TDA

Toronto Debate Academy

TDA Beginner Debate Guide

Toronto Debate Academy ▸ www.torontodebateacademy.com ▸ Version 2.4

TDA Beginner Debate Guide

Introduction

This guide provides an overview of the essential elements that a beginner debater needs to know. To learn more about debate and advanced debate techniques, we recommend visiting the Resources page at www.torontodebateacademy.com.

About the TDA

The Toronto Debate Academy provides debate education programming for Jr. High and High School Students. We run weekly classes, open and private tournaments, and workshops.

The Toronto Debate Academy only employs highly experienced debate instructors to ensure that our programming is second to none. Our services are highly customizable and can meet the needs of students at all levels of experience.

Please contact us at info@torontodebateacademy.com if you would like to discuss our programming options and how we can work with you to help you or your students *Debate Better*.

Debate Overview

All debates have two sides. The side that is in favour of the resolution is called either the *Government* or the *Proposition*. The side that is opposed to the resolution is called the *Opposition*. Teams normally have two speakers but there can be more in certain styles of debate.

> TIP: The teams are often referred to in short form as "Gov", "Prop", and "Opp".

During a debate, the teams alternate speakers. The goal of alternating speakers is to provide an opportunity for the debaters to explain why they disagree with the arguments of the opposing side. This disagreement is something debaters refer to as *clash*. Good rounds of debate have lots of clash.

What happens at Tournaments

The typical tournament is 20 to 100 teams in size. The tournament host chooses the style of debate and the resolutions. Tournaments range in length from three rounds to six rounds of debate. Some tournaments also have quarter-final, semi-final, and final rounds.

> TIP: Regular rounds are often referred to as "closed rounds" whereas quarter-final, semi-final, and final rounds are called "open rounds" and/or "break rounds".

Some tournaments have a prepared resolution (meaning that all teams know the resolution in advance and prepare prior to the event). Tournaments with prepared resolutions usually arrange it so that all teams get to debate both sides of the resolution.

Other tournaments use impromptu resolutions, or use impromptu resolutions for every round after the prepared rounds. An impromptu resolution is given to the debaters 15-30 minutes before the debate starts and debaters must prepare as a team (i.e. without help from teachers, parents, or other students) and without the use of electronic devices. Printed materials like *Almanacs*, student notes, and magazines are sometimes allowed during "prep time".

Tournament Organization

The tournament pairings for each round will either be done randomly or will be "bracketed". A bracketed tournament is one where teams are paired against other teams that have the same number of wins or points. At a bracketed tournament, the teams with the most wins at the end of the closed rounds break to the open rounds. At some tournaments, teams break based on individual speaker scores or a combination of speaker scores and wins. [Note: there is an explanation of how judging works later in this Guide].

Model Building

Most resolutions at high school tournaments are straightforward. An example of a straightforward resolution is *This House Believes That Canada Should Make University Tuition Free*. This resolution is straightforward because it tells you exactly who is doing what.

Some resolutions are less clear and require the Government team to interpret and define the terms of the debate. An example of a less clear resolution is *This House Would Legalize Child Labour*. This resolution is less clear because you do not know who "This House" is, what qualifies as a child, and what type of labour is included. [Note: over the past ten years specific resolutions have become the norm and vague resolutions are less common].

> TIP: Resolutions typically use acronyms. Here are the most common ones:
> THW – This House Would
> THBT – This House Believes That
> THS – This House Supports
> BIRT – Be It Resolved That
> THR - This House Regrets
> THO - This House Opposes

Regardless of whether the resolution is straightforward or not, the Government team needs to have a model (this is also sometimes referred to as "defining the terms" although the TDA recommends the modelling method described below over a definitional method in which each key word is defined separately).

When creating a model, the Government is cautioned to define the resolution such that there will be a good, contentious debate. Making the model too difficult for Opposition (referred to as a "tight" model) will not help Government do well.

