

ORAL ADVOCACY (4): GIVING A ROAD MAP

SL: Hi, welcome back. I'm Sabrina and this is the Quick Guide to Oral Advocacy. In this episode, we'll show you how to present a road map succinctly. Specifically, you'll learn: elements of a good road map – stance and supporting arguments; verbs to signal your stance – *believe* and *argue*; phrases to signpost arguments – *make an argument*, *advance a submission*; and temporal conjunctions to list arguments in order – *first*, *second*.

SL: A road map serves to inform judges of your overall stance; how many supporting arguments you have; and what those arguments are.

SL: In other words, it previews the structure of your presentation. A precise and concise road map thus enables judges to follow your arguments better. Is this the only advantage? Not really! A good road map also 'teaches' judges to ask questions at appropriate times.

SL: Now, let's see how Mansi provides a road map in the competition:

MS: We believe that this Arbitral Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to hear this dispute and I have two submissions in this regard. The first concerns the interpretation of Clause 65, which is the dispute resolution clause in the Distribution Agreement, and the second concerns the conduct of the parties as regards fulfillment of the procedures specified within Clause 65.

SL: In this example, Mansi first expresses her team's stance, that the Arbitral Tribunal has no jurisdiction. Then she informs the judges how many submissions she will put forward and describes briefly what they are about.

SL: It's worth noticing that Mansi uses a cognitive verb *believe* to signal the stance.

EN: We *believe* that this Arbitral Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to hear this dispute.

SL: You could also use *argue*, a more powerful verb, instead of *believe*.

EN: We *argue* that this Arbitral Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to hear this dispute.

SL: Another thing you can observe from Mansi's road map is the use of expressions such as *the first* and *the second* to signal the order of arguments. Now, take a look at another road map given by Heather and you can also identify this linguistic strategy:

HC: The Claimant makes two arguments in respect of Terms of Reference C and D. Our first argument is that Bill 275 does not vitiate the Respondent's obligations, and our second argument is that there is no risk with enforcement. I'll turn now to the first of these two arguments. The Claimant advances two submissions in support of this argument. First, that the Respondent breached their obligations and second, that Bill 275 does not amount to an exemption.

SL: In Heather's road map, you can also learn some phrases that signpost arguments.

EN:

- To *make* two arguments
- To *advance* two submissions

SL: Overall, it's important to keep your road map succinct and to the point. If you can use one sentence to summarize each of your submissions, then you're on the right track!

SL: After watching this episode, we hope you've learnt that: a road map informs judges of your overall stance, how many supporting arguments you have and what those arguments are; various verbs can be used to show your stance and signpost arguments. For example: We **believe** that; The Claimant **advances** two submissions. It's a good habit to organize your arguments in order with temporal conjunctions such as *first* and *second*. For example: **First**, that the Respondent breached their obligations and **second**, that Bill 275 does not amount to an exemption.

SL: In the coming three episodes, we'll learn how to cite facts and refer to different authorities. See you!