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PREFACE

This book is intended for classes in high-school debating. It is an outgrowth of the work of the Michigan High School Debating League, in which for several years the authors have been interested and with which they have been intimately associated, the one as the organizer and state manager of it, the other as a teacher in high schools that have participated whole-heartedly in the debates of the league.

The aim has been to correlate closely the results of this two-sided experience with high-school debating, and to present what seem to us the most important considerations arising out of it. Since it seems fair to assume that the problems of debate are much the same everywhere, it is hoped that the experience here represented will be found useful wherever high-school students engage in this fascinating activity.

Perhaps one of the merits of the book, if merits it has, will be found to consist in what is left out of it. For instance, the usual traces of formal logic will be found missing. While we hope that our conception of debate includes the idea that it is a logical process, we have searched in vain for someone who has succeeded in building up practical debate experience on a basis of formal logic. Though we admit that some elementary knowledge of inductive and deductive argument may not harm debaters,—any more than a knowledge of Latin harms them, at any rate,—still we feel that from a practical
point of view it is perfectly possible to dispense with
logic as such and to allow the student to approach the
subject from a purely common-sense point of view. Our
experience, and the experience of many others, forces us
to conclude that formal logic has no necessary or even
desirable place in a textbook for high-school debaters.
We have divorced it.

While this book is intended for high-school debaters
as debaters, our modesty goes much farther. We hope
that this book will contribute something to the orderly,
rational process of dealing with perplexing public ques-
tions. We hope that in its small way it will make its con-
tribution to that store of knowledge and method by and
through which the citizen of tomorrow will exercise his
or her citizenship. If, through our insistence upon clear
analysis and briefing, upon the finding and sifting of
evidence, upon honesty of procedure, and, lastly, upon
regarding debate as a means of throwing light on ques-
tions of public policy instead of regarding it as a game to
be played and as a chance to whip a rival school,—if,
through our insistence on these things, we shall have en-
couraged students to do rationally and honestly what the
average citizen now too often does through prejudice and
blindness, we feel that we shall have contributed some-
thing worth while to the education of our day. This,
after all, is the real end to which the practice of debate
is but the means.

For the use of copyright material the authors wish
to express their grateful appreciation to the Physical
Culture Magazine for a quotation from an article by
Dr. Frank Crane.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A historical art. Debating is not a new art. It was practiced as long ago as 365 B.C. by Demosthenes, the great Attic orator, when he gave his famous forensic against Androtation. Today Demosthenes' oration "On the Crown," which he delivered in reply to his arch-enemy, Æschines, is still studied in our high schools and colleges as a model of refutation. Some critics claim that this reply of the eminent Greek orator is the greatest rebuttal speech of all time.

Not only with the Greeks, but also with the English, has debating been of historical importance. For two hundred years it has been much practiced in the British Houses of Parliament. It is as debaters as well as statesmen that we remember such famous men as Edmund Burke, Charles James Fox, William Pitt the Younger, Richard B. Sheridan, and William E. Gladstone. One of his eminent contemporaries said that Charles James Fox was "the most brilliant and accomplished debater the world ever saw," and so we should probably have thought, if we could have heard him delivering his famous speech on "The American War" in 1780. Of William Pitt the Younger, it was said that "next to Fox he was the greatest debater of the Revolutionary Period,"
and Gladstone must be set down as one of the ablest
debaters that ever spoke in Parliament.

America also has produced statesmen who are famous
for their skill as debaters. The Lincoln-Douglas debates
are known to every high-school student, as are also the
forensic contests between Daniel Webster and Senator
Hayne of South Carolina, whose fiery words made the
United States Senate Chamber resound in 1850.

Most of the debaters who have made themselves fa-
mous had special training in the art of debate. Charles
James Fox accepted every opportunity offered to debate
while he was a student at Eton and Oxford; even after
he entered Parliament, at the age of nineteen, he conti-
ued to perfect himself in the forensic art. Gladstone
trained himself in debate in the Oxford Union, which is
probably the oldest organization for this purpose in
existence. Burke, Sheridan, and Pitt all gave special
attention to training for debate. Webster began his
preparation before he entered Phillips Exeter Academy,
and continued it through his student days at Dartmouth
College. Although Lincoln was denied the advantage of
formal school training, he was preparing himself both
directly and indirectly for the debate platform, long
before he ever encountered Stephen A. Douglas.

Present interest. The past few years have seen a
great renewal of interest in the art made famous by
Lincoln and Gladstone. This interest has manifested
itself in an increasing number of interschool debates,
in the formation of many new debating leagues, and also
in numerous political debates. For example, there was
the debate in May, 1920, in Carnegie Hall, New York,
between Governor Henry J. Allen of Kansas and the
late Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of

Labor. The question was whether or not a law prevent-
ing strikes, such as the law which established the Kansas
Industrial Court, was destructive to the rights of labor.
Equally famous was the recent debate in Boston on the
World Court, between John R. Clarke of Ohio, who re-
signed his justiceship in the United States Supreme
Court to devote the remainder of his life to world peace,
and Henry Cabot Lodge, the late distinguished Senator
from Massachusetts.

Definition and types of debate. Debate is the oral presen-
tation of the two sides of a question. The presentation
consists of a constructive argument by each speaker, in
which the main points are presented, and a
rebuttal argument, in which the points of one's oppo-
nent are attacked and one's own points are defended.

Various forms of team organization are used. One
may plan class debates with one speaker on each team,
with two speakers, or with three. There are occasions
when time and the nature of the proposition make a
"one-speaker team" advisable. For the majority of in-
terscholastic debates, however, a three-speaker team is
preferred.

The open-forum type of debate is also gaining rapidly
in popularity. The strictly open-forum type implies that
after the teams have presented their constructive argu-
ments, the rebuttal is given by the audience. This pro-
cedure is most successful when two conditions exist:
(1), when the audience has definite knowledge of the
subject, and (2), when the audience is quite evenly
divided in its opinion. For example, the proposition
"Resolved, That Highland Park shall be annexed to
Detroit" made a successful open-forum debate, because
the audience, which consisted of an equal number of
students from each city, had a vital interest in the subject, and because all of them possessed much definite information about it. Many open-forum debates degenerate into meaningless discussions, because the class or audience which is participating is uninformed and therefore presents mere opinions instead of facts.

Purpose of debate. Whether teams consist of one, two, or three speakers, whether the open-forum style or the more common form with rebuttal time for each speaker is used, the purpose is the same. The purpose of all school debates, whether they take place in a debating class, in a debating society, or in the high-school auditorium with the team from a visiting high school, is threefold: first, development of skill in public speaking; secondly, the development of the ability to think; thirdly, the promotion of better citizenship.

1. The first purpose of debating is to develop skill in public speaking. Whether one's ambition is to be a doctor, a merchant, a lawyer, a minister, a teacher, a public-health nurse, a dentist, an architect, a traveling salesman, a politician, or an engineer, one needs the ability to speak in public. The American man uses his ability in public speaking to sell real estate and bonds and to make Rotary Club speeches. The American woman uses her skill in speech-making in her club work, in gaining new high-school buildings, and in preventing the nomination of unworthy candidates at her political-party conventions.

Debating trains one to meet every kind of problem, to meet a variety of audiences, and to be alert for new problems and new obstacles. The student of debate learns not merely the best methods of presenting a memorized speech, but he also gains experience in extemporizing, in thinking of the argument he is trying to present instead of the mere words. Just the other day a successful traveling salesman said that it would have been worth hundreds of dollars to him if, in his boyhood, he could have had systematic training in the art of debate. Abraham Lincoln and Daniel Webster became two of the world's greatest orators because they participated in debates at every opportunity.

2. The second purpose of debating is to develop the ability to think. It is impossible for a student to prepare his case for a debate without thinking. It is equally impossible for him to prepare a sound case without thinking logically and truly. As a high-school student said last year, "I didn't know that I could think before I began to debate." It was debating that developed his ability to think and showed him the real pleasure that comes from using one's mind logically and well. Also, debating trains a student to think on his feet. People often say, "I can prepare a set speech and deliver it, but I find it very hard to make my mind work out new thoughts when I am facing an audience." This is exactly the kind of thing which the debater becomes skilled in doing. Once this habit has been firmly established, one need not be afraid to face any audience.

3. The third purpose of debating is the promotion of citizenship. In order to be intelligent voters, we citizens are constantly in need of more knowledge about current problems. Nothing is better than a debate to bring out the facts. Moreover, in a debate the citizen gets both sides of the question in the same evening, so that he has a splendid opportunity to compare the main issues, weigh the evidence, and draw his own conclusions. Often only one side of a question has been presented by the press of a community; so citizens are more than glad to hear both
sides and to learn the facts which they have neither the leisure nor the means of gaining for themselves. For example, many communities have known only one side of the controversy over the Chicago drainage canal, and many others have heard only half the question of the St. Lawrence waterway project. Many citizens did not know that there were two sides to these questions until they heard debates on them.

Debate also arouses interest in civic questions. More and more frequently contests are being arranged for this purpose. Recently a debating team from the Michigan State Normal College at Ypsilanti and a team from Ferris Institute, located at Big Rapids, Michigan, met on the platform in a neutral city to debate on the question of Japanese immigration. This debate was avowedly for the purpose of presenting the facts of the case in an interesting manner. The decision was immaterial. When fewer than 50 per cent of our qualified voters vote in a national election, such contests are valuable in stirring us from our political lethargy. Skill in debate is a most valuable asset in club, church, social, school, or political activities, and thus it is a promoter of the best citizenship.

In summary, the purpose of debating is to develop skill in public speaking, efficiency in thinking, and intelligence in citizenship. Winning or losing a decision is always incidental to these three aims.

Benefits of debate. The benefits that are derived from debating are numerous and important:

1. One of the greatest benefits derived from debating is the correlation, organization, and use of knowledge which has already been obtained in other courses of study. Too often a student gets his history in one course, his French in another, his English in another, with little or no rela-

tionship between them. Debating furnishes the best of bridges for such chasms. One year, when the question of cancellation of war debts was being debated, one of the team exclaimed, "It seems to me that we use everything that we ever learned in school in this debate." The same opinion was repeatedly expressed by other debaters. For example, on the question of debt cancellation, Robert used his knowledge of French to read the French newspapers in order to get true French opinions that had not been garbled by translation and British censorship. Louise utilized her knowledge of history in finding historical examples of debt cancellation and repudiation. Earle brought into play his knowledge of economic laws gained from his course in economics. Donald's acquaintance with commercial geography helped tremendously in working out points about payment. It was Norma's mathematics that enabled her to work out percentage and interest and to compile statistical results. Dorothy's course in civics and current topics furnished a valuable background for conditions in European and American politics. Every debate affords a splendid opportunity to correlate the knowledge which has been gained in at least five different courses. In addition, the training acquired in the English class is used in outlining, writing, and delivering the arguments.

that, if it were not for the introduction which they had received through debating, such magazines would be practically unknown to them.

3. A third benefit is the discovery of new sources of material. After a debater has utilized his own knowledge, after he has read everything available, he turns to new fields. There are personal interviews, letters, telegrams, and lectures that present new evidence. For example, when debating the question of Philippine independence, Dorothy and Norma interviewed a certain pastor who had just returned from the islands; Mary had personal interviews with two teachers who had taught in our island possessions; and Earle wrote letters to two university professors who were experts on the question. During our debates on cession of war debts, Robert had a most interesting visit with the French consul in our city, who was glad to talk with him about France and who also promised him some new material. This led to a similar interview with the British consul. Such new contacts mean interesting friendships in later life.

4. A fourth beneficial result from debating is a respect for evidence. Last year, when twenty high-school students were asked what they considered the three greatest benefits from debating, fifteen answered "a demand for proof." One learns to demand definite statements, supported by facts, instead of vague assertions, high-sounding phrases, meaningless platitudes, and glittering generalities. Debating trains one to collect evidence, to evaluate it, to scrutinize its source, to discard the unworthy, and to utilize the worthy. Such training functions in everything, from village gossip to world problems. For example, if unpleasant reports are being circulated about a friend, one will demand the facts of the case and their source. Having learned these, one will then know how to disprove them. The same rules of evidence work equally well in an argument on the World Court. High-school debaters will testify, as they have done dozens of times, that debating, more than anything else, has taught them to abandon unsupported assertions in their own speeches and also to question and to weigh carefully anything that they read and hear. A respect for proof, a demand for facts, a knowledge of evidence, and a desire for the truth, in so far as it can be ascertained, are some of the greatest benefits of debating.

5. A fifth benefit which comes to the debater is training in organization. Repeatedly debaters have told how organizing points for debates has helped them to outline their work in other courses, how it has aided them in grasping the salient points of a recitation or lecture. Teachers verify this assertion. To quote again from a questionnaire about the three greatest benefits from debating, eighteen of the twenty students named "the ability to organize any material which I may need to use." Anyone who has listened to the scores of rambling, disorganized speeches which are inflicted upon the American public will appreciate the value of organization of material, best learned in debating.

6. Skill in public speaking has been stated as one of the three aims of debate. Many are the benefits which debating contributes to a student's delivery. Orations, declamations, and dramatics train students in the delivery of set lines, but it is debating which furnishes the best background for extemprop speaking. It is one thing to deliver a memorized composition well; it is quite another to speak fluently when one's exact words have not been committed to memory before the contest. De-
bating gives one confidence on the platform. It points out the defects in one’s voice, and trains one to correct them. It helps one to make gestures that are forceful and convincing. It trains one to face the people in his audience squarely and to speak to them directly. Such are a few of the benefits in delivery which come through debating.

7. A seventh benefit is a respect for time. In a class discussion one may talk overtime, with the forbearance of the class and the patience of the teacher; but in debating the time for speaking is limited: the gavel sounds, and woe to him who continues speaking! At a recent banquet a speaker had been asked to talk three minutes; instead he spoke for thirty. Everyone was tired, bored, and determined never again to be present at any function where this man was scheduled to speak. At another banquet four speakers who had been invited to speak for five minutes so extended their remarks that it was eleven o’clock before the speaker of the evening was called upon. He, being a gentleman of wisdom, arose, and stated that since it was so late, since everything had been said, and since the banquet guests were weary, he would not detain them any further. Thus, because four people had never learned to respect time, was lost a splendid opportunity to hear a man of importance say something worth while. A speaker who has had training in debating is not likely to exceed his time limit.

8. Finally, debating develops personality. Training in the proper habits of speech, practice in the art of public speaking, and the knowledge that one knows how to present his case give self-confidence and poise. Debating is one of the best methods of overcoming stage fright. Many a student who would not have the courage to speak alone is encouraged by the presence of his colleagues in debate. For example, Harry was so timid that he turned white whenever he was asked to rise and read in class during his freshman year. Town people said, “That boy can never debate. He is too timid. He wouldn’t dare say a word in public.” However, all knew that he had brains. Strengthened by the support of his colleagues, he agreed to debate. The first night was torture. He kept himself together by locking his hands tightly behind his back. Yet he did so well that his friends were surprised and pleased. The second debate he did better, but he was still painfully frightened. After the fifth debate he gained enough confidence to let his arms hang at his sides part of the time instead of fastening them in a death grip at his back. At the state championship debate, Harry was pointed out by one of the judges as the best speaker of the six on the platform. Through debating this boy had overcome stage fright, had gained confidence and poise, and was the pride of his community. The case has been very well put by no less an observer of men than Dr. Frank Crane, in the Physical Culture Magazine for May, 1925, where he states:

Learning to speak strengthens your will power, for you are constantly putting it against the will of others.

It puts your intellect against the intellect of others. It makes you think in a straight line. It makes you concentrate because you have to hold your audience.

It makes you think from the other person's viewpoint. If what you talk about is not made of interest to your auditor, he will cease to listen.

It makes you express yourself in clear, forceful language. If you are incoherent, you fail.

In a word, it forces you to develop and strengthen just those qualities which make you a bigger man in everyday life.
Thus it is that personality is developed by public speaking and debating.

Conclusion. Debating is a historical art which is much in use at the present time. It may be practiced in many forms. The benefits derived from debating are numerous: the correlation of knowledge already acquired, the acquisition of new material, the learning of new sources, respect for evidence, the ability to organize material, skill in delivery, respect for time, and the development of personality. Underlying these eight benefits are the three main purposes of all debating: to acquire skill in delivery, efficiency in clear thinking, and intelligence in citizenship.

EXERCISES


2. Read Demosthenes’ oration “On the Crown” aloud in class to gain familiarity with its form.

3. Give reports on the lives and oratory of such eminent British debaters as these:
   a. Edmund Burke.
   b. Charles James Fox.
   c. William Pitt the Younger.
   d. Richard B. Sheridan.
   e. William E. Gladstone.
   f. David Lloyd George.

4. Give reports on the lives and oratory of such eminent American debaters as these:
   a. Abraham Lincoln.
   b. Daniel Webster.

5. Prepare an oral account of such familiar debates as these:
   a. The Lincoln-Douglas debates.
   b. The Hayne-Webster debate.
   c. The La Follette-Allen debate on compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.
   d. The debate on prohibition enforcement printed in the Forum for November and December, 1925.

6. Compare the styles of debating which are exemplified in the United States Senate debates of April, 1924, on the question of Japanese immigration, with the intercollegiate debates on that subject printed in “Intercollegiate Debates,” Vol. XI (1924–1925).
CHAPTER II

WHAT IS A DEBATE PROPOSITION?

How a debate arises. The psychologist says that "we are creatures in an environment." He means by this that we do not live each one alone, as Robinson Crusoe did on his island before he found his man Friday. We live with others, and we have to work with and get along with others. Hence it is not strange that a large proportion of our actions are not individual, but group actions. One person, for instance, cannot organize a baseball team all by himself; he must have the help and cooperation of others. One person alone cannot be a literary society; many people must join their efforts. One person cannot make a government all by himself; he must take into account many hundreds or thousands or even millions of people. In fact, we see that all our actions are influenced by the fact that we live in society, and not by ourselves.

Now experience, even a very limited experience, teaches us that when many people try to act together, whether it is to organize a baseball team, to form a literary society, to institute a government, or to do any of the thousand things that we have to do, there will arise differences of opinion as to what ought to be done and as to how it ought to be done. It is very seldom that we all agree on anything; and the more important a thing is, the more apt we are to disagree on it. Each one naturally thinks that his way is the best, and each one naturally wants to see his own ideas carried out.

It is out of just such situations of disagreement that debate arises. Every high-school student has no doubt taken part in discussions that arose over differences of opinion connected with school affairs. Possibly it was a matter of when and where to hold a class banquet or a picnic. Possibly it was over different means of raising money to buy uniforms for the ball team or to finance a school debate. When our forefathers, after the American Revolution, wished to adopt a Federal constitution, they had many earnest and heated discussions and debates as to just what kind of instrument it ought to be. When the question of slavery became acute, before the Civil War, different people thought differently about the way the situation should be handled, and Lincoln and Douglas held public debates on the question. We all know that questions are constantly arising in public life, and that Congress and our state legislatures are almost constantly discussing the various ways of answering them.

A debate is an organized and well-regulated discussion of one of these bothersome questions. Its purpose is to get the different sides of the question before us as clearly as possible, to find out what the reasons are for favoring one side or the other, and to discover all the facts that have any bearing on the question on either side. By doing these things we shall be able to act more intelligently when the question comes to a vote. We shall be less apt to be governed by our whims and fancies in deciding the question if it has been well debated. In a word, we shall be able to act more as becomes educated and intelligent men and women. That we may so act is one of the real purposes of debate.

Objections to debating. But every once in a while somebody comes along with an objection to debating. Such
a person may say: "Why waste our time talking so much? Why not consult a specialist who can tell us what to do? Why not study the facts scientifically and get the answer to our problem? It is facts we want, not fine speeches." To such a person let us try to make reasonable answer. Let us first admit that where it is possible to settle a question by reference to the facts, the question should be so settled. No sane person can quarrel with so reasonable a proposition. And many questions can be so decided. If the question comes up as to how many people our literary-society hall will seat, there is no use in debating that question. The way to settle it is to send someone to count the seats in the hall. We do not need to debate the question of how much money we have in the bank. We can find that out by asking the man in the bank. Nothing is to be gained by debating as to the date on which Abraham Lincoln was born: this can be determined by reference to the proper authority. We may, for convenience, group together all such questions, and call them questions of fact. And we may admit freely that thus far our critic is right: there is no use debating them. We may even go one step farther with him, and agree that we desire all the facts and all the scientific study and all the expert advice that it is possible to get on all questions.

