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Worlds-Style Debate as a Model of Educational Debate
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Parliamentary Systems and Worlds-Style Debate

Educational debate is usually modeled on some legislative system such as a congress or a parliament. In some cases, it is based on a legal model. The format of educational debate on which this book will focus is modeled on debate in parliamentary systems of government and is called Worlds-Style debate and sometimes, not surprisingly, British Parliamentary debate. This format is the most popular form of educational debate in the world. Beyond its popularity, it has been chosen as the format for this book for a variety of reasons. First, Worlds-Style debate is a lively and energetic format involving four teams of two people not only giving persuasive speeches, but also interacting with each other through questions and comments throughout the debate.¹ Second, Worlds-Style debate is a format in which students can practice a variety of advocacy skills ranging from argument construction to refutation to organization to delivery. Third, because each Worlds-Style debate involves four two-person teams, eight people have the opportunity to actively participate in each debate. Eight participants stand in contrast to the two to four people who participate in other forms of debate. So, for educational and practical reasons, Worlds-Style debate provides an excellent format for educational debating and for that reason, is the focus of this book.

The Parliament of the United Kingdom, on which Worlds-Style debate is most closely modeled, consists of members of various political parties. Currently the major parties in the

¹ The interaction takes place in what is known as points of information that will be discussed later in this chapter.
British Parliament are the Conservative and Unionist Party, the Liberal Democrats, and the Labour Party. Sometimes, one party or the other will hold a majority of seats and, therefore, will be able to better control the outcome of debates and of policy in general. In other situations, no party may hold a majority, and a coalition may arise wherein two or more parties agree to cooperate in order to achieve a majority of the seats in the Parliament. As of this writing, the Liberal Democrats and the Conservative parties have formed a coalition to create a majority in the British Parliament. That is the first coalition since the era of Winston Churchill eighty years ago. The coalition has not been particularly cooperative, but they have formed a majority to control the government (*The Economist*, December 22, 2012).

In the British Parliament, the party or parties that command a majority of seats (whether a single party or a coalition) are generally referred to as the *Government*. The party or parties in the minority are referred to as the *Loyal Opposition*. As stated earlier, the parliamentary form of government including both the Government and the Loyal Opposition is the model on which the educational style of debate called *Worlds-Style* debate is based.

A *Worlds-Style* debate consists of four teams arguing two different sides of a motion\(^2\). The motion is ordinarily presented to the four teams between fifteen and thirty minutes prior to the beginning of the debate. That time is referred to as *preparation time*. During that time, each team needs to think about how they will approach the debate.

Two of the four teams are assigned to represent the Government and the other two teams are assigned to represent the Opposition. Whatever the motion, both Government teams are expected to support the motion, making sure that the two Government teams’ arguments are consistent with one another even though the arguments may be different. In other words, the two Government teams are expected to support a similar position even though their reasons for doing so may differ. Similarly, the two Opposition teams are expected to argue against the motion in ways that are consistent with one another although their arguments also may be different.

To extend the analogy between the kind of debate that actually occurs in the British Parliament and the kind of educational debate called *Worlds-Style* debate, assume that the two teams from the Government side consist of persons from a coalition government consisting of, say, the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats. In our analogy, those two parties have formed a coalition in order to maintain a majority. Other parties might be a part of the loyal opposition, say, the Labour and Unionist Party along with the Democratic Unionist Party. Imagine that a bill is being proposed in the Parliament and that the Government, in this case a coalition of Conservative and Liberal Democrats, supports the bill. Those two parties may both support the bill, but they may do so for different reasons. Similarly, the Labour and Unionist Party and the Democratic Unionist Parties may oppose the bill although for different reasons. In this situation, the two Government parties remain loyal to one another by providing support for the bill. Similarly, the two opposition parties are loyal to one another in opposing the bill.

---

\(^2\) A motion is a statement that will be the subject of the debate. Sometimes a motion is called a debate topic, a resolution, or a proposition.
The two parties that constitute the Government may support the bill for different reasons, as do the two parties that combine to be the Loyal Opposition. In fact, sometimes speakers from one Government party may be motivated to use a different argument for supporting a bill because that argument appeals more to the party’s constituents. The same is true for speakers from each of the parties. Thus, we may find a situation where members of parliament from different parties support a bill for different reasons because those reasons are more persuasive to their particular constituencies.

