategies for developing definitions you are now in a position to go back to the list of topics that were moved, seconded and given a preliminary definition. Poll your group to list the topics in order of importance, working on the theory that the most important issue is the one about which most of the group have some opinion. Start with the number one topic. Get someone to read out a dictionary definition of the topic. This is a lexical definition. Ask the group if this is what they meant. With a little prodding

they will admit that it really doesn't capture the issue. Now go on to encourage and coordinate discussion providing the best stipulative, explicative, ostensive and real definitions that the group can provide. Don't tell them the names of the definitions until after they've provided it. Once the group is clear that they understand and can express the topic they wish to discuss you are in position to actually begin discussion, but to do so you will need a motion on the floor. Your goal is to work towards the specific wording for a motion or a series of motions dealing with different aspects of the topic that you have been defining. Remember that the purpose of a motion is to get something done, therefore the motion should recommend doing something to change the way things are.

Now you are in a position to moderate a forum in which everybody in the room has the right to say something supporting or opposing the motion. Remember that the motion itself is one that they have already agreed to as being the most important. It is also one about which your audience has the most knowledge because they have all been party to the process of defining it. You are creating an environment where people are at ease to speak their minds and where they feel that they have something to say.

## **Putting it all together**

### **Practice what you preach**

When your audience and you understand more clearly what you want to talk about, not in terms of conclusions you have reached or positions you have taken, but more importantly and simply in terms issues you have identified and defined, you are in a position to take a break and explain case analysis to your audience.

In reviewing goals, needs, comparative benefits, criteria, status quo and patch and repair strategies you will be able to discuss your selected topic and enjoin selected discussion of it from your audience. At the same time you show them how to develop these case strategies themselves. By the time you have reviewed the different strategies and focused superficially upon your topic each time, you will have created an enriched environment where your audience knows better how to think, understands more clearly what the topic means and can respond more confidently when given the mandate to put a motion on the floor and discuss it.

As you start to discuss things you will be able to introduce your audience to some other "rules of order". An agenda has a very simple logical structure:

- A call to order gets everyone's attention;
- A roll call discovers who is present;
- A declaration of quorum acknowledges that there are enough members present (according to the constitution) to proceed with the meeting;
- A motion to pay expenses mandates that the group will pay for the meeting;
- Business carried forward or tabled from previous meetings needs to be resolved;

- Business correspondence that has occurred between the last meeting and this one needs to be entered into the record.

Three functions must be performed:

- some one must chair the meeting,
- the finances must be kept,
- the meeting must be recorded and there should be a backup.

A chairperson, a treasurer and a secretary need to be appointed.

- The treasurer's report needs to be read discussed and
- motions need to be made concerning business arising or its adoption.
- The secretary should have circulated the minutes from the last meeting so that everybody knows where they left off.
- The president will provide a report, usually on the status quo and
- the chairperson will introduce call for the authors of agenda items to speak to them.
- A motion to adjourn is not debatable and need only a seconder for the question to be called, at any time in a meeting. The reason for this is to protect the voting members at any meeting from being blindsided or cornered into making discussions about issues with which they are uncomfortable and need more time to resolve. If a majority wants to stop the meeting they can do so at any time.
- The majority will be defined in the constitution of the business.

You can even develop a constitution, a bill of rights for your audience! Define a quorum. Set standards of decorum. Get your audience to become a team by including them in the process that defines their rights and responsibilities.

## **Facilitating the Seminar and Reaching Conclusions**

Defining topics, understanding and discussing levels of language and audience expectations, teaching your audience how to develop case strategies, encouraging the creative side to think outside the box, varying points of view, developing a forum in which your audience is at ease to participate, keeping order and focus: all of these skills are part of the public speakers arsenal. The speaker uses these tools to engage to audience by making topics real, interesting and relevant.

The focus of presentations is usually predetermined by the speaker in consultation with the organizers of an event. In a high technology workshop for three hundred employees from all levels of a corporation, for example, I undertook to educate the audience about innovation and patent opportunities and to create an enriched and 'easy' environment in which employees would become better team players. I further undertook to generate a list of innovation opportunities to produce more revenues. I divided the attendees up

into groups, first by department, and I then cross-pollinated departments by dividing the seminar into new groups with diverse members. I challenged the new group members to enlighten each other about the opportunities for innovation from within their departments. I then had the original groups re-form with the mandate that each member should report back to the group upon the innovation ideas and opportunities that had come from their first meetings with members of other departments. The outcome was to be a list of innovation opportunities presented by each department. I collated all this material in a break and gave copies to everyone. I then undertook to solicit for a realistic appraisal and ranking of opportunities. I then created group leaders to chair meetings to discuss and make recommendations about actions the company could undertake to be more innovative. These study groups were made up of employees from a full cross section of departments who were this time selected because they had voiced interest or had specific areas of expertise in particular innovations. The outcomes the seminar had undertaken to provide were an employee list of innovation opportunities; a company with more interdepartmental cross-pollination and better team spirit. I needed to bring together and re-focus a company that needed more revenues fast.

## Appendices

### After-Dinner Speaking

1.1) Each speaker must deliver an address that is designed to entertain as well as to inform. It should be the sort of speech that would be given after the annual dinner for some group of the speaker's choice. It should not be just a stand-up comedy routine.

1.2) Notes must be limited to one card, and should be used as little as possible.

1.3) The speaker must address an imaginary audience of his choosing (e.g. the left handed society or the dental association). He may have the chairman identify his audience immediately prior to his speech or he may do so himself at the start of his speech. No props may be used.

1.4) Each competitor must speak for 5 minutes. There will be a time penalty of 2 points for speeches which are up to 30 seconds under 4 minutes or up to 30 seconds over 6 minutes. There will be a time penalty of 10 points for speeches under 3 minutes and 30 seconds or over 6 minutes and 30 seconds.

1.5) Salutation is optional.



## Persuasive Speaking

2.1) This speech is designed to persuade and must be on a serious topic, although this does not mean that humour and wit might not be useful at points in the speech.

2.2) A problem/solution approach must be taken, i.e. speakers must identify a problem (it need not be an earth-shattering one) and propose, or at least examine, one or more solutions to it.

2.3) Speeches should be prepared beforehand and should be from 7 to 13 minutes in length.