Questions of fact and of policy. But now we shall have to take issue with his objection to debating, and insist that there are problems on which there will be differences of opinion even after we have consulted experts, made a scientific study, and gathered all the facts that we can get. Such questions we shall call questions of policy, to distinguish them from the questions of fact spoken of before. There are a great many of these questions of policy. They cannot be settled as easily as can questions of fact. We cannot know what is "right" and what is "wrong" about them, because the facts do not all point the same way, because scientific study of them leads to no final conclusion, and because experts differ among themselves. Still we often have to act on these questions, as on questions of fact. We have to act on them as wisely as possible, without a complete knowledge, because complete knowledge is not possible.

We often think we know the right answer to these questions, but that is because we are blind to everything but our own point of view. We are narrow-minded. Others think they know, and they are just as sure of their conclusions as we are of ours, though their conclusions are different from ours. They, too, are narrow-minded and mentally blind. The fact is that such questions do not have a "right side" and a "wrong side." We should not think of them as questions of right and wrong, but rather as questions of policy. When we vote on them, we adopt what seems to the majority the best policy; but if we are honest, we have to admit that our decision may turn out to be unwise and that we may later have to change it. On such questions we must find out all there is to know, and then act in accordance with our best judgment. These are questions for debate, and debate exists to clarify them and to make us thoroughly acquainted with them in all their aspects, so that we may vote intelligently.

Let us look at a few examples of this kind of question. We have called them questions of policy. The question of the government ownership of railroads is a good example. There are almost countless facts involved in this question. But those who know these facts very well, and who have wise minds and good judgments, differ widely on the wisdom of government ownership. The facts them-
What a debate is and what it is not. What, then, is a debate? It is not a contest between two schools to decide which can "whip" the other. It is not a game in which one is to defeat the other. It is not a contest of "throwing words at each other." It is an orderly and systematic discussion of some question of policy, the purpose of which is to throw light on all sides of the question upon which, sooner or later, some group will have to take action. That is the whole of it. If we have judges to decide which side has put up the better case, that is because we want to stimulate interest in the debate. We usually work better if something is at stake; hence we have decisions in debate, to bring out the best that is in us. But we must be very careful to understand that the judge does not decide the question. All he does is to express an opinion as to which team has done the most effective debating. This enables us to compare ourselves with others and to learn from our mistakes as well as from the mistakes of others — all to the end that we may perfect ourselves in debate and learn the best ways of bringing out the merits of the side of the question that we happen to be defending.

Five essentials of a proposition for debate. Now we are in a position to define the proposition of a debate. Any discussion, whether public or not, is better if the subject is narrowed down and stated clearly, so as to avoid rambling statements and needless arguments. A proposition is the statement of the subject for debate. It is so worded that it makes the subject perfectly clear and understandable, and defines the position to be taken by those who propose it. Suppose we state the qualities of a proposition.

1. The proposition should include just one question and no more. Suppose we should decide to debate the proposition "Resolved, That our high school should have two debating teams and admit all students to the debates without charge." Now here we have two distinct subjects for debate. A debater might favor one and not the other. The arguments would become hopelessly mixed up, and no clear-cut case could be made for or against the proposition. The question should be made into two propositions: "Resolved, That our high school should have two debating teams" and "Resolved, That we admit all students to the debates without charge." There will then be two debates. We can consider each question separately and decide each on its own merits. Always state the proposition so that there will be just one thing to debate and decide.

2. The proposition should state the question definitely. We must know just what it is that we are going to debate. The proposition "Resolved, That Latin should be required" is not definite and clear. It does not state whether Latin is to be required of high-school students or of college students, nor does it state how much Latin is to be required. It would be better to state it thus: "Resolved, That two years of Latin should be required of all high-school students." Before we can debate any question intelligently we must know just what the proposition is.

3. The proposition should be stated as simply as is consistent with accuracy. A proposition simply stated enables the audience to tell what the debate is all about, whereas a complicated proposition only puzzles them. If it is not possible to make the statement clear without making it exceedingly complicated, then the best way to do is to state the proposition simply and draw up a series of qualifying statements to be used by the teams, agreeing upon the exact ground to be covered. Suppose the question of joining the League of Nations with reser-
vations is to be debated. Instead of embodying in the proposition all the reservations, and so making the question cumbersome, it would be better to state the question, "Resolved, That the United States should enter the League of Nations with reservations." Then draw up a separate statement embodying the reservations and have both teams agree to confine the debate to this statement.

4. The proposition should be stated affirmatively. All good propositions state a proposed change in conditions. To carry out the debate properly, the affirmative side should always advocate the change and the negative should oppose it. If a question is not stated affirmatively, the affirmative is compelled to oppose a change and the negative to advocate it. But it is a general rule in court procedure that a prisoner is supposed to be innocent till he is proved guilty, and it is generally assumed also that conditions which exist are all right unless they are proved otherwise. Since the affirmative always opens the debate, a question stated negatively makes necessary a defense of conditions before they have been attacked. It would be as logical for a lawsuit to be opened by the defense. Hence the question is always stated so that the affirmative, in opening the debate, can attack the existing conditions covered by the debate and tell just what they propose to do. "Resolved, That the United States should not enter the League of Nations" is not stated affirmatively; neither is "Resolved, That Michigan should not have capital punishment." Both these propositions would compel the affirmative to defend conditions which have not as yet been attacked in the debate. Leave out the "not" in both questions, and the propositions are all right. Always state the proposition so that the affirmative shall advocate a change in existing conditions.

5. The proposition should be stated as a resolution. This is a matter of form, and is practically always adhered to in debate. Begin all questions with "Resolved, That..." and then state the resolution as above directed. To sum up, then, a debate is an orderly discussion of a question of policy — a question on which we have to take action and take it without a complete knowledge of what may come of it. We do not debate questions of fact, but questions of the wisdom of some proposed action. In order to debate intelligently, we state the question to be debated in the form of a proposition. This proposition must embody just one question, it must be definitely stated, it must be simple in statement, it must be stated affirmatively, and it must be in the form of a resolution.

EXERCISES

1. Prepare two-minute speeches, to be given before the class, on the following subjects:
   a. How does debating arise and what is the need of it?
   b. What is a "question of fact"? Illustrate.
   c. What is a "question of policy"? Illustrate.
   d. Answer the objection "We want facts, not fine speeches."
   e. Why is a question for debate not a question of "right or wrong"?
   f. Can a question for debate be "proved conclusively"? Why?
   g. Give illustrations of your own, showing how it might spoil a debate to embody two or more questions in one proposition.
   h. What is meant by stating a proposition "affirmatively"?
   i. Name three questions that have arisen among the students recently, and tell whether they are questions of fact or of policy.

2. Name five local questions on which the community might be asked to take action. State them in the form of good debating propositions.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND PROOF

Various steps in preparing a debate. Thus far in this book we have considered what a debate is and how to formulate a proposition for debate. We now turn to the business of preparing the actual debate.

Briefly, the preparation of a debate consists of (1) analyzing the proposition to find out more specifically what must be done to “prove” it; (2) making a brief, or picture, of this analysis; (3) finding the evidence with which to support the various contentions — in other words, proving our statements; (4) finding the evidence with which to offset the proof of the other side — in other words, refuting the statements of the opposition. Still more briefly considered, preparation for the debate consists of analyzing and proving our proposition. If we think of it in this simple way, we shall be less likely to be confused in the steps that follow.

Value of analysis in everyday life. Suppose we look at this matter of analysis in the very simplest way. It is really a very simple matter to understand if we go about it in a common-sense way.

Suppose that a man comes to me with a proposition to sell me a house. How can I analyze his proposition? I first ask myself the question “Why should I consider investing in a house at all?” I find, upon thinking it over, that there are two possible reasons why I might consider the proposition. I might want the house to live in, or I might want it for an investment. Suppose I want a house to live in. Other questions now suggest themselves: “Is this house about the size I want?” “Is it in a location that pleases me?” “Is it finished in the way I like?” “Is it well built and properly equipped?” “Is it worth the price asked for it?” “Can I afford to put this much money into a house?” “Could I probably sell it again if I desired to do so?” In asking myself these questions, I am really analyzing the proposition of buying the house. “Analysis” means “breaking a thing up into smaller parts.” Now I have taken this proposition apart, and I find that buying this house is a matter of satisfying myself as to certain very definite things about the house. It helps to make the proposition clear, does it not? If I can answer these questions, I can settle the problem of buying the house. I cannot well answer the larger question without answering the points brought out by the analysis.

Suppose I want a house, not to live in, but as an investment. The analysis will be somewhat different, because under these conditions I shall ask myself different questions. I shall now ask myself questions like these: “Is this the kind of house that I can sell at a profit?” “Will other people want to buy such a house as this?” “Can I rent it so as to make money on the investment?” “How much money shall I have to put into repairs before I can rent or sell it?” Perhaps I can go further with my analysis and say to myself, “A good investment is one that is safe, one that is profitable, and one out of which I can get my money when I want it. Is this house a safe investment? Can I make a profit on it? Can I get my money out if necessary?” If I can answer these questions, I can answer the big question of buying the house.
The analysis helps me to decide. By breaking up the big question into little ones I can come to a more intelligent conclusion.

Let us suppose now that a man comes to me with a proposition to have the government own and operate the railroads. He says that this question is coming to a vote one of these days, and asks me to make up my mind how I will vote on it if given the opportunity. Now instead of making up my mind blindly, instead of allowing my prejudices to carry me away and dictate an unintelligent vote, suppose I set about it to analyze the question. As before I ask myself, quite impartially, some questions. Why should I, or anyone, want the government to own the railroads? Well, it must be because someone thinks that it would be better all around if the government owned them. But in what way might it be better? What do we mean by “better” in this case? I force myself to go further. I find that a “better” railroad would be one that would give better service, that would carry freight and passengers more speedily and more safely. It would also be one that would perform its service more cheaply. I find that, as a patron of railroads, I am interested in good service and in low rates. Any plan that will give me better service and lower rates looks good to me. Now I ask myself: “Would government ownership of railroads give better service? Would it tend to make rates lower?” There may be other questions involved, but these seem to be the chief ones. If I find that I can answer these questions in the affirmative, I shall be in favor of the government’s owning and operating the railroads; if I find that the answer is in the negative, I shall be against it.

Now let us notice that these examples of analysis bring out rational motives for being in favor of or against the main proposition. They force us to drop our prejudices. They bring us out into the light of reason in dealing with these questions. We are trying now to settle the questions on a basis of reason and sense. No questions have arisen about politics. It is not a question of whether I am a Republican or a Democrat or a Socialist, of whether I am a Catholic or a Methodist or a Jew, of whether I am a conservative or a radical: it is simply a question of what is involved in each of the questions; it is a question of getting down to bed rock on the proposition and making a decision on a basis of horse sense. This is the value of analysis: it helps us to understand what is involved in the proposition and to approach the solution with an open mind and with a determination to settle it with reason and not with prejudice.

One great trouble with us is that we tend to settle public questions without being clear in our minds as to the basis of settlement. Our thinking, what there is of it, is fuzzy. It is not clear. If someone raises the question of a larger army, we settle it with a wave of the hand. We are for it, or we are against it, but we do not know why. We have no good reason for our belief. It is interesting, but altogether disgusting, to listen to the discussion of a public question in a hotel lobby or on a street corner. Each man has his mind all made up in advance. He can advise us offhand about it. He has it all settled, without wasting a bit of energy in analysis or in hunting up facts. And these men all have votes. When one thinks of how little thought is given to the great questions that confront the voters of this country, the wonder is, not that we make so many muddle-headed decisions but that we make so few. The real wonder is that we are able to get along at all. But, as a nation, we must learn to use
the brains that we have if we are to justify democracy. Many wise and good people are coming to lose faith in democracy simply because the average voter shows so little sense in dealing with public questions. As students, preparing ourselves to take part in one of the greatest enterprises of all the ages,—the business of running our own affairs without having a king or a dictator run them for us,—we must learn to use intelligence as voters. And one of the first steps in this process is to learn to analyze public questions and talk about them intelligently, so that we may decide them with wisdom.

It is also a fact that we make a great many muddle-headed decisions in our personal affairs. We buy stocks and bonds and real estate "on a hunch" that it will be a good investment. We do not take time to analyze each transaction. We buy an automobile without taking the time to find out whether or not we can afford it. Some people even get married with less thought than they would give to the purchase of a hound dog. Surely a little intelligence used in the right way and at the right time would accomplish wonders and save us from many of the troubles under which we suffer because of rash and ill-considered actions. With life getting more and more complex it is probably not too much to say that the very existence of our civilization depends on our learning to think and to use sense instead of passion and prejudice. The World War taught or should have taught us this. We must learn to use wisdom instead of TNT and poison gas, or we shall be lost.

Analysis of questions for debate follows exactly the same simple procedure as was illustrated earlier in the chapter. A question of public policy comes up, and we are to debate it. How shall we go about the matter of analysis? The simple way is to begin asking ourselves the same kind of searching questions that we ask about the purchase of a house. How did this question arise? Who wants the change made, and what are his reasons for wanting it? Some questions are very complex, and the analysis is far from simple. But if we go about it sensibly we shall soon begin to see some light breaking through.

"Ready-made" analyses. Perhaps the most common mistake in analysis is in accepting an analysis ready-made. Many people simply divide up the question into three parts, to fit the three debaters, and proceed to argue it on the division of "necessity, practicability, and justice," or on some other easy and meaningless division. Now we do not buy a house because it is "necessary, practicable, and just." We do not do anything else on such a silly and meaningless basis as this. We try to find the real basis of our action by asking searching questions. The ready-made analysis is the lazy debater's way of going about it. It is a substitute for thinking, and a very poor one at that. Suppose we decide at the start that our debates shall be based on something more fundamental than this. It is harder work, but it is much more worth while.

Finding the real issues. Suppose that our question is "Resolved, That capital punishment should be reinstated in Michigan." Now we might say that it should be reinstated because it is "necessary, practicable, and just," but this will not get us any further than we were at the start. We have not analyzed our question: we have simply divided it without thinking. Let us ask some more searching questions about capital punishment. Why should anyone want to establish it in Michigan?
Well, someone says that if a man knows the penalty for murder is death he will hesitate about murdering; in other words, he says that capital punishment will deter crime. Someone else says he doesn’t think it will; that a murderer does not think about punishment when he commits murder. At any rate we have come upon a pertinent question: “Will capital punishment deter crime?” We may go further and raise another question: “Is capital punishment more humane than life imprisonment, in dealing with murderers?” Another question suggests itself: “Is there much danger that innocent people may be sent to death through mistakes in trials?” Now we have broken our question up into small parts: (1) Will capital punishment tend to deter crime? (2) Is it more humane than life imprisonment? (3) Does it unduly endanger the lives of innocent people? If we can give intelligent answers to these questions, we can vote intelligently on the larger question of capital punishment.

We shall call these smaller questions the issues of the debate. We can now set about finding material for answering the smaller questions. And on these issues we can find a great deal of evidence.

When once we have the issues of our question we can set about the task of proving them, because we can then know definitely just what it is that we are going to try to prove. We shall not be sidetracked on things that do not concern the question for debate. We can stick to our subject. The affirmative will say, “We support the question of capital punishment because we believe (1) it will deter crime, (2) it is a more humane way of dealing with murderers than is life imprisonment, and (3) that it does not unduly endanger the lives of innocent people.” The negative can take exactly the opposite stand and oppose the adoption of capital punishment because (1) it does not deter crime, (2) it is not so humane a way of dealing with murderers as is life imprisonment, and (3) it endangers unduly the lives of innocent people.

Recognizing the true issues. How shall we know when we have analyzed a question well and whether the issues found are true issues? Well, it must be admitted at the outset that different people may analyze differently and come to different issues. Analysis is not a mathematically exact process. But if it has been carried out conscientiously, if the history of the question has been studied, if it is known how the question came to be discussed and who is advocating it, one cannot go very far wrong in his analysis. Once rid of the notion that analysis is “hard” and that it is “mysterious,” once having set about it with common sense by asking simple, direct, and searching questions, a fair analysis will follow. Two tests may be applied to the issues to determine whether they are real issues or not.

(i) Real issues are those on which the two sides are likely to disagree. For instance, as seen above, the affirmative and negative are likely to disagree as to whether capital punishment deters crime, as to whether it is more humane than life imprisonment, and as to whether it endangers unduly the lives of innocent people. Suppose we had asked ourselves the question “Is it right to take a life for a life?” Now in all likelihood the two sides would not disagree on this. Both would probably admit that revenge is not a proper motive for punishment. There would not be any use in arguing a thing that both sides would admit at the start or that would not be reasonable. Hence this would not be an issue in the debate. It would be “admitted matter.”
Real issues are those which are strictly relevant to the question. Suppose we had asked ourselves the question “Is it proper to execute people for stealing?” Now this is not pertinent to the question. Nobody advocates capital punishment for stealing. Capital punishment is advocated for murder and for one or two other very serious crimes. We would call this question “irrelevant.”

If, in reviewing the issues that we have found by analysis, we find that the two sides disagree in answering them, if they are not “admitted” or “irrelevant,” and if they go right to the heart of the question, if, in other words, they are the things which will have to be proved in order to prove the proposition, then we may say that we have found the issues. Our analysis is now complete. These issues will form the skeleton of the brief, which is to be discussed in the next chapter.

Proving the proposition. Proving the proposition is the process of establishing the issues and, by establishing them, of establishing the proposition. If the real-estate man can show me that the house which he wants me to buy is a safe investment, that it will be a profitable investment, and that I can get my money out of it when necessary, he has “proved” his proposition that I ought to buy the house. If a debating team can show that capital punishment will deter crime, that it is more humane than life imprisonment, and that the lives of innocent people will not be unduly endangered by it, they have established their proposition, or, as we say, proved it.

Warning against “conclusive” proof. What does it mean to establish or prove a proposition? In the first place, we must remember that no debate proposition can be “conclusively proved.” This phrase should never be used in a debate. No question of policy can ever be

“conclusively proved” or “proved beyond the shadow of a doubt.” If it could, it would be a question of fact and not one of policy, and so not debatable. One of the most common mistakes in debating lies in trying to prove too much. Debaters must always remember that there is much to be said on the other side, and that the best that can be done is to make a better case for their side than the other team makes for its side. If this is kept in mind, the debate will be on a much higher plane throughout.

Warning against “burden of proof.” Another warning is necessary in our study of proof. Debaters are often prone to talk much about “the burden of proof,” and not infrequently to try to win a debate by insisting that “the burden of proof is on our opponents.” Now there is such a thing as burden of proof. It rests on the affirmative. In a court of law the burden of proof rests on the prosecution, which is the affirmative. A man is considered to be innocent till he is proved guilty. This is right and proper. In a similar way conditions are supposed to be all right as they are unless someone can show good cause for changing them, and since the affirmative always advocates the change, the burden of proof rests on them to show that a change ought to be made. This, also, is right and proper. There is no sense in making a change unless it can be shown reasonably that it is for the better. But here the matter ought to drop. The judge or judges of the debate understand this, or should understand it. There is nothing to be gained by insisting on it all through the debate. By insisting on it the judge is apt to get the impression that the debaters are short of real material and that they are trying to win the debate on a technicality. He will penalize them for this, and he ought to do so. No good debater tries to win a debate on a techni-
cality: he tries to win it by proving his proposition. Life is too short to waste it in technicalities, and the time of a debate is far too precious to fritter away in trying to take advantage in little ways when there are big things to be done. If one is on the affirmative, he should accept the burden of proof and set about the business of the debate. If he is on the negative, it is proper to mention once during the debate that the burden of proof is on the affirmative, and to outline what the affirmative must reasonably prove to sustain their proposition. Having done this, he should get busy to keep them from doing it by building up his own case and by attacking theirs. Let him forget about the burden of proof and get on with the debate.