**Worlds-Style Debate Format**

An analogical situation is created in the educational debate format called Worlds-Style debate. Two teams of two persons each, assigned to the Government side, will support the motion though the teams may not support the motion for the same reason. Similarly, the two Opposition teams will oppose the motion perhaps using different reasons to do so. While in an actual parliament, speakers from the same side may choose different reasons to appeal to their constituents, in the Worlds-Style debate format, different teams may choose to support (or oppose) the motions for different reasons in order to make sure their particular team appeals positively to the adjudicator.

Worlds-Style debaters try to distinguish themselves from the other team on the same side in a manner similar to the way the Liberal Democrats and the Conservative parties try do distinguish themselves from one another. The Conservative and Liberal Democrats support one another by being members of the Government Coalition but, at the same time, have interests in distinguishing themselves to their audience of voters. Another reason for creating this distinction involves a practical reason that stems from the convention of how a Worlds-Style debate is judged. At the end of the debate, the judges are asked to rank each of the teams from first (best) to fourth (worst.) So, while the Government teams are primarily competing with the Opposition teams, each Government and Opposition team is subtly competing against the other team on their own side. This internal competition is set because of the forced rankings that a judge is expected to deliver.

The Worlds-Style debate format used in educational debate differs from an actual debate in the Parliament because the Worlds-Style debate format maintains very strict speaking times for each speaker. A debate format consists of a description of the teams in the debate, and the order and times for the speeches that make up that debate. The Worlds-Style debate format differs from many other educational debate formats because it involves four teams rather than two. As already stated, the choice of four teams is consistent with the kinds of debate that we might envision in a Parliament involving a coalition government.

Each of the four teams in a Worlds-Style debate is assigned to one of four “positions.” These positions are: First Government, First Opposition, Second Government, and Second Opposition. The First Government and Second Government teams are charged with the responsibility of supporting the motion while the First Opposition and Second Opposition teams are charged with opposing it. Two speakers represent each of the four teams and each speaker gives a speech of seven minutes. Usually a debate tournament consists of at least four “rounds” of debate. In the first round, teams are assigned to the four positions at
random, then are rotated through the other positions until each team has had the opportunity to debate in each of the four positions.

Each team consists of two persons, each with a unique title. The chart below shows the title that is given to each speaker, the team of which that speaker is a member, and the time limits for the speech. The members of each team can decide which of the team members will fill each role. For instance, the members of the First Government team can decide who will be the Prime Minister and who will be the Deputy Prime Minister.

### Worlds-Style Debate Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Title</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper House (First Half of the Debate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Government</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of Opposition</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Opposition</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Prime Minister</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Government</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Leader of Opposition</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Opposition</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower House (Second Half of the Debate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Government</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Government</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Opposition</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Opposition</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Whip</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Government</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition Whip</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Opposition</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above chart, the First Government and the First Opposition teams deliver the first four speeches, then, the Second Government and Second Opposition teams deliver the last four speeches. Therefore, the First Government and First Opposition teams, sometimes called the “upper house,” generally are responsible for the first half of the debate, and the Second Government and Second Opposition teams, sometimes called the “lower house,” have the responsibility for the second half.

The table above describes all of the formal speeches but it does not describe one of the most important and dynamic parts of the debate: points of information. Points of information provide opportunities for members of each team to interact with members of the teams defending the opposite side of the motion. Points of information can be questions to the opposing speaker, brief arguments in refutation of the speaker’s position, brief arguments directed against the motion in general, or any other kind of statement that the person making
the point of information wishes to make. For instance, if the Prime Minister is speaking, any
member of either Opposition team may request a point of information. Similarly, if a member
of the Opposition team is speaking, any member of either Government team may offer a
point. Points of information can be offered after the first minute of a speech and before the
last minute of the speech. The first and last minute of each speech is “protected” against
interruption. The point of information can last no more than fifteen seconds and may take the
form of a question, a statement, or an argument. The speaker’s time continues during the
point of information, so the fifteen seconds becomes a part of the speaker’s seven-minute
speech.