How to Make a Model

A good model includes most (**but not necessarily all**) of the following:

1.) **Implementer** - the governing body or group in charge of carrying out the policy (e.g. a reasonable person/everybody, the Canadian Government, Provincial Government, Western Liberal Democracies, NATO, the U.N., the City of Toronto, etc.)
2.) **Scope** – the area and people affected by the resolution:
   a. Location (e.g. Ontario, global/regional, within an organization's member nations, etc.)
   b. Affected groups/demographics (e.g. persons above/under 18, illegal immigrants, First Nations individuals, etc.)
3.) **Additional parameters** – to ensure that the policy is feasible and that loopholes are minimized (e.g. government regulation, special training, preconditions, creation of an oversight board, opt-in/opt-out system, etc.)
4.) **Goal(s)** – what exactly is the policy meant to achieve? How does one determine its effectiveness? (e.g. to reduce crime, to distribute economic benefits more efficiently, to improve national security, to protect the rights of X, etc.). This element is crucial, as

it will allow the teams in the round to clearly identify the point(s) of clash. When developing your goal, always try to connect it with who you are trying to help/protect. No model will be the same. The most important thing you can do when making a model is to ask yourself if the model gives enough information that all sides can debate it. Likewise, more information is not necessarily better. For example, saying that a model will be implemented in six months is unnecessary unless there is a specific event that you are waiting for. Only include the information necessary and there will be less confusion in the round.

Example Model

The following is an example of how to model a vague resolution: *THW legalize child labour*.

Example:
"[Introduction]…which is why we are proud to support the legalization of child labour. We model this resolution as follows: The **governments of developing countries** should allow **individuals under the age of 18** who are **willing and able** to work to be legally employed. This would apply to all types of labour provided that the same health and safety rules that exist for adults also apply for children. When passing this bill the governments should **increase regulation to ensure that children are not being forced to work and are receiving fair compensation**. Our goal in passing this resolution is to **improve the quality of life of impoverished families.**"

Constructive Arguments

Speeches in parliamentary debate consist of a series of constructive arguments. Being able to develop unique constructive arguments is crucial in debate because it breaks down the speech into components, makes the arguments easier to follow, and ensures that there will be good clash between the two teams.

The foundation of a good constructive argument is PAEL, which stands for:

> **Point:** The sentence you want the judge to remember and the conclusion to your analysis. (1 Sentence)
> **Analysis:** The explanation of why your point is true followed by why your point matters. (3-5 Sentences)
> **Example:** A real world or hypothetical example that shows why your point makes sense. (1-2 Sentences)
> **Link:** Is how your point is connected to the resolution. (1 Sentence)

An easy way to think about PAEL is to compare it to a paragraph in a thesis paper. The Point is like a topic sentence, the Analysis proves the topic sentence, the Example supports the Analysis, and the Link connects the Point to the Goal, which is just like a thesis.

> TIP #1: If you are having trouble developing analysis, just keep asking 'why?' or 'so what?' after each of your sentences. Your answers to a series of why's and so what's is your analysis. Also, never forget to say why your point matters after you explain why it is true.
>
> TIP #2 – New debaters often put their example in front of their analysis. This is a mistake because if the example is refuted or distinguished, the entire point will fall. If you put your example after your analysis, the point will remain intact even if your example turns out to be bad.

Example Argument

Point: Guns are dangerous
Analysis:
[WHY] guns fire bullets at a high velocity

[SO WHAT] when bullets hit a human being they cause tremendous damage;
[SO WHAT] this results in a serious injury or in some cases death;
[THIS MATTERS BECAUSE] when people use guns to resolve disputes they are far more likely to seriously injure or kill one another than if no guns are present.
Example: The murder rate is higher in the U.S. than Canada because it is much easier to own a gun in the U.S.
Link: therefore, because guns are dangerous, guns should be banned.

Speech Organization

How to organize a speech is one of the first things that new debaters need to master in order to be able to make it through a round of debate. The following techniques are crucial for new debaters to learn.

Roadmapping

Outline what you will be talking about in your speech:

Example:

"[Introduction] …*I have three constructive arguments regarding i) deterrence, ii) justice, and iii) common sense. I will then move on to a thorough refutation of the Prime Minister's points.*"

> TIP: Students often either say their entire point (takes too long) or only say their number of points (no lead in). The best strategy when roadmapping is to say the least amount possible while still giving an indication of what your case is based on.

Flagging

Flagging is the act of prefacing each new part of the speech with an identification. This identifies for the listener when you are finished a point and starting a new one and which points you are refuting.