What it means to prove a proposition. In debate proving a proposition means establishing that proposition reasonably, in the face of the opposition. This is true on both sides of the case. It is simply a question of which team can make a more reasonable showing for its side. It makes no difference whether the debate is in Congress or in the high school; the principle is the same. When we vote on a measure, we vote for the side that seems the more reasonable to us. The debate aims simply to establish the reasonableness of a particular proposition. How can this be done?

Proof by means of comparison. Proof is accomplished by reasoning, on the basis of evidence. In a later chapter we shall see what constitutes good evidence. For our present purposes we may simply think of evidence as the facts and authorities that can be used to prove our case. How may we use these materials as proof? We shall have to do it by showing what bearing these facts and authorities have on our contentions.

Suppose we look at the process of proof in the very simplest way possible. The process is the same for questions of fact and for questions of policy. Suppose we take a question of fact and see how it is proved. Imagine two boys in a disagreement as to whose apple is the larger. What do they do to prove their contentions? They compare the apples, do they not? They measure or weigh them, and then they compare the measurements or the weights. In other words, they get the facts and then make a comparison between the facts of one apple and those of the other. Since this is a question of fact, they will be able to decide definitely whose apple is the larger, or that the two apples are the same size.

If, now, instead of a question of the size of apples, we have a question of two ways of dealing with the crime of murder, we follow exactly the same procedure. We shall get all the facts we can, and then we shall compare one set of facts with another set to see if we can decide which is better. Since this is a question of policy, we shall not expect to get a final decision; but at any rate we shall be able to form an intelligent opinion.

Let us look at the question of capital punishment more closely. Remembering the issues, let us consider the first one: that capital punishment tends to lessen crime. Does it, or does it not? We must first get the facts. To get them we must read all about capital punishment. We shall find some statistics which show that in some states where capital punishment is in force there are fewer murders than in Michigan. Now we are comparing a capital-punishment state with a non-capital-punishment state.

To be sure that our comparison is just and that therefore our proof is good, we must be sure of two things. We cannot compare the actual number of murders in one
state with the number in another, because the two states will not be the same size. We must be sure first, then, that the number of murders per thousand population is the basis of the comparison. In other words, the comparison must be a fair one. In the second place, we must be reasonably sure that the lower percentage of murders in the capital-punishment state is due to capital punishment and not to some other cause. Just because two things go together is no reason for supposing that one is the cause of the other. Hot weather and a Fourth-of-July celebration often go together, but neither one is the cause of the other. Now, is the lower percentage of murder due to capital punishment or to some other cause? Perhaps we shall find that the state with the low percentage is an agricultural state, with a native population of high intelligence, whereas Michigan is a state with large industrial and mining centers and with a large number of foreign-born people, many of whom are ignorant and impulsive. We must be sure, therefore, that the cause which we assign for the lower number of murders is the real cause. We can do this only by showing that there is no other reasonable cause for the stated condition.

And so we go on, making all the comparisons possible to show that capital punishment tends to lessen crime where it is in force. One particularly good comparison would be that between the percentage of murders in Michigan when Michigan had capital punishment and the percentage during the first few years after it was abolished. But, in all cases, proof is simply a matter of comparison. By comparing one thing with another, we make up our minds which is better.

Suppose we are dealing with the second issue, "Is capital punishment more humane than life imprison-

ment?" Again the proof is a matter of comparison. We compare the horrors of one with the horrors of the other. We get all the facts that we can on both sides, and compare these facts.

In the third issue, "Does capital punishment unduly endanger the lives of innocent people?" we look up the facts again, and then make our comparisons. How many innocent people have been known to have been executed? What is the percentage compared with the total number of executions? Is the percentage large or is it negligible? How does it compare with the amount of injustice done under a system of life imprisonment?

Suppose the question is one of government ownership of railroads. What comparisons can we make? What proof can we offer? Well, we can compare countries that have government ownership with those that do not have it. We can find the facts as regards rates and service in each country and make our comparisons. We shall have to be very careful here, because countries differ greatly. Especially do European countries differ from ours. If rates are compared, for example, the comparison will have to be made on some common basis of money. Their money would have to be given in terms of ours, or vice versa.

Another possibility would be to compare some governmentally owned business, such as the post office, with privately owned railroad business. Here the comparison would be easier in some respects, because we are dealing with the same country in both cases. It would be harder in others, because we are dealing with two different kinds of business. But by thinking our way carefully and by guarding against unjust comparisons, we could devise some very good proof on either side of this question by these two kinds of comparison.
If we are debating the League of Nations, again the proof is a matter of comparing the advantages of staying out of the League with those of entering it. We might compare the advantages on both sides, both as regards ourselves and as regards other nations. Suppose we make the comparison between the advantages and the disadvantages of entering. Get the facts, and the opinions of those in a position to judge, and compare what is to be said for with what is to be said against. This is the process of proof, and it is the whole of it, for a debate is always a discussion of the relative merits of two things. As a team on one side of the question, it is our business to show the advantages of that side. It is the business of the opposing team to show the advantages of the other side. This is our business as debaters. As voters, it will be our business to make a judgment between the two sides and to vote for the side that we believe to be more reasonable.

What, then, is proof? Proof is the process of making a comparison between two things, for the purpose of showing that one thing is better than another. The essential thing to remember in making the comparisons is that all comparisons must be fair. If, in comparing, we assert that one thing causes another thing, as we often have to do, we must be reasonably sure that some other cause did not bring about the result, but that our alleged cause did bring it about. If we do not make sure of this, the opposing team will find flaws in our argument and so render it useless. If we are not fair in our comparisons, we lay ourselves open to charges of shallow thinking or of dishonesty. In a debatable question there are always plenty of comparisons possible if only we know the facts. And these comparisons can be made with all fairness. This is the very essence of good debating.

Honesty in proof. Finally, it cannot be too strongly urged that proof must be carried out with the utmost honesty. Let us not concern ourselves too much with so-called “debate strategy.” The best strategy in debate is absolute honesty and clear thinking. Dishonesty and trickery are the refuge of those who cannot or will not think straight or who are too lazy to hunt up the facts. A wise judge will see through tricks. He will reward openness and candor in argument. He will respect a solid case as opposed to a “trick case.” Honesty is still the best policy, but it ought to be much more than a question of policy: it ought to be a question of principle. In the long run honest proof wins debates if it is also sound proof. But, win or lose, honest proof brings its own reward. It is well to remember that one often has to look in the mirror, and it is something of a satisfaction to see there the image of an honest debater.

EXERCISES

Discuss before the class the following questions, keeping within the time limit set by the instructor:

1. What is meant by “analyzing a proposition”?
2. Analyze the following questions:
   a. Shall I buy a life-insurance policy?
   b. Shall I go to college?
   c. Shall I study German?
   d. Shall the government own the coal mines?
   e. Shall we have the honor system in examinations?
   f. Shall the Philippines be given immediate independence?
   g. Shall textbooks be furnished free to all students?
4. What do we mean by “irrelevant matter”? Illustrate.
5. How may we know when we have the real issues after analysis?
6. What is the value of analyzing a proposition?
7. Illustrate from conversations you have heard recently the need of analysis in common, ordinary questions discussed.
8. How do you "prove" that one thing is better than another?
9. Discuss the phrase "Proved beyond the shadow of a doubt."
10. What kind of questions can be proved conclusively? Can they be debated? Why?
11. What is meant by "burden of proof"? How far may it be urged?
12. Prepare proof on one phase of one of the questions given above.
13. What cautions are necessary in cause-and-effect arguments?
14. Discuss honesty in its relation to proof.

CHAPTER IV

SOURCES OF MATERIAL

Preparing the bibliography. After the proposition has been chosen, after it has been subjected to its first analysis, after the main issues have been determined, the next step in preparation for a debate is the finding of material with which to prove one's case. This is one of the most fascinating parts of the whole procedure. Finding an unusual piece of new material is as thrilling for the debater as is the discovery of a rare orchid to the botanist or the finding of a new compound to the chemist. To one who sincerely wishes to prove a point to himself or others, the collecting of material becomes a habit. Instead of blindly accepting the opinions of others about prohibition, the World Court, the Dawes plan, or the Ruhr problem, the student who is trained in debate is constantly accumulating information from which he draws his own conclusion about these questions. Often the material is collected over a period of many years. More often, however, it must be obtained for school use within a period of three or four weeks. When this is the case the nine sources listed in this chapter will lead quickly and surely to a wealth of hidden treasure.

In the pursuit of evidence it is highly desirable for the debater to keep the name and date of each reference. The name of the article to be read, the page reference, and the name of the author are worth noting. This list of the basic references which the debater plans to use in the
preparation of his case is called the bibliography. The preparation of a bibliography gives the speaker a definite working basis, and it also saves time for him in the later stages of preparation. One should always aim to make his bibliography representative of the whole field of thought on a given question. Consequently one's references should be chosen from a variety of sources rather than from only one periodical or book. A brief bibliography of the League of Nations follows.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1. The Woman Citizen, December 29, 1923, p. 17
2. The Woman Citizen, June 2, 1923, p. 13
3. The Survey, May 15, 1920
4. The Literary Digest, September 16, 1922, p. 20
5. The American Journal of International Law, July, 1925, p. 475
   "The League of Nations and Unanimity," by Sir John Fischer Williams, K.C.
   "Toward Peace," by Lieutenant Colonel C. A Court Reppington
7. Current History, February, 1924, p. 758
   "Tangible Gains from the Versailles Treaty," by Denys P. Myers

Material from personal knowledge. Many students have the idea that personal knowledge is worthless in debate; still others have the impression that personal knowledge is all that is necessary. Both are wrong. The first thing to do in preparing material is to utilize what is already known. If the subject is "the city-manager type

of government," if one has lived in a town which has that type, and if one has studied about it in civics class, he ought to have some knowledge of the subject already at his command. On the other hand, if the subject is the Dawes plan, and if he has read nothing about it, his personal knowledge is nil. Suppose that we write on a card, in the following form, whatever personal knowledge has been gained from observation, from previous reading, or from previous study.

PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE

Fact 1
Fact 2
Fact 3
Etc.

Please notice that the card calls for facts, not opinions. We may have many opinions about the question, but it is our business now to forget our opinions and list the facts.

Material from personal conversation. Personal conversation is often considered a weak source of material, because it is sometimes used incorrectly. For example, personal conversation about the question of prohibition in the United States is almost invariably indefinite opinion rather than fact, and concerns itself with only the small community known to the conversers. Sound debating does not grow from such soil. However, conversation is a valuable source of material to a debater for the following purposes: first, to make the general issues of the controversy distinct; secondly, to learn whatever facts are given, though the number is small; thirdly, to learn new sources of material. Many a personal conversation has led to an interview, book, or letter of tremendous importance. In debating the question of Philippine independence, it was a personal conversation with a
Filipino, who could not be used as an authority himself, that led directly to a valuable interview with an authority and to some new pamphlets and books.

There is no better mental training than separating the worth while from the worthless in conversation. The debater who has learned to do this will profit much from conversation with his schoolmates, with his family at home, with his teachers, and with his friends. Furthermore, as in the case of personal knowledge, the facts should be set down immediately, to avoid confusion and inaccuracy. Again use the following form.

**PERSONAL CONVERSATION**

Fact 1   Fact 3
Fact 2   Etc.

If this procedure is followed, personal conversations will supply a few facts that are worth while and will lead to still more material.

**Material from personal interviews.** After having exhausted the first two sources, and after having done some reading upon the subject for debate, a student may profit much from the personal interview. The number of interviews depends upon the nature of the subject. If it is a question of great local interest, such as a new swimming pool for the high school, or if it is a question upon which very little has been written, the wise debater will plan many personal interviews. On the other hand, if the question is one on which there have been volumes published, time will be better spent in reading than in talking.

The success of a personal interview depends upon two things: (1) the experience of the person interviewed and (2) the student's attitude. If an interview is to be valuable enough to justify the time that it costs, the person from whom you seek information must be an acceptable authority; he must be one who has had experience in all or part of the field under discussion. If the subject for debate is a new gymnasium for your school, it would be good preparation to interview your superintendent of schools, a member of your board of education, as well as some parents who have children in school and who are taxpayers. Each person can give you valuable material about his particular phase of the subject. Before the interview the student should outline a list of questions upon which he desires information. This saves time for both the student and the person interviewed and prevents the discussion from being rambling and purposeless. After the interview the information gained should be written at once in the form suggested for the first two sources. A few interviews which are carefully recorded, well planned, and obtained with the right people are splendid sources of information.

**Material from personal letters.** There are times when a personal letter is the only possible means of securing information. After the debater has exhausted every other available source,—books, magazines, pamphlets, and special reports,—if he still lacks some vital bit of information he is justified in dispatching a personal letter to an eminent authority who can supply what he wants. For example, during the preparation of a debate on the question of Philippine independence, it was rumored that the Filipinos were already maintaining, independent of the United States, a diplomatic service in twenty-four countries. The debating squad hunted for weeks through every book and pamphlet, but no information on the subject was forthcoming. Consequently they felt justified in writing a personal letter to an eminent professor of
political science who had just returned from a year's study in the Philippines. He answered the question, when every other source had failed. Another example occurred in a series of debates on ship subsidy. The more the debaters read, the more confused they became about the number of merchant ships which the United States had lying idle after the World War. The statements of number varied so greatly that only a letter to the United States Shipping Board in Washington, D.C., revealed the true facts. Men and women of affairs are too busy to write numerous personal letters of a general nature. However, they are usually willing to answer one or two definite questions about a subject on which they are authorities, when it is evident that the student has exhausted every other available source. Personal letters should not be written by the dozen; they should be short, concise, and definite. They are a most valuable source of information to be used when the need is real.

Material from current magazines. One of the debater's sources of material which is most easily available is the current magazine. Many of our best weeklies and best monthlies are found in the debater's own home. Others are available in the school library, the city library, or through the Extension Division of the library of the state university. If a library is at your service, look up the subject which you are debating in "The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature," "Poole's Index," or the "Annual Library Index." If there is no library in your community, the Extension Division of your state-university library will supply you with a list of magazines on the subject and, in many cases, with the magazines themselves. It is not the purpose of this book to advertise periodicals, but the following are recommended as reliable sources of material on public questions, with the assurance that the perusal of these will lead to a wider acquaintance with others.

**Weeklies or Biweeklies**

1. The Literary Digest
2. The Survey
3. Collier's Weekly
4. The Outlook
5. The New Republic
6. The Dearborn Independent
7. The Independent
8. The Living Age
9. The Scientific American
10. The Saturday Evening Post

**Monthlies**

1. The Atlantic Monthly
2. Current History
3. The Review of Reviews
4. The North American Review
5. The Century Magazine
6. International Woman Suffrage News
7. The National Geographic Magazine
8. Asia
9. The Mentor
10. Current Opinion
11. The World's Work
12. Scribner's Magazine
13. Harper's Monthly
14. The American Magazine
15. The Woman Citizen
16. The Forum
DEBATING FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

The successful debater must have a working knowledge not only of the one subject before him for debate, but also of current affairs in general. To this end the reading of current magazines is a valuable means. After a student has listed the magazine references which are given for his subject in the various Reader's Guides, he has finished only half his quest in the realm of periodicals. In the question of the entrance of the United States into the World Court many magazine articles will have been published after the Reader's Guide went to press; consequently the wise debater will find himself constantly reviewing our best magazines, week by week and month by month, so that no new up-to-the-minute material will escape him.

Material from technical and professional magazines. In addition to the information which comes from general magazines, many subjects for debate are such that they demand the more detailed and authoritative material which comes from the technical or professional magazines. Poor, indeed, is the business or profession which does not boast one journal or more to sing its praises and propound its doctrines. Naturally many of these journals present a very prejudiced point of view on certain questions, but it is part of the debater's business to be conscious of this, and to offset it by learning all that he can about the other side. For example, if one is debating the city-manager type of government, he will want to read the City Manager Monthly and the Municipal Review; for the question of Philippine independence he will read the American Historical Review and Annals of the American Academy; for the question of capital punishment, the American Law Review and the Michigan Law Review; for a labor question, such as the

MINIMUM WAGE or the compulsory adjustment of labor disputes, valuable material will be found in the United States Labor Review, the Quarterly Journal of Economics, the Iron Age, the Iron Trade Review, Political Science, American Industry, Law and Labor, the Manufacturer's Record, the Open Shop Review, and the Weekly Review. If a proposition which involves engineering is being debated, — for instance, the St. Lawrence waterway project or the Chicago drainage canal, — one will profit by reading Marine Engineering and the Marine Review. If the subject is a Federal department of education for the United States, one should read the Journal of the National Education Association and the monthly publication of a state teachers' association. Questions of international importance like the League of Nations, the World Court, and the Geneva Protocol are well handled in the Quarterly Journal of International Law. These examples have been cited not with the idea of presenting a complete list, but rather with the thought of giving the reader a glimpse of the vast field of material which he may explore, if he desires and if the urge for new material is sufficient.

Material from books. Books are always a rich source of material. They are standard. Periodicals come and go, but the book remains. As with magazines, however, more than one book must be read and more than one point of view examined, if prejudice is to be avoided. Books for debating classify themselves in three groups:

1. Encyclopedias. Nelson's, Appleton's, Chambers's, and Johnson's encyclopedias, Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, the Encyclopædia Britannica, and Bliss's Encyclopædia of Social Reform are one or all available for every student. Used wisely they are a valuable source of
information. They are practical for two purposes: to
give the reader a general, historical view of his subject
and to supply information that is needed for a certain
point. Never can the encyclopedia be substituted for
more intensive reading in preparation for a debate.

2. Books on subjects other than the one for debate. After
the debater has read all the material listed under his
subject, he has not yet exhausted the supply. Dozens of
facts may be disclosed about a certain subject in books
whose titles sound quite foreign to the proposition under
discussion. Such statements are likely to be much more
impartial and truthful than is something which is written
to prove a certain proposition. For example, a student
will probably find a more unbiased account of prohibi-
tion enforcement in the diary of a social worker who sees
all phases of our social problems than he will in a book
which is written with the specific purpose of proving
prohibition good or bad. The only way to find such ma-
terial is to read the indexes of all books which sound as if
they might bear even the slightest relationship to the
subject under discussion. Book-browsing of this sort is a
most enjoyable pastime and leads to material for debate
which would otherwise remain unrevealed.

3. Books by authorities in the field. Every proposition
for debate which is of more than local importance has
been the subject for a book by some authority. Such
books are especially valuable, because their authors have
studied their subjects thoroughly and over a long period
of time. For example, books which present their re-
spective subjects in a manner that is sound, direct, and
most useful to the debater are "The New Merchant
Marine," by E. L. Hurley; "Principles of Labor Legis-
lation," by J. R. Commons and J. B. Andrews; "Our

Sources of Material

Insular Possessions," by Charles Burton Harrison;
"Military Education in the United States," by Captain
Ira Louis Reeves; "Commission Government in Ameri-
can Cities," by Ernest S. Bradford. In order to be sure
that one has the latest books on the subject which he is
studying, it is wise to follow the book advertisements in
such magazines as The Atlantic Monthly, The Century,
Current History, and Scribner's. New books are con-
stantly being published, and constant vigilance is neces-
sary for the debater who wants to be well informed on his
subject. One debating team found four new books on
Philippine independence through magazine advertise-
ments, long after their bibliography had been compiled
from the Reader's Guide.

