

HARANGUE

Round 1
Publication



IN THIS ISSUE

**WELCOME TO HARANGUE 2012 | WHERE DO TOPICS COME FROM? | 10 TIPS TO CHAIRING A DEBATE |
MATTER MATTERS: THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT ARGUMENT | WHAT YOUR ADJUDICATOR WANTS | AND MORE!!!**

WELCOME TO HARANGUE 2012

Dear students,
Welcome to the 2012 edition of Harangue, the DAV's student magazine!

I hope you have a successful and exciting 2012 Schools Competition season, and that Harangue provides you with many laughs, tips and insights along the way. **HARANGUE** has been the the DAV's student round-by-round publication for a while now, but like flares and the colour orange, it has been coming in and out of fashion for a while.

Though this year, it is back and bigger and better than ever. We've got more colour, more matter areas, and more prizes. As a new and relatively inexperienced publications officer, (given by the fact that in making this edition, I learnt what the word 'harangue' meant)

HARANGUE (NOUN): A LENGTHY AND AGGRESSIVE SPEECH

it would be great to hear from you as to what you liked, didn't like, or want more of in the future. This edition has been printed and circulated around schools, but for all future editions (rounds 2 to 5) **HARANGUE** will be available for download at the DAV website, (dav.com.au) in both a print friendly and wonderful colour version. Happy reading, learning and most importantly, debating!

Allan Quanchi | Publications Officer



ALLAN QUANCHI - DAV PUBLICATIONS OFFICER.

Allan will be compiling and publishing HARANGUE this year.

Any submission or feedback for HARANGUE would be greatly appreciated, and can be sent to publications@dav.com.au

MATTER MATTERS

In each edition of **HARANGUE**, we will have an adjudicator write in about a specific matter area to help you make new and interesting arguments within debates.

This week we have **Ming Kang Chen**, writing in about First Principles: The Role of the Government.

Ming Kang is current Bachelor of Commerce student at Melbourne University and is a DAV finals adjudicator. You can often see him round at many regional nights.



HANDY HINT

There is a difference between practical and principled arguments.

- Principled arguments are based on an idea (eg. What should the government do, and why it's just)
- Practical arguments however either positive or negative, and are based upon a practical action (eg. if junk food is banned in school canteens, less children will be obese)

FIRST PRINCIPLES:

THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT

What is it?

If you have debated more than once, then chances are at some point you will feel as though you are making an argument that you have made before. You may have decided to use an argument from a previous debate, as it is applicable to this topic. While this is pretty convenient, there's more to it than what may first appear—you may inadvertently be using what are called **first principles**.

First principles are ideas or theories that are applicable to many debates because they are so broad and general (for example: what is the government's role within society? To control and regulate it, or allow people to make choices and be free?). These principled ideas aren't arguments within themselves, but they can be made into convincing ones. Because of this, the reason they are called 'first' principles is because they are so fundamental to a team's case, they're usually the first point within the debate.

Is that it?

No, there is a bit more to it. In debating, different topics have different principle 'areas'. These might include (but are definitely not limited to) *banning* something dangerous (guns), *regulating* a part of society (voting rules), or *providing* something for a group of people (education). Once you can identify the 'area' of the topic, first principle based arguments can be made from them.

Example time

Let's use the **role of government** first principle in the topics: "*That we should ban alcohol,*" and "*That we should ban recreational drugs.*" In both topics we are talking about banning a substance(s) that could be dangerous in certain ways to people in society. Given it is probably the government which will ban the item, we

need to think about **why** it is the **role of the government** to do this.

For example (in a very simplified form). *Recreational drugs are harmful. Things that are harmful should be banned. The government has a duty to protect people from things that are dangerous. Therefore, it is the **role of the government** to act and protect its citizens by banning recreational drugs.*

Note: we started off with the first principle (a principle idea of whether the government should intervene or not) and explained why it is the role of the government to intervene. Then you can start explaining why the government protecting its citizens is important, how it does so in other circumstances, and why people can't make a free choice.

It is very important to make sure that you explain **why** the government's role is to do something in the first place, as the easiest rebuttal to a role of the government argument is to question whether it is the role of the government to do something at all! Ask yourself questions like, *should the government ever interfere with people's personal decisions even if it doesn't affect others?* and work out whether your side of the topic is in support or opposition to it.

How to rebut first principles

Simple, just be the other principle side of the debate. In the case of the examples mentioned above, explain why it is not the **role of the government** to regulate, but instead to allow freedom and individual choices.

If you don't want to rebut the principle, you may agree that the role of the government is to protect, but then disagree with the **method** by which the other side has chosen to act (are they being too restrictive on the actions of citizens, or is the governments actions going to cause worse problems?)

Remember: all these principled arguments need to be justified, otherwise they are simply assertions with no weight. Best of luck arguing.

Ming Kang Chen

10 TIPS TO CHAIRING A DEBATE

While being the chairperson of a debate may not seem like that big of a deal, the chairperson plays a vital role in ensuring a timely and smooth debate for all involved. Here are a couple of tips to help make your job as chairperson look even more polished and professional.