Example:

"My first point is…[States Point]…Therefore we should ban…Now I'd like to move to my refutation. In response to the LO's first point, this is why x is wrong…[Refutes Point]… Now I'd like to rebuild my partner's points. Regarding our first point, the LO failed to distinguish…"

Restate Points and Conclude

At the end of the speech, it is always a good idea to summarize what the speaker said and restate that they still propose/oppose the resolutions.

Example:

"Mr. Speaker, I have told you about x, y, z and proved that A is helped and B will also benefit…therefore we should ban…for these reasons we beg to propose."

> TIP: Often in conclusions students just state that they had "x" number of points. It is much more effective to focus on the actual substantive things that were proven in a conclusion rather than just the number of things said.

Teamwork

Teamwork is important at all points during a debate but it is probably most important during the prep time for an impromptu round.

Teammates should start by discussing what the resolution means (its impact and difference from the status quo) and developing a model. Then they should brainstorm arguments and turn the best

arguments into PAEL format for use during the debate.

TIP: Who came up with the point should not matter when deciding which team member will present it. Always run points in the order that will do the most to help your team win.

Common Preparation Mistakes

- Too much time on the model
- Too much time on a single argument
- Not enough time thinking about what the resolution actually means
- Forgetting to think of examples
- Not talking to your partner or understanding their points

TIP: Remember the following if you are debating with someone with different opinions than you:
-Be respectful
-Take turns speaking
-Try to reach a consensus
-Be willing to give and take

Argument Formation

It can be hard for new debaters to think up arguments in 15 minutes. One method that works is to think about all the different stakeholders that are impacted by a resolution. For example, a change in education policy would impact teachers, parents, students as well as other groups.

Example Brainstorming Results

Resolution: *THW Eliminate Trial by Jury*

Step one is reaching the understanding that this means that Canada should not use a jury (*a randomly chosen group of adults*) to decide trials (*when a person is accused of committing a crime and they go to court*). Instead a judge would make the decision. Once you are clear on the resolution's meaning you can proceed to brainstorm arguments.

Government Points	Opposition Points
1) Juries are made up of citizens that may be biased or prejudiced. 2) Judges are trained to make tough decisions and have studied law. 3) Juries are forced to make life and death decisions that may haunt them the rest of their lives. 4) Juries may misunderstand information that is presented. 5) Juries are inefficient at making decisions, and hung juries often occur where no decisions are made at all.	1) Juries are a fundamental part of democracy and our legal system. The peoples' voice and participation is crucial. 2) Judges are only people and are susceptible to biases and prejudice. 3) Bribery of one person is more likely than an entire jury. 4) Juries are made up of many people and bring different cultural, religious, financial, and racial perspectives to making decisions. 5) Jury members can be experts in anything at random, and that may be the difference

6) Juries are easily influenced by the media and public opinion despite the legal system's efforts to prevent this. 7) Jury duty impedes people's work, life, and family responsibilities.	between innocence and guilt. Judges cannot be experts at everything. 6) Prisoners have the right to be judged by their peers and not by a judge that he perceives as biased or not on his side.

Refutation

In almost every style of debate, the speaker must Directly Refute any constructive arguments in the previous speaker's speech.

Direct refutation is analysis that directly clashes with (and ideally disproves) the constructive argument. For example, if the speaker made the constructive argument that nuclear weapons are a global threat, the direct refutation could be that rather than being a threat, nuclear weapons have made war less likely due to the threat of mutually assured destruction.

> TIP: The TDA has an entire guide on Refutation on the Resources page of its website.

Direct refutation should always flag the constructive argument before starting the actual refutation (e.g. "in response to the PM's first constructive argument…[insert refutation]).

> TIP: Referring to the point number is crucial to allowing the judge to track what you are refuting. Avoid saying "the PM said something about X"

Rebuilding

Rebuilding is the process of addressing the refutation made against your partner's constructive arguments. The biggest mistake that debaters make is that they confuse rebuilding with restating. It is not sufficient to just restate the argument. Instead, debaters need to show the judges that they understood the refutation made and can respond by showing why the refutation was wrong and why the point still stands.

A good way to think about rebuilding is to think about it as refutation to the refutation.

Prepared Topics

As discussed above, prepared topics are used at some tournaments. Prepared topics are usually more difficult than impromptu topics because the tournament organizers know that students will have an opportunity to research the subject beforehand.