Material from special documents and reports. The hun-
dreds of special documents and reports fall into two
classes: first, those that are compiled by the govern-
ment; secondly, those that are the work of special or-
organizations. As examples of the first we have, for the
subject of universal military training, "The Army War
College," War Department Document No. 531; for Phili-
pine independence, Hearings of the United States House
of Representatives Committee on Insular Affairs, H.R.
22142; the compulsory arbitration of labor disputes,
Hearings for December 14, 1906, H.R. 10840; for ship
subsidy, "A Naval Auxiliary Merchant Marine," by
W. G. McAdoo, Senate Document No. 4. A letter to the
United States Printing Office, the Congressional Library,
or the departments of navy, war, or agriculture will al-
ways bring valuable material. Your congressmen will also
mail you bulletins. This information is provided for us
as citizens of the United States, at great cost. Debaters,
use it!
In the second place we have the pamphlets and reports that are prepared and published by various organizations. If one wishes to prepare a debate on the St. Lawrence waterway project or the Chicago drainage canal, he will find that much material has been collected by the boards of commerce of Detroit, Buffalo, and Chicago. Material on the child-labor amendment is available at the offices of the Employers’ Association. Almost every problem of local interest has been the subject of fact-gathering by the local chamber of commerce and by business clubs. Visit them, and they will gladly tell what they know.

Material from newspapers. Because newspaper articles must be written hastily, and because they are actually prepared only for the moment, they are considered less valuable as sources of material than are books, pamphlets, and periodicals. Nevertheless the newspaper does serve the debater in two ways. In the first place, the daily press keeps one informed about what is happening day by day. In debating the question of Japanese immigration during the time that Congress was acting upon it, one could not afford to wait for a weekly or a monthly to give the facts. At such a time the newspaper is invaluable. It keeps one up to date on the proposition. In the second place, the newspaper often helps the debater to bring a proposition nearer home to his audience. In one debate in which the opposition was trying to prove that the Japanese were ready to attack the United States at once, their opponents, the visiting team, scored splendidly when they pointed out to the audience that a headline article in their own evening paper extolled the Japanese for their friendliness to us. In addition to these two purposes, a few newspapers are considered reliable sources for most information. Such publications as The New York Times, The Springfield Republican, and The Christian Science Monitor, belong in this category. Debaters should train themselves to distinguish between the desirable and undesirable use of the daily paper in debate.

Any debater who utilizes these nine sources of material will always be well supplied with facts. If one source does not yield them, another will.

EXERCISES

1. List on a card as suggested in this chapter the facts which you know from personal knowledge for the following propositions:
   a. Resolved, That girls are better students than boys.
   b. Resolved, That the moving pictures promote the use of good English.

2. List on a card as suggested in this chapter the facts which you have gained from personal conversation about the following propositions:
   a. Resolved, That our high school should have a new swimming-pool.
   b. Resolved, That the prohibition laws are enforced in our city.

3. Make a personal interview with the city manager, one of the councilmen, a club woman, and a business man in your town on some local problem such as the following:
   a. The city-manager form of government.
   b. The widening of the main street.
   c. Municipal ownership of the gas and electricity production.
   d. A municipal ice-skating rink.

4. Write a personal letter to your congressman or United States senator asking for one or two definite pieces of information which you have been unable to secure otherwise.
In your letter you may ask questions on any of the following subjects for debate:

a. Philippine independence.
c. Muscle Shoals.

5. Prepare a bibliography from our current magazines, following the model given previously in this chapter. Suggested subjects are these:

a. Immigration.
b. Prohibition enforcement.
c. The Locarno compact.
d. The Bok peace plan.
e. The minimum wage for women in industry.

6. Prepare a bibliography of ten articles from technical and professional magazines on the following questions:

a. The St. Lawrence waterway project.
b. The Chicago drainage canal.

7. Prepare a bibliography of ten books on the question of Philippine independence.

8. Prepare a bibliography of ten special documents and reports on the proposition "Resolved, That the proposed child-labor amendment to the National Constitution should be adopted by the United States."

9. Prepare a bibliography of ten newspaper references on the question of the month; for example, the Locarno compact for the month of November, 1925. Make the bibliography from at least four different newspapers, some local and some from other parts of the world.

10. Criticize in class the bibliographies prepared in the foregoing exercises from the following points of view:

a. Date of the reference.
b. Reliability of the author.
c. Variety of sources.
d. Has the bibliography under discussion exhausted the field of information on the proposition?

CHAPTER V

EVIDENCE

Definition of evidence. In the previous chapters we discussed the nature of a proposition, "sources of material," and found out where to go to get things to read, so as to inform ourselves about the question for debate. It now becomes necessary to go into some little detail as to the use of this material. We cannot, and do not want to, use all of it. What shall be used, and why?

The material that we use to prove our proposition is called evidence. In court, evidence is brought in to show certain things concerning the truth or falsity of the charge. Witnesses are introduced, and their testimony is called evidence. A gun may be brought in and used as evidence. Evidence consists of the facts and the testimony of witnesses. Now in debate we have evidence also. It is used in a similar way. Both sides introduce it to prove their cases.

Evidence of fact and of authority. In debate, evidence is of two kinds: fact and authority. Evidence of fact consists of statistics and similar matter that can be cited to support one's case. It is the best type of evidence. "Facts are facts," as the saying goes. If this kind of evidence is honest, it cannot be disputed. One may deny the conclusions that are drawn from the facts, but he can hardly deny the facts. By very virtue of its nature, a fact is not open to dispute. It is the basis of all good argument and gives one a solid basis for his proof.
Evidence of authority is less valid, but is nevertheless very useful. It may be disputed, but still it has weight if it is of the proper kind. Evidence of authority consists of the opinions of men and women who are in a better position to form sound opinions than we are. It may be impossible to cite facts to prove my case completely, but if I can cite well-known authorities I have added weight to my arguments. We are in the habit of attaching weight to the opinions of well-known people when these people have our respect. We may be without facts to prove that the pain we suffer is caused by appendicitis; but if a well-known doctor, whose judgment we respect, gives it as his opinion that we have a case of appendicitis, we are apt to take his word for it. He may not be able to prove it without performing an operation, but nevertheless we respect his judgment and act according to his advice.

Now, in our reading we are continually running against facts and authorities. How may we know whether or not these facts and authorities are good evidence to use? Three simple tests may be applied to determine this matter. Since, in debate, facts are almost invariably gathered by someone other than the debater, we may apply the same tests to both kinds of evidence. We usually have to take somebody’s word for even our facts; hence it becomes a question of the reliability of the one who gives us either the facts or the opinion, as the case may be.

Competency as a test of evidence. The first question we should ask about evidence is this: “Is the person who gives the facts or the opinion in a position to know the facts or to form an intelligent opinion?” In other words, is he a “specialist” in this field? A person may be very wise and very honest and yet not be in a position to know about this particular thing. We may take the physician’s word for facts and opinions in the field of medicine, but he is not necessarily to be trusted on questions of politics or economics. It is not a question of his honesty; it is a question of his knowledge in this particular field. If the facts or opinions come from some great economist and if they concern economics, we say they are probably to be trusted. But we will not take the economist’s word in the field of medicine. So the first question we should ask of our evidence is this: “Where do you come from? Who vouches for you?” We should aim to present only such evidence as will satisfy this test. Testimony that comes from one in a position to know is said to be competent testimony.

Absence of prejudice as a test of evidence. A second question that we should always ask, after we have determined that the evidence comes from a specialist, is this: “Is the source of this evidence prejudiced?” The best evidence is that which comes not only from a specialist but from an unprejudiced specialist. A person may be in a position to know the facts and to form an opinion, but he may be so prejudiced that he cannot state the facts fairly or form an unbiased opinion. It is for this reason that no judge may sit in judgment in any law case in which he has a financial interest. His interest might tend to make him prejudiced. A United States senator may know a great deal about the tariff, but if we find that he is a “rock-ribbed” Republican or a “hidebound” Democrat we are doubtful as to his ability to state facts or opinions in an unprejudiced way. An extreme socialist may know a great deal about economics, but we would probably take his testimony with many grains of salt.

Unwilling testimony.” Perhaps the best kind of evidence is what we call unwilling testimony. If a person
who is in a position to know the facts is strongly prejudiced, and yet gives testimony against his general inclination or belief, we value that testimony highly. It is assumed in this case that the testimony must be true, or it would not be given. Such a person is testifying against his own convictions. He is virtually admitting something, and he is doing so, presumably, simply because it is beyond dispute. If it were not, he would dispute it. He would like to think that it isn't true, but he cannot think so. This fact has great value in debate. If one can quote evidence for his side from one who strongly favors the other side, he has made a strong point. In reading, we should be on the constant lookout for such evidence. If we can say, "Why, even Mr. So-and-so, who stands strongly against our position, admits this," we have scored heavily for our side.

Recency as a test of evidence. Still another test to apply to our evidence is "Is the evidence recent?" Often much depends on this. As life goes on, what was once true may be true no longer. It would be foolish to quote the census of 1880 to prove a point regarding the present population of the United States. Then, again, people sometimes change their opinions. If we quote some prominent man on a subject, and our opponents answer by saying, "Yes, that is what that man thought thirty years ago, but this is what he thinks now," and then proceed to quote a recently expressed opinion that contradicts the first, we are in an embarrassing position. In reading, we must note when the facts or opinions were written. If the evidence is old, we must be sure that it is still good if we are to use it.

If we can honestly say of a piece of evidence that it comes from one in position to know, that it comes from one who is unprejudiced or that it is admitted by one who is prejudiced for the other side, and that it is the most recent evidence of its kind, the evidence is good. These tests should be applied to all evidence that is used. We shall not expect to find evidence that will satisfy all these requirements perfectly, but we must try to use only such evidence as satisfies them reasonably. Very few people, for instance, are perfectly free from prejudice, but there are some who are so evidently prejudiced that their evidence is of no value at all. At least we should keep clear of evidence that by these tests is hopelessly bad.

Honesty, fairness, and definiteness in citation. In selecting evidence to use, be honest. There is no more despicable trick known to debating than "manufacturing evidence." Do not, under any circumstances, make up evidence "out of whole cloth." Be honest, or do not debate. Fortunately, the manufacturing of evidence is far less common than it used to be. If you have reason to question the honesty of an opponent in this regard, do not accuse him of dishonesty, but ask him for the definite citation of his evidence. Dishonest evidence cannot be cited.

Furthermore, in selecting evidence, be fair. Do not read part of a sentence or paragraph that happens to sound like a defense of your position, and leave unread the part that contradicts it. It is said that "the devil can cite Scripture for his purpose." Usually this is done by reading an isolated sentence or passage, taking it out of its context and making it appear to mean something that it does not mean. Avoid all such manifest unfairness. Quote your authority fairly. If the sense of it is against you, then it is not evidence for your side. Few things are more humiliating, moreover, than to use such
distorted evidence and then have your opponent rise and read the rest of the passage. If you use ordinary fairness in quoting, there is no danger of this.

In using evidence in debate, make definite citations. Do not be content with saying that "Lord Bryce says..." Rather say, "Lord Bryce, in his 'American Commonwealth,' p. 78, says..." Always give the source of your evidence, and make it definite enough so that your opponents can look it up if they wish. This is common fairness. Your opponents have a right to know the source of your evidence. A judge, too, likes to have you make things definite. It takes a little time, but the time is well spent. If you have found something in the Literary Digest, in quoting it give the real source. It is not enough to say "The Literary Digest of December 14, 1922, says..." Rather say, "The Literary Digest of December 14, 1922, quotes William Allen White as saying in the Emporia Gazette..." This fixes the evidence to its final source. Care in this regard is of the utmost importance.

Recording evidence for use in debate. In taking down evidence for use later, always use a card index. Cards three by five inches are the handiest. These are of stock size and are easy to use on the platform when necessary. Always put at the top of the card a phrase which tells at a glance what the evidence is about. Then take down a digest of the article read or copy a quotation, as the case may be, and always put down the exact source, so that you can turn to the source again if you should wish. And remember the law of the index: Just one idea to a card and just one card to an idea. If you put two or three things on a card, you cannot separate them later, to use in different places, without copying. Neither can you index the cards in your box properly, since you have two or three ideas that belong in different places, under different heads, all on one card. If one thing is spread over two cards, one of the cards may get lost or misplaced; then neither card is worth anything. Learn to condense material so that you can keep your index well organized. Make appropriate divisions in your index box, and file the cards in such a way that you can instantly turn to all the material you have on any one phase of the question. This may save your life in debate, when you will not have time to run all through a stack of cards hunting for one that has not been properly indexed. Time spent in indexing and organizing your index is well spent. Keep your evidence in order so that you can find it at an instant's notice. Having evidence is of no avail unless you know where it is. Pope says, "Order is heaven's first law." It is one of the first laws of the index, too. The great trouble with the old-fashioned notebook was that it had no order about it. Things were put into it as they were found, and to get anything out of it was a big task.

Sufficiency of evidence. How much evidence is necessary to prove a point? This is a question that cannot be answered offhand. Everything depends on the importance of the point,—on whether it is a hard or an easy point to establish,—and on the amount of evidence given by the other side. There is such a thing as using too much evidence. When a point is once satisfactorily established, to give more evidence is not only a waste of time, but it strains the patience of the judges and the audience. Learn to watch the audience in speaking, and when you judge that they are satisfied with your proof of a point, pass on to another, even though you have additional evidence to offer. But be sure that you have enough good evidence to satisfy a reasonable person.
You will not expect to satisfy everybody in the audience, of course, but it is necessary to use enough evidence to satisfy those who are open to conviction.

Supporting assertions. Never let any statement go unsupported by evidence. Whenever you make a statement or an assertion, be sure that you cite good evidence of its validity. The judges and audience cannot be expected to take your word for it. This is no reflection on your honesty, but, in the nature of the case, you are prejudiced in favor of your side. Listeners want facts and authorities from an unprejudiced source. One of the most common weaknesses in debate lies just here — in the failure to back up assertion with evidence. The ability to base every statement and assertion by facts and authorities is one of the distinguishing marks of a good debater. This, of course, means work. It means that to be a good debater you must know the facts. Our critic, cited in an earlier chapter, said, "We want facts, not fine speeches." Let us answer him now by saying, "We want facts, packed into good speeches." If you can convince a judge that you know the facts and that you know how to use them, you can win his favor, and you can win it honestly. Crowding in the facts crowds out the "hot air." And "hot air" does not win debates. Get down to bedrock. Base your whole case on good evidence, — evidence that will stand the test, — and if you present it clearly and interestingly you will win your share of debates.

Evidence from various sources. Produce evidence from a variety of sources. If you quote from only one or two authorities the audience and judges will get the not unnatural impression that your proposition is backed by only one or two people, and they will accordingly have their doubts about its worth. Quote widely wherever possible. Besides, if you rely on one source of evidence only, and your opponents succeed in throwing some discredit on this source, your case is badly weakened; whereas if you can point to many sources of facts and authority, it is much harder for your opponents to discredit your case. A stool with only one leg is very unstable, but a stool with three legs stands solidly.

Reserving evidence for rebuttal. It is a good plan to reserve some evidence on each point for use in rebuttal. If the other side attacks your argument, you can then give additional evidence of its validity. Using up all your evidence in constructive argument is like shooting all your ammunition at the first rabbit you see. You may need some of it for other game. If one shot kills the rabbit, save the rest of your ammunition for something else.

Summary. In summary, the source from which you quote your facts or opinions must be competent, unprejudiced, and recent. You must be honest and fair in presenting evidence. Quote with definiteness. Record all evidence, with source, very carefully on cards, and index with great care. Use enough evidence to satisfy reasonable people, and do not allow any statement to go unsupported. Show a wide variety of evidence, and save enough evidence to make a good showing in rebuttal.

EXERCISES

Make short speeches in class on the following subjects:

1. What is meant by "evidence"? Define and illustrate.
2. What is the difference between evidence of fact and evidence of authority?
3. Illustrate what is meant by "competent testimony."
4. What is meant by "prejudiced testimony"? Illustrate by examples.
5. How is recent evidence superior to old evidence? Illustrate.
7. What is meant by "quoting fairly"? Give an illustration of unfair quotation of evidence.
8. How much evidence should one use to prove a point?
9. Discuss "unsupported assertion" and show its weakness.
10. What is the advantage of variety in evidence?
11. Make an assertion and support it with evidence that meets the three tests. Do this with other assertions, until you are thoroughly familiar with the means of establishing a point.

CHAPTER VI

THE BRIEF

Nature of an outline and of a brief. The brief brings order out of chaos. Making a brief is a delightful task if the debater has carefully performed the previous steps in preparation. After the proposition has been chosen and analyzed, after the sources of material have been discovered, after the evidence has been collected, the arrangement of material is next in order. This is the process called briefing. A brief is the formal outline of the material to be used in proving a proposition.

Every student has at some time or other done outlining for English, history, or civics. The brief, however, is a formal outline, which means that it follows a more definite form than does an ordinary outline. If one is allowed five minutes in which to prepare a talk on the subject "What our Town Needs Most," he would be justified in using an outline like the following:

WHAT OUR TOWN NEEDS MOST
1. A new library
2. A recreation building
3. A municipal swimming pool
4. A good hotel
5. A woman’s-club building

Such an outline would remind one of the main points and would organize the material sufficiently for a short talk. But this is not a brief: it is merely an outline. It must go further in order to be useful to the debater.
First, the outline uses only single words and catch phrases to express an idea: the brief uses complete sentences. The speaker himself may know what he intends to say for each of the topics in the outline, but to someone else it would be meaningless. In debating, one's material must always be as clear to one's colleagues as to oneself; consequently the complete thought must be expressed in a complete sentence.

Secondly, the outline need not contain all the material. It usually contains only the main points. The brief must contain everything in the argument: main points, subpoints, evidence, and sources of evidence. Too many debaters have the idea that they have briefed their case when they have made an outline like the following:

The United States should adopt a system of compulsory voting.

I. The people in the United States are neglecting their duty.  
   A. Examples in last election.
II. Voting is a duty as well as a privilege.  
   A. Our forefathers died to give it to us.  
   B. The country cannot continue without voting by all citizens.
III. All other methods of making our citizens vote have failed.  
   A. Advertising.  
   B. Organized effort on the part of churches, clubs, and civic societies.

Although this outline goes farther toward being a brief than does the outline which was first illustrated, it is still not a brief. A few subpoints are given, and a few points are stated as complete sentences, but there is no evidence and no citation of sources of material. The outline may pass without these; but the brief, never.

Thirdly, the outline may omit many parts which are necessary in the introduction of a brief: the brief must contain the entire introductory matter.

Fourthly, the outline does not require as much care in indention and labeling: a brief, to be valuable, must always be correctly indented, must have its sections carefully labeled, and must show the proper regard for numerals and letters which represent the different values of different points. Starting with the knowledge of outlining which we already have as a base, we must now add to that the parts which are necessary for a brief, being particular about indentation and labels. The result will be a brief.

Purpose of the brief. The inexperienced debater often questions why so much time should be devoted to organizing his material into a brief, but the debater of experience learns to consider his brief as his best friend. Its purpose is fourfold:

First, the brief shows the proper relationship of points. When one is collecting evidence, he is very likely to put all his material together without making a clear distinction between main points and subpoints. For example, if one is collecting material on the city-manager form of government, he usually lists all his points, main and subordinate, in a manner like the following:

1. The city-manager form saves money.
2. The city-manager form has worked in
   Abilene, Kansas,  
   San Diego, California,  
   Grand Haven, Michigan.
3. The city-manager form means better sewers, better water mains.
4. The city-manager type means a technically trained executive.
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5. It is difficult to secure competent business men to administer city affairs at their own expense.

6. The city-manager plan means better streets.

7. The city-manager eliminates politics in administration.

It is the function of the brief to reorganize the points and place them in the proper position according to their importance.

I. The city-manager plan means a better executive.
   A. The city-manager is a technically trained executive.
      1. He is trained in engineering.
      2. He is trained in political science.
   B. The city-manager is in a position to be free from local politics.

II. The city-manager plan means better government.
    A. It means better sewers and better water mains.
    B. It means the elimination of waste, and hence a saving of money in government.

III. The city-manager plan has worked successfully.
    A. It has worked in Abilene, Kansas.
    B. It has worked in San Diego, California.
    C. It has worked in Grand Haven, Michigan.

This arrangement of material shows clearly the relationship between the points and their relative importance.

Secondly, the brief reveals the weak spots in the argument. One may have failed to collect facts for one of the most important links in the chain of evidence. In this case the brief will show it. To illustrate: if the debater is briefing an argument for the World Court, he may have failed to collect sufficient evidence about the number of cases which the court has tried. His brief reveals this neglect; so he can proceed to collect more evidence.

