

# Debate Examples Script

## Structure of a Team Case – Speakers' Roles

(as per the Native-speaking English Teachers' Association Inter-School Debate Competition)

### 1<sup>st</sup> Affirmative Speaker

- Greeting
- Introduce the motion.
- Define the motion and explain why you define it this way. If you use dictionary definitions, make sure that you also explain the meaning of the whole motion in your own words and in a way that everybody can understand.
- Introduce your team line – explain and develop it.
- Say which areas you will cover and which areas your second and third speakers will cover.
- Present your own argument(s) and support with reasons, concrete examples, facts, etc.
- Summarise and, if time permits, provide linking to your next speaker's arguments.

### 1<sup>st</sup> Negative Speaker

- Greeting
- Comment on the definition of the motion given by the Affirmative Team. Give reasons for any differences you have.
- Show why the affirmative's line is unacceptable and highlight the problems with it (structure, logic, facts).
- Introduce your team line – explain and develop it.
- Say which areas you will cover and which areas your second and third speakers will cover.
- Present your ideas with concrete examples to support your points.
- Summarise and, if time permits, provide linking to your next speaker's arguments.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Affirmative Speaker**

- If the Negative Team had a different definition of the motion, continue to argue your team's definition, or you may accept amendments if you see no disadvantage in doing so.
- Attack the negative's case: show why it is unacceptable and give reasons (rebuttal). You can also respond to any criticisms made of your team's case by the 1<sup>st</sup> Negative. Always try to raise a couple of points of rebuttal but then make sure you spend enough time on developing your team case.
- Present and develop your arguments, giving concrete examples for the points you make.
- Summarise the points you made with reference to the team line and motion.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Negative Speaker**

- Continue to attack the affirmative's line and arguments (rebuttal). It is very important that you do this strongly before giving your own arguments, but make sure that you spend enough time on your own team case. You cannot win a debate on rebuttal alone.
- Develop your own arguments.
- Summarise the points you made with reference to the team line and motion.

## **3<sup>rd</sup> Affirmative Speaker**

- Organise your notes carefully as this will be your team's last chance to speak. Review both cases; compare and contrast; show the advantage of the affirmative case. Use a mixture of general and specific rebuttal.
- You should **avoid** introducing totally new material, unless it is specifically in reply to a point made by the negative side. You should develop ideas already introduced by your first and second speakers.
- Finish by summing up the affirmative's case with reference to the team line and motion.

## **3<sup>rd</sup> Negative Speaker**

- Review both cases; compare and contrast; show the advantage of the negative case. Use a mixture of general and specific rebuttal.
- You must not introduce new material unless it is in your rebuttal of a point made by the affirmative side. You should develop the arguments introduced by the first and second speakers.
- Finish by summing up the negative's case with reference to the team line and motion.

Examples of the Chairperson’s Script

Welcome to the \_\_\_\_\_ Debate.

This debate is between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.  
*(Name of school)* *(Name of school)*

The Affirmative Team is from \_\_\_\_\_.  
*(Name of school)*

The speakers are:

1 <sup>st</sup> Speaker:	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Speaker:	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Speaker:	
Team Advisor:	

The Negative Team is from \_\_\_\_\_.  
*(Name of school)*

The speakers are:

1 <sup>st</sup> Speaker:	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Speaker:	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Speaker:	
Team Advisor:	

The Adjudicator for this debate is \_\_\_\_\_.

Each speaker may speak for 3 minutes. There will be a warning bell (*demonstrated by the timekeeper*) at 2 minutes 30 seconds with two bells (*demonstrated*) at 3 minutes to indicate the speaker’s time has expired. A bell will be rung continuously (*demonstrated*) if a speaker exceeds the maximum time by more than 15 seconds.

The topic of this debate is:

THAT \_\_\_\_\_.

*(The chairperson introduces the speakers as their turn comes up.)*

Order of speakers	Name	
The 1 <sup>st</sup> Affirmative Speaker,		will begin the debate.
The 1 <sup>st</sup> Negative Speaker,		will begin their case.
The 2 <sup>nd</sup> Affirmative Speaker,		will continue their case.
The 2 <sup>nd</sup> Negative Speaker,		will continue their case.
The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Affirmative Speaker,		will conclude their case.
The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Negative Speaker,		will conclude the debate.

