

worlds subsidy policy

Explanatory Memorandum

Worlds is a tournament where we generally send hacks – people who love debating for debating’s sake, and have been in the society for a while. Last year we sent only one first year debater, one second year debater and the rest (which made up 75% of the contingent) two and a half year debaters or more. They went because they love debating tournaments (or potentially some for love of debating unto itself).

So why have a subsidy at all? It is generally accepted that a subsidy is meant to be an encouragement to get people to go along to tournaments, rather than an entitlement or reward. Whilst we did have trouble getting people along to the Botswana Worlds last year, this is by far the exception rather than the rule. We generally have no shortage of takers, and Berlin certainly will be such a case, and a subsidy will (probably) not change this. So why bother?

The answer is similar to the one from last year, where we promoted a conditional subsidy. Rather than using a subsidy to encourage people to attend the tournament itself, we used it to encourage people to help out with the society. The policy (to the best of my knowledge) was simple and hardly a high benchmark: you got half if you debated with a novice at a tournament, and the other half if you adjudicated a tournament where novices were present. Tantamount to how low the bar was set, of the eight attendees, four were not regular members in debating, and yet six went with full subsidies, one with half and one with none. In reality, although it sought to get people involved in the society, I don’t think feel it managed any greater involvement than was already expected. Thus, I would like to up the ante this year and make it harder to achieve.

The policy is set out below. The methodology I used to reach this conclusion is to firstly look at what is reasonable. Four events I feel is a good amount, as you will see when I explain further. Notably, this includes things like tournaments that people would attend anyway, and fundraising events that people are expected to be at, so it isn’t much more than people should do without the encouragement – it just encourages those less likely to bring service to the society to do a little more, or save us a little dosh. Moreover, I also feel that there should be a different burden for novices (noting that our second years are about to flourish into experienced debaters at the conclusion of Easters, and thus don’t count), as they have been in the society for a shorter amount of time and don’t necessarily have as much to give back (yet!), but should be encouraged to develop as much as possible instead.

Secondly, I looked at how we could divide it. Taking the notion of debating with novices and adjudicating novices last year, I think this is an acceptable way to demarcate it to a degree. However, logically there are more opportunities to adjudicate debates. Thus I melded them

slightly. This led me to make the divide more of an on-campus/off-campus one. This is for two reasons. One, as although there is a usual tendency towards debating, some members aren't comfortable doing so, and will just be adjudicating at Worlds anyway, meaning that no one has to necessarily debate in order to get there (although just about all will, as plenty of opportunity is provided for that). Two, as it allows us to include things like schools-related events, which are the absolute necessity in order to fund subsidies anyway.

Thirdly, I looked at what events this could encapsulate. Obviously, schools events and novice related tournaments, like Easters and Spring Mini, sprung to mind. But other things such as camp and mac micros also bore some relevance, and have been factored in.

Finally, what pleases me is that a lot of experienced people will do this and a fair amount more, and this policy exists not to help them. In reality, many individuals in the society have probably done most of it already, and Easters will only take them one step closer. The policy exists to encourage those less committed to do a little bit more so they can have their pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, and with any luck it will encourage such acts to take place.