Thirdly, a brief is essential for one's colleagues as much as for himself. In proving a proposition debaters are constantly working as a team of two or three. To do this successfully, each must have complete knowledge of what his colleagues' share of the problem is, as well as of his own. The brief, with its emphasis through spacing, indentation, and labels, tells at a glance the important and the less important points. Briefing prevents the points of one speaker from overlapping those of another. The brief is the best method yet devised to designate what material belongs to one speaker and what to another. Thus it is a necessary part of preparation not only for the individual, but for the team as a whole.

Fourthly, the brief means a definite basis for either a memorized or an extemporaneous speech. It contains all the facts, organized, tested, correlated, and supported by the evidence with its sources. Here in a clear, compact, easily read form is found all the data. The subject matter is completely prepared. If the speaker wants to write his speech and memorize it verbatim, his brief supplies the material; if he wishes to speak extemporaneously, he may simply study his brief. To the experienced debater the brief is his best friend, always a reliable basis for his speech.

Organization of material preparatory to briefing. Much time will be saved for the student who is careful to organize his material before he writes a word of his brief. It is assumed that all evidence has been collected and filed on three-by-five cards, according to the procedure outlined in Chapter V. It is also assumed that the debater has discovered his main issues through a painstaking analysis of the question. Let us take, for example, the proposition "Resolved, That the Philippine Islands should be given their immediate and complete independence." Analysis has revealed that the main issues are (1) that the Filipinos are socially prepared for their
independence; (2) that they are economically prepared for it; (3) that it is our moral obligation to grant them their independence. Each of these main issues should be written on a separate card, another card should be labeled "Introduction," and a third labeled "Refutation." These five cards should be placed separately on the desk, and the work of organization be started. All the cards tending to prove that the Filipinos are socially prepared for independence should be placed with the card which is labeled with that issue, all the cards relating to the economic situation should be put with the second group, and all the cards pertaining to our moral obligation should be put with the third group. In the same way any material which is more of an answer to the opposition than proof for one's constructive argument should be placed under "Refutation," and all material which deals with the history, origin, or definition of terms should go into the pile labeled "Introduction."

Sometimes one is not sure in which group a certain point belongs. Often this means that the material does not logically belong in the constructive argument, but rather that it should be saved for refutation, where one needs everything. If such is not the solution, the card may be tentatively placed under one issue with the understanding that the final organization of subpoints will put it in its proper place. After this general distribution of evidence has been made, the wise debater will carefully read over his cards as he has them grouped. This study is most valuable for fixing points in one's mind, as well as for the purpose of paving the way for the next step, which is the grouping of subpoints.

Next comes the grouping of divisions of the main issues, and then the subdivisions. To continue with the illustration already used, under the main issue that the Filipinos are socially prepared for independence, we have the following divisions: (1) education, (2) public health, (3) literacy, and (4) homogeneity. Then we divide the cards on social preparation for independence into four groups which correspond to this division. Next we examine these four divisions to determine whether or not a further subdivision is necessary. If it is advisable, as in the case of division 1, we subdivide. The division of education falls into the four subpoints: (1) number of schools in the islands, (2) number of native teachers, (3) increase in school attendance, and (4) percentage of Philippine revenue that is spent for schools. After all the recorded evidence has been completely classified in this way, each pack of cards should be carefully labeled with the name of the subdivision, the division, and the main issue to which it belongs.

Finally, the student should arrange the cards of each group in their proper order. In doing this the principles of logical order and of climax should be kept constantly in mind. In the question of Philippine independence the social issue would logically come first. It is the easiest to grasp; it is nearest to the experience of the audience. All the listeners know about schools, teachers, and school taxes, even when they are ignorant of economic and international relationship. Begin with the simple, and advance to the complex. Start with something known to the audience, and lead them to the unknown. For the same reasons the economic argument comes second. Finally, place the moral argument third. It makes a splendid opportunity for a plea to your listeners, it presents something more than figures when their minds have grown a little tired, and it means a good climax.
The best of arguments may be ruined by poor arrangement. Logical sequence and climax are two sound corner stones in the temple of successful debating. The proper attention to these two points means easy brief-making and a sound case.

Writing the title. The title of a brief is useful for the same reason that all titles are useful: to state the general content of the document so briefly that it may be understood at a glance. The title should indicate that the paper is a brief, it should state the proposition, and it should give the side of the question which is being upheld.

**A BRIEF FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE (OR THE NEGATIVE) ON THE PROPOSITION**

Resolved, That ————

Writing the introduction. The introduction of a brief is necessary to present general information about the subject which is vital to both teams as well as to the audience. All this material may or may not be presented in the final argument. If it is not given in one of the constructive arguments, and a question arises about it, a glance at his brief is sufficient to solve the problem for the debater. A complete introduction contains six parts in the following form:

1. Origin of the question.
2. History of the question.
3. Definition of terms.
4. Exclusion of irrelevant matter.
5. A statement of admitted or waived matter.
6. Main issues.

1. The origin of the question means exactly what its title implies: the beginning of the proposition as a subject for debate. Why is it being debated at this particular time? What action of the state legislature has put it in the foreground of discussion? What congressional measure has made it an immediate issue? The origin of the question should answer the query Why are we debating this particular subject at this particular time? To illustrate: the origin of the question for a debate on the entry of the United States into the World Court read as follows: "December 17, 1925, Congress will consider the entrance of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice. For this reason the subject is of particular interest at this time." In the case of the question of Federal child-labor legislation, the origin of the question read: "During the past year a child-labor amendment to the Constitution of the United States was passed, and many states ratified this amendment. This aroused much discussion of the subject, and makes it of special interest at this time." If the proposition for debate is a school question, such as the installation of a swimming-pool in the school gymnasium, the origin may read: "There is before our city Board of Education at the present time a measure appropriating five thousand dollars for a school swimming-pool. This is the reason for our immediate interest in the subject."

2. The history of the question extends much further. It goes back to the very beginning of the story and carries it through to the present time. A good history gives dates. It is definite. It abounds in facts. It gives all the general information that there is on the proposition from the time when it was first heard of to the present day. The origin of the question tells why a certain subject is being debated; the history tells the life cycle of the
proposition. To illustrate: a brief history of the question of Philippine independence follows:

A. In 1898 the United States took over the Philippine Islands, with the understanding that eventually they would have their freedom.

B. In 1916 Congress passed the Jones Bill, in which the islands were promised independence as soon as a stable government should be established.

C. In 1919 President Wilson stated that a stable government existed, so that they were now ready for independence.

D. In 1921 the Wood-Forbes Commission spent four months of investigation in the archipelago, after which they reported that the Filipinos were ready for more autonomy, although not entirely prepared for complete independence.

E. Repeatedly throughout the past nine years bills have been presented to Congress for the purpose of granting independence to the Philippines, but thus far none of these bills has been passed. Thus, for over twenty-six years the Filipinos have been struggling for independence.

A good history is definite. It contains dates. It is complete. It presents the story from the very beginning to the present time. It is brief. Naturally, if the brief is very long, the history may be of correspondingly greater length, but usually one hundred, one hundred and fifty, or two hundred words are sufficient. Finally, a good history should be impartial. It is not the function of the history of the question to state arguments; these are left for the body of the brief. The history should present a general account of facts which are of equal value to both the negative and the affirmative. The debater who follows these five suggestions will find himself writing histories that are of real value to himself and to his audience.

3. The definition of terms clarifies any part of the proposition which is in question. Furthermore, such definition often means that the proposition may be shortened by several words. For instance, in the proposition "Resolved, That the European war debts to the United States should be canceled," if we had to include the names of all the nations included in the term "European," as well as a statement about the exact meaning of war debts, the statement of the proposition would be long and cumbersome. Instead, we state the proposition briefly, and then write the following definition of terms:

A. "European" refers to those nations which, as our allies in the World War, borrowed money from us. It means the nations of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and Italy.

B. The term "war debts" means not the money borrowed from private corporations in this country, but money borrowed from the United States government itself.

In the proposition "Resolved, That our high school should adopt the honor-point system," the term "honor-point system" needs complete definition; otherwise the debate will end in confusion. Does it mean the honor-point system for scholarship or for extra-curricular activities?

In the proposition "Resolved, That citizens who fail to vote at three successive elections should be disfranchised,"

A. The term "citizens who fail to vote" means those who fail to vote at three successive elections.

B. Successive elections include all elections — local, state, and national.

C. The excuses of personal illness or a death in the immediate family are considered valid.

D. Absence from the city is considered a valid excuse except in those states where provision is made for absent voters.

E. The term "disfranchised" means that the citizen shall be denied the right to vote for a period of five years.
The foregoing definitions answer clearly the questions which a reading of the proposition would naturally present to the debater's mind, and puts the debate on a sound foundation. The definition of terms must be accepted by both sides. Consequently it is fair, impartial, and a real clarifier of misunderstandings. If the introduction contained nothing else except the definition of terms, it would be worth the debater's while to write one.

4. Exclusion of irrelevant matter. The majority of debaters have their minds so well trained that little extraneous material enters their case. However, with some propositions it is wise to think carefully about the matter and to write down in definite form those points which have no place in the debate. To illustrate: if we are debating prohibition enforcement in Kansas, we should not include Florida. If we are discussing migratory-bird laws of Canada, we should not include the United States. If we are presenting the evils in the drug traffic, we do not include alcoholic liquors. When we are debating independence for India, we should not include South Africa, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or any other British possession. If the proposition is that of Japanese immigration we have a right to exclude the Chinese and other Orientals from the discussion. When two teams are debating the proposition "Resolved, That the United States should join the World Court," some member of the negative invariably drags in the League of Nations, which is not the proposition for that particular debate. For a debate on the World Court, part four of the introduction may well read:

IV. Exclusion of irrelevant matter
   A. The League of Nations is not included in this debate.
   B. The Geneva Protocol is not a part of this discussion.

Such an exclusion of irrelevant matter keeps clear the main issues of the debate, keeps the debaters from rambling, and, like the definition of terms, prevents misunderstandings and unpleasantness at the time of the debate.

5. Statement of admitted or waived matter. There is one kind of argument that is always waived in school debating, namely, the constitutionality of the question. When we are debating the question of child-labor legislation, the constitutionality of the proposition is waived. That problem is left to our constitutional lawyers and to the Supreme Court of the United States. In a debate on the St. Lawrence waterway project the constitutionality of such an undertaking is waived. It is understood by both teams that it is for our courts to decide whether or not the United States has a legal right to build such a waterway with Canada. Constitutionality and legality are always waived. Those are problems for lawyers, not for high-school or college students; and they concern not the merits of the question but technicalities involved in making changes of a legal nature.

Often other material is admitted. For example, in debating the proposition "Resolved, That all high-school graduates should go to college," it is admitted that genius will succeed without formal training; so the negative is wasting its time when it cites at great length such names as Lincoln, Bryant, Shakespeare, and Thomas Edison. It is admitted that the person of exceptional talent will succeed without college. In debating our entry into the World Court with the Harding-Hughes reservations, it is admitted that no change can be made in the court without the consent of the United States, that the United States shall have the privilege of helping to elect the judges of the court, that the United States will bear its
share of the expenses of the court, and that the United States can withdraw from the court upon sufficient notice. Any negative team that argues that the United States has no power to elect judges and that the court can be altered by the Assembly of the League of Nations without our consent is debating contrary to fact, because it is admitted, by including the Harding-Hughes reservations, that the United States will have all the privileges of other members after she has joined. Thus, like the exclusion of irrelevant matter, a statement of admitted or waived matter avoids confusion, keeps the main points clear, and makes the debate more definite.

6. The main issues. The main issues have already been found in the analysis of the proposition. If there is to be any change in their statement, it will have been made during the process of organizing material before the actual writing of the brief. The number of issues is usually three, but it may be two, five, or even six. However, the smaller number of three has been proved more convenient for memory, repetition, and organization. The main issues in the brief should always be stated as interrogative sentences. Often students think that the following is a statement of issues:

A. Social
B. Economic
C. Moral

It is only a lazy method of outlining. The main issues must always be written as complete interrogative sentences, as in the following illustration:

VI. Main issues
A. Is the proposition sound from a social point of view?
B. Is it economically sound?
C. Is it morally justified?

When the main issues are stated in this definite manner, they are valuable to both teams as well as to one student. Even a stranger could read them understandingly. The whole introduction should be concise, accurate, and fair.

Briefing the argument. The argument, or discussion, should contain all the material which has not been used in the introduction. This part of the brief is written in the same form as is the introduction in respect to symbols, intension, and sentence structure, but there are also a number of special rules to be considered.

First, all evidence that has been collected to use for refutation should be stated in the argument under the point to which it is related. It should be labeled as refutation, so that no confusion will arise over the purpose for which you put it there. It should also indicate clearly the point which it is expected to refute. To illustrate again from the question of Philippine independence: if one has the affirmative and expects his friends of the negative to claim that the archipelago is in danger of seizure by Japan, he will plan refutation for that argument of the opposition. In the brief the point of refutation would logically fall under the moral issue, and should be stated as follows:

It is our moral obligation to grant independence to the islands, for

A. We promised them their independence.
B. Our democratic ideals demand it.
C. Refutation.
   The negative may claim that there is danger from Japan.
   This is false, because Japan has no desire for the Philippines.
   1. Her leading statesmen declare she has no desire for the Philippines.
   2. Her present policy is not imperialistic.
The foregoing shows that it is easy to keep refutation distinguished from other parts of a given point if a student is careful to label every piece of evidence of refutation with its proper identification tag. Labels are the key to clarity in briefing.

Secondly, the source of all material should be listed under the evidence. Naturally, this does not apply to common information about which there will be no question. Neither does it apply to such axiomatic facts as Edmund Burke used when he said to Parliament, "You cannot pump the ocean dry." However, most of one's argument is disputable matter, which is based on facts which are themselves many times disputable. It is very embarrassing to have the authenticity of one's facts questioned and not be able to show that they came from a sound source. Stating the source of one's information definitely in the brief eliminates such unpleasantness. It also gives the reader increased confidence in the brief as a whole. If the sources are sound and reliable, one cannot help feeling that a debater has built up his whole case from the best available material. In this event the debater may be proud of his results; he is a workman who needs not be ashamed. The source of material should be stated completely, with the name of the magazine, its date, page, and the name of the author, as follows:

I. The Philippines are socially prepared for independence, for
   A. The education has developed to a high state, for
      1. The number of schools has doubled in ten years.
      The magazine Asia for November, 1921
      Gertrude Emerson.

The debater who has learned the first lesson of recording evidence as it was presented in Chapter V, will know that recording the source of evidence in the brief is a task that saves time and labor.

Thirdly, the main headings of the argument should be identical with the main issues in the introduction. To shift a main issue of the introduction to a subpoint, or vice versa, is to invite confusion and to defeat the purpose for which the brief is written. The main issues of the introduction are automatically the main headings of the argument. If one has a sound reason for changing the main issues, he should by all means do so, but he should be sure to record the change in the introduction. Main points are to be kept identical throughout the brief. The following section of a brief shows what the relationship should always be.

INTRODUCTION

I.
II.
III.
IV.
V.
VI. Main issues
   A. Are the Philippines socially prepared for independence?
   B. Are the Philippines economically prepared?
   C. Is there moral justification for granting them independence?

ARGUMENT

I. The Philippines are socially prepared for independence.
II. The Philippines are economically prepared for independence.
III. The Philippines should have their independence for moral reasons.

Thus it is evident that the main issues of the introduction are identical in thought with the main headings of
the argument: the only difference is that the former are interrogative sentences, and the latter are declarative. Main points are main points throughout the brief.

Fourthly, every minor point should read as a reason for the truth of the major point which immediately precedes it. This is a matter of care in logical arrangement. Sometimes one finds in an amateur brief a confusion of points such as the following:

I. Prohibition enforcement is improving, for
   A. The cost of maintaining the socially unfit in public institutions is tremendous.

In this case the author’s mind took a mental leap which omitted part of the case. If A is to follow logically as proof for I, what the writer should have stated is

A. The number of socially unfit due to alcoholism is decreasing in our public institutions.

The point about the cost of maintaining alcoholics in our public institutions belongs under another subject entirely, probably under the main heading

I. Alcoholism is too expensive for the United States, for
   A. The cost of caring for alcoholics in our public institutions is tremendous.

If, in the organization of material previous to the writing of the brief, one has failed to be logical in every place, briefing will reveal the error so that it may be corrected before the argument is presented to an audience.

Fifthly, no minor point should repeat the major point preceding it. In his zeal to record everything the new debater sometimes repeats points. This is confusing. It is also wrong, because it is expected that the brief will be a logical development of a case. Each point should advance a little from the point preceding it; I leads to A; A, to 1; 1, to a. In addition to the objections that repeating a point is confusing and retards the development of the brief is the fact that it is dangerous, because it creates the impression of giving proof when none is stated. In other words, a repetition of points leads to the very common fallacy of begging the question. A student debater frequently says something like this:

I. The state of Michigan should adopt capital punishment, for
   A. The state of Michigan should have capital punishment.

It is obvious that no new thought is added by A, although the audience is supposed to have been carried a point farther.

In October, 1924, when the debating team from Oxford University, England, met the University of Michigan debaters on the question of prohibition, one of the Oxford speakers presented the following argument:

I. I do not want prohibition in England, for
   A. I do not want prohibition in England.

The speaker spent twelve minutes trying to make the audience feel that he was advancing I by repeating it as A. When he finished, the substance of his argument was “I do not want prohibition, because I do not want prohibition.” Careful briefing would have shown the speaker in question that his argument was standing still while time was going on. Never repeat points in a brief. It is confusing, unsound, and dangerous.

Sixthly, the argument should be developed only as far as the evidence extends. Many students consider that they are making a complete brief when they outline their points according to the preceding principles without
any regard for evidence. Evidence is the pith of the brief. With only a little thought one can sit down casually and outline the main points. It is the evidence in the brief which proves that the author has carefully collected facts to support his contentions. Under all circumstances the brief should be carried as far as you can present evidence. Then, if there are some arguments for which proof is still lacking, one should search out more evidence and add it to the case before one calls the brief complete.

Briefing the conclusion. After the argument has been briefed, the conclusion naturally follows. This consists of two parts: the summary and the plea, appeal, or peroration, according to the term which you choose to apply. This latter should also include a statement of the proposition. The conclusion of the brief is written in the following form:

CONCLUSION

I. Summary
   A.
   B.
   C.

II. Plea
   A.
   B.
   C.

In the summary it is usually considered sufficient to state only the main points — those that were the main issues in the introduction and the major headings of the argument; however, if a student wishes to spend the time to summarize further, there is no law against stating sub-points also in the conclusion.

There is a law, however, against stating new material in the summary. A speaker should never introduce new points in his conclusion, because such practice is confusing and because it is a sign of poor planning on the part of the debater. The summary is exactly what its name implies: a summarization of the material which has already been presented, and not a place to introduce new points.

On the platform the debater finds himself at the end of a ten-minute or twelve-minute argument with only one, two, or three minutes for a conclusion. This means that his summary must be well condensed in order to leave time for even a brief peroration. With such a time limitation the wise debater will put only main arguments in his summary, and trust that the preceding subpoints were sufficiently organized and presented to remain in the minds of his audience.

The plea, or peroration, is a vital part of the debate. At its best it serves as a final clincher for the preceding argument, appeals to the best emotions of the audience, and is a finishing touch for the discussion; at its worst it appeals to the baser emotions, steals time that is needed for the presentation of facts, and spoils an otherwise sound case. True debating is primarily intellectual. Therefore the peroration which is entirely emotional in its appeal must necessarily be limited. The peroration in a debate should present in a few well-chosen words exactly what it is that the audience is asked to do. The debater may ask his auditors to lend their moral support to the project which he is advocating; he may ask for their financial support; he may plead for their votes. He may appeal to them to refrain from forming any opinion until they have carefully thought over the material presented in the debate. Again, one's listeners may be implored to write letters or send telegrams to their councilmen,
state legislators, congressmen, or senators to secure the passage of a certain measure.