Only a debater defending the opposite side of the motion as the speaker can request a point of
information. In other words, the debaters supporting the motion can request points of
information of members of the Opposition teams, and vice versa. To request a point of
information, a debater rises and politely says something like “point of information please,” or
“on that point.”

The debater giving the speech has the authority to accept or refuse the request for a point of
information. If the request for a point of information is accepted, the person who has
requested the point has a maximum of fifteen seconds to make the point. As stated earlier, the
point can be a question, a statement, or an argument. Sometimes points of information are
made to ask an opponent to clarify a position but more commonly, they are made to attempt
to undermine an argument being made by the speaker. More will be said about points of
information in Chapter 11.

Responsibilities for Speakers in Worlds-Style Debate

Although points of information are a common occurrence in every speech in the debate, each
speech contains elements that are unique to that speech. The following table explains the
basic responsibilities of each debater. Following the table is a fuller explanation of the
responsibilities of each speaker.
## Speaker Responsibilities for Worlds-Style Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Speaker Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper House (First Half of the Debate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Prime Minister*             | • Defines and interprets the motion  
• Describes the approach the First Government team will take  
• Constructs the case for that interpretation of the motion                                        |
| *Leader of Opposition*       | • Establishes a stance that both Opposition teams will defend throughout the debate.  
• Refutes the case of offered by the Prime Minister.  
• Constructs one or more arguments against the motion as the Prime Minister interpreted it.       |
| *Deputy Prime Minister*      | • Refutes the arguments presented by the Leader of Opposition.  
• Rebuilds the case presented by the Prime Minister.  
• Constructs one or more new arguments supporting the case of the Prime Minister.                |
| *Deputy Leader of Opposition*| • Continues refutation of case presented by the Prime Minister.  
• Refutes any new arguments presented by the Deputy Prime Minister.  
• Rebuilds arguments of the Leader of Opposition  
• Constructs one or more new arguments supporting those presented by the Leader of the Opposition.|
| **Lower House (Second Half of the Debate)**                                                                                                            |
| *Member of Government*       | • Supports the general direction and case of the First Government team.  
• Briefly continues refutation of First Opposition team’s arguments  
• Refutes new arguments introduced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.  
• Constructs at least one new argument that is different from but consistent with the case of the 1st Government (sometimes called an extension). |
| *Member of Opposition*       | • Supports the general direction taken by the First Opposition team.  
• Briefly continues refutation of the case of the First Government team.  
• Refutes arguments introduced by the Member of Government.  
• Constructs at least one new argument (extension) that is different from but consistent with the case of the 1st Opposition. |
The following sections briefly describe the speeches given by each of the eight speakers listed in the previous table. Those very brief descriptions will be expanded in later chapters.

**Prime Minister**

The debate begins with a seven-minute speech by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has three basic responsibilities: (1) to define and interpret the motion, (2) to describe the approach the First Government team will take, and (3) to develop the case for the motion. The first of those responsibilities, defining and interpreting the motion, is particularly important because it sets the stage for the entire debate. Defining and interpreting the motion are similar but subtly different processes. When defining the motion, the Prime Minister will explicitly define any ambiguous terms that might be contained in the motion. When interpreting the motion, the Prime Minister will then use those definitions, along with the motion as a whole, to focus and narrow the motion so that the rest of the debate can be productive.

So, the process of defining and interpreting the motion consists of defining any ambiguous terms, then focusing and narrowing the debate. The Prime Minister has the right to define and interpret the motion and the responsibility to do so in a reasonable fashion. If the Prime Minister’s interpretation is a poor one, the likely result will be a poor debate. In order to properly define and interpret the motion, the Prime Minister should: define any ambiguous terms in the motion; show how those definitions are reasonable ones and; interpret the motion by appropriately narrowing it in a way that will lead to a good and productive debate. More will be said about defining and interpreting the motion in Chapter 6 on constructing arguments for the First Government team.
The second responsibility of the Prime Minister is to describe the approach that the First Government team will take in the debate. That responsibility is most important in situations where the motion involves advocating a policy or action. In those cases, the Prime Minister’s interpretation may include a proposed policy or action. Sometimes, the Prime Minister’s interpretation of the debate will consist of a brief description of some course of action that the Government team will defend. When the Prime Minister interprets the motion by describing a proposed policy or course of action, that interpretation sometimes is called a “model” or simply a “proposal.” The Prime Minister is not required to present a model, but may choose to do so when he or she wants to present a clear outline of the proposed policy or action.