2.4) Props may not be used. If notes are used, only a single index card of notes is allowed, although competitors should bear in mind the fact that judges tend to be more impressed by speakers who do not use notes.

2.5) There must be a persuasive element to the speech, although this may take a number of forms. For example, the persuasive aspect might be in convincing the audience that a problem does in fact exist, or in convincing them of the causes of the problem, or that the speaker's proposed solution will solve the problem.

2.6) There will be a time penalty of 2 points for speeches which are up to 30 seconds under 7 minutes or up to 30 seconds over 13 minutes. There will be a time penalty of 10 points for speeches under 6 minutes and 30 seconds over 13 minutes and 30 seconds.

2.7) Salutation is optional.

## Interpretive Reading

3.1) Each participant should read (not recite) a passage of prose or poetry (or a collection of poems), serious or humorous, with an appropriate brief introduction. The piece(s) must have been published. Past efforts have included everything from Dr. Seuss to George Orwell.

3.2) Judges will be concerned with how much the reader's voice and presentation add to the material rather than with the talent of the author.

3.3) Please note that this is a reading, not a dramatic presentation. While the use of facial expressions and gestures is encouraged where appropriate, they should not distract from the primary emphasis in this category. Competitors may stand or sit but should not move around excessively.

- 3.4) The time limits are from 7 to 13 minutes, including a brief introduction of 30 to 60 seconds. The introduction should give the background of the author and the work, and some indication of the particular interest or appeal of the selection.
- 3.5) There will be a time penalty of 2 points for speeches which are up to 30 seconds under 7 minutes or up to 30 seconds over 13 minutes. There will be a time penalty of 10 points for speeches under 6 minutes and 30 seconds or over 13 minutes and 30 seconds.
- 3.6) Salutation is optional.

## Dramatic Interpretation

- 4.1) This is a memorised selection chosen from plays which are of literary merit and which have been published. In rare cases the selection may be from short stories, novels or essays of literary merit.
- 4.2) A simple costume and one prop are permitted but are not mandatory.
- 4.3) The host school will provide a stage area where possible, but the prop and costume, if used are the responsibility of the competitor.
- 4.4) The time limits are from 50 to 12 minutes, including a brief introduction of 30 to 60 seconds. The introduction should give the background of the author and the work, and some indication of the particular interest or appeal of the selection.
- 4.5) There will be a time penalty of 2 points for speeches which are up to 30 seconds under 5 minutes or up to 30 seconds over 12 minutes. There will be a time penalty of 10 points for speeches under 4 minutes and 30 seconds or over 12 minutes and 30 seconds.
- 4.6) Salutation is optional.

## Cross-Examination Debating

- 5.1) This event involves a cross-examination debate on a prepared topic. All teams will debate both sides of the topic.
- 5.2) The topic will be announced at least one month prior to the tournament, unless circumstances make it impossible to do so.
- 5.3) Schools entering this event must enter a full team, i.e. two students. The team will debate together throughout the competition.
- 5.4) The debates will be conducted according to the attached Rules of Cross-Examination Debate.

## Sample Rules of Cross-Examination Debating

1. There are two two-person teams, designated respectively "Affirmative" and "Negative".
2. If there is a chairman, he or she will open the debate and call upon each speaker in turn. The chairman may be addressed in each speaker's opening salutation as

"Mr." or "Madame Chairman: but need not be addressed otherwise. No salutation is required, but it is customary for each speaker to begin each speech with some polite form of address such as "Mr. Chairman, honourable judges, worthy opponents, ladies and gentlemen", depending upon who is present in the room.

3. Speeches are addressed to an audience consisting of the judges and all other persons in the room. Other debaters are customarily referred to in the third person during speeches, either by name ("Sally Jones said in her constructive speech...") or by title ("The first negative speaker argued that..."). In cross-examination, debaters address each other directly ("Did you say...").
4. Each speaker delivers a constructive speech and cross-examines one member of the opposing team.
5. Following his/her constructive speech, each speaker must submit to cross-examination by the member of the opposing team who is not speaking next.
6. All speakers are allotted equal amounts of time for their constructive speeches and their cross-examination respectively.
7. *Constructive Speeches*
  - Each team must present its main lines of argument (its "case") and the principal evidence supporting each in the course of its two constructive speeches.
  - The members of each team may divide between them the labour of presenting the case in any way they see fit.
  - Any constructive speech (except the first affirmative) may also include explicit attacks upon the case of the opposing team and explicit replies to attacks made by their opponents.
8. *Cross-Examination*
  - The purpose of cross-examination is to allow each team the opportunity to elicit damaging admissions from its opponents regarding their case. These admissions may then be used against them in subsequent speeches.
  - Each speaker seeks to elicit these admissions by asking questions of the opposing speaker whom he/she is assigned to cross-examine. The person being examined is required to respond to these questions in some way. Both questioner and respondent should avoid speeches. Questions may be based on statements made earlier in the debate, on arguments which the questioner expects his/her partner to present, or on any topic, which the questioner thinks, may bring his/her side advantage, regardless of its apparent relevance to the debate. Questions may not, however, be personal ("Do you use drugs?").
  - The questioner may not demand simple "yes" or "no" answers. The subject has the right to explain any answer briefly, but is forbidden to stall or filibuster. If the respondent is answering at inordinate length, the questioner may interrupt (as courteously as possible) in order to continue the line of questioning.

## 9. *Rebuttal*

- The purpose of rebuttal speeches is to give both teams the opportunity to summarise their cases, defend them from attacks by opponents, and press attacks upon their opponents.
- New lines of argument may not be introduced in rebuttals. Exception: In the first affirmative rebuttal, which follows two successive negative speeches, the speaker may deal with new issues raised in either of these negative speeches, even if this requires a new line of argument.

In general, the introduction of substantial items of new evidence should be avoided in rebuttals. Exception: If the second negative constructive or the first negative rebuttal speaker has demanded additional evidence on any point in the affirmative case, the first affirmative rebuttal speaker may respond accordingly.