The following is a list of prepared topics that have appeared at tournaments:

1. THW veto the Palestinian bid for UN membership.
2. THW abolish native reserves.
3. THW allow doctors to lie to their patients to use the placebo effect.
4. THW ban the advertising of pharmaceuticals to patients directly.
5. Canada should eliminate universal healthcare.
6. THBT public services are better run by private companies.
7. THW abolish the "no man left behind policy."
8. THW invade North Korea.

How to Plan for Prepared Topics

- Start your research with any proper nouns in the resolution (e.g. “Palestine” and “North Korea”)
- Look for pages that summarize the topic (e.g. Wikipedia)
- Once you have an understanding of what the resolution means, start searching for articles that either discuss the controversy or take a side
- Analyze the sources you read, if the source is a major publication like the New York Times, the information is credible. If the source is a blog, it may be accurate but be discerning and look for a credible source that supports it
- Separate your notes into sections for 1) Model; 2) Gov Points; 3) Opp Points; and 4) Other information
- Continue researching until you have made a model and 3 to 4 constructive arguments for each side
- Never script out the speech. Make use of notes because a debater that is clearly reading is less persuasive.

Points of Information (POIs)

POIs are opportunities for debaters to rise during their opponent’s speech and offer a question or comment. The time during which a POI can be offered is usually restricted to between the first and last minute of the debater’s speech. To offer a POI, the debater stands up and if they like, makes a short comment such as “on that point?” or “point of information?”. The debater is strictly prohibited from including any information about their POI before they are acknowledged by the speaker.

The speaker can “accept” the POI by acknowledging the person standing or they can “wave them down” and/or say “No thank you" or “Not at this time”.

> TIP: it is a much better strategy to waive down POIs than to say something out loud because this will not interrupt your speech

POIs can be used to clarify something the speaker said, point out a flaw/contradiction in the speaker’s argument, or to raise previous argumentation by your team that the speaker has not properly dealt with. POIs should always be in the form of a question, even if all it is is adding “Would you not agree…” to the start of a statement. That said, it is incredibly frustrating for judges when “would you not agree” is said over and over again in a round so try to mix it up. Shorter question words like ‘what’ and ‘why’ are much more direct and effective.

It is important to keep the POI **brief and to the point** (5-10 seconds), but also to keep yourself in the round with both strong use and acceptance of POIs.

In styles of debate where the speaking time is five minutes or less, speakers are typically required to only accept one POI. When the speeches are longer than five minutes, the speaker is expected to take two POIs (assuming that there were sufficient opportunities to accept POIs). When no POIs are offered, debaters are advised to state that they will take a POI if one is offered. If none are offered after that point the judge will know that you did not take 1-2 POIs because the other team did not offer any.

Debaters are also encouraged to offer frequent POIs, although there should always be at least a 15 second pause before offering another POI after being waved down.

Lastly, new debaters often accept too many POIs and/or stop abruptly whenever someone stands to offer a POI. Both of these are

mistakes. Remember, the person speaking has control over the debate. Speakers are advised to always finish what they are saying before taking a POI and to not let the person standing distract them while they are talking. As well, unless the speaker plans to take the POI within ~15 seconds of it being offered, that person should be waived down, not left standing indefinitely.

> TIP: Never take a POI in the first minute or your speech. Since you have not covered much material yet, it will be about something else and may throw off your pace and organization. Likewise, always offer POIs early in speeches as these can greatly throw off your opponent if they are accepted

How Judging Works

Debate rounds at tournaments are judged by 1 to 5 judges. The judges vary by age, occupation, and debate experience, but they all have the same tasks: determine which team won, award speaker scores to the debaters, and provide written or oral feedback.

In order to determine who won a round of debate, judges will look at several factors including the following categories which are explained in detail:

- Content and Evidence
- Argument and Reasoning
- Organization
- Presentation and Delivery
- Refutation and Rebuttal

Content & Evidence

· Does the first speaker on each side provide at least 2-3 distinct constructive points? Does the second speaker on each side either provide new constructive points or significantly deepen the analysis of the previous points?

· Are the points relevant to the debate and meaningfully connected to the resolution?

· Are the points supported by persuasive evidence and not just asserted as fact? In a prepared round, is actual research brought forward to support the arguments? In an impromptu round, is there evidence of general knowledge and creative examples?

· Is the evidence brought forward by the debater appropriately varied and representative (qualitative and quantitative, taken from different authorities, considerate of geographical and temporal differences)?