The final responsibility of the Prime Minister is to construct a “case” for the motion. Simply stated, a case consists of one or more arguments supporting the Prime Minister’s interpretation of the motion. Therefore, the Prime Minister will outline the arguments supporting the interpretation and will develop each of those arguments. The Prime Minister need not present all of the arguments for the First Government team. In many cases, the Prime Minister will state that the First Government team will have a certain number of arguments, and that the Deputy Prime Minister will present others.

The Prime Minister is responsible for presenting what is called a *prima facie* case. The phrase *prima facie* means literally “first face.” Thus, the Prime Minister must present a case that, on its first face, is convincing enough to support the motion. That the arguments presented constitute a *prima facie* case does not mean that they are so strong they cannot be refuted. Nor does *prima facie* mean that those arguments constitute the totality of the arguments that can and will be used to support the motion. Simply put, a *prima facie* case is one that is strong enough to convince a reasonable audience prior to any refutation being brought against it. As stated earlier, the Member of Government and the Leader of Government will introduce new arguments in support of the motion in their speeches.

**Leader of the Opposition**

Before considering the primary responsibilities of the Leader of Opposition, a few words about how the Leader should react to the Prime Minister’s definition and interpretation of the motion are in order. In most ordinary situations, the Leader of the Opposition should explicitly accept the definition and interpretation of the motion as presented by the Prime Minister. In extraordinary cases, when the definition is completely unreasonable as to preclude meaningful debate, the Leader of the Opposition has the right to reject the definition. The problem with rejecting the definition is that such an action will ultimately lead to a very bad debate for which the First Opposition team must share the responsibility with the First Government team who introduced the unreasonable interpretation in the first place. Therefore, even in the event of an unreasonable definition, the Leader of the Opposition should point out to the judge and the audience that the definition and interpretation presented by the Prime Minister is unreasonable, but then should go ahead and accept the definition for the purposes of the current debate.
After considering the definition and interpretation offered by the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition has three primary responsibilities: (1) to establish the stance that both Opposition teams will pursue throughout the debate, (2) to refute part or all of the Prime Minister’s case, and (3) to present one or more arguments in opposition to the Prime Minister’s interpretation of the motion. No “rule” indicates that these responsibilities must be carried out in a particular order. The order is completely at the discretion of the debater.

Sometimes a situation will call for beginning with refutation and then proceeding to argument construction, and sometimes a savvy debater will begin by constructing arguments then proceeding to refutation. In fact, especially advanced debaters are sometimes able to weave refutation and construction into a tapestry that creates a seamless fabric of argument.

As the responsibilities of the Leader of Opposition and the rest of the speakers are explained, one point needs to be made clear. The responsibilities can be carried out in a variety of ways. Each responsibility can be addressed individually, or they can be woven together into a tapestry of argumentation. The main point is that the responsibilities are derived from the logical and persuasive functions of a speech, not from some arbitrary rule-driven calculus. How these responsibilities are carried out is a judgment made by each individual speaker. Having explained that each responsibility can be carried out in a variety of ways, the remainder of the discussion of each speaker’s responsibilities, for the sake of clarity, will be detailed as if they were separate and independent responsibilities.