#### 10. Evidence

- Both teams are expected to support their major lines of argument with sufficient evidence to make them logically persuasive.
- Evidence may consist of facts, statistics, and/or authoritative opinions drawn from published or publicly accessible sources (not private conversations, personal letters, or similar sources). Debaters may assert that some facts are "general knowledge", but judges must decide for themselves what value, if any, to attribute to such assertions.
- Debaters should always be prepared to document the source of any evidence. It is customary, but not mandatory, to cite the source of most evidence when it is introduced in a speech.
- Evidence may never be fabricated or deliberately misrepresented. A debater who is shown to have done so may be disqualified from further competition.

#### 11. Definitions

- It is the duty and privilege of the affirmative team to make clear at the beginning of the debate as precisely as possible how it construes the resolution. This may be done by defining each key term individually, by paraphrasing the resolution as a whole, and/or by presenting the plan by which the affirmative proposes to implement the resolution.
- In prepared cross-examination debates, definitions should embody the standard meanings of the terms of the resolution in contemporary public discourse. Creative, novel, or whimsical definitions are not appropriate. The affirmative must construe the resolution in such a way as to make it debatable. They may not construe it as a tautology or a truism.
- The negative may challenge the definitions offered by the affirmative only at the beginning of the first negative speech and only on the grounds that the definition does not meet the requirements set out in the previous rule. The judges must decide at the end of the debate whether such a challenge is warranted. Meanwhile, the negative may either attempt under protest to make its case under the definitions offered by the previous rule

and make its case under them. If the negative does not challenge the definitions offered by the affirmative at the beginning of the first negative speech, it will be assumed to have accepted them.

## *12. Other Duties and Privileges of the Affirmative and Negative*

**Affirmative:** The affirmative has the burden of proof and the compensating privilege of presenting the opening and closing speeches. The affirmative is not required to offer a plan, but since it is required to show that the resolution is feasible and does not entail significant disadvantages, the affirmative usually chooses to offer a plan – a reasonably detailed description of the way in which the resolution should be implemented – as the most efficient and persuasive way to accomplish these tasks.

**Negative:** The negative enjoys the benefit of presumption. Therefore, debates in which the speaker scores produce a tie are awarded to the negative. Strictly speaking, the negative is not required to "make a case" in order to win, but may confine itself merely to attacks upon the affirmative case. In theory, the negative wins if it mounts a completely successful attack on one major element of the affirmative case. In practice, completely successful attacks are extremely rare. The negative may introduce a counterplan, an alternative proposal. A counterplan must solve the same problems, attain the same goals, or bring about the same advantages as the affirmative claims will be done by the resolution, but by means entirely different from those stated or implied in the resolution. If a counterplan is introduced, it must be in the first negative speech.

## *13. Speaking Times*

### **Constructive Speeches:**

Each constructive speaker is granted a thirty second grace period to finish his/her speech after the allotted time has expired. Judges will disregard anything said after the grace period has ended.

### **Cross-Examination:**

The cross-examiner must stop speaking as soon as the time allotted for cross-examination has expired. If a question has been asked but the time allotted expires before the respondent is able to answer it, the respondent may choose whether to answer it. If he or she chooses to answer, the answer may continue briefly beyond the time.

### **Rebuttals:**

Rebuttal speeches must end as soon as the allotted time for them has expired. There is no grace period. Judges will disregard anything said after time has expired.

#### 14. Other Matters

- Speeches in cross-examination debates may not be interrupted. There are no points of order, personal privilege, or information. Heckling is prohibited.
- Violations of rules, misquotations of opponents, and similar matters may be called to the judges' attention in constructive or rebuttal speeches, or occasionally in cross-examination. Judges will rule on these matters at the end of the debate and should consider them as they decide the outcome of the debate. The chairman has no role in such rulings.
- If there is no chairman, the judge (or chief judge if there is more than one) will begin the debate by recognising the first affirmative speaker. Thereafter, debates should speak in turn without formal recognition.
- The team with the highest total number of speaker points must always be the team that wins the debate. If the two teams' total number of speaker points are tied, the negative team must win.

#### Parliamentary Debating

5.1) The debates will be impromptu, co-ordinate debates in parliamentary style. Each team will consist of two debaters who have been paired randomly but who are not from the same school.

5.2) A list of topics will be presented to the teams 30 minutes before the start of the debate. One team (designated on the schedule) will choose the topic, after which the other team will select the side that it will take. Different lists of topics will be used for each round. During the preliminary rounds, each debater will choose the topic once and the side once.

5.3) Government teams will prepare in the rooms allocated for each debate. The opposition teams will prepare outside of the room 15 minutes prior to the start of the debate, the opposition will get the definition from the government. If the opposition feels that the government definition is undebatable, it must appeal to the tournament director, whose decision is final. The definition may not be changed or challenged during the debate.

5.4) The length and order of speeches are as follows:

Prime Minister.....	5 minutes
First Opposition Speaker .....	8 minutes
Minister of the Crown.....	8 minutes
Leader of the Opposition.....	8 minutes
Prime Minister's Rebuttal.....	3 minutes

30 seconds grace will be allowed for each debater, after which the Speaker shall terminate his speech. There is no minimum time for speeches, nor are there any time penalties.

5.5) The debates will be governed by the attached Rules of Parliamentary Debate. However, since different parts of the country have different debating

traditions, picayune quibbling over rules is not encouraged. Debaters are advised to debate the resolutions and not the rules.

5.6) The results of the debate will be based entirely upon speaker's points. Win/loss records are irrelevant.

5.7) Heckling and parliamentary points are allowed but should not be so frequent that they prevent the opposing debater from having a fair opportunity to speak. Debaters from the West Coast may find that there is far less heckling, etc. than they are used to.

5.8) Debaters will have a different partner for each of the 2 preliminary rounds.