What the appeal is depends upon the nature of the subject. In a debate on the proposition "Resolved, That our American Indians should be granted the full rights of United States citizens" the peroration might be a plea for the moral support of the audience. For the question "Resolved, That the state of Michigan should adopt capital punishment" the last speaker for either team might conclude his argument with a plea for votes or for financial assistance to wage the fight for his side. In a debate on the problem of prohibition the last speaker might beg the audience to wait to form an opinion until prohibition has experienced a longer trial. So long as the entrance of the United States into the World Court is before Congress, debate on that subject may be well concluded with the appeal to write or telegraph one’s representatives at Washington for immediate action. In the best intercollegiate and high-school debating the customary peroration is a simple appeal, in from one to three short sentences, for some one of these forms of support or favor. The following shows what the conclusion of a brief usually presents:

CONCLUSION

I. Summary
   A. The Philippines are socially prepared for independence.
   B. They are economically prepared for it.
   C. It is our moral obligation to grant it to them.

II. Appeal
   The Filipinos cannot gain their independence without assistance. They are human beings like ourselves, with the same patriotism, the same love of country, the same aspirations for development as ourselves.

THE BRIEF

In view of these facts will you not lend your support to help our brown brothers of the archipelago gain freedom and happiness?

We have faith that you will.

Again, the peroration may be further simplified and stated in the following manner:

II. Peroration
   In view of the facts (A, B, C, of the summary) and the many others which we have presented for your consideration, we believe that you will agree with us that the Philippines should have their immediate independence.

If the peroration is brief, well adapted to the audience, and suited to the subject, there need be no fears about its effectiveness.

Refutation in the brief. There are three ways of treating refutation in the brief: it may be included under each point, it may be made a separate heading under the argument, or it may be made a separate heading coordinate with the introduction, the argument, and the conclusion.

1. Refutation may be included under each point in the argument. This has the advantage of keeping the material organized by points. It has the disadvantage of compelling the reader to go through the entire brief to find out what material has been set aside for refutation. Often one wants to consider refutation by itself, and it takes too much time to read through an entire brief.

2. Refutation may be made a separate heading under the argument, as follows:
   I. Main point
   II. Main point
   III. Main point
IV. Refutation
   A.
   1. a.
   B.
   1. a.

The advantage of this form is that all the material for refutation is grouped in one place instead of being scattered throughout the argument. This is very often a great timesaver. The disadvantage is that there must be a complete repetition of the points that were given under I, II, and III of the argument. In spite of this, most students seem to prefer this place for the refutation.

3. A third plan, one that is not followed so often, is to make the refutation a fourth part of the brief, coordinate with the introduction, the argument, and the conclusion. The following outline shows the form:

   I. INTRODUCTION
   II.
   III.
   IV.
   V.
   VI.

   I. ARGUMENT
   II.
   III.

   I. REPUTATION
   II.
   III.

   I. Summary
   II. Appeal

   I. CONCLUSION

In this way the evidence which has been planned for the refutation is all in one place, as in the second plan. It is located before the conclusion, and thus shows itself an integral part of the case. This plan is frequently followed with good results. The debater may decide for himself which of the three forms he desires to use. In any case he must remember to state clearly the point to be refuted, as well as his refutation. He must also remember that refutation demands evidence as much as do other parts of the case. If the refutation is made clear and complete, it will mean all that it should in the brief.

General principles of briefing. In addition to the specific rules which have been presented for briefing the introduction, argument, refutation, and conclusion, there are certain general principles which apply to the brief as a whole.

1. The brief consists of three parts: introduction, argument, and conclusion. Refutation must be included, either as a section of the argument or as the third part of the brief.

2. Complete, simple sentences should always be used. The inexperienced debater who attempts to substitute one or two words for a complete sentence is only storing up future trouble for himself. Only the author of the brief understands the single word, and he soon forgets its meaning. Complete sentences mean that the brief will be as clear fifty years hence as it is on the day of writing.

3. Label the parts of your brief. The three major sections should be labeled with their proper titles: Introduction, Argument, Conclusion. The introduction should have the six parts, labeled “Origin of the question,” “History of the question,” “Definition of terms,” “Ex-
clusion of irrelevant matter," "A statement of admitted or waived matter," and "Main issues." The conclusion should have two parts labeled "Summary" and "Appeal." These labels are absolutely essential for clearness and completeness.

4. Each section of the brief should be indented to correspond with its position. Indention should be uniform throughout. The headings of the argument should be indented the same amount as the headings of the introduction, as in the following:

**INTRODUCTION**

I.

II.

III.

IV.

V.

VI.

A.

B.

C.

**ARGUMENT**

I.

A.

Thus I and A in the argument are the same distance from the margin as are I and A of the introduction. Not only should labels and symbols be indented, but also the material that follows under them. Often a student indents his numerals properly and then spoils his brief by extending the evidence to the margin in the following manner:

**ARGUMENT**

I. The Philippines are socially prepared for independence, for

A. Their schools are in excellent condition, for

1. The number of native teachers has increased greatly in the past ten years.

**THE BRIEF**

It is obvious that such an arrangement defeats the main purposes of the brief: it obscures the beginning of the points, hides the symbols, and is altogether confusing.

When the material as well as the labels and symbols are properly indented, the whole brief is clear:

**ARGUMENT**

I. The Philippines are socially prepared for independence, for

A. Their schools are in excellent condition, for

1. The number of native teachers has increased greatly in the past ten years.

5. Lettering and numbering should be uniform. The accepted plan for briefing rules that the words "introduction," "argument," and "conclusion" be listed without numerals. This means that the first point under the introduction should be I, and its subpoint A, the point under this is 1, and the succeeding part is a. Under II this same form is repeated. The first point under the argument should be I, not A, and the same principle should be applied to the conclusion. The form should read thus:

**INTRODUCTION**

I.

II.

**ARGUMENT**

I.

A.

1.

a.

6. The sentences of the brief should be concise. One of the points may have been found as a whole paragraph, but that is no reason why it should be copied as an entire paragraph in the brief. It should be condensed, only the
main thought being kept. One must remember that he is writing a brief and not a speech.

7. All points should be arranged as headings and subheadings. All material logically stands as a major point, or as a minor point to prove the major point. Arguments work upward or downward like four steps in a set of stairs.

I.
   A.
      a.

Everything that you have collected belongs in some one of these sections. Nothing should stand by itself.

8. The main issues should correspond throughout the brief. The three, four, or five points which are stated as the main issues should be the same as I, II, III, IV, or V of the argument. In the conclusion A, B, and C are the equivalent of A, B, and C under the main issues of the introduction. These three, four, or five main points are the backbone of the case and should remain identical.

9. Each heading should express a single point. It is very confusing to read

I. The Philippines are socially prepared for their independence and have their foreign trade well developed,

When what the author intended was

I. The Philippines are socially prepared for independence.
II. They are economically prepared for independence, for
   A. Their foreign trade is well developed.

10. No double symbols should be used. Sometimes, because of haste or indolence, a debater will spoil his brief by using double symbols, as in the following:

THE BRIEF

I. A. The World Court settled the dispute over the Silesian border.

Here the author has omitted the statement of I and caused confusion by trying to unite I and A. The points should read thus:

I. The World Court settled many disputes, for
   A. It settled the dispute over the Silesian border.

Every heading is important enough to deserve a complete statement; therefore there is no excuse for using double symbols.

11. All references should be completely stated. If the reference is to a magazine, the name of the magazine, the date, the page, and the name of the author should be given, as:

   The Atlantic Monthly
   November, 1921, p. 688
   E. Alexander Powell
   "Are we giving Japan a Square Deal?"

If the reference is to a book, the name of the book, the author, the page, and the date should be stated. Debaters have a special need for knowing the exact date of all material at a moment’s notice. For example:

   "The People of the Philippines" (1925)
   Frank C. Laubach
   P. 120

If the reference is to a pamphlet, the same form should be used and, in addition, the official number of the document should be stated.

12. The points should be arranged in order of climax. The main issues of the introduction, I, II, and III of the argument, and A, B, and C in the summary should follow this rule. The argument which is considered
strongest, which is expected to make the greatest appeal to your audience, should be placed last.

Conclusion. The student who will learn and apply these simple rules will find briefing a pleasure. It brings order out of chaos, clarifies the issues in the speaker's mind, reveals weaknesses in the case, presents a guide for the whole team as well as for the individual student, eliminates useless material, and guarantees that one's material can be as easily understood fifty years hence as it is at the time of preparation.

In order that the student may have a complete model for his guidance, briefs are presented in the Appendix, with evidence and sources.

EXERCISES

1. Write an introduction for a brief on some proposition related to your school.

2. Write the introduction to a brief on one of the national problems listed in Appendix A.

3. Correct in class the introduction assigned in 1 and 2 and in every case give the complete reason for a correction.

4. Write the argument and conclusion for the brief assigned in 1. Correct them in class as assigned in 3.

5. Write the argument and conclusion for the brief in 2 and correct them in class as assigned in 3.

6. Without the aid of texts write a complete skeleton brief such as the one presented on page 68.

7. Brief the next sermon or lecture which you have the opportunity to hear.

8. Brief the introduction to Burke's "Speech on Conciliation with America."

9. Brief Lincoln's Peoria speech which was given in Peoria, on October 16, 1854.

10. Brief the argument that is presented in your next class debate.

11. Read some model debate speeches aloud in class, and point out the six parts of the introduction, and brief the argument.

12. Brief the refutation for at least five points which may be presented by your opponents in debating the propositions chosen for 1 and 2.

13. Make a complete brief of one of the following modern speeches:
   d. "The March of the Constitution," by Andrew S. Draper, LL.D.
   e. "Education for Life," by Minot Judson Savage, D.D.

14. Write a complete brief for an argument on some subject in which you are vitally interested, following the model brief in Appendix C.
CHAPTER VII

DELIVERY

Importance of good delivery. The analysis of the question, the preparation of the evidence, and the writing of the brief are of tremendous importance, but nevertheless they are only part of debating. The best case in the world may fail to win an audience if it is poorly delivered. One of the greatest masterpieces in argumentation, Burke’s “Speech on Conciliation with America,” failed to win Parliament because it was poorly delivered. Of course there were other contributing causes for its failure to win votes, such as the ignorance of Parliament at that time, the fact that King George had its members under his control, and the fact that Burke delivered his argument too late, after his fellow members had already determined to use force in the colonies. However, it was true of this speech, as of Burke’s others, that he spoke so poorly as to be called the dinner bell of the House. Lord Erskine, one of Burke’s contemporaries in Parliament, crept out of the House of Commons on all fours rather than listen to Burke speak; but later, after he had read the speech, he declared that it was the most remarkable ever given in Parliament. Most debaters will never have their speeches read; if they fail to deliver their arguments well, their case is lost. Therefore it is imperative that a student should consider the delivery as carefully as he does the subject matter of his argument.

Methods of delivery. There are five methods which are used in the delivery of debating speeches.

1. The Impromptu method. This means that without any briefing, search for evidence, or practice in delivery a student may attempt to give a debating speech. Impromptu speeches are sometimes necessary at a banquet or at a dinner or a convention, but there is no excuse for one in debate. The purpose of debate is to prove something about a proposition. This requires facts. Facts must be searched out, digested, and organized before they can be delivered. When such debaters as Burke and Webster feel that months of preparation are necessary for a speech, the high-school or college student certainly needs some definite preparation to justify his appearance on the platform. A speaker has no right to cheat his audience by appearing before them without previous thought. A debater is supposed to know more about the subject than do his auditors. If he does not, he is stealing their time. Impromptu debate is pure sham.

2. Reading the case. Some speakers attempt to deliver their case by reading from cards. In this event the cards, not the audience, receive the speaker’s attention. Reading means loss of contact with one’s hearers; it means an audience that is bored and restless; it means that more than half the effectiveness is destroyed. The listeners reason that if the speaker has not mastered his subject matter sufficiently to make it his own, he does not know much more about the material than do they themselves. This lessens their confidence in the debater. Again, the cards may be dropped on the floor, may become disorganized, or may be blown aside by a current of air. In these cases the speaker is a pitiable object; with his
props gone he is helpless. Cards may be used for the reading of a few long direct quotations or for the presentation of complicated statistics. Here their usefulness ceases. Further than this no reading should be done from the platform.

3. Memorizing verbatim. Memorizing verbatim is a point on which authorities differ. Some believe that the entire constructive argument should be memorized word for word; others maintain that none of it should be memorized; still others contend that at least the pith of the speech should be so treated. It is certain that our greatest orators — Burke, Webster, and Demosthenes — memorized certain portions of their subject matter after it had been carefully written. All of them had consistent training in memorizing long passages. Daniel Webster said, “Many a piece did I commit to memory and recite and rehearse in my room over and over again.” Throughout his early life Burke committed to memory large parts of Virgil and Horace, and Demosthenes trained his memory by forcing himself to repeat every speech he heard. Such practice enabled them to retain the thought of their speeches without as much conscious effort as the beginner needs to exercise. It is good training to memorize the first four or five speeches that one delivers. The advantages of this method are that it leaves one free from the effort of struggling for words, so that he may devote himself more whole-heartedly to the other matters of delivery which are presented later on in the chapter. The novice who is constantly wondering what he will say next has little time to give to watching emphasis, enunciation, and directness, whereas the speaker who is free from word worries can consider the elements of delivery in a critical manner. After a few speeches have been memorized verbatim, after the beginner is initiated into the ways of the platform, he may gradually memorize less and less of his argument, until eventually he finds himself using methods 4 and 5. The best school debaters have usually been those who pursued this course. Their first speeches were memorized verbatim to give confidence and accuracy; then, as they became more experienced in the forensic art, they gradually memorized less and less; until, finally, their work was largely extemporaneous. Memorizing is sound and sure for the novice.

4. Memorizing ideas. Instead of learning their constructive argument word for word, some debaters prefer to memorize the ideas of their speech. When one has carefully fixed in mind the major points of a brief, and when one is an experienced speaker, no memorizing further than this is necessary. In their early training Webster, Burke, and Demosthenes memorized quantities of poetry and prose. They memorized extracts from their early speeches. But later, after they had freed themselves from the shackles of inexperience, they delivered most of their subject matter extemporaneously. The history of debating for the past quarter of a century shows a steady increase in the tendency toward the extemporaneous speech in debating, as well as in other types of public speaking.

5. Combining the extemporaneous with the memorized. In pursuing this course the speaker memorizes thoroughly certain fundamental parts of his constructive argument. In every speech there are some paragraphs, some points, that should be delivered, regardless of what the opposition may say. There are certain brief quotations which can be easily memorized; there are short citations of
statistics which are better memorized than read from cards. Such paragraphs, quotations, and statistics should be learned so that the debater "knows them backward." At least these parts of the case will be accurate, complete, definite, fluent, and stated in the best of English, which is much more than can be said for most student speaking that is exclusively extemporaneous.

With this amount of memorizing completed, the student may spend two, three, four, or five minutes in extemporizing at the beginning of his constructive argument. In addition to this he may extemporize throughout his speech, to the extent of pointing out the relationship between his argument and that of his opponents. This matter of adaptation will be treated later in the chapter. Although one may begin his debating career with a completely memorized speech, he should constantly work toward a combination of memorized and extemporaneous speaking. Experience in training many interscholastic debaters, and observation of a great many debaters under all kinds of circumstances, show this combination to be the most effective.

Personality. After one has chosen the method by which he will learn his speech for presentation, there are nine elements of delivery in which he must prepare himself before he has a right to take the platform. One of the most important of these is personality. A speaker who has a splendid personality is one in whom certain positive qualities are present. A strong personality is the first requisite for success on the platform. But, more than that: public speaking develops one's personality. Several years ago George M. Reynolds, president of one of Chicago's largest banks, wrote in the American Magazine that the vital factors in personality are neatness, cheerfulness, courtesy, alertness, patience, unselfishness, and appreciation of human nature. All these qualities count on the platform. The effective debater must be neat in his appearance; his clothing must be suitable for the occasion and well pressed, his hair must be neatly combed, and his shoes must be freshly polished. The effective debater is cheerful. A few students think that it is clever to affect a grouchy, but this is dangerous cleverness to try on an audience. One should look pleasant and agreeable. Grinning is undesirable, but a pleasant smile for the audience goes a long way toward winning a debate. By way of illustration a certain debater, who was not so intellectual as his colleagues, had a smile and a habitual cheerfulness which did much to win debates and to make everyone on the team agreeable. Courtesy is another characteristic which is soon obvious to one's audience—courtesy to colleagues, courtesy to opponents, courtesy to auditors. Alertness is also necessary. Some high-school students, and even some college students, consider it clever to appear indifferent, to slump down in their chairs, to affect an attitude of nonchalance. Immediately an audience thinks, "If he is as indifferent to his case as that, why should I concern myself?" and thus effectiveness is lost. Patience is necessary at the debating table. One must be patient with one's colleagues. An audience is quick to notice irritability or impatience of any sort. Unselfishness and an appreciation of human nature show very quickly in debate. If one is considerate of the rights and opinions of others, his speech will soon reveal it. As a consequence the audience will place more confidence in what he says.

There are at least six other elements in personality which reveal themselves quickly on the platform: up-
rightness, modesty, dignity, humor, intellectuality, and aggressiveness.

If a student is dishonest, shiftless, and underhanded off the platform, he will not amount to much on it. Morality, integrity, pure character show in one's face and manner. Modesty is essential. Conceit is disgusting at all times, but never more so than on the platform. There comes back in memory a team of three boys who were so conceited that the audience rejoiced when they lost the decision of the judges. The proposition for that debate has been forgotten, but not the colossal conceit of that team. Self-importance, not debating, was the note of the evening.

The debater with a strong personality will stand in a dignified position. Intellectuality, the attitude of a genuine student, shows quickly. All our great orators have been tireless students of books, men, and affairs. One should develop the brain power that he has. Aggressiveness is vital to debating. One may be meek elsewhere, but on the platform, fighting for a cause, one must be forceful enough to convince others that a given course is right. A certain girl, as third speaker of her team, helped them to a most successful season because of her aggressiveness. She lacked many other qualities of a strong personality and she ranked lower than her colleagues in dignity, intellectuality, neatness, and courtesy, but she always won every audience with her fighting spirit. She had the fire! She loved to fight! When aggressiveness is tempered with humor that is spontaneous, kindly, and appropriate, effective debating is sure to result. In the past debating has included too little humor. In the future let us use more of this very effective tool in public speaking and in school debates.

Cultivate these thirteen powerful characteristics, and forensic success will be yours.

Voice. There is an eminent authority in the public-speaking profession who chooses or rejects candidates for his debating teams very largely on the basis of voice. Of course, this is an exaggeration of the importance of voice. Nevertheless, it shows how vital a good voice is to one's success. Demosthenes realized this, and ran up a hill while reciting speeches so that he could enlarge his lung power and thus improve his voice. One reason why William Jennings Bryan was for thirty-five years the most successful orator in the United States was that he had a voice so strong, so full, and so melodious that people would sit for hours without becoming tired of its beautiful music.

The voice should be clear in tone. It should be loud enough for all in the room to hear, but it should not be any louder. The speaker should begin with his voice at a conversational pitch; even then, in the excitement of debate, it has a tendency to rise to a high pitch that is unpleasant for one's listeners and harmful to one's vocal apparatus. By constant thought and concentration the voice can be trained to remain low in pitch.

Much of a speaker's tone quality depends upon his breathing. One successful instructor in the art of speech, who has taught in one of our leading Eastern colleges for women for the past fifteen years, has always devoted the major part of the time in her first course to the study of breathing. Everything in the course was subordinated to the practice of breathing. In class or in private conference correct breathing was the chief objective. This instructor had constructed a special table on which students lay, so that she could the more accurately correct
and adjust their breathing habits. Her motto "Breathe abdominally!" became a slogan of the campus.

Some will say that this particular instructor exaggerated the subject of breathing out of all proportion to its importance, but the fact remains that she taught her students how to breathe properly. The speaker who insists upon breathing only with his chest is doomed to have a voice that is weak, thin, and lacking in carrying power. The speaker who breathes deeply, who practices abdominal breathing, will increase the force, volume, and power of his speech organs. Debaters who are chest breathers need to work consistently for correct breathing if they desire a voice of lasting force and depth of tone.

