



# THE HAGUE LAW DEBATE TOURNAMENT



OPEN Q&A  
SESSION 2023





Opening statements		Rebuttal		Conclusion
TEAM A	The team will have 4 minutes to conduct the “pro” opening statements	1st speaker has 2 minutes to present arguments and start rebuttal	2nd speaker has 2 minutes for rebuttal and to introduce new points	3rd speaker has 2 minutes for rebuttal and to summarize the arguments
	The team will have 4 minutes to conduct the “con” opening statements	1st speaker has 2 minutes to present arguments and start rebuttal	2nd speaker has 2 minutes for rebuttal and to introduce new points	3rd speaker has 2 minutes for rebuttal and to summarize the arguments



**A. Content of the arguments to support the debate position**  
[point range 0-5 per element]

1. Clear structure (beginning to end)
2. The goal of argument - clarity and explanation
3. Clear conclusion
4. The originality of ideas/concepts used
5. Effectiveness of argumentation style
6. Use of hard law
7. Use of relevant case law (reliability)
8. Relevancy of the examples
9. Logos (reasons, origins, context)
10. Pathos (emotions of the audience)
11. Ethos (elaboration on the concepts and values)
12. Reactivity (using opponent's arguments in own favour)

**B. Presentation of the position**  
[point range 0-6 per element]

1. Language
2. Modulation
3. Effective use of Body Language / gestures
4. Persuasiveness
5. Effort of preparation (as perceived during the match)

**Overall impression of the team's performance**  
[point range 0-10]

**Extra (possible point deductions)**

1. Going over speaking time [up to -2.5]
2. No courtesy shown to the opposing team and/or jury [up to -2.5]
3. Misunderstanding of the topic [up to -2.5 if minor, up to -5 if major]
4. Reading (on screen/device/material) [up to -5]







# Grading Criteria - Part 1

## **A. Content of the arguments to support the debate position** [point range 0-5 per element]

1. Clear structure (beginning to end)
2. The goal of argument - clarity and explanation
3. Clear conclusion
4. The originality of ideas/concepts used
5. Effectiveness of the argumentation style
6. Use of hard law
7. Use of relevant case law (reliability)
8. Relevancy of the examples
9. Logos (reasons, origins, context)
10. Pathos (emotions of the audience)
11. Ethos (elaboration on the concepts and values)
12. Reactivity (using opponent's arguments in own favour)





# Grading Criteria - Part 2

## **B. Presentation of the position**

[point range 0-6 per element]

1. Language
2. Modulation
3. Body Language
4. Persuasiveness
5. The perceived effort of preparation

## **Overall impression of the team's performance**

[point range 0-10]

## **Point deductions**

1. Going over speaking time [-2.5]
2. No courtesy shown to the opposing team and/or jury [-2.5]
3. Overt reading [up to -5]
4. Misunderstanding of the topic [-2.5 to -5]



# THE HAGUE INTER-UNIVERSITY LAW DEBATE TOURNAMENT 2023

## RULES & REGULATION

2023

### The Hague Inter-University Law Debate Tournament

[This document is for the sole use of the THULDT 2023 judges.]

#### Judge's Handbook

### The Hague Inter-University Law Debate Tournament

2023



### The Hague Inter-University Law Debate Tournament

#### Overview of the match grading criteria

MATCH ROUND: \_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE: \_\_\_\_\_  
TEAM: \_\_\_\_\_

#### A. Content of the arguments to support the debate position [point range 0-5 per element]

1. Clear structure (beginning to end)
2. The goal of argument - clarity and explanation
3. Clear conclusion
4. The originality of ideas/concepts used
5. Effectiveness of argumentation style
6. Use of hard law
7. Use of relevant case law (reliability)
8. Relevancy of the examples
9. Logos (reasons, origins, context)
10. Pathos (emotions of the audience)
11. Ethos (elaboration on the concepts and values)
12. Reactivity (using opponent's arguments in own favour)

#### B. Presentation of the position [point range 0-6 per element]

1. Language
2. Modulation
3. Effective use of Body Language / gestures
4. Persuasiveness
5. Effort of preparation (as perceived during the match)

#### Overall impression of the team's performance [point range 0-10]

#### Extra (possible point deductions)

1. Going over speaking time [up to -2.5]
2. No courtesy shown to the opposing team and/or jury [up to -2.5]
3. Misunderstanding of the topic [up to -2.5 if minor, up to -5 if major]
4. Reading (on screen/device/material) [up to -5]

Every team will receive grading sheet after the match.

Members of the jury may decide to include commentary & feedback relevant to each team's performance during the match.

The feedback may include tips for future match preparations, advice on what to avoid during the match and presentation or specific feedback for members of the team.

The level and extent of the feedback depends on each judge.

Each team can receive maximum 300 points per match prior to the Final Round (ie max 100 points per judge).

#### \*FOR TRAINING PURPOSES ONLY

*This document outlines the grading criteria that will apply in the ed. 2023. The actual grading sheet shall be made available to the members of the jury and then provided either in its original form or in its processed form to the teams with the feedback provided by the members of the jury.*



Learn more

Discover

The Hague Inter-University Law Debate Tournament & Concours Inter-Universitaire de Debat de La Haye







Q&A

GO

[www.coraxfoundation.com](http://www.coraxfoundation.com)





# Stay up to date

[competitions@coraxfoundation.com](mailto:competitions@coraxfoundation.com)

## Website

[WWW.CORAXFOUNDATION.COM](http://WWW.CORAXFOUNDATION.COM)

## LinkedIn

[HTTPS://WWW.LINKEDIN.COM/COMPANY/CORAX-FOUNDATION/](https://www.linkedin.com/company/corax-foundation/)



## Facebook

[CORAX FOUNDATION | FACEBOOK](https://www.facebook.com/coraxfoundation)