## Sample Rules of Parliamentary Debate

1. The debate will be presided over by Mr. or Madam Speaker.
2. The government team (the side in favour) shall sit on the right hand side of the Speaker. The Opposition (the side against) shall sit on the left side.
3. The speaking order will be as follows: the Prime Minister, followed by the first Opposition member then the Minister of the Crown (second Government speaker) and followed by the Leader of the Opposition (second Opposition speaker). Finally the Prime Minister will deliver the Government rebuttal.
4. Maximum speaking times are 5 minutes for the Prime Minister's first speech, 8 minutes for the other speeches and 3 minutes for the Prime Minister's rebuttal. There are no minimum times.
5. During the rebuttal, members (debaters) may not bring up any new arguments or new evidence except in direct refutation of material, which has already been presented.
6. All remarks must be addressed to the Speaker of the House and not to anyone else, e.g. say "Mr. Speaker" not "Mr. Speaker, honourable judges". The member must address Mr. Speaker in his/her sentence.
7. Other members (debaters and members of the audience) should be referred to by their constituency (e.g. the Member for their last name or their city), office (e.g. the Prime Minister) or as "The Honourable Member" or "The Honourable Gentlemen" or "The Honourable Lady". They may be referred to as "he" or "she" but never as "you".
8. Members will speak only when called upon by the Speaker, except for points of order, privilege and heckles.
9. Points of order are raised when the person speaking has broken the rules of the house. Typical reasons for points of order are going significantly overtime, failure to address Mr. Speaker, addressing someone other than Mr. Speaker (e.g. referring to your opponents as you), using inappropriate language or introducing new arguments in the rebuttal. Points of Order do NOT include the debater putting his hands in his pockets, not wearing a tie or jacket or speaking from somewhere other than his/her side of the House.

10. Points of privilege are raised if a member has been misquoted, significantly misrepresented or personally insulted.
11. Points of order or points of privilege are raised while another member has the floor (i.e. is speaking). If a member wishes to raise a point of order or privilege, he/she should stand and say "Point of order, Mr. Speaker" or "Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker". The person who was delivering his/her speech must stop talking and Mr Speaker will ask the member what the point is. The member raising the point should state it as briefly as possible. The Speaker will then rule it well taken or not well taken. The member who was delivering his/her speech will then continue it, taking appropriate action if the point was ruled well taken (e.g. if he/she had not addressed Mr. Speaker, he/she should do so or if he/she was introducing new arguments in his/her rebuttal, he should stop doing so). The time taken to raise a point is not included as part of the member's speaking time.
12. Points should neither be too frequent nor trivial.
13. Heckles are brief comments from other members, usually but not necessarily witty. They should not be so frequent that the member does not have a fair chance to speak.
14. The government must define the resolution. Their definition must be accepted unless it is undebatable or unreasonable. If the Opposition wishes to challenge the definition they must do so prior to the start of the debate by appealing to the tournament organiser. The opposition must show that the government's definition is unacceptable and then substitute their own. Definitions may not be challenged during the debate.
15. The government may introduce a plan for implementing the resolution if they wish to, but they are not required to do so. If they do propose a plan, they must fully explain it during the Prime Minister's speech.
16. If, and only if, the government introduces a plan, the opposition may introduce a counterplan, but it is not required to do so. A counterplan is an alternative method of implementing the resolution which is significantly different from the government plan and is demonstrably better than the government plan. If the opposition wants to introduce a counterplan, they must fully explain it during the address of their first speaker.
17. Props (e.g. drawings, models) may not be used.
18. Courtesy must be shown to all other members at all times.

## Newscast

- 7.1) Each participant will be given an issue of a newspaper. After 30 minutes preparation, he must deliver, from original manuscript, a 4 minute 'top of the hour' radio news broadcast. Judging will be on the basis of the selection of news, clarity of presentation, originality, use of voice, credibility and adherence to time.
- 7.2) The host school will provide an isolated facility for the competitors to use as a preparation room. The host school will also endeavour to provide a variety of



newspapers for the different rounds, including an international and a local paper, providing always that all competitors in a given round are furnished with identical material.

7.3) No part of the manuscript may be prepared in advance, and the competitor may not cut and paste sections of the newspaper into his manuscript.

7.4) Weather reports, sports news, interviews and editorials are acceptable, at the student's discretion and provided that they are based on the material found in the paper. No advertisements are permitted.

7.5) No eye contact is expected between the competitor and the judges, since this is a radio newscast. The judges may choose to sit with their backs to the competitor.

7.6) Each competitor must speak for 4 minutes. There will be time penalty of 10 points for speeches under 3 minutes and 45 seconds or over 4 minutes and 15 seconds. There will be a time penalty of 25 points for speeches under 3 minutes and 30 seconds or over 4 minutes and 30 seconds.

7.7) Salutation is optional.

## Extemporaneous Speaking

8.1 time: 3 to 5 minutes

8.2 Each participant will draw three topics and choose one, 30 minutes before speaking.

8.3 Topics will be based on major and international stories covered in newspapers, news magazines and on-line news sources during the six months prior to the tournament.

8.4 Topics will be framed in question form.

8.5 The host school will provide an isolated facility for the competitors to use as a 'preparation room'

8.6 Competitors may not bring in any research material nor will the host school provide any research material.

8.7 Their speeches must be based on their own knowledge of the subject.

8.8 During the speech, a competitor may refer only to notes prepared during the preparation period.

8.9 These notes must be on a 3 x 5 index card.

8.10 The host school will provide the card.

8.11 The speaker will have 3 to 5 minutes to speak.

8.12 There will be a time penalty of 2 points for speeches which are up to 30 seconds under 3 minutes or up to 30 seconds over 5 minutes.

8.13 There will be a time penalty of 10 points for speeches under 2 minutes and 30 seconds or over 5 minutes and 30 seconds.

## Impromptu Speaking

9.1 time: 3 to 5 minutes

9.2 Each speaker will draw three topics, which may be words, quotations, phrases, statements or some combination of the four.

- 9.3 The speaker then has two minutes to prepare, during which time they must decide which of the three they will speak on and to prepare comments.
- 9.4 Competitors may sit or stand while preparing, but must remain in the room.
- 9.5 Competitors may make notes, although these may not be used when speaking.
- 9.6 Competitors may speak in favour of the topic, against it or about it.
- 9.7 Competitors may interpret the topic within reason however, they must deal with the topic that they have been given and not use a previously prepared speech on a barely related theme.
- 9.8 Wit, humour, philosophy, sentiment or absurdity, are all equally welcome.
- 9.9 Judges will be looking for agility of thought, for "meat on the bones", for organisational ability and, above all, for the ability of each speaker to communicate with style and originality.
- 9.10 Competitors must speak as themselves and not adopt a persona nor must they be seen to be making use of previously prepared material.
- 9.11 At the end of the speech, competitors must hand the topics back to the chairman and the chair' must then read out the topic that was chosen.
- 9.12 Each competitor must speak for 3 to 5 minutes.
- 9.13 There will be time penalty of 2 points for speeches up to 15 seconds under 3 minutes or up to 15 seconds over 5 minutes.
- 9.14 There will be a time penalty of 10 points for speeches over 5 minutes and 15 seconds or from 16 to 30 seconds under 3 minutes and a time penalty of 25 points for speeches under 2 minutes and 30 seconds.
- 9.15 Salutation is optional.