Gestures. Every speaker should learn to use a few fundamental gestures. Some use more, others less, according to the personality of the speaker. William Jennings Bryan was a man of many gestures; Woodrow Wilson, of few; A. Maude Royden, the great English preacher, uses them constantly; Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, America's leading feminist, uses them very sparingly. The following simple rules will serve as guides:

1. **Have variety in gestures.** Many a debater seems to think that the open-hand gesture is the only one acceptable. The open hand is very useful, but so also are the index, the counting gesture which uses three or four fingers, the clinched fist where extreme forcefulness is desired, the explanatory gesture, gestures of disgust, the open-arm gesture which expresses ideas that embrace the whole world, and the uplifted-arm gesture. This latter was William Jennings Bryan's favorite; it was very effective for him, but it is one of which the beginner should be wary.

2. **Use both hands equally.** There are exceptions to this rule, but more mistakes flow from its violation than from its observance. Everyone has heard the speaker who uses only his right or his left arm in gesturing. Balance is necessary in gesticulation.

3. **Keep the forearm level with the elbow for all except the uplifted arm.** It looks ludicrous to see a speaker's hands drooping toward the floor. The audience should be their focal point.

4. **Gestures should coordinate with the speaker's words.** In the sentence "The Philippine Islands are ready for independence" the italicized words are to be emphasized and should receive the beat of the gesture. Speakers sometimes expend all their energy at the beginning of the sentence, with the result that the forcefulness of the gesture is gone before the word to be emphasized has been reached. The most important words of a sentence and the beat of gesture should always be simultaneous.

5. **Gestures of the hand should coordinate with other bodily movements.** The gesture should follow the eye. When one is looking to the right, he should use the right hand for gesturing; when he is looking to the left, the left hand.

The same principle applies to movements of the feet. If one is stepping forward with the right foot, he should use the right hand for gesture; if he is moving forward with the left foot, the left hand. These principles must be observed, because the audience senses a lack of coordination more quickly than any other error and because observance of these rules strengthens forcefulness many fold.

6. **Avoid using too many gestures.** Gestures can be overused. Moving one's hands every second is not
desirable. Constant gesturing means a loss of forcefulness at the most crucial points of the argument.

7. Practice gestures until they are your own. In practicing gestures one may count one, two, three, four, five, to learn how to time the beat; gestures should be practiced while all kinds of sentences are repeated; they should be practiced before a mirror to see that the rules of good gesticulation are being observed and before teacher and classmates for their criticisms; and they should be used at every opportunity that develops to speak in public. Practice, practice, practice, makes perfect. After a while the mechanics of the process will disappear, and one will find himself using gestures as unconsciously and as easily as he walks.

Pronunciation. The platform, whether it is before a class of twenty or before an audience of five thousand, is not the place to stumble over the pronunciation of words. Yet many debaters do so, with the result that the audience thinks, “Well, if the speakers were as careless about the preparation of their evidence as they are about their pronunciation, one can’t put much confidence in their argument.” With dictionaries easily available in home, school, and library and with the criticism of parents, teachers, and classmates to guide, slovenly pronunciation is inexcusable. Aside from the mispronunciation of such proper names as La Follette, Arkansas, Illinois, Los Angeles, Hawaii, and Roosevelt, the most common errors occur in ten simple words. Debaters seem to delight in saying “children” for “children,” “govermnunt” for “government,” “civilization” for “civilization,” “becuz” for “because,” “jist” for “just,” “probly” for “probably,” “wai” for “well,” “git” for “get,” “aginst” for “against,” and “ejicaion” for

“education.” Such carelessness has no place in speaking, especially in public speaking.

Enunciation. The people who mispronounce also enunciate badly. Some omit their final “g’s, always saying goin’, comin’, walkin’, sayin’, cryin’, thinkin’.” Some omit the first half of numerous words and say “told ’um” for “told them,” “finished ’at” for “finished that.” Some slight their final “t’s in such words as get, wait, sent, hate, late, rate, date. Others slight their final “d’s in such words as mend, lend, blend, trend, send, friend. Still others never definitely finish a word that ends in “l, such as parallel, well, tell.

There are two reasons why such errors in enunciation should never be tolerated: first because they react badly on the speaker; secondly because they reflect badly on the audience. One who is slovenly in enunciation becomes the same in thinking. Precision in speech tones up one’s mental processes and makes him alert and intellectually active. An audience will attribute accuracy in argument and thoroughness in thought to the careful speaker. In the same way, careless speech habits are synonymous in their minds with careless thinking. Therefore speech must be watched, and the best habits cultivated, making enunciation a positive force in delivery. In Appendix B are listed some exercises in enunciation. They should be practiced until speech is accurate and decisive at all times.

Walking. It is understood that a speaker will not remain precisely in one position throughout a speech of ten or twelve minutes. Some walking must be done to break the monotony of standing in one place for so long a time. It also is used to indicate a change of thought in the speech. There are certain rules for walking as well as for gestures.
1. **Walk slowly.** It is to be remembered that rhythm of speech should coordinate with the rhythm of bodily action.

2. **Walk in the direction in which you are looking.** It is laughable to see a speaker walk to the right while he is looking to the left.

3. **Shift your position at the introduction of new points.** This helps to indicate a change in thought.

4. **Make your steps short.** A debater walks on the platform for the purpose of varying his position rather than of reaching a definite goal.

5. **Never walk backward.** Walking backward implies a retreat in argument. It also is unnecessary, if the speaker is careful to start the proper distance from the edge of the platform and is particular to take short steps.

6. **Avoid walking too much.** Some debaters shift the position once each minute, but perhaps once in two minutes is sufficient.

7. **Make your walking inconspicuous.** It is well to practice walking while counting one, two, three, four, five; then to practice walking while talking; and finally to practice it with both speaking and gesturing. How much practice is necessary depends upon the student, but at least enough is required to make walking on the platform second nature. Then it can be done easily, and thus adds to a speaker's delivery instead of detracting from it.

**Emphasis.** Emphasis is necessary for two reasons: (1) to avoid monotony and (2) to drive home the most important parts of a sentence, paragraph, or speech. Of the various ways of securing emphasis seven are of special value.

1. **Emphasis by original phrasing.** If all one's material is delivered to the audience in the same stereotyped phrases, there is no distinction in values. If it is really desired to drive a point home, one must strive to state his facts in an original manner. If he states that there are one hundred and sixty thousand divorces in the United States annually, the statistics do not mean much to his audience. If he wants to emphasize the size of the figures, he may say that divorces are granted at the rate of one every four minutes throughout the year. The student should coin phrases that are original, as Edmund Burke did in his speech on "Conciliation with America" when he described Lord North's plan as "ransom by auction."

Daniel Webster, in his reply to Hayne, epitomized his whole speech with the striking sentence "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!"

At the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1896 William Jennings Bryan coined two phrases that have lived for thirty years and will live for years to come, when he said: "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

A. Maude Royden, the great English preacher, stated the central thought of her entire speech in a way never to be forgotten when she said in Detroit in 1923, "The world is at the crossroads!"

2. **Emphasis by repetition.** The repetition of words, phrases, clauses, and even sentences will make a thought stay in the listener's mind. When we have the repetition of clauses in the same construction or parallel construction, the emphasis is doubly effective. As an example of emphasis by the repetition of a single word, we have this closing sentence from Lincoln in his debate with Stephen A. Douglas at Ottawa, Illinois, August 21, 1858: "But
in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas and the equal of every living man."

Another example of emphasis by repetition is given to us in Burke's famous lines on peace in his "Speech on Conciliation":

Not peace through the medium of war; not peace to be hunted through the labyrinth of intricate and endless negotiations; not peace to arise out of universal discord fomented from principle in all parts of the Empire; not peace to depend on the juridical determination of perplexing questions, or the precise marking shadowy boundaries of a complex government.

3. Emphasis by climax. This means an arrangement of points according to their importance, so that the most important will be placed last and will be led up to by those preceding. This is the method which Daniel Webster used in his reply to Hayne when he was summarizing his opponent's case. Webster said:

I understand the honorable gentleman from Carolina, first, to maintain that it is a right of State Legislatures, whenever, in their judgment, this Government transcends its constitutional limitations, to arrest the operation of its laws; second, to maintain that this right exists under the Constitution, but not as a right to overthrow it; third, to maintain an authority on the part of States to check the General Government; fourth, to maintain that the State may lawfully decide for themselves, and each state for itself, whether in a given case, the act of the General Government transcends its power; fifth, that, if the exigencies of the case require it, any State Government may, by its own sovereign authority, annul an act of the General Government.

Here the climax reached in the word "annul" gives it the desired emphasis.
this the great debater launched into two ponderous sentences, one of which was five printed lines and the other thirteen lines in length.

Variety may be obtained by using different kinds of evidence instead of overworking one form. Changing tones, altering the rate of speed, and varying one's gestures are additional means of achieving variety in delivery. Appropriate stories and humor should be introduced, but these must always be subordinated to the main purpose of debating, which is to prove a proposition. English debaters indulge in so many stories and so many humorous quips that the audience often forgets the subject for debate. On the other hand, we Americans are prone to eliminate all humor for the sake of having more time for argument. Both are extreme. We need to introduce more humor into our debating, and the English should use less.

By using different kinds of transition sentences the debater may vary his speech. Nothing is more deadening to a debate than to have speaker after speaker introduce each new point by saying, "The second reason why a ship subsidy is desirable is that it will sail our ships." This is a definite way of introducing points, but it should be varied by such statements as "Another point for your consideration is . . .," "In going further into the question we find . . .," "In addition to these reasons there is the question of . . .," "Furthermore, the plan is . . .," or, "Finally, let us point out the . . ." With these, as well as many other methods of transition, monotony may be avoided.

Procedure on the platform. 1. Order of procedure. After a debater has prepared himself according to the standards of delivery which have been previously described, he is ready for the platform. The order of speakers is given in the following program to show to what business the chairman of a debate, whether in the classroom or the auditorium, must attend.

**DEBATE**

**NORTHEASTERN HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1924, 3:30 P.M.**

**Resolved:** That the adoption of a ship subsidy would be a wise national policy

**I. Sides**
Northwestern: affirmative
Kalamazoo Central: negative

**II. Time**
Constructive speeches: ten minutes, with warning at eight
Rebuttal speeches: five minutes, with warning at four

**III. Timekeepers**
Northwestern: Thomas Funk
Kalamazoo: Franklin Bush

**IV. Judges**
Professor H. S. Lyman, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti
Miss Virginia Stearns, debating coach, Highland Park High School
Mr. S. E. Elliot, University of Michigan, former varsity debater

**V. Reading of the interpretation of the question**

**VI. Constructive speeches**
A. Affirmative: Norma Greene, Detroit
   Negative: Robert Krill, Kalamazoo
B. Affirmative: Ruth Reynolds, Detroit
   Negative: John Gorr, Kalamazoo
C. Affirmative: Lyle Elsman, Detroit
   Negative: Alvin Rockwell, Kalamazoo
VII. Rebuttal speeches

A. Negative: Mr. Krill, Kalamazoo
Affirmative: Miss Reynolds, Detroit

B. Negative: Mr. Gorr, Kalamazoo
Affirmative: Miss Greene, Detroit

C. Negative: Mr. Rockwell, Kalamazoo
Affirmative: Mr. Eissman, Detroit

VIII. Decision of the judges

A similar program containing all this information should be in the hands of every debating chairman fifteen minutes before the contest, in order to avoid delay and confusion.

2. Division of time in the speech. Many debaters make the mistake of spending a third or even half their time in introduction. One's listeners want the argument and are impatient over too much delay. Furthermore, time is too necessary for the proving of points to permit so large a portion of it to be devoted to introduction. The first speaker for the affirmative has the special duty of presenting introductory material, and so he may devote one, two, or three minutes of a ten-minute argument to the history, origin, and definition of terms; but the remaining speakers should start giving their constructive arguments immediately after they have addressed the chair and the audience, and have made some adaptation to the material that has gone before.

The amount of time spent in conclusion also varies with the position of the speaker. The last debater for each team should spend at least a tenth of his time in summarizing the case of his side. A minute is the smallest amount of time that can be devoted to summarizing by the third speaker, and often more time is necessary. Summarizing is a vital part of debate. It reminds the audience of the major points, finishes the case, and clinches the argument. Time spent in summary, especially by the third speaker, is well spent. The first two members of the team should summarize their own cases as briefly as possible. Daniel Webster, in his reply to Hayne, gave a peroration that was eighteen printed lines in length, but that was for a speech of several hours' duration. Burke's "Speech on Conciliation with America" was over a hundred pages long, but his peroration consisted of only four lines. This shows that the peroration for a ten-minute speech should be confined to one or two lines. Still a third affirmative speaker on the question of Philippine independence was heard to rant for eight of his ten minutes in a highly emotional peroration; another debater on the question of ship subsidy spent seven of his ten minutes in an emotional, flag-waving appeal which neither proved nor summarized anything. In almost all cases the summary should not exceed a minute, and the peroration should be limited to one or two sentences.

3. Poise. One should never start speaking until he is in perfect poise. After stepping into position, one, two, or three feet from the edge of the platform, and after addressing the chair, one should pause a moment in order to be in perfect poise before speaking. This means standing firmly on two feet with one foot slightly in front of the other, with hands at the sides, and with eyes looking directly at the audience. It means also taking a deep breath and having perfect confidence before uttering the first sentence. Nothing is more beautiful than the poise, perfect composure, calmness, and dignity that gain immediately the respect of one's audience.

4. Directness. Directness is another platform quality which is indispensable. The speaker who looks at the
floor, at the ceiling, or through an open window will never convince anyone. One must look at his hearers directly at all times. This does not mean, however, that one must stare rudely at anyone in the audience in order to hold attention. Inexperienced speakers usually are indirect because they are embarrassed. The case of an exceptional debater comes to mind. He was so indirect during his first six weeks of training that many people declared he could never succeed on the platform. But he had determination: he conquered his fault, and at the end of the year his directness was 100 per cent. The story is told of a certain eminent public speaker who acquired directness by compelling himself to talk directly to a chair in his room day after day. It is good practice to fix attention on some object — a chair, a mirror, or a picture — and then practice until one can talk to that object for several minutes without letting the attention wander. This method, combined with practice in the classroom, trains the debater to be direct.

5. Confidence. Confidence in oneself is another essential of successful platform work. The trembling, undecided, fear-haunted weakling never won debates. The debater may feel a little concern about appearing on the platform, — most people do, — but this should soon be completely overshadowed by confidence in one’s colleagues and confidence in his case. After one has prepared his subject matter conscientiously, after he has trained himself in the art of delivery, he has no cause to be afraid. He is “a workman who needeth not to be ashamed.” He has interesting facts which he wishes to present to his audience. He is eager to learn what the opposition will present. He has a cause that he wishes to plead. He is prepared, and he wishes to speak. All these positive emotions will drown the fear bogey if the speaker will let them. Confidence is not conceit. It is the greatest of boons to the debater.

6. Earnestness. Sincerity and earnestness are the next requisites for excellent delivery. People have doubted the soundness of some of Bryan’s speeches, but they have seldom doubted the sincerity of the man. Reading the life of every eminent orator that the world has ever produced, from Demosthenes in 384 B.C. to the great Commoner in 1925, one finds one characteristic, one reason for success, repeated in every biography. Every orator of note has been credited with earnestness. If one is not sincere, if he does not believe what he is saying, he cannot expect others to believe. The world is full of public speakers who, though they lack almost every other desirable characteristic, succeed because they are so much in earnest. Sincerity and earnestness are requisite if one is to debate well.

7. Adaptation. One of the things which distinguishes real debating from sham is skill in adaptation. The true debater does not confine himself to a memorized speech, but uses, instead, the first two, three, four, or five minutes of his time to adapt the material of the previous speaker to his own case. In other words he extemporizes, and refutes important points instead of letting them rest in the minds of his listeners for a half hour before they are answered. It is good psychology to refute evidence before it has been completely accepted by one’s audience. The skillful debater will finally adapt the whole constructive argument that he has previously memorized by statements like the following:

The opposition have told you ... But let us look at this matter farther, or
The negative have said that . . ., whereas exactly the opposite is true, as we shall now explain, or
Thus far in the debate the affirmative have completely ignored the question of . . ., which we will now discuss.

The clever debater will also use adaptation throughout his constructive argument in every place where there is a clash of issues. When a debater has his main speech well memorized, he can easily insert expressions which will show the connection between his points and what has been said by his opponents. It is poor debating to say that your opponents have made a certain statement when they have not. The debater must listen carefully to his opponents, and then make the connection as in the following: "The Philippines are economically ready for their independence, contrary to what the first speaker of the negative just told you." Adaptation such as this is real debating.

8. Questions. Most debaters overdo the matter of asking questions. There are students who think that it is clever to formulate a list of ten or fifteen questions, some of which are important and some of which are so unimportant as to be almost irrelevant. This sort of interrogation is bad form and a platform nuisance. Two or three questions are sufficient. The purposes for which they may be used will be treated in the chapter on refutation. Furthermore, questions should be asked at the times when they seem most effective. The old practice of the first speaker of the team rushing to the edge of the platform and saying "We have a few questions that we should like to ask" is poor debating. It is artificial. It shows that the questions were manufactured to fit any occasion rather than this particular debate. It is now considered an antiquated procedure. Ask two, three, or four well-chosen questions at various times during the debate, and then see that your opponents answer them.

9. Using a speaker's desk. The debater should make himself independent of the speaker's desk. It is useful for just two purposes: to receive a debater's cards at the conclusion of the adaptation at the beginning of his constructive argument, and to hold the book, pamphlet, or magazine from which the debater wishes to quote in his refutation. The other alternatives are to slip the cards in one's pocket, or to step to one's team's table and put the material there. Either method may prove awkward, although with practice a speaker can soon gain skill in the latter. Never should a debater stand behind the stand. Seldom should he pound the stand vigorously with his fists. Such experienced, eminent orators as A. Maude Royden and Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt can lean lightly on a speaker's stand and still present their arguments convincingly. William Jennings Bryan knew how to rest his left arm on the stand, lean toward his audience, and speak effectively in a confidential manner. Genius can always take exception to the common rules of procedure, but the beginner can seldom talk effectively while he is leaning on a desk.

Recently a debating team representing one of our Middle-Western universities tried to ape the nonchalant, indifferent platform presence of the English university men against whom they were debating. The Americans draped themselves on the speaking stand, leaned on all sides of it, and in general used it as a prop, with a resulting loss in poise, forcefulness, and power. When these men stood straight on both feet and had no speaker's stand they were effective debaters; leaning on the stand, they slouched physically and mentally.
Debating etiquette. Debating is a formal art. In spite of the fact that there has been a tendency in the past decade to make it more informal, there are still many rules which continue to guide its procedure. There is etiquette for all occasions. One would not think of addressing the president of the United States with an informal “Hello there.” No more should one ignore certain formalities of debate. For this reason the following simple rules are called to the attention of debaters.

1. **Personalities should be eliminated.** One’s opponents should never be called by name. Instead, they should be designated as “the opposition,” “our opponents,” “the negative” or “the affirmative,” or “the gentlemen or ladies of the opposition.” If one wishes to designate where certain material was presented, he refers to the first speech of the negative or to the third speech of the affirmative. Sometimes it is permissible to use such expressions as “Our friends from Chicago.” One’s opponent’s personal opinions should never be cited as evidence in a debate. This is done in our United States Congress, and there is often a temptation to do so in high-school debates, but it is discourteous and in poor taste.

2. **Use plural pronouns.** The debater should seldom, if ever, use the personal pronoun “I.” It is better to say “We of the affirmative contend” or “We maintain.” The use of “we” is also desirable in order to include the audience in a statement; as, “We know that the United States sacrificed millions of dollars in the World War.” This gives the audience a direct interest in the statement and makes them sharers in the argument. Similar results come from the use of the pronoun “you”; as, “You all know that Woodrow Wilson was sacrificed on the altar of Democracy.”