First, the Leader of the Opposition should establish a stance that both Opposition teams will pursue throughout the debate. This responsibility is similar to the Prime Minister’s responsibility to interpret and narrow the motion for the debate. Certainly, the Leader of Opposition is not in a position to restrict the arguments that the Second Opposition team will present, but the Leader of the Opposition, nevertheless, has the right and the responsibility to describe the general direction that both Opposition teams will take. Chapter 7 will note that the Leader of Opposition can chose among several alternatives: (1) defending the present situation, (2) defending the present situation with minor alterations, or (3) constructing an alternate proposal that is different from both the present situation and the Government team’s proposal. The point made here is that, if the Leader of Opposition chooses any one of those three alternatives, both the First and Second Opposition teams are obliged to follow those alternatives in the same way that the Second Government team is obliged to follow the interpretation advanced by the First Government team. If the First Opposition team chooses to explicitly defend the present situation, the Second Opposition team cannot simultaneously be loyal to the First Opposition and abandon a defense of the present situation to pursue an alternative proposal.

Second, the Leader of the Opposition should refute part or all of the Prime Minister’s arguments for the motion. Because of the limits of time, the Leader of Opposition cannot reasonably expect to refute all of the Prime Minister’s arguments. The proper goal is to select and refute the most important arguments presented by the Prime Minister. More will be said about refutation in Chapter 10.

Third, and most importantly, the Leader of the Opposition should present one, two, or three arguments directed against the Prime Minister’s interpretation of the motion. Those arguments are different from the arguments offered in refutation. They should consist of the
most persuasive reasons that the Leader of the Opposition can present to convince the audience to reject the motion as interpreted by the Prime Minister.

Deputy Prime Minister

The Deputy Prime Minister has three primary obligations: (1) to refute arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition, (2) to rebuild the case presented by the Prime Minister, and (3) to construct one or more arguments for the case presented by the Prime Minister.

First, the Deputy Prime Minister defends and rebuilds the case presented by the Prime Minister by engaging any refutation presented against the case by the Leader of the Opposition. That task needs to be accomplished in a very systematic fashion. The Deputy should take up the Prime Minister’s argument one by one and defend each argument against any important points of refutation offered by the Leader of the Opposition. Thus, at the end of that section of the Deputy’s speech, the audience should see that the case originally presented by the Prime Minister still stands as strongly as it did when initially presented. If that obligation is not carried out clearly, then all the work done by the First Government team and by the Prime Minister to establish a strong and compelling case will be lost.

Second, the Deputy Prime Minister should refute any of the important independent arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition. Like the Leader of Opposition, the Deputy should not try to refute all arguments, just the most important ones.

Finally, the Deputy Prime Minister should construct one or two additional arguments to the case presented by the Prime Minister. The reasons for adding new arguments are two-fold: First, the Prime Minister may not have had adequate time to develop all of the arguments that the First Government team wishes to present and, second, presenting these additional arguments gives Deputy Prime Minister a constructive role in the debate. Rather than simply rebuilding and refuting, the Deputy Prime Minister also has an important role in constructing arguments for the motion. Thus, the adjudicator will judge both the refutation and construction of arguments offered by the Deputy Prime Minister.

Deputy Leader of the Opposition

The duties of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are similar to those of the Deputy Prime Minister. The Deputy Leader should 1) advance the refutation offered by the Leader of Opposition, 2) refute arguments offered by the Deputy Prime Minister, 3) defend and rebuild new arguments offered by the Leader of the Opposition, and 4) construct one or more new arguments that can be added to those being offered by the Leader of Opposition.

First, the Deputy Leader should advance the refutation offered by the Leader of the Opposition. Advancing the Leader of Opposition’s refutation involves extending the important points of refutation offered by the leader of the Opposition. If the Deputy Leader ignores the refutation offered by the Leader, the judge and audience might rightly assume that the refutation presented by the leader was either faulty or not very important. Instead, the
Deputy Leader needs to advance that Leader’s refutation showing that the original refutation is still sound.

Second, the Deputy Leader should refute any new arguments presented by the Deputy Prime Minister. As suggested earlier, an effective Deputy Prime Minister probably will have offered arguments above and beyond those offered by the Prime Minister. If that is the case, the Deputy Leader should engage those arguments, as this speech is the last opportunity for the First Opposition team to refute those arguments.