## **A Guide to Hosting a Debate and Speaking Tournament**

### **One Year Before**

At the AGM from **the previous year** you should get the current list of all the member schools. You should also assemble a package of the event descriptions, rules, rule changes and any other useful materials that the previous tournament has provided. There are many telephone numbers, cards, connections and ideas to be gleaned at the previous year's tournament.

### **Five Months Before**

Before schools break in **June** you should send out an initial contact letter to all schools. This initial invitation should solicit an 'intent to attend' response. You should

not however expect hard responses from everyone until September. Many schools must generate funds to attend this event so sending a letter that staff can use to attract the attention of their administration is important. School letterhead/IISPSL letterhead and perhaps a covering letter from your headmaster/mistress is not a bad idea.

## **One month Before**

In **early September** you should send another formal invitation / follow-up letter to all schools. You should request a response by early October (give a date). In many schools there is so much going on in the first few weeks of school that to expect an earlier response is unrealistic. You can however ask for an 'intent to attend' response early and a detailed response later.

## **Information You Will Need**

The information **you need to provide** should include:

- a) All the event descriptions and entry regulations. *See Appendix One*
- b) All the rules, times, penalties and procedures. *See Appendix Two*
- c) The Dates of the event. The arrival and departure dates.
- d) A working draft of the schedule, including free time and an insight into the number of meals that are likely to be provided.
- e) The addresses and contact numbers of the tournament organizer and the school.

The information **you need to solicit** should include:

- a) **From the students:** Name, sex, age, School address, Home Address, home contact#, school contact#, dietary preferences, allergies, Health plan #, Extended Health plan # (if necessary), Parent/student signature on Liability waiver, statement of willingness to be billeted, statement of willingness to pay for hotel if not billeted.
- b) **From the coach:** School Name, Coaches name, Coaches contact numbers (telephone/fax/internet home and school), Registration fee, event entries for all of the team members, request for information or assurances regarding the adequacy of the school's liability insurance, and (ASAP) Flight #s, arrival and departure times.

## **Some advice concerning husbandry of judges and event quirks**

Each room needs at least three judges, preferably more, to hear and evaluate each speaker. Some events are more judge efficient than others.

Cross examination debate is your least efficient event and will require your judges to hear four speakers in one debate in approximately one hour. Judges do not do well listening for much more time. Don't burn out your judges; you want them to be your friends. Only give them one debate to do. Also your total number of participants must be divisible by four, otherwise teams will have to have byes, and that is undesirable.

Parliamentary Debate, Dramatic interpretation and Interpretive Reading are next least efficient in terms of numbers of contestants per judge.

The traditions of Parliamentary Debate vary enormously. In the West students rise, and frequently, on points of order, information and privilege (and they heckle too !) while students from Manitoba and Ontario deliver their speeches in a style akin to Oxford or Cambridge Academic Debate (virtually no interruptions), New England students are in the middle and the Brits, Bahamians and Cypriots are in the middle: you must make clear in your briefings to the judges and the competitors which styles are appropriate ! Parliamentary debate will use up your component of judges in fifty minutes. If you have 32 debaters you will need eight rooms and at least twenty four judges (three per room) to complete one round.

Dramatic Interpretation is your showcase event and if you wish to reward or impress patrons, invite them to the finals. This event also profits from an audience: situate it in your largest venue and encourage students, billets, the press and members of the physics dept. to attend; it may change their point of view. Again, this can be a long event and don't expect your judges to hear more than five competitors an hour.

Interpretive Reading can also be a long event, so reckon on no more than six competitors per hour per room. At the judges briefing they need to be reminded that they should listen more than they watch, but that they must ascertain that the competitor is actually reading the piece and not reciting it!

Persuasive Speaking is not much more efficient, perhaps less, and can be a little demanding for judges as the material is usually serious, so don't expect your group of judges to listen to more than six per room.

After Dinner speaking is great fun, can be unpredictably bawdy, tawdry or very entertaining. As it is After Dinner Speaking, trying to schedule it after dinners is a good idea, like Dramatic Interpretation, After Dinner thrives on an audience and I tried at least to schedule the finals to occur in front of an audience.

Your impromptu events (impromptu, extemporaneous and radio newscast) are your most efficient events and you can expect to hear perhaps ten contestants per hour per room. Remember to order copies of newspapers you intend to use well in advance because it is often very difficult to get fifty copies of two different newspapers. The

logistics of running impromptu events are more difficult and require sequential releasing of topics and, in the case of Radio Newscast, some seclusion for preparation. See the enclosed moderator's instructions.

Allow time for change-over between events and provide a lounge and food: interaction between the adults who do the judging makes the event far more enjoyable for them.

The coaches are a great asset. Don't overuse them as judges and try to arrange their schedules so that they have 'spares' in blocks of time which can be useful to them. Most of the coaches are very experienced and you should spread them evenly throughout all the rooms when you use them. If your other judges are novices, and in small towns this is unavoidable, then you can use your coaches scores as a norm in case there is a difficulty with ballots. The executive of IIPSL can assist you with spoiled ballots or judicial stupidity. In your judges briefings you should try to establish what type of performance in a particular event warrants a specific range of scores. One old curmudgeon judge who gives a grade of 65 to the top student in the tournament can wipe that student out completely and if his score is more than approximately 20 % off the average of the other judges scores, particularly if it is way out of wack with one of your coach's scores, then it should probably be discarded. As tournament organizer, you have the right to throw out any deviant ballots; but it is probably more prudent, politic and less worry for you to ask the executive to do it. In any case, your scorekeepers should be given the parameters of deviance (I quite like that term) so they can alert you to any problems. Remember that the top overall school award is decided from the results of the preliminary rounds, while the individual event winners are decided from the final rounds.