At this point, depending upon the type of debate, questions from the floor (audience) might be accepted. This gives members of the audience an opportunity to question arguments presented by either side of the debate. The chairperson would call for questions, one at a time, to be addressed to either the Affirmative or Negative Team. Teams are awarded points according to the way they handle their responses.

**At the end** of the debate, the chairperson announces:

We will now take a short break to allow the adjudicator time to make a decision. Please stay in the room. It won't take long. *(If there is a panel of adjudicators, the chairperson announces that the adjudicators will retire to make their decision and awaits their return to announce the result of the debate.)*

The adjudicator, Mr/Ms \_\_\_\_\_, will now deliver the adjudication and announce the result of the debate.

Thank you Mr/Ms \_\_\_\_\_ and congratulations to both teams.

That concludes the debate. I'd like to ask the two teams to congratulate one another by shaking hands, and we thank you all for coming. *(or something similar according to context)*

## Examples of Speakers' Scripts

The following are examples and templates for speech starters used in debates by Mr Perry Bayer's students:

### First Speaker (or Leader) of the Affirmative

#### *Example topic: That Globalisation is Ruining our World*

Mr Chairman/Madam Chair, Members of the Negative Team, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . Nobel Prize-winning economist Professor Joseph Stiglitz of Columbia University, New York, who was just here for the 6<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation, wrote in his Nobel prize-winning book *Globalisation and its Discontents*, that "truly fair competition would be beneficial to most of the world's citizens, but that today's so-called 'globalisation' is unfair competition which only benefits a **few** individuals and a **few** companies in a **few** of the world's richest countries. It is the triumph of the **few** against the many".

This is a good starting-point for our definition. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines "globalisation" as "world-wide trading", but we need to go further. Roget's Thesaurus, the number one idiomatic dictionary, says that globalisation is the "systemic penetration of world markets for the **benefit** of the World Trade Organisation/World Bank elites". Note that this "market penetration" is not for **our** benefit as world citizens, but for the benefit of the elite few.

Let's use the Concise Oxford definition of the verb "ruining" as "greatly damaging", while Roget's Thesaurus defines "our world" as "all people's social systems, forms of economic organisation, including our home-grown industries and self-owned stores".

So today's motion is clear. This system of penetrating world markets for the benefit of the elite few is greatly damaging our social system, our forms of economic organisation and our environment. This is what "ruining our world" means and this is what is happening right now. Let me stress – we would not be against "truly fair competition" that would be beneficial to most of the world's citizens. However, we have to be very clear about what the current WTO style "globalisation" is. It is market penetration to benefit an elite. Therefore, it is clear that this "globalisation" is "greatly damaging" or "ruining" our world.

I, as Leader, will show you how globalisation is damaging our social system worldwide. Yolanda, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker, will examine local and international examples of economic damage caused by "globalisation". Last but not least, Erica, my 3<sup>rd</sup> Speaker, will demonstrate the damage caused to our world's environment.

As Professor Stiglitz has said, "truly fair competition" would be beneficial, but the WTO's market penetration actually fosters unfair competition. The biggest companies in the richest countries grab the lion's share of the world markets, pushing out smaller companies in poorer countries. The poorer countries are then only useful as sources of cheap labour for the offshore companies.

This damages the world's social systems. One of the best examples comes from Mexico, which acceded to the WTO in 1993. One of the conditions that the US Treasury insisted on was that Mexico dismantle its minimum wage laws. The World Bank annual figures showed that the minimum wage declined from 40 Mexican pesos an hour in 1992 to 23.5 pesos by 1995.

Both the US and Mexican societies lost out. US firms like the Nike Shoe Company moved to Mexico and the higher-paid US workers lost their jobs. Mexican workers then had to work twice as hard for fewer pesos. Their legal protections were gone and then the US union protections had to be lowered so that US workers could compete. The only winner was the Nike Shoe Company whose profits soared by 55.6% between 1992 and 1996, according to World Bank figures.

Therefore, I leave you with this thought, "Globalisation is ruining our world".