Third, the Deputy Leader should defend and rebuild any arguments presented by the Leader of the Opposition. The task of the Deputy Leader is to make sure that the Leader’s arguments still stand firm in the mind of the judges and audience. To do so, the Deputy Leader needs to consider each argument one by one, engage any refutation offered by the Deputy Prime Minister, and therefore rebuild each argument.

Finally, the Deputy Leader should present one or more new arguments against the motion. Those arguments can be similar to the arguments raised by the Leader of the Opposition, yet they should be new ones to give Deputy Prime Minister a more constructive role in the debate.

**Member of Government**

The Member of Government initiates the second half (lower house) of the debate. The Member of Government needs to defend the general direction taken by the First Government team and, more importantly, needs to show how the Second Government team has a new and fresh position or adds something new and dynamic to the debate. In other words, the Member of Government needs to defend the thesis of the First Government team, while doing so for different reasons. The obligations of the Member of Government can be summarized as follows: (1) defend the general perspective of the First Government team, (2) continue refuting arguments made by the First Opposition team, (3) refute any new arguments offered by the Deputy Leader of Opposition, and (4) construct one or more new arguments that are different from but consistent with the case offered by the First Government team. A more detailed explanation of the responsibilities of both the Member of Government and the Member of Opposition speakers can be found in Chapter 8.

The first responsibility of the Member of the Government is to defend the general direction of the debate initiated by the First Government team. In so doing, the Member of Government demonstrates a sense of loyalty to the other team defending the motion. This part of the Member’s speech is important but need not be time-consuming. One minute or less devoted to this aspect of the speech will probably be sufficient.

Second, the Member of Government should continue refuting arguments made by the First Opposition team. The Member of Government should not use the same refutation as provided by debaters of the First Government team, but should introduce new points of refutation unique to the Second Government team.
Third, and related to the second obligation, the Member of Government should refute new arguments presented by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. If the Deputy Leader’s arguments are not refuted at this time, the First Government team will likely have no other opportunity to do so.

Finally, the Member of Government should develop one or more arguments that are different from but consistent with the arguments offered by the First Government team. Those new arguments are usually referred to as “extensions” because they have the effect of extending or advancing the debate. The extension is one of the most important tasks of the Member of Government’s speech because it provides an opportunity to distinguish the Second Government team from the First Government while simultaneously remaining consistent with the overall approach of the First Government.

Debaters supporting each side of the motion (Government and Opposition) will be judged not only in comparison with debaters from the other side, but in comparison to the other team on their side. An extension argument allows an adjudicator to compare the Second Government team to the First Government.

**Member of Opposition**

The Member of Opposition begins the second half of the debate for the Opposition side. Like the Second Government team, the goal of the Second Opposition team is to remain consistent with the First Opposition team while presenting a perspective unique to the Second Opposition. To accomplish this goal, the Member of Opposition needs to fulfill several roles: (1) defend the general direction taken by the First Opposition team, (2) briefly continue the refutation of the case of the First Government, (3) provide more specific refutation of the arguments introduced by the Member of Government, and (4) present one or more new arguments that are consistent with, yet different from, those presented by the First Opposition team.

First, the Member of Opposition should defend the general perspective taken by the First Opposition team. This need not be a time-consuming enterprise, but its accomplishment will show how the Member of Opposition is being loyal to the arguments of the First Opposition team. An important point that should not be missed is that the Member of Opposition’s arguments must be consistent with the stance offered by the Leader of Opposition. If the Leader of Opposition defended the status quo, so must the Member of Opposition. If the Leader of Opposition presented and defended an alternative or counter-proposal, the Member of Opposition must also defend that stance. Of course, the Member needs to defend the opposition stance by using new and unique arguments, and must remain loyal to the stance adopted by the Leader.

Second, the Member of Opposition should briefly continue the refutation of the case presented by the First Government team. Again, this continued refutation should be brief and should involve new points of refutation not yet considered by members of the First Opposition team.
Third, the Member of Opposition should present more specific refutation of the arguments introduced by the Member of Government. Refutation of the Member of Government’s arguments is an important task because those are completely new arguments supporting the Government side and have not yet been joined by the Opposition side.