### **Billets, schedules and the arrival package and procedures.**

a) The Students: Upon arrival the students should receive a package which includes the schedule of events, their specific events, their billet's names, addresses and telephone numbers, specific instructions about arrival and departure times for pick-up, drop-off with billets, a map of the school, a letter of welcome (which might well include a section concerning behaviour), other information concerning the host town, contact #'s at the host school and at the coach's hotel.

b) The Coach: The coach should have all the information which the student's have, specifically including all of billets' contact #'s. The coach will also need a schedule of pick-up/drop-off times and locations to get to and from the hotel. The coach should have a judging schedule too.

c) The Billets: The host families should have a letter of thanks, a schedule of pick-up/drop-off times and locations, a schedule of events, the contact #s for the school,

the organizer and the coaches; and the names, schools, sexes, ages, dietary preferences and medical information of the student/s they will be billeting.

d) The Judges: should get a schedule of events, including the names of the competitors; a schedule of briefings; a map of the school; copies of the rules for the events they are judging and a letter of thanks.

## **Operations Central**

If you can put all of your data regarding students, coaches, judges, billets, times, locations, events and moderators on one open data base you will be able to tell anyone where to go and you will be able to find who is missing. You will be able to tell which judge is missing a ballot and you will know which moderators to contact for support. You will need to provide an information officer who is always at the same location (marked on the maps and appearing in the schedules for everyone). That person answers questions and gets people to the right locations. It should not be your job as tournament organizer to spend all your time doing this work. You will also need a problem solver who will be in charge of the rooms and to whom the moderators will report if there are missing judges, competitors or if there is other confusion. Your score room should not be Operations Central. Moderators should be responsible for double checking all ballots and delivering them in person to the score room at the conclusion of each round. The score room should have all schedules so that they can find missing ballots, judges and moderators. You should probably refer all rule violations and procedural wrangles to the executive who can solve these issues for you.

## **Boats and Trains and Planes:**

You should probably let all the participating schools make their own arrangements regarding initial arrival at the school and final departures. It is not really worth the trouble to try to co-ordinate the many variables when the schools are really better left to their own devices.

## **Awards:**

Schools like to have some hardware to show that their participation in this quite expensive tournament is justified. First, second and third for each individual event; Trophies for the top ten overall competitors and for the top five school teams, and trophies for the top three overall under 16 competitors are all appropriate. IISPSL has several perpetual trophies which may or may not have been returned or awarded in the

previous years: check with last years organizers and with the executive. Do not worry about the selection for the competitors who go to the Worlds: the executive will do that.

## **Budget:**

When you make the schedule you will be able to get a pretty good idea of your costs.

Food: count the number of meals you will be providing and multiply by the number of contestants, coaches, chairpersons and judges that you will be feeding. It is always a good idea to offer meals to the judges, if you can: they give up their time and make the tournament work. They really enjoy comparing notes with the other judges and talking to the competitors. Your meals costs vary depending on the facilities at your school. I was able to provide breakfasts at \$3.00/person; lunches for \$4.00/person and dinners for \$6.00/person. The awards banquet came in at \$12.00/person. Remember to keep a common room available and stocked with coffee, juice, donuts and cookies: Judges, coaches, moderators, helpers and competitors snack all day.

The transportation costs vary enormously: if you have a school transportation dept. and can dedicate a bus and driver for coach's transport you can get away with the driver's salary and gas. It was far less expensive for me, and less trouble too, to dedicate a bus for coach's use than it would have been to reimburse everyone for taxis. Any group expeditions will obviously involve more buses and the costs will depend upon your school's bus facilities. Commercial bus rentals are much more expensive.

You will generate a ton of paper: ballots, schedules, booklets etc. and these costs are hard to estimate. 50 sheets of paper per competitor is probably not a bad guesstimate however, so 100 competitors equals about 5000 sheets. Most schools absorb these costs from their operating expenses but if you can figure out your duplicating and paper costs you can work it out pretty easily.

Aside from the perpetual trophies you will probably award about fifty trophies/plaques at approximately \$12.00 each.

Usually there is a major event: theatre, boat trip, circus etc and you can work out costs pretty easily. Remember to add in the coaches, chaperons and other hangers on who attend these functions!

When I hosted the tournament I paid an extra \$300.00 for five days of additional liability insurance, on top of the school's nominally comprehensive coverage. The peace of mind alone was worth the cost. Waivers really don't mean very much and liability is liability: you should speak to your insurer in regards to this issue.

The facilities you will need for the events themselves, at any one time, will vary with the popularity of the events, but as a rule you will need twenty classrooms for a forty school tournament. I had thirty six schools in Victoria and I don't think I ever had to use more than 17 classrooms. 2:1. You will need a big reception area and luggage storage area for arrivals. You will need a 6:00 AM to 2:00 AM lounge with bathroom access, a computer work area with rooms for boxes and boxes of ballots, Change rooms, dining rooms, quiet study areas, secure lock up preparation rooms and stand by

overnight accommodation for stranded billets. Two hundred people tend to take over a school. The head of the school usually hosts a reception.

## **Running the tournament: Moderators Instructions for all events and Room Allocations**

Finding good students to run the events for you is an asset and I enclose a copy of instructions to moderators, speakers, timers and a sample schedule for the event I hosted so you can get some idea how the events flow and how much help your host students can be. I have included sign up sheets for student volunteers too!

### **Instructions: Impromptu**

2 mins. preparation; 3-5mins. to speak.

#### **To start:**

- 1) Make sure all the judges have enough ballots. I'll supply you with plenty. Make sure they know how to fill them in. Be sure they write the students name, his code and #, and the round #.
- 2) If someone appears who is not on your master list: send him to me (probably in the library). If a contestant does not show up 1) ask others in the room if they know where he is; 2) send a swift native runner to me !
- 3) Announce the name of the first speaker and have him write his name/code on the board.
- 4) You will have displayed in front of you nine (9) impromptu topics, face down. Invite the contestant to pick three. He will examine all three. He will choose one, which he will keep. You will take the other two from him, put them in your special box, and replace all three spaces in front of you with three new topics from the supply I give you. Repeat this process for each contestant.
- 4) As soon as the contestant has returned the two topics to you, start your watch; inform him that his two minutes preparation time have started. When two minutes are up: ask him to begin.