### **First Speaker (or Leader) of the Negative**

***Example topic: That women who undergo cosmetic surgery have been duped***

Madam Chair, Members of the Affirmative Team, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . the Leader of the Affirmative tried to have a field day with horror stories about women's cosmetic surgery, but as a former HK Chief Secretary, Anson Chan, wrote "Most of the cosmetic surgery HK women undergo is small-scale and necessary, usually the result of accidents or previous surgery, say for breast cancer. For the minority of women who choose cosmetic surgery for reasons of 'vanity', they are 'vain' with their eyes open, they have not been 'duped'."

The Leader gave an adequate definition of women as \_\_\_\_\_ and the verb "undergo" as \_\_\_\_\_. But their definition of "cosmetic surgery" was a bit narrow. The 2006 New Worldwide Webster's Dictionary has defined "cosmetic surgery" as "more than medical treatment to improve a person's appearance"; it is "also reconstructive work to rebuild damaged body tissue or limbs". The definition of the verb "duped" also needs more attention. It is more than being "fooled". It is being "deliberately tricked or cheated by an outside force", not "through your own decision". The Affirmative Leader also tried to say that \_\_\_\_\_ but this is not accurate because \_\_\_\_\_.

I, as Negative Leader, will show you that women who undergo cosmetic surgery have been unlucky with an accident, illness or an operation, or maybe some are vain, as Anson Chan has said, but they have not been "deliberately tricked or cheated by an outside force" which is what being "duped" means. \_\_\_\_\_, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker, will examine the actual situation in China, which is the world's fastest-growing cosmetic surgery market, while \_\_\_\_\_, my 3<sup>rd</sup> Speaker, will demonstrate the fallacy of gender-based assertions, such as this one, that the female sex, but curiously not the male sex, has been "duped" into having cosmetic surgery. How can this be? It is far too sweeping a statement.

A survey conducted by RTHK in November 2006 showed that 70.7% of the women surveyed who had had cosmetic surgery had needed to have reconstruction work following an accident, illness or operation, especially after breast cancer surgery as mentioned before. The majority of the women had to rebuild their bodies. It wasn't a choice. They were not being "duped" by anybody. They wanted to replace parts such as a breast cut off in a mastectomy operation or to improve horrific facial scars suffered in a car accident.

Even the 29.3% who had elective cosmetic surgery had chosen it themselves: they had not been duped by surgeons or anyone else. Those statistics formed the basis of Anson Chan's speech.

Given figures such as these, I leave you with this thought "Women who undergo cosmetic surgery have not been duped".

**Template starters for the Second and Third Speakers**

**Second Speaker of the Affirmative**

Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . the Leader of the Negative has made a sincere effort, but alas, has misunderstandings that I would like to clear up.

The Leader tried to show you that \_\_\_\_\_, and then attempted to \_\_\_\_\_, but failed to say that \_\_\_\_\_.

This is not accurate because \_\_\_\_\_.

**Second Speaker of the Negative**

Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . the Leader and 2<sup>nd</sup> Affirmative Speaker have made a sincere effort, but alas, have misunderstandings that I would like to clear up.

The Leader tried to show you that \_\_\_\_\_ (Rebuttal).

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker then attempted to \_\_\_\_\_, but \_\_\_\_\_.

They also said that \_\_\_\_\_, but this is not accurate because \_\_\_\_\_.



**Third Speaker of the Affirmative**

Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . I commend the Leader and 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker of the Negative for their sincerity, but I have to point out some errors of interpretation.

The Leader tried to \_\_\_\_\_ but, unfortunately \_\_\_\_\_ . The 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker argued \_\_\_\_\_ but did not realise that \_\_\_\_\_. Then, they tried to say \_\_\_\_\_, however, they forgot to point out \_\_\_\_\_.

They also got confused trying to say that \_\_\_\_\_ when it is clear that \_\_\_\_\_.

**Third Speaker of the Negative**

Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . I commend the Affirmative Team for their sincerity, but have to point out some errors of interpretation.

The Leader tried to \_\_\_\_\_ (Rebuttal) \_\_\_\_\_, but unfortunately \_\_\_\_\_.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker argued that \_\_\_\_\_, but did not realise that \_\_\_\_\_.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> Speaker then tried to say \_\_\_\_\_. However, they forgot to say \_\_\_\_\_.

They also got confused trying to say that \_\_\_\_\_, when it is clear that \_\_\_\_\_.