· Does the debater's content and that of their partner add up to a full *case* for the side they are defending, rather than being discrete points?

· Does the debater show subtlety and moderation in their arguments, avoiding unnecessary extremes? Do they take on a burden of proof that is neither too narrow nor too polarized?

Argument & Reasoning

· Does the debater understand the whole question being debated, the essence of their opponent's objections to their arguments, and how the particular issues that emerge during the debate relate to one another?

· Does the debater explain each point in full, spelling out relevant premises or assumptions, and argue why it is evidence for their case?

· Does the debater recognize and expose weaknesses in the opponents' evidence and reasoning, for example through POIs?

· Can the debater effectively respond to opponents' critiques of their logic or argumentation?

Organization

· Does the debater present material in a clear, fluent, logical and coherent manner?
· Can you follow where the debater is going from one idea to the next?
· Does the speech have an effective introduction and conclusion and landmarks in-between?
· Does the debater use all of their time without rushing or stalling? Is an appropriate amount of time devoted to each component of the speech?
· Do the constructive points unfold in a logical order, with the fundamental arguments appearing first and derivative ones appearing later?

Presentation & Delivery

· Does the debater speak smoothly and confidently without filler words such as 'like' and 'we tell you that'?
· Does the debater hold your attention and use a variety of stylistic techniques? Is there humour, wit, or passion, as appropriate, in the their delivery?
· Do they speak in grammatical sentences using a varied and appropriate vocabulary? Does the debater use rhetoric effectively without relying too heavily on catch phrases or fillers?

Refutation and Rebuttal

· Does the debater directly acknowledge and address their opponents' points?
· Do they effectively diffuse their opponents' points through appropriate counterexamples, evidence, or logical deconstruction?
· Are the opponents' points refuted thoroughly and systematically, in a manner that is easy to follow? Does the debater ensure that no significant points raised previously are left unexamined?
· Does the debater make concessions where appropriate to avoid defending ridiculous propositions, while still minimizing the force of an opponent's objection?
· Can the debater persuasively rebuild their case in light of objections made by the other team, without simply reiterating what was initially said?

Further criteria

· Does the debater take on a reasonable burden for their side, through defining the resolution and/or framing the scope of their constructive points?
· Does the debater accept at least 1 POI in a constructive speech (assuming enough are offered), and deal with it effectively?
· Does the debater offer POIs until at least 1 is accepted by their opponents? Are the POIs concise questions that help to dismantle the opponent's point or train of thought? Does the debater return to the POIs in a later speech (where possible) to highlight what was proven?
· Does the debater display cooperation and consistency with their partner and clash with their opponents?
· Are the relevant points of contention between the two sides helpfully framed and analyzed, especially in rebuttal speeches?
· Do the debaters engage meaningfully with the resolution, and not with a simplified version of it or a prefabricated understanding of how the other team would interpret it?
· Does the debater listen actively during the debate and show the ability to think on the spot?

What Happens After the Debate

When the debate ends, the judge will ask the debaters to shake hands and leave the room. The judge(s) will then review their notes. If there is more than one judge, sometimes the judges will discuss who they believe won the round and why. The judge(s) will then fill in their ballot. If the tournament has oral feedback, the debaters will be asked to come back in and the judge(s) will provide comments. If there are no oral comments, the judge(s) will write down their comments on the ballot and a copy of the ballot will be given to the debaters after the tournament. Some tournaments also tell debaters who won the round during the first 1-5 rounds of the tournament (this is called "open adjudication").

A judge's decision is final and must be accepted. There is no appeal process and you should never argue with your judge about the result. Many judges are willing to provide additional individual feedback if you approach them after the debate while they are free.

Remember that if 100 judges watched your debate, it is unlikely that all 100 would agree on the result. Even if 80/100 judges would give you the win, there's a 20% chance that you will have a judge that will give you the loss. Sometimes you will benefit from what appears to be a "bad call" but sometimes you will not. Debating is always somewhat subjective and it is important to accept this fact.

Common Styles of Debate

British Parliamentary (BP) – A style of debate most often used at University run tournaments. BP is also the style of debate used at the World University Debate Championships. BP is unique in that four teams (two on Gov and two on Opp) compete in the same round. At the end of the round teams are ranked 1st to 4th. For more information on BP check out the TDA BP Guidebook.