#### **Immediately at the conclusion of each speech:**

- 1) Tell the judges the time of the speech



2) Have the next contestant choose his topic; time 2 mins.  
and make sure you return the two unchosen topics to the special box; replace all three with new ones.

3) Let the judges keep all their ballots until the end of the round. Then collect them in yourself. Check to see that they are all clearly and correctly completed and that there are the right number. Take them to the scoring centre. Bring your special box to me.

4) If all this works well you should be able to process one speaker every eight minutes. You should be able to complete your 10 or 11 speakers on time.

There will be approximately 50 impromptu speakers therefore I will need five (5) volunteers from 1:30 to 3:30 on Friday for this event and five (5) volunteers from 1:30 to 3:30 on Saturday:

Friday: (Impromptu)

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Saturday: (Impromptu)

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

## **Extemporaneous Speaking**

30 mins. preparation; 3-5mins. to speak.

1) 30 minutes prior to the start of the actual speaking and before the judges arrive, at approximately 1:30 P.M. on Friday (and Saturday), the Extemporaneous competitors will show up at your room. You will have displayed in front of you nine (9) extemporaneous topics, face down. Invite the contestant to pick three. He will examine all three. He will choose one, which he will keep. You will take the other two from him, put them in your special box, and replace all three spaces in front of you with three new topics from the supply I give you. Repeat this process for each contestant at seven minute intervals until each of your ten or so contestants has chosen one. Note that because the starting time of the speakers is staggered by about seven minutes, some contestants will not have received their topics when the other contestants have begun speaking. It takes two people to administer this event. One to handle administering the topics and the other to run the event in the room. You will each need stop watch. As soon as the contestant has returned the two topics to you, start your watch; inform him that his thirty minutes preparation time have started and that your partner in the classroom will be expecting him to start speaking in exactly 30 minutes and will also expect speakers to continue arriving to speak every 7 minutes from then on.

2) If someone appears who is not on your master list: send him to me (probably in the library). If a contestant does not show up 1) ask others in the room if they know where he is; 2) send a swift native runner to me !

3) Make sure all the judges have enough ballots. I'll supply you with plenty. Make sure they know how to fill them in. Be sure they write the students name, his code and #, and the round #. And that the judges sign their ballots so that if there are any problems we can find them.

4) Announce the name of the first speaker and have him write his name/code on the board.

Immediately at the conclusion of each speech:

1) Tell the judges the time of the speech

2) Let the judges keep all their ballots until the end of the round. Then collect them in yourself. Check to see that they are all clearly and correctly completed and that there are the right number. Take them to the scoring centre. Bring your special box to me.

3) If all this works well you should be able to process one speaker every seven minutes. You should be able to complete your 10 or 11 speakers on time.

There will be approximately 12 extemporaneous speakers therefore we can do it in one room and I will need two (2) volunteers from 1:30 to 3:30 on Friday for this event and two (2) volunteers from 1:30 to 3:30 on Saturday:

Friday Extemporaneous:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Saturday Extemporaneous:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #1 and Timeslot #5

Impromptu and Extemporaneous

Timeslot #1

1:30 to 3:30 P.M. Friday.

1:30 P.M. to 2:00 P.M. : Preparation for Category One Round  
One (Impromptu and Extemporaneous)  
and Judges' Briefing.

2:00 P.M. to 3:30 P.M. : Category One, Round One.

Timeslot #5

1:30 o 3:30 P.M. Saturday

1:30 to 2:00 P.M. : Preparation for Category One Round Two (Impromptu and Extemporaneous) and Judges' Briefing.

2:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M. : Category One, Round Two.

**Instructions for Radio Newscast** 30 minutes preparation time and 4 minutes speaking.

**To start:**

1) 30 minutes prior to the start of the actual speaking and before the judges arrive, at approximately 3:30 P.M. on Friday (and 11:00 on Sunday), the Newscast competitors will show up at your room. You will have many identical copies of a newspaper in a box. You will give them out to the competitors, in the order in which they will be speaking, (I will give you a list!) one every six minutes, . You will tell the competitors that they must return in exactly 30 minutes to deliver their newscasts. Note that because the starting time of the speakers is staggered by about six minutes, some contestants will not have received their topics when the other contestants have begun speaking. It takes two people to administer this event. One to handle administering the newspapers and the other to run the event in the room. You will each need stop watches. As soon as the contestant has received his paper, start your watch; inform him that his thirty minutes preparation time have started and that your partner in the classroom will be expecting him to start speaking in exactly 30 minutes and will also expect speakers to continue arriving to speak every 6 minutes from then on.

2) If someone appears who is not on your master list: send him to me (probably in the library). If a contestant does not show up 1) ask others in the room if they know where he is; 2) send a swift native runner to me !

3) Make sure all the judges have enough ballots. I'll supply you with plenty. Make sure they know how to fill them in. Be sure they write the students name, his code and #, and the round #. And that the judges sign their ballots so that if there are any problems we can find them.

4) Announce the name of the first speaker and have him write his name/code on the board.

5) The competitor will deliver his newscast to the backs of the judges. You must make available a watch or clock with a second hand which the competitor can see. You will

start timing his delivery as soon as he commences and at the four minute mark, whether he has stopped some time ago or is in mid-sentence, you will sound a little bell of your own devising ! The judges have been instructed to deduct a time penalty on a sliding scale in accordance with the suggested deductions on their ballots.

Immediately at the conclusion of each speech:

1) Let the judges keep all their ballots until the end of the round. Then collect them in yourself. Check to see that they are all clearly and correctly completed and that there are the right number. Take them to the scoring centre.

2) If all this works well you should be able to process one speaker every six minutes. You should be able to complete your 10 or 11 speakers on time.

There will be approximately 20 newscast competitors, therefore we can do it in two rooms and I will need three (3) volunteers for each of the two timeslots. One to give out papers (two at a time every six minutes to each speaker from each of the two rooms) and one each to administer the event in each room.