- 1. Introduce yourself as the chair:** it's a formality that is often missed.
- 2. Ask for mobiles to be switched off or turned to silent:** ask this early on because it often takes time for everyone to switch their phones off, and you don't want to disrupt the first speaker.
- 3. State the topic:** while obvious to the debaters, the audience may not know the full topic, or all of the words within it. This is especially important for secret topics!
- 4. Announce the teams and sides**
- 5. Announce the speaking times:** this way, the rules are clear and there can be no accusation of bias. Speaking times are below.
- 6. Call on each speaker:** introduce each speaker only when the adjudicator indicates to you that they're ready.
- 7. Knock loudly:** keep time carefully, and either knock the desk or ring a bell so that everyone in the room can hear. If you're like me and your knuckles get sore from hitting the desk, use whiteboard marker to knock the desk or clap your hands instead.
- 8. Announce the length of the speech at the end:** while sometimes adjudicators time the debates themselves, you should still announce it for the benefit of the audience and debaters (and just in case the adjudicator was late in hitting start/stop!)
- 9. Conclude your role:** inform the audience that the adjudicator will come to their decision and deliver the result in a few minutes.
- 10. Thank yourself:** being a chairperson means you've heard a lot of speaking, and only seen the back of debaters' heads. But feel proud that you too contributed to the running of the debate.

And remember to knock twice at the last time (that's 8 minutes for A and B Grade, 6 for C grade and 5 for D grade) to let the speaker know their time has completely run out.

Speaking Times

A Grade: 6 to 8 minutes. Knock at 6 and 8
B Grade: 6 to 8 minutes. Knock at 6 and 8
C Grade: 5 to 6 minutes. Knock at 5 and 6
D Grade: 4 to 5 minutes. Knock at 4 and 5

WHAT YOUR ADJUDICATOR WANTS!



Samuel, one of the DAV's most prominent adjudicators, spoke to HARANGUE about 8 little things you should/should not do to easily impress your adjudicator.

1. Please, please, please, DO NOT waste the first minute of your speech introducing yourself or your team mates. Your adjudicators will have your names written on the score sheet in front of him/her, and luckily for everyone involved, the DAV prefers to employ adjudicators who can read.
2. Don't tell me what position you are speaking. For the same reason mentioned above, the DAV also employs people who can count, and if that fails, your names are written in order of speaking on the score sheet. Save those precious seconds to add more material and arguments to your speech!
3. Whatever you do, NEVER EVER let your parents insert jokes into your speech to make it funny. As you know, parents often think of themselves as amusing comedians, but your adjudicators are like you. Even though we may be old, we still don't find your parents' jokes funny. If you have something amusing to say (which doesn't distract from the material of

your speech) then go ahead, bring a smile to your adjudicators' face.

4. However, avoid using common sayings and clichés. These include anything from "An Apple a Day Keeps the Doctor Away" to "Throwing the Baby out with the Bathwater". Remember, if it doesn't add anything to your speech, don't include it.

5. Team Lines. These seem to come in and out of fashion in cycles. But they should be treated in the same way as a ticking time bomb. Use with caution as they can often blow up in your face. My advice is to avoid them all together, as a rhyming jingle isn't enough to win a debate.

6. Look at me! Your speech is aimed at persuading the adjudicator. Your opposition will NEVER agree with you no matter how good your speech is, because they're there to disagree. It seems easy, but many people fall into this trap. Plus it's nice to feel as though the person standing in front of the room wants your attention.

7. Conclusions have the power to reinforce and clarify your position in the debate, or be repetitive and boring. No adjudicator wants to hear the exact same words as your 1st speaker's team split. Change the phrasing from what has been said previously, and make sure you have the best (and strongest) wording that paints your argument in the best possible light. Ensure your conclusion is short and punchy.

8. There are some examples you should never use. These include, starving children in Africa, Mother Theresa or ANYTHING to do with Hitler. These examples are frowned upon and disliked by your adjudicator almost as much as personal examples. There are many reasons why we discourage personal examples, but most importantly, it makes it really uncomfortable for your opposition to rebut them. It causes the debate to stall because no one wants to rebut the example you gave of your dying family member by saying "look, we don't actually care about your relative, and we think you've just made this up".

Samuel

WHERE DO TOPICS COME FROM?

Amit Golder (Vice-President of the Schools Competition) explains the topic selections process

Well dear, when a mummy topic and a daddy topic love each other very much... No but really, there are two answers to that:

1. The process

The Vice-President (Schools) is ultimately responsible for generating all the topics in the DAV Schools Competition. We do this by getting many topic ideas (over 150!) from a select group of high quality adult adjudicators, coaches and debaters, then refining them down over the course of a couple of weeks to the final list of prepared, advised and secret topics you finally see.

The topics are then sent to a small group of school teachers, to seek their feedback. Once that entire process is completed, the topics are posted on the website!

2. The substance

The DAV tries to ensure that topics are all interesting, accessible, fair and varied. This means we aim to provide a mixture of contextually relevant topics – which relate to issues prominent in the news and matters of public debate – as well as more classical topics that may not have a particular contextual source, but which involve issues which are still relevant and interesting. We try to ensure a variety of topic areas including politics, economics, criminal justice, environmental, education etc.

If you have any questions or topic suggestions please email me at vps@dav.com.au !

Amit Golder | Vice-President (Schools)



IN THE NEXT EDITION OF HARANGUE

- Round 1 wrap up
- Quiz time (and yes, there will be prizes)
- More MATTER MATTERS
- Tips and tricks to make your rebuttal zing.
- And more!!!

MANY THANKS TO THE CONTRIBUTORS

- Amit Golder
- Ming Kang Chen
- Samuel
- And all the DAV office staff

Want to submit something?

All submissions can be sent to the DAV publications officer at publications@dav.com.au

DEBATERS ASSOCIATION OF VICTORIA

(p) 03 9348 9477

(e) debater@dav.com.au

(w) www.dav.com.au