

# The Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill Society

*in conjunction with*

THE ALBERTA DEBATE AND SPEECH ASSOCIATION

*and*

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA DEBATE SOCIETY

P R E S E N T S



THE 2008-2009

## Edmonton Journal Churchill Debate and Speech Competitions

P R E P A R A T O R Y   P A C K A G E

---



# Senior High Canadian National Style

*Eligible Competitors:*  
Grade 10, 11 and 12  
students ONLY  
from Edmonton  
and surrounding  
area.

- This debate will take place in Senior High Canadian National Style.
  - All teams will be given the opportunity to use the full Open times (that is, 8-8-8-8-4-4, as outlined below) and are encouraged use the full speaking time if possible.
  - There is no Beginner division.
  - Points of Information (POIs) are strongly encouraged. Each debater should accept two POIs in the course of his or her speech, and should offer POIs to his or her opponents during their speeches. The first and last minutes of each constructive speech are protected; the reply speeches are entirely protected. No POIs should be offered in this time.
  - Heckling is prohibited.
- 

## Adjudication

### DEBATE

In determining which team won and which team lost each round of debate, judges will assign each debater a speaker score. This will be done on the basis of Content, Presentation style, and Strategy.

- **CONTENT** covers the arguments that are used, divorced from the speaking style. Judges will look at the quality and depth of substantiation of the arguments and the counterarguments or clash. Clash is an essential part of the debate and will be weighted heavily.
- **PRESENTATION** covers the way the debaters speak. Judges will look at the degree to which the presentation complements the argument. Students will be penalized for reciting or directly reading pre-written speeches (even if they are memorized), for lowering the tone of the debate, or for lack of structure (when it impedes the clear communication of ideas).
- **STRATEGY** covers three concepts: the timing (and thus the structure) of the speech, whether the speaker understood the issues of the debate, and whether the speaker fulfilled his or her specific role within the framework of the debate.

Judges will assign scores out of a theoretical maximum of 100, with up to 40 points for each of content and presentation, and 20 for strategy; judges may also choose to give scores holistically. Regardless, speaker points at this tournament will fall within the range of 60—80, with an average of 70. There will be no low-point wins: the combined speaker scores of the winning team must be at least as great as those of the losing team.

### DEBATE RESOLUTION

“This House Supports the actions of  
Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer on  
April 13, 1919 in Amritsar.”

# Canadian National Style Debate Flow Sheet

## High School – Canadian National Style

### The Task of the Proposition Team

- The Proposition will argue **for the resolution**
- Members of the Proposition team will provide contentions and arguments and evidence in support of the resolution
- If the Proposition Team's Position is, on balance, more credible than the Opposition, then the Proposition wins the debate

### The Task of the Opposition Team

- The task of the Opposition is to argue **against the resolution**
- Members of the Opposition team will provide contentions and arguments and evidence in opposition to the Proposition and in support of the Opposition position
- If, on balance, the Opposition Team's Position is more credible than the Proposition, then the Opposition team wins the debate.

1 <sup>st</sup> Proposition (Sr. Beg – 6 min, Sr. Open – 8 min)	1 <sup>st</sup> Opposition (Sr. Beg – 6 min, Sr. Open – 8 min)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Proposition (Sr. Beg – 6 min, Sr. Open – 8 min)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Opposition (Sr. Beg – 6 min, Sr. Open – 8 min)	Opposition Reply Speech (1 <sup>st</sup> Opposition) (4 min)	Proposition Reply Speech (1 <sup>st</sup> Proposition) (4 min)
Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	<p>Both reply speeches summarize their position and point out the basic flaws of the opposition.</p> <p>No new arguments can be introduced although new evidence (examples, logic etc.) is allowed.</p> <p>Explain why your team should win and the other team should lose.</p> <p>Remind the judges of your arguments.</p> <p>Tell the judges why they should believe your arguments even after the other team's attack.</p> <p>Explain why the judges should not listen to the other team.</p> <p>Review critical evidence.</p>	
Definitions	If necessary, challenge definitions	Show unity with Caseline	Show unity with Caseline		
Theme/Case line	Theme/Case line	Clash with Opposition arguments	Clash with Proposition arguments		
Model (If Needed)	Clash with Proposition arguments	Additional arguments to support resolution	Further arguments against resolution		
Arguments in support of resolution	If necessary- counter model, otherwise arguments against Proposition	Conclusion	Conclusion		
Conclusion	Conclusion				

### Style Information

The first and last minute of all constructive speeches are protected, meaning Points of Information are not permitted.

Points of Information are not permitted in the reply speeches

# Adjudication

## PUBLIC SPEECH

For public speech the Judges will take into account the following criteria:

- Did the speaker have sufficient impact to inform, entertain or persuade?
- Did the candidate provide an effective introduction?
- Did the candidate arrange his/her ideas in a logical order?
- Did the candidate link his/her ideas coherently?
- Did the candidate conclude effectively?
- Did the candidate establish direct eye contact with his/her audience?
- Did the candidate make effective use of body language?
- Did the candidate achieve fluency?
- Did the candidate display enthusiasm in his/her presentation?
- Did the candidate exhibit clear, distinct diction?
- Did the candidate vary his/her tone effectively?
- Did the candidate show poise?
- Did the candidate choose ideas that demonstrated his/her understanding of the topic?
- Did the candidate use rationale, believable or persuasive statements?
- Did the candidate limit the topic to ideas that could be developed adequately in the time available?
- Did the candidate make use of one or more statistics, examples, anecdotes, common knowledge, and expert opinion to inform, entertain or persuade?
- Did the speaker capture and hold your interest?

### **SPEECH TOPIC**

Express your views on the decisions made by Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer on April 13, 1919 in Amritsar.