Timeslot #2 3:30 to 5:30 P.M. Friday

Newscast

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #6 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. Sunday

Newscast

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

## **Instructions for Parliamentary debating**

1) Thirty minutes prior to the start of the event the four debaters who have been assigned to your room should appear there. You will know who to expect and they should know where to go. One pair will be designated to select the topic. You will have nine topics face down in front of you and they will select three. From the three they will choose one. You will discard the other two and return the other six to me. The pair of competitors who chose the topic will then allow the other pair to choose the side (Government or Opposition). You will then let the Government work in the classroom and send the Opposition to prepare elsewhere for thirty minutes with the proviso that they must return in 15 minutes so that the government can furnish them with the definition. If they are not prepared to accept the definition: send all four debaters to me in the library.

2) When the thirty minutes are up you and at least three judges will be in the classroom which you have prepared with two desks to the left and two desks to the right of a desk in the middle for the speaker. You are now the timer and you will hold up time cards unobtrusively for the debaters to see, counting down their speaking times to zero. You will stop your watch for all interruptions and resume timing only when the debater has the floor to himself. You must insure that the speakers each get their full allocation of time:

P.M. = 5 mins; 1st Opp. = 7 mins; Min. of Crown = 7 mins;  
Leader of Opp. = 7 mins and P.M. = 2 mins.

3) If someone appears who is not on your master list: send him to me (probably in the library). If a contestant does not show up 1) ask others in the room if they know where he is; 2) send a swift native runner to me !

4) Make sure all the judges have enough ballots. I'll supply you with plenty. Make sure they know how to fill them in. Be sure they write the students name, his code and #, and the round #. And that the judges sign their ballots so that if there are any problems we can find them.

5) Write the name/code and party of all the debaters on the board prior to the start of the debate.

Immediately at the conclusion of the debate:

1) Let the judges keep all their ballots until the end of the round. Then collect them in yourself. Check to see that they are all clearly and correctly completed and that there are the right number. Take them to the scoring centre.

There will be approximately 44 competitors in this event so that means we will need 11 rooms at 4/room. I will need 11 volunteers for each of the two timeslots for this event.  
Timeslot #2 3:30 to 5:30 P.M. Friday Parliamentary

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

6) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

7) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

8) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

9) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

10) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

11) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #6 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. Sunday Parliamentary

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

6) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

7) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

8) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

9) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

10) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

11) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_



Timeslot #2 and #6 Parliamentary and Radio Newscast

Timeslot #2 3:30 to 5:30 P.M. Friday

3:30 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. : Preparation for Category Two, Round One (Parliamentary and Radio Newscast) and Judges' Briefing.

4:00 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. : Category Two, Round One.

Timeslot #6 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. Sunday

11:00 to 11:30 A.M. : Preparation and Judges Briefing  
for Category Two Round Two  
(Parliamentary and Radio Newscast)

11:30 to 1:00 P.M. : Category Two Round Two.

## Instructions for After Dinner and Persuasive Speaking

1) These are both prepared events and need little effort to administer. Make sure that all the competitors are there. I will give you the lists. Make sure all the judges are there. Make sure all the judges have enough ballots to judge all the contestants; I will give you a supply.

2) You will need a stop watch: simply time the length of the performances, and at the conclusion tell the judges. You will signal discretely to the competitors with time cards (counting up to 5 mins. for After Dinner and up to 13 mins. for persuasive).

3) Let the judges keep all their ballots until the end of the round. Then collect them in yourself. Check to see that they are all clearly and correctly completed and that there are the right number. Take them to the scoring centre.

There will be approximately 40 competitors for After Dinner and 20 competitors for Persuasive. Therefore I will need 4 volunteers for After Dinner and Three for Persuasive.

After Dinner Friday:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

After Dinner Sunday:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Persuasive Friday:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Persuasive Sunday:

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #3 and Timeslot #7

Timeslot #3 Friday Evening 7:00 to 9:00 P.M.

**7:00 P.M. to 7:30 P.M.** : Preparation and Judges Briefing for  
Category Three Round One (After Dinner and Persuasive Speaking).

**7:30 P.M. to 9:00 P.M.** : Category Three, Round One.

Timeslot #7 Sunday Afternoon. 1:00 to 2:30 P.M.

**1:00 P.M. to 1:30 P.M.** : Preparation and Judges briefing  
for Category Three Round Two (After Dinner and Persuasive)

**1:30 to 2:30 P.M.** : Category Three Round Two

### **Instructions: Dramatic Interpretation and Interpretive Reading**

1) These are both prepared events and need little effort to administer. Make sure that all the competitors are there. I will give you the lists. Make sure all the judges are there. Make sure all the judges have enough ballots to judge all the contestants; I will give you a supply.

2) You will need a stop watch: simply time the length of the performances, and at the conclusion tell the judges. You will signal discretely to the competitors with time cards (counting up to 13 mins. for Interpretive and up to 12 mins. for Dramatic).

3) Let the judges keep all their ballots until the end of the round. Then collect them in yourself. Check to see that they are all clearly and correctly completed and that there are the right number. Take them to the scoring centre.

### **Instructions for Cross Examination Debate:**

1) This a prepared event. Four debaters will be sent to your classroom. You will know who to expect. Set up the classroom with two desk on either side of the moderators desk.

2) I will give you a moderator's script. It provides the flow chart for speaking. One of the judges will be the moderator. They will know who they are. You are the timekeeper. Hold up the appropriate time cards for each speaker.

3) Make sure that the judges know who is speaking and ensure that their ballots are filled out properly. Have the competitors write their names/code round # on the board.

4) At the conclusion of the debate, collect the ballots and return them to the score room.

There will be approximately 20 Cross Ex competitors for five rooms; 20 Dramatists for 3 rooms and 36 Interpretive readers for 5 rooms. (remember that these are two hour slots !)

Timeslot #4 Cross Ex

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #4 Interpretive

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #4 Dramatic

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #8 Cross Ex

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #8 Interpretive

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #8 Dramatic

1) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_ Rm# \_\_\_\_\_

Timeslot #4 Saturday and Timeslot #8 Sunday

**Saturday: 10:00 to 10:30 A.M.:**Preparation and Judges Briefing for Category Four, Round One (Interpretive Reading, Dramatic Interpretation and Cross Ex. Debate)

**10:30 to 12:30 A.M.** : Category Four, Round One.

Sunday: Timeslot #8

**2:30 to 3:00 P.M.** : Preparation and Judges briefing  
for Category Four Round Two.  
(Interpretive, Dramatic and Cross Ex)

**3:00 to 4:30 P.M.** : Category Four Round Two