

Judging a Debate

A. The goal of the lesson

The aim of this lesson is to prepare students to judge a BP debate. The lesson can also be used to teach judging in another format, with some minor alterations. This also makes students able to understand what is important for a judge in a debate and therefore choose their material while they speak.

B. Activities

Lecture (30 minutes):

Give an overview of the main principals of judging a BP debate.

Exercise:

Come up with example situations and have group discussions about how the call should look like. If you have more time, you can also have an example debate or watch a debate recorded previously. You can use the examples in the Verification or Theory as a basis for the discussion. You can use an example round from the Worlds Schools Debating Championships on YouTube. We recommend finding an inround.

Q and A:

Go over the questions students still, have after the lesson.

C. Preparation

- Go over the theory of judging.

<http://training.scottisheudc2018.com/article/49/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B3qLCTOxFDY&feature=youtu.be>

- Prepare the theory and example exercises.

- Think about what situations are clear enough as examples.

E. Verification

- What can trainer do to conclude the lesson (possibly model questions for conclusions) and particular activities?

- what are the issues that cause the most trouble while judging?

- What should every trainer do to learn from the lesson for the future:

- What activity/example/discussion produce best results at this lesson?

- What was the biggest problem during the lesson? How can I avoid/prevent it in future?

- Did I avoid/prevent the biggest problem which occurred the last time? If no, why?

F. Theory

Selection of judging discussion exercises:

AP/WSDC

Motion: THW ban smoking

Proposition explains that most smoke comes out of factory chimneys and this is what should be restricted. The most effective plan for this is global CO₂ quota trading, as we have in the EU currently.

Proposition brings multiple well explained arguments about how almost all countries would have the motivation to participate in the scheme, how it would actually cut CO₂ emissions, and why reducing CO₂ emissions is important at all.

The opposition clearly states in their first speech that this is a squirrel. In their speeches, the opposition rebuts proposition arguments to the extent they can, and explains how people should have freedom of choice to damage their health, how tobacco companies are the largest taxpayers, and how alternative regulations can protect 3rd parties from harm.

Who wins? Why?

AP/WSDC

Motion: THW ban smoking

Proposition explains that most smoke comes out of factory chimneys and this is what should be restricted. The most effective plan for this is global CO₂ quota trading, as we have in the EU currently.

Proposition brings multiple well explained arguments about how almost all countries would have the motivation to participate in the scheme, how it would actually cut CO₂ emissions, and why reducing CO₂ emissions is important at all.

The opposition doesn't say a single word about proposition case in any of their speeches. Instead, they talk about how people should have freedom of choice to damage their health, how tobacco companies are the largest taxpayers, and how alternative regulations can protect 3rd parties from harm.

Who wins? Why?

AP/WSDC

Motion: THW ban smoking

Proposition explains that most smoke comes out of factory chimneys and this is what should be restricted. The most effective plan for this is global CO₂ quota trading, as we have in the EU currently.

Proposition brings multiple well explained arguments about how almost all countries would have the motivation to participate in the scheme, how it would actually cut CO₂ emissions, and why reducing CO₂ emissions is important at all.

Opposition tries to rebut the proposition's arguments, but this is not very convincing. Opposition adds two constructive arguments about how CO₂ is not the worst greenhouse gas (instead it's CH₄), and how the world has no regulative body that could enforce quota trading. All arguments are rather poorly explained and contain huge gaps, one can see that the team was not ready for this plan.

Who wins? Why?

BP

Motion: THW abolish life sentence

OG plan foresees that life sentence cannot be given for any crime but fixed-term sentences can last up to 100 years for very hard crimes. The team explains in their arguments how very hard crimes deserve extra tough punishments and how isolation is the only way to protect the rest of the society from such people.

OO is an ironman, says that this plan is a squirrel and does one simple, rather poorly explained arguments about how life sentence is cheaper for the society than having recurring criminals coming out of the prison every once in a while.

CG uses both of their speeches to repeat 1G arguments word-by-word, paying no attention to the case of 1O.

CO rebuts 1G and talks about how imprisonment as a punishment method should be abolished altogether as keeping people in prison is very expensive for society.

How to make the decision? What technical mistakes did every team do?

BP

Motion: THS the construction of Rail Baltic in Estonia

OG covers three arguments: RB brings economic benefits, RB allows people to travel faster and more conveniently, RB is good for the environment by directing part of freight from highways to the railway.

OO shows how economic benefits are based on assumptions that are not very certain and how it is highly likely that RB will require subsidies in the future, and how the railway will destroy animal populations in Western Estonia by cutting the country in half, whereas the damage from the latter is larger than the opportunity to travel a bit faster.

CG talks about EU support being a net benefit for the Estonian economy, even is part of this will go to cover operating expenses in the future, explains how economic benefits are not important as RB will create strategic benefits thanks to the new swift opportunity to move military assets from Central Europe (noting Estonia's dangerous geographic location), and thanks to future transport opportunities from Northern Norway to Central and Southern Europe when the Arctic Ocean melts further. Additionally, 2G rebuts 2O extension by pointing out that the compensation offered is sufficient.

OO talk about RB damaging people living on the route as they will lose their houses, fields, and homes.

Who gets what place? Why?

The chair begins the discussion by asking for the opinions of the other judges and revealing his own

What is the best order for handling teams to make the decision making as efficient as possible?

Situation 1:

W1	C	W2
1 3	1 2	2 3
4 2	4 3	1 4

Start from CG, W2 agrees with C in everything else and W1 differs only in 2nd and 3rd places.

Situation 2:

W1		
3	2	
1		4

C		
1	2	
3		4

W2		
4	3	
2		1

Crazy stuff. W2 is the most dissonant tone, as their decision is opposite to C's. Begin from CG to find a common ground with W1 (easiest to do by comparing the CG and OO teams). Then deal with the first half, bringing the CO-discussion for latest.