Canadian Parliamentary (CP) – A style of debate used at the Canadian University National Debate Championships. At the high school level, CP is similar to CNDF and has two teams and impromptu resolutions.

Canadian National Debate Format (CNDF) – A style of debate used at the Canadian High School National Championships and at many provincial championships. Tournaments with this style usually have a prepared resolution followed by impromptu rounds.

World Schools Debate Format (WSDF) – A style of debate used at the World Schools Debating Championship (the international championships of high school debating). This format has two four member teams but only three students on each team give speeches. The fourth member assists with resolution preparation. Outside of Australia and Asia, this format is rarely offered at local tournaments.

Conclusion

Getting involved in debate is one of the most rewarding things a young student can do. Debate teaches public speaking, critical thinking, confidence and a life-long desire to know more. It is one of the only academic activities that is as competitive as sports and something that students can continue to enjoy and compete at right through university.

This Guide is intended as a starting point, but it is far from the last word on debating. As debaters improve, it is important to continue to develop technique and knowledge in order

to excel at competitions. The TDA has several more advanced debate guides available on our website. We also encourage students to join their school's debate club and/or join our classes. Being successful at debate, like any other competitive activity, requires practice and dedication. Do not be discouraged if you do not do well at your first tournament. Just remember that as long as you are improving, you are succeeding.

Key Takeaways from the Beginner Guide

	DO	**DO NOT**
Modelling	• Ensure that the difference between Gov and Opp is clear • Use all the necessary elements from Implementer, Scope, and Additional Parameters • Always have a goal	• Forget to have a model • Change key elements of the resolution • Design the model to be impossible for Opp
Constructive Arguments	• Point: The sentence you want the judge to remember and the conclusion to your analysis. (1 Sentence) • Analysis: The explanation of why your point is true followed by why your point matters. (3-5 Sentences) • Example: A real world or hypothetical example that shows why your point makes sense. (1-2 Sentences) • Link: Is how your point is connected to the resolution. (1 Sentence)	• Forget to put your conclusion first • Speak for less than 1 minute per argument • Forget to explain both why the point is true and why the point matters
Refutation	• Attempt to explain both why the point is not true and why the point does not matter	• Only repeat other arguments your team made • Spend more time repeating the point than refuting the point • Repeat any of the point (if possible)
Rebuilding	• Engage with the refutation first • After directly engaging the refutation, explain why your partner's point is more believable than the refutation	• Only repeat your partner's point • Only repeat the refutation then state it is wrong • Refute the refutation in a way that invalidates your partner's point or changes the importance of your partner's point
Notetaking	• Take pointform notes of everything said in the debate	• Script out what you plan to say in full sentences
Roadmapping and Flagging	• Remember to roadmap your speech and flag each transition • Include some information about what you will say in your roadmap	• Skip your roadmap • Start your speech with your roadmap • Only mention how many points you will have in your roadmap • State the entire point in your roadmap

	• Always use point numbers for new arguments and refer to point numbers when refuting and rebuilding	• Flag by saying "the speaker talked about…" without referring to a point number
Summarizing	• Refer to what you said specifically and what you have proven • Always refer to the resolution and why your team is winning	• Only say how many points you gave or that you gave refutation
Teamwork	• Cooperate with your partner • Share information with your partner • Do not fight over who will give what points • Help make their speech as good as possible	• Fight with your partner • Ridicule your partner's ideas • Focus only on your own speech • Start a debate without knowing everything your partner will talk about
POIs (offering)	• Say "on that", "POI" or some other sound when you stand up • Sit down when waived down • Keep POIs short • Make sure you ask a question • Sit down when you finish speaking	• Start with "would you not agree" • Provide a background on things previous speakers said • Speak or stand after the question has been asked • Stand up immediately after being waived down • Forget to offer POIs to each speaker
POIs (taking)	• Listen carefully • Answer directly to the best of your ability • Get back to your speech as quickly as possible	• Take a POI in the first minute of your speech • Stop talking when a person stands up • Accept a POI anytime other than when you are flagging a transition to a different part of your speech • Say "no thank you, not at this time" instead of silently waiving down while you continue your speech
Receiving Feedback	• Listen respectfully • Request additional feedback when possible • Write down all feedback given	• Argue with your judge • Complain to others about your judge (unless there is a serious reason to do so such as bias)