Finally, the Member of Opposition should present an extension—an argument consistent with yet different from that presented by the First Opposition team. Like the Government’s extension, presenting the Opposition’s extension is an important responsibility of the Member of Opposition because it allows the Second Opposition team to show its loyalty while clearly differentiating themselves from the First Opposition team.

**Government Whip**

The Whip speakers for both teams have the responsibility to close the debate for their respective sides. The Government Whip should accomplish three goals: (1) refute the extension offered by the Member of Opposition, (2) rebuild the extension offered by the Member of Government, and (3) summarize the debate from the perspective of the Government side. More will be said about Whip speeches in Chapter 9.

The first responsibility of the Government Whip is to refute the extension offered by the Member of Opposition. The Government team will not yet have discussed this extension, therefore, its refutation is an important responsibility of the Government Whip.

The second responsibility of the Government Whip is to defend and rebuild the extension offered by the Member of Government. The Member of Government’s extension is a very important part of the Second Government’s case and, in all likelihood, will have been refuted by the Member of Opposition. Therefore, defending this extension is important to the overall case of the Second Opposition team. Sometimes, rather than providing an explicit defense and rebuilding of the Member of Government’s extension, the Government Whip may decide to include that defense as a part of the overall summary.

The final and, perhaps, most important responsibility of the Government Whip is to summarize the debate from the perspective of the Government side. The summary may be accomplished in a number of ways. The summary can examine the issues as addressed by both teams; it can regroup the issues into categories that are new to the debate; or, it can discuss the debate from a different or higher perspective than has been previously introduced. The summary should, of course, be made from the Government’s perspective while being and appearing to be fair-minded. Similarly, the summary should be fair to the First Government team but should focus on the arguments pursued by the Second Government.

**Opposition Whip**

The responsibilities of the Opposition Whip are almost identical to those of the Government Whip except that they are accomplished from the perspective of the Opposition side rather than the Government side. Again, the Opposition Whip should (1) refute the extension
offered by the Member of Government, (2) defend and rebuild the extension offered by the Member of Opposition, and (3) summarize the debate from the perspective of the Opposition side.

The details of that speech are exactly like those of the previous speech except that they focus on the Opposition side of the debate rather than the Government side. Once again, the primary goal of this speech is to summarize the debate from the perspective of the Opposition side, particularly from the point of view of the Second Opposition team. This summary should fairly support the Opposition side of the debate while focusing on the accomplishments of the Second Opposition team.

**Summary**

This, then, is the basic format of Worlds-Style debating: four teams of two persons each engage one another through a series of seven-minute speeches interspersed by points of information. The teams from each side maintain loyalty with one another while simultaneously demonstrating the unique qualities of their own arguments. That format is analogous, although not perfectly so, to the kind of debate that one might envision in a real parliament.

Much has been introduced here that has not been fully developed. Later chapters will further explore issues that have only been mentioned here, such as case construction, opposition arguments, points of information, refutation, and many others.
Terms and Concepts From Chapter 5

Check your memory and comprehension by describing or defining these key terms and concepts:

- Government
- Opposition
- Motion for debate
- Prime Minister
- Definition and interpretation of the motion
- Model of the motion
- Case
- Prima Facie case.
- Leader of Opposition
- Opposition stance
- Deputy Prime Minister
- Deputy Leader of Opposition
- Member of Government
- Member of Opposition
- Extension argument
- Government Whip
- Opposition Whip
- Summary speeches
- Upper house
- Lower house
- Points of information

Discussion Questions For Chapter 5

What is the legislative model for Worlds-Style debate?

What is meant by the following phrase? “The First Government team has the right to define and interpret the motion and has the responsibility to do so in a reasonable manner.”

Why is the presentation of an opposition stance an important obligation of the Leader of Opposition?

Why is the presentation of an extension argument an important obligation for the Member of Government and Member of Opposition?

Which speakers are allowed to offer points of information?
Exercise For Chapter 5

Have students listen to a video recording of a Worlds-Style debate. Debates can be found at http://willamette.edu/cla/china_debate/curriculum/index.html, or at a number of different locations on the Internet. Conduct a discussion in which students comment on every speech, noting whether or not debaters successfully meet the obligations of that speech.