



EVENT REPORT

1. Event Overview

Name: British Parliamentary Debate

Date of Event: 6th February 2026

Venue: VLTC L206

Organized by: Debate Club

Coordinators: 3rd and 2nd Year members of Debate Club.

Judges :

Divya Mathur, PhD scholar, Dept.of Humanities

Saloni Kumari, PhD scholar, Dept.of Humanities

Kunal Thapliyal – General Secretary

Winner:

1st Position: Arpita Sahu & Prakriti

2nd Position: Dhyaan & Siddhi

2. Introduction

The Debate Club successfully organized an offline event titled "British Parliamentary Debate". The event served as an interactive platform where students expressed their viewpoints on diverse motions, engaged in high-stakes clashes through British Parliamentary style debates, and sharpened their argumentation skills. Participants tackled complex propositions as members of government or opposition benches, delivering structured speeches, responding to Points of Information, and crafting rebuttals to dismantle opponents' cases. It also honed public speaking prowess under time pressure while familiarizing debaters with BP's signature flow: whips summing up, protections from interruptions, and the thrill of unscripted interventions.

Event Theme: Fostering intellectual discourse, teamwork, and analytical thinking through British Parliamentary debates on pressing contemporary issues, while contextualizing the ideologies of great global thinkers.

Objective: The British Parliamentary Debate aimed to sharpen participants' communication, critical thinking, and teamwork skills through high-energy clashes on real-world motions.



Target Audience: First and second year students from MNIT, alongside peers from colleges across the region, uniting a vibrant broader college community.

3. Event Highlights

● Activities:

1. British Parliamentary Debate: Logical, incisive discussions that elevate reasoning and clash ideas effectively.
2. Live Judging: Real-time evaluation by a panel of judges to ensure fair and unbiased results.
3. Key Learnings: Participants grasped the vital role of concise, punchy arguments and razor-sharp active listening – essentials for dominating Points of Information and rebuttals in the heat of debate.

1. Participation:

The event witnessed enthusiastic participation from around 60 students pre-evaluated and 16 students were selected for the main round of the event, with first-year and second-year students actively managing and participating in the event.

2. Event Structure:

The competition was conducted in three distinct phases:

❖ Screening Round:

- From around 60 eager participants, 16 standout students advanced, selected through intense British Parliamentary-style rounds and judged by seasoned 2nd-year coordinators.

❖ Semi Finals:

- Groups of 8 participants formed 4 teams - Opening Government, Closing Government, Opening Opposition, and Closing Opposition – tackling provocative motions like "This House believes racial justice is primarily a domestic issue," "This House believes the Ukraine-Russia war signifies the end of Cold War architecture," and "This House believes modern democracies govern through fear rather than consent."



- Each speaker held 4 minutes: protected first and last minutes for core arguments, with the middle 2 open to Points of Information (POIs).
- Rounds kicked off with the Opening Government's 1st speaker, immediately challenged by the Opening Opposition's 1st speaker and so on.
- Participants were judged by 3rd-year seniors across three pillars: Matter (30%) for content quality, general knowledge, and logical argumentation; Manner (40%) for speaking skills, clarity, confidence, body language, voice modulation, and fluency; and Method (30%) for strategic structure, effective rebuttals, POI engagement, and seamless teamwork.
- From this round, a total of 8 People were selected to proceed to the next round of the event.

❖ Finals:

- Top 4 teams, 2 each from the semifinals were selected for the final intellectual discussion.
- Topic: "This House believes that the backlash against AI-generated art reflects anxiety about labor rather than culture," participating teams clashed over economic vulnerabilities like AI tools (e.g., Midjourney, Stable Diffusion) scraping artists' work without compensation, displacing illustrators and designers in industries from advertising to gaming; historical parallels such as Luddites fearing machinery or photographers threatening painters; cultural arguments pitting AI's democratizing potential (empowering amateurs) against claims of soulless imitation lacking human intent; intellectual property battles over training data ethics and copyright lawsuits (e.g., Getty Images vs. Stability AI); and broader implications like universal basic income for creatives or AI as a collaborative evolution akin to past tech shifts, with Opening Government emphasizing job loss fears, Opposition highlighting aesthetic purity concerns, and Closing teams extending to global labor markets in developing nations.
- Judges evaluated participants on Speaking skills, Clarity of Content, Content Quality, General Knowledge, Level of Confidence, Body language, Voice Modulation, Fluency, argumentation skills and Presentation skills.
- 2 teams, one from government and other from the opposition were awarded according to their merit.

3. Event Duration:



The event was conducted offline, starting at 10:00 AM and concluding successfully by 1:00 PM.

4. Feedback and Suggestions

The British Parliamentary debate event garnered overwhelmingly positive feedback from participants, judges, and audience alike.

Key Highlights

- **Well-Structured BP Format:** The progression from screening rounds to semifinals and finals—with 4-team benches, 4-minute speeches (protected first/last minutes, 2 minutes for POIs), and clear speaker order—ensured fair, high-stakes competition and skill-building.
- **Judging Panel:** 2nd-year students handled screening for fresh perspectives, while 3rd-year seniors judged semifinals and finals, delivering balanced, expert evaluations via Matter, Manner, and Method criteria.
- **Topic Relevance:** Debaters raved about motions like "This House believes racial justice is primarily a domestic issue" and those upon the modern democracies.
- **Preparation Time:** 5 minutes pre-round proved ideal, fueling concise arguments without stifling spontaneity. Participants were allowed to use mobile phones and notepads amid the event.

Participants' Feedback

1. "This BP debate was electrifying and skill-sharpening—the motions provoked diverse clashes, boosting my rebuttals, confidence, and strategic thinking."
2. Suggestions: Moderators could prompt quieter speakers during POIs or protections to amplify bench contributions.

Audience Feedback

1. "Loved the motion variety - from AI art backlash to global conflicts - and the raw energy of live rebuttals and POI interruptions."



5. Conclusion

The Debate Club's offline flagship "The British Parliamentary Debate" was a resounding triumph, unleashing raw enthusiasm and razor-sharp skills from members and participants alike. First and second year students stole the show with fierce participation, exuding commitment and poise on the benches. The event propelled debaters beyond comfort zones, arming them with a high-octane BP arena to boldly propose, clash via POIs, and dismantle opposing cases on provocative motions.

6. Event photos