## BRIGADIER-GENERAL REX DYER



In the spring of 1919, despite Gandhi's pleas (though often in his name), Indian resistance went from passive to active. Violence flared when a crowd tried to enforce the *hartal* (a national day of 'self-purification' but in essence a general strike) at Delhi railway station on 30 March. Three men were killed when troops opened fire. The most notorious clash, however, was at Amritsar in the Punjab, where one man attempt to stop what he saw as an incipient rerun of the Indian Mutiny. In Amritsar, as elsewhere, people had responded to Gandhi's call. On 30 March a crowd of 30,000 gathered in a show of 'passive resistance'. In 6 April there was another *hartal*. The situation was still peaceful at his stage, but sufficiently tense for two of the local nationalist leaders to be taken into custody and deported. When news of the arrest spread, violence flared. Shots were fired; banks attacked; the telephone lines cut. On 10 April a series of violent protest had resulted in 5 British government workers being build from a bank and beaten to death. On 11 April a Church of England missionary named Manuella Sherwood was knocked off her bicycle and beaten insensible by a mob. At this point the civilians handed over power to the soldiers. That night, Brigadier-General Rex Dyer arrived to take charge.

A short-tempered, pugilistic chain-smoker, Dyer was not noted for the subtlety of his approach to civil unrest. At Staff College he had been summed up as 'happiest when crawling over a Burmese stockade with a revolver in his mouth'. By now, however, he was fifty-four and a sick man, in constant pain from war wounds and riding injuries. His mood was thunderous. On his arrival, he received instructions from Michael O'Dwyer, the Punjab Lieutenant Governor, which stated unambiguously: 'No gatherings of persons nor processions of any sort will be allowed. All gatherings will be fired on.' The next day he issued a proclamation formally prohibiting 'all meetings and gatherings'. When on 13 April, a crowd of 20,000 people thronged the Jallianwala Bagh in defiance of these orders, he did not hesitate. He took two armored cars and fifty Gurkha and Baluchi troops to the scene and, as soon as he had deployed them around the crowd, gave the order to open fire. There was no warning and the crowd had no chance to disperse, since the eight-acre meeting ground was surrounded by wall on all four sides and had only one narrow entrance. In ten minutes of sustained shooting, 379 demonstrators were killed, and more than 1,500 wounded. In the aftermath, Dyer ordered public floggings of high-caste suspects. Any Indian entering the street where Manuella Sherwood had been attacked was forced to crawl on his stomach.

The hard line initially had support. O'Dwyer endorsed Dyer's action. His superior officers quickly found fresh work for him to do in Afghanistan. Some local Sikhs even made him an Honorary Sikh in a ceremony at the

Golden Temple, likening him to 'Nikalseyan Sahib' (John Nicholson, the legendary hero of the 1857 Mutiny). At home the *Morning Post* opened a sympathy fund for Dyer, collecting over £26,000 from donors, among them Rudyard Kipling. However, the mood changed quickly from self-righteousness to remorse. Dyer's undoing began when two Congress-supporting lawyers succeeded in having him summoned before an inquiry to answer for his actions. His unabashed admission that his intention had been to 'strike terror into the whole of the Punjab' brought the roof down on his head. In Parliament Montagu angrily asked of those who defended Dyer: 'Are you going to keep your hold upon India by terrorism, racial humiliation, and subordination and frightfulness ...?' Less predictable was Churchill's denunciation of the massacre as 'monstrous'. It was 'without precedent or parallel in the modern history of the British Empire. It is an event of an entirely different order from any of those tragical occurrences which take place when troops are brought into collision with the civil population. It is an extraordinary event, a monstrous event, an event which stands in singular and sinister isolation.'

Insisting that firing on unarmed civilians was 'not the British way of doing business', Churchill accused Dyer of undermining rather than saving British rule in India. This was simply 'the most frightful of all spectacles, the strength of civilization without its mercy'. Dyer was hastily Invalided out of the army. Although he was never prosecuted, his career was over.

---

The above is an excerpt from *Empire* by Niall Ferguson. Individuals interested in exploring this topic further are encouraged to read his book. In addition to *Empire*, Andrew Roberts' *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples Since 1900* is encouraged for individuals wishing to know even more.

*In addition to the facts listed above the University of Alberta Debate Society (UADS) wishes to include the following facts:*

- 1650 rounds of ammunition were fired.
- Dyer ordered the soldiers to ignore the wounded.
- Hunter Inquiry, an investigatory body established by the British House of Parliament for the purpose of investigating the massacre, concluded, with much dissent amongst its members, that:
  - The lack of notice to disperse upon the soldiers arrival was an error
  - The length of firing was an error
  - The lack of attention for the wounded was unacceptable.
  - Some dissenting members concluded that Dyer had "acted impetuously, but correctly. The beginnings ... of revolt, justified the actions taken, ... while these actions are on the extremity of acceptability, they are still within its realms. This Inquiry cannot condemn [these actions] without limiting the ability of officers to execute their orders effectively."

## **A general warning against the use of Wikipedia**

Its accuracy, especially concerning this topic, is highly suspect. Much of the entries surrounding this event have been subsequently edited since the release of this topic to represent a false account of the events of that day. Amongst these is the inclusion of a statement by a Pakistani government official who claimed the massacre cost the lives of “10,000 men, women and children innocently shot in cold blood.” A figure, which if true would have meant that each bullet fired managed to kill 6.06 people.

## **General note on this debate**

This is not to be a debate of the facts, it is to be a debate of principles. If any research contradicts the above information, it is strongly suggested that debaters ignore it. This debate can be won on both sides through interpretation and application of the facts presented above. Additional facts may be used but will be treated with mild suspicion.