3. **No “honorable judges.”** At a recent meeting of the Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech in Ann Arbor a prominent professor who is constantly in demand as a judge of debate arose and said that he thought “honorable-judging” a judge was supposed to be passé, but that he was receiving altogether too much of it in his experience. When a debater has addressed the audience as “Ladies and gentlemen,” that is sufficient. The judges are included in this salutation; at least we trust that they are ladies and gentlemen. It is embarrassing for the judges to be singled out from the other people in the room. It is bad taste to place the judge above the other members of the audience by addressing several sentences especially to him. Thus, the practice of “honorable-judging” is bad taste, embarrassing, superfluous, and contrary to the wishes of the judges themselves.

4. **Sarcasm.** Sarcasm may be clever in repartee, but it is discourteous on the platform. The debater who is bitter, cynical, and sarcastic in speech either lacks self-control or else has such a poor argument that he is trying to veneer it with cleverness. The audience may laugh for the moment, but in reality they, your opponents, and your judges are antagonized by sarcasm. How often after a debate do we hear someone say, “A... is certainly a splendid debater,” and a judge replies, “Yes, in some ways, but she is too sarcastic.” The habit can be overcome and should be overcome. Sarcasm does not pay.

5. **Charts.** The use of charts is usually undesirable. Debating is a contest in public speaking, not drawing—in the oral presentation of facts, not statistical graphs. However, if charts are used, courtesy demands that they be left hanging for the use of the opposition. They should be placed in such a way that the members of the other
team can see them from where they are sitting. Charts used by one team are sometimes turned so far toward the audience and placed so near the edge of the platform that the opposing team cannot possibly see them. This is discourteous in the extreme.

6. Conversation. It is entirely permissible to engage in conversation with one's colleagues, if the talking can be done quietly. There are often points and methods of attack which must be discussed. However, if the talking cannot be done quietly enough not to disturb the speaker, the members of a team should write their communications. If the platform is small, or if one of the team has an extra strong voice, special care must be taken to be courteous. Conversation should be carried on only in whispers.

7. Time signals. Whether the signals are given by a gavel or by the rising of the timekeeper, every debater should know that the time has come for him to stop speaking. One has a perfect right to finish his sentences, but that is all. To continue talking overtime is not only discourteous to one's opponents, but it antagonizes the audience.

Many collegiate debaters have the practice of giving their colleague an extra time signal in his constructive argument to warn him that he has spent sufficient time in adaptation. Sometimes it is more confusing than helpful. If such a signal is to be given by dropping the lid of a rebuttal box, it ought to be agreed to by both teams, so that one side need not feel that an unfair advantage is being taken. But, in general, each speaker should be entirely on his own resources.

8. Communication with people in the audience. Gesturing or whispering to anyone in the audience is entirely forbidden; this includes a laugh directed toward any person. Trouble always follows the violation of this rule. Debaters ought to be too busy with their case to communicate with the audience by gesture, laughing, or whispered word. Communication also creates distrust. In one important debate a coach sat near the front of the auditorium and had her team communicate with her by gesture and by nodding of the head. The audience felt that the points to be answered in rebuttal were being indicated. No communication at all is the only safe way.

9. Handing material to the opposition. Often a question must be written out and handed to one's opponents. Sometimes a certain magazine or book is asked for. These should be handed courteously to the opposition, instead of being flung at them in a disdainful fashion. Courtesy pays. It wins an audience as much as does sound argument.

10. The chairman. The chairman should remain neutral at all times. His sympathies may be with the home team, but he should never show it in his remarks, in giving time signals, or by talking with one team and ignoring the other. The chairman at an important debate announced that the debate would start as soon as... High School, the visiting school, would make themselves ready. As a matter of fact, the visiting team was waiting, as they had been for twenty minutes, for the water pitcher and tumblers, which the chairmain should have had on the tables an hour before the contest. The rudeness of the chairman gained him nothing, for it was resented as much by the judges as by the visiting team. The chairman should try to keep the audience quiet and respectful during the speeches of both teams, and should exert himself to keep the debate on a high plane.
11. Conceit. Conceit has no place on the platform. If a speaker is naturally egotistical, he should train himself to subordinate that quality. The debater should be aggressive, but never overbearing; he should be confident, but never conceited. Sometimes debate decisions are lost through overconfidence. Defeat is often bitter, but it is a splendid antidote for conceit. The moment that a decision has been rendered, the defeated team should step over to the winners and congratulate them. This is the mark of good sportsmanship and good breeding. It is also an admirable foil for conceit.

12. Rising to a point of order. There is evidence of a tendency on the part of interscholastic debaters to have the negative rise to a point of order during the closing argument of the third affirmative speaker. The first objection to this practice is that it is not a point of order at all that is risen to, but a point of argument. Invariably the negative speaker who interrupts states that the affirmative have misjudged or misquoted the negative case. This is not a point of order, but a point of argument. A point of order is a question of procedure. For example, if a speaker should debate out of turn this would be a point of order to be risen to by either team. A point of order is a parliamentary question, not a part of the argument.

Rising to a point of order is unfair, because it spoils the smoothness and continuity of the final affirmative speech.

It is discourteous, because it interrupts a speaker in the time that is set aside for his own case.

It is poor sportsmanship, because it breaks into the argument of the affirmative, when the negative have had an equal amount of time entirely free from interruptions.

DELIBERATION

It is unnecessary, because judges are intelligent enough to note misquotations by the affirmative. If the negative have failed to make their case clear during their own time, they should not encroach upon the rights of the affirmative to do so.

Thus rising to a point of order is a misnomer: it is unfair, unnecessary, poor sportsmanship, and discourteous. It should be discouraged.

EXERCISES

1. Prepare at least one speech, using each of the following methods:
   a. Memorize a short speech verbatim.
   b. Memorize the major ideas.
   c. Give a speech that is extemporaneous for the first three minutes and memorized for the remaining ten minutes.

2. Write your impressions of the personality of each student as it is revealed on the platform. From these estimates a student will learn what phases of his personality he should work to strengthen. The following criteria may be used in judging:
   a. Neatness
   b. Cheerfulness
   c. Courtesy
   d. Alertness
   e. Patience
   f. Unselfishness
   g. Uprightness
   h. Appreciation of human nature
   i. Modesty
   j. Dignity
   k. Humor
   l. Intellectuality
   m. Aggressiveness

3. Find out whether you breathe correctly. Then spend ten minutes daily for a month in doing exercises to promote abdominal breathing.

4. Use fifteen minutes of the class period for two weeks in reading short passages of literature with your voice at the proper pitch.
5. Present through drill in class the fundamental gestures. Then practice the exercises, both with and without speaking, until they become so natural that you feel free to use them on the platform. Practice the gestures first with counting, as follows:
Start on 1  
Raise arm on 2  
Drop arm for beat of emphasis on 3  
Hold gesture through 4, 5, 6

6. Study the words in Appendix B until all of them are pronounced correctly.

7. Spend part of the recitation period for three weeks in practicing the exercises for enunciation which are listed in Appendix B.

8. Practice walking with and without talking until you can change your position without effort.

9. Read portions of great speeches aloud for drill in emphasis, variety, and pausing.

10. Read aloud the debating speeches presented in Appendix D, for drill in emphasis, variety of tone, and pausing.

11. Review before each debate the twelve points listed under "Debating Etiquette." Familiarity with these principles will soon eliminate all undesirable tendencies.

12. If you have never used refutation at the beginning of your constructive argument, do so no later than in your third class debate. If you have some knowledge of debating, use adaptation in your first class debate.

13. Have a series of debates on simple subjects until you have gained poise, confidence, and directness. Nothing but practice will bring these three assets.

14. Plan a debate in which the major subject is to use adaptation in the constructive argument. After that debate, such adaptation must be insisted upon in each contest. Practice is the only way to gain skill in adaptation.

CHAPTER VIII

REFUTATION

Definition. Refutation is that part of an argument in which the case of the opposition is answered. It is refutation that most distinguishes the art of debate from other types of public speaking. Almost any person of normal intelligence can deliver a memorized speech, but it takes arduous practice to be able to present refutation effectively. The quality of a debate should be judged, above everything else, by its refutation. Skill in refutation means the highest of skill in debate.

It is for his skill in refutation that Demosthenes is ranked so high in the realm of forensics. As was pointed out at the beginning of Chapter I, Demosthenes' oration "On the Crown" is considered by many critics to be the greatest rebuttal speech in history.

When refutation is used. Refutation means weakening or destroying the arguments of one's opponents. It is entirely destructive, in comparison with one's constructive argument. Although the terms are sometimes used interchangeably, refutation is distinguished from rebuttal in two ways: in the first place, refutation takes the offensive against the argument of one's opponent, whereas rebuttal includes both the attack on the opposition and the defense of one's own case. In the second place, "refutation" is the term which is usually applied to attacks made during one's constructive argument, whereas "rebuttal" refers directly to the second speech,
which is given by each debater for the express purpose of refutation. It is customary to speak of refutation at the beginning of one's constructive argument and of refutation in the rebuttal speeches.

Since refutation is the backbone of debating, it is obvious that it should be used extensively. Too often the amateur debater thinks that he has done all that is necessary when he gives refutation in the five minutes which are usually allotted to him for his rebuttal speech. Nothing could be more erroneous. The best debaters engage in refutation constantly throughout their arguments. In a ten-minute constructive speech at least three minutes should be left at the beginning for answering some of the statements of the preceding speaker. In private conversation we do not wait thirty, forty, or sixty minutes to answer objections to our plans: we answer them immediately. So in debate, points should be answered as soon as possible after they are made. This prevents them from becoming firmly fixed in the minds of one's audience, shows that the debater is quick to grasp and attack the argument of the opposition, and proves that he is a ready debater, as skilled in the art of refutation as he is in presenting a memorized argument.

Adaptation in refutation. Refutation, in the form of adaptation, should also occur throughout one's constructive speech, as well as at the beginning. Adaptation at its best requires even more skill and practice than does ordinary refutation. By adaptation is meant the making of a direct connection between the argument of the preceding speakers and one's own case. Obviously the first affirmative speaker cannot taste the joys of adaptation, but the remaining five speakers of the teams can and should.

Adaptation should be achieved in two places: first, at the transition between the refutation and the first point in one's constructive argument; secondly, at any point further in the argument where one's evidence connects directly with a statement made by any of the preceding speakers. By way of illustration let us consider the speech of the first negative debater on the question "Resolved, That the coal mines of the United States should be owned by the government." Invariably the first affirmative speaker dwells long on the point that the evils of the coal industry are rapidly increasing in the United States. The first point in the memorized argument of the first negative speaker is that these evils are decreasing. Consequently the adaptation for the first negative speech is easily achieved in the following form:

In the fourth place, the first affirmative speaker has told you that the evils of the coal industry are steadily increasing in the United States under private ownership, but, ladies and gentlemen, we find that the opposite is true. Strikes, one of the worst evils of the industry, have steadily decreased in the past few years. In the past decade there have been only three coal strikes, and these were settled before a serious coal shortage was caused.

The first negative speaker then proceeds to advance other pieces of evidence to prove the decrease in the evils of the coal business. In this way the adaptation is so well made and the transition so smooth that the debater often reaches the third or fourth minute of his memorized argument before the audience is aware that he has finished refutation. Such adaptation represents the highest skill in debate and involves much training and experience, but the goal is worthy of the effort.

Sometimes the preceding speaker fails to present a point which bears the direct relationship of that in the
illustration. In such a case it is the debater’s business to find a point that will make a smooth transition. Although it is not so desirable as the transition illustrated, one may always make a smooth transition in the following more general form:

The first affirmative speaker has praised government ownership in glowing terms, but, ladies and gentlemen, government ownership is not necessary, when coal strikes are decreasing so rapidly in the United States. Coal strikes have decreased until there have been only three in the past ten years, and these were of short duration.

Adaptation should be used not only at the beginning of one’s memorized argument but also throughout the speech, wherever there is a direct relationship between one’s points and the words of the preceding speakers for the opposition. In debate it is not sufficient to offset the points of one’s opponents: the skilful debater will always go farther and point out that he has offset the objections offered to his plan. The method is to insert in the constructive argument, wherever they belong, such expressions as these:

1. Contrary to what the negative have told you.
2. This answers adequately the statement made on this point by the preceding affirmative speaker.
3. We offer, in contrast to the examples given by the second negative speaker, the examples of . . .

There are three requisites for success in this kind of adaptation: first, a constructive argument so perfectly memorized that interruptions are not disconcerting; secondly, constant practice in actual debate; thirdly, careful attention to the words of the opposition, so that their case will be familiar.

Smooth adaptation throughout one’s constructive argument marks him as the most skilled of debaters. Such adaptation stands as the highest of the four steps toward skill in refutation. The simplest form, which every debater must use, is that in the five-minute rebuttal speech; the next highest to be achieved is three or four minutes of refutation at the beginning of one’s constructive argument; the third highest is to make the smoothest possible transition between what has gone before and the first point in one’s memorized speech; the fourth and highest achievement is to make smooth adaptations constantly, whenever the opportunity presents, throughout one’s constructive case. Practice and effort will enable every debater to become skilled in these four stages of refutation.

There is only one place in debating where refutation is not desirable: (it should not be used at the end of a constructive argument.) Some debaters misjudge their time so badly that they find themselves with two or three extra minutes after their summary has been given. They use this time for refutation. Such procedure is unwise for two reasons: first, because it means that the conclusion of one’s speech will be the weakest in delivery when it ought to be the strongest; secondly, because the logical arrangement is to answer objections before advancing one’s own case. Ninety-nine debaters out of a hundred will show more forcefulness in a memorized conclusion than in one that is extemporaneous. Moreover, in argumentation in politics or business one is expected to clear the field from objections before advancing new points. Hence, from the point of view of logical order and from the point of view of delivery, refutation should never be used to fill in the last few minutes of one’s time for speaking.
Division of refutation. After considering the definition of refutation and its place in the debate, the next step is to make a division of points among the members of the team. The exigencies of debate prevent an absolute division of labor. In theory, every speaker should be able to answer every point of the opposition. In practice, it is wise to have each speaker completely responsible for certain points. This prevents confusion at the table on the night of the debate and means better delivery for certain fundamental points. Every speaker should be completely responsible for the defense of his own case. His colleagues may be compelled to help him to answer certain points which immediately precede their arguments, but, on the whole, each speaker should defend his own part of the case.

Wording of refutation. Next let us consider the wording of refutation. The best rebuttal thought in the world may be completely ruined by weakness in statement. The memorized argument is constructive; refutation is destructive in form. The statement of it should make clear this difference, in order to avoid confusion in the minds of one’s audience. Too often have we heard debaters who stated both parts of their case in the same manner, with the result that we in the audience were wondering whether the speakers were presenting new points or meeting the objections of their opponents. Clearness is vital to the life of a debate. To preserve clearness it seems best, before giving the refutation, to state the point of the opposition which is being refuted. This is a simple rule to follow, but it is necessary to maintain a distinction between refutation and the constructive case.

Besides learning to state the point of refutation before refuting it, the debater should also familiarize himself with the various phrases which make concise introductions for refutation. Some expressions which are useful in this respect follow:

1. This is only one example of the point. Other examples . . .
2. This is a weak argument for the negative to advance, because . . .
3. The date of their evidence is 1908, whereas that which we presented is for . . .
4. The opposition have given you a mere assertion, whereas we have . . .
5. This statement of our opponents is disproved by the fact that . . .
6. Our opponents have given you unreliable evidence for their point that . . . Better evidence comes from . . .

Such opening sentences as these will indicate the nature of the refutation to follow and will distinguish between the constructive argument and refutation.

Delivery of refutation. Closely connected with the statement of refutation are the rules for its delivery. It is not enough to think out clever answers for rebuttal: the answers must be delivered with conciseness, clearness, and color. The following rules deal with the delivery of refutation.

1. State the exact words of your opponents. The exact words of the opposition should be given before you refute them. It is not sufficient to have a general idea of what they said: your knowledge must be exact. For example, “The negative have told you that the League of Nations is unsuccessful” is too general for the best refutation. Rather give the exact statement of the opposition, such as the following: “The negative have told you that the League of Nations did not settle the Corfu case.”

Obviously the general statement is more easily answered, but it is not the best debating, because it does
not give the precise point of the opposition. To be accurate, exact words of the opposition should be quoted. In answering dates, authorities, and examples exact statements are necessary.

2. *Always have a clincher for every point.* Every point should be summarized briefly. Many rebuttals which are otherwise effective fail to reach the audience because they are not clinched. Every rebuttal point has three parts:

A. The statement of the point to be refuted.
B. The statement of the evidence and its source.
C. The clincher, or the connection between the evidence used and the whole argument.

The following brief example is taken from a debate on the abolition of the direct primary:

A. The affirmative have told you that the primary is bad, because Smith of Illinois and Vare of Pennsylvania spent thousands of dollars to be elected in their primaries.

B. But, ladies and gentlemen, the affirmative neglected to tell you that these are the worst examples they can find. The affirmative neglected to mention that in California, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, or the thirty-eight other states which have primary laws there have been no primary elections with the "too much money" taint.

C. Thus, judging from this evidence, there is not so much corruption in our primary elections as the affirmative would have you believe.

Thus A presents the point to be answered; B states the refutation, the evidence, and the source of the evidence; and C clinches the whole point by connecting A and B with each other and with the whole case.

3. *The number of points that can be handled by each speaker is limited.* With five minutes for rebuttal, seven points are about all that can be answered. With that number the debater may meet three minor points and four major ones, devoting a minute each to the latter. Some debaters attempt to answer twelve or fifteen points in five minutes, with the result that their rebuttal is mere assertion without evidence, without sources of evidence, and without clinchers. It is better to take fewer points and answer them thoroughly. Not fewer than five, not more than seven, is a safe rule for most occasions.

4. *The last speaker for each team should summarize the debate as a whole.* At least one minute out of the five should go into a summary. If the opposition has presented a strong case, two minutes may be wisely spent; if the third speaker is unusually skillful in analysis, he may spend three minutes in summary of the whole debate. Three forms of summary for the final speaker are listed here, but only the last two are recommended:

*Form A*

In summary, then, we of the affirmative have shown that the United States should join the World Court, because

I. It is ... 
II. It is ... 
III. It is ... 
IV. It is ...

*Form B*

I. The negative have told you ... and this has been answered in our ... constructive speech.
II. The negative have told you ... and this has been offset by our ... argument.
III. The negative have told you ... This has been met by our ... constructive speech. Therefore we of the affirmative contend that our case still stands, and that the United States should join the World Court.
Form C

I. The first negative speaker told you . . . This was disproved by . . ., which was presented in our first constructive argument, and by the point that . . ., which our . . . rebuttal speaker gave.

II. The second negative speaker told you . . . This was answered by our . . . rebuttal speaker. The second negative speaker also said that . . ., and this we answered in our . . . constructive argument.

III. The third negative debater said that . . ., but this was more than offset by our . . . constructive speaker and by our . . . rebuttal speaker.

IV. Moreover, the negative asked us three questions which were answered by our . . . speaker at the beginning of her constructive argument. We, early in the debate, asked the negative two questions which they have consistently ignored. Moreover, the negative have failed to give us the evidence for which we asked concerning their point about . . .

In view of these facts we of the affirmative believe that our case still stands.

Because . . ., because . . ., and because . . ., we contend that the United States should join the World Court.

It is obvious that Form C will require the most time and the most skill; but when it is well given, it is by far the most complete and the most convincing.

5. The fifth rule is to present one’s points in order. The first point in refutation should always be in answer to something stated by the preceding speaker. It is best to answer points directly and immediately, instead of letting them rest in the minds of the audience. After the first point or two have been answered properly, one may propound any questions that he wishes to ask the opposition. One important point should be planned for the last minute, between the time of the warning and the time of the final signal. It is well for the debater to arrange his rebuttal cards in the proper order while he is at the table, and then present them in the order planned. Nothing is more annoying to an audience or more disconcerting to the debater himself than fumbling through a whole pack of cards for the special card needed. Orderliness and careful planning will prevent such confusion.

6. Give evidence for every point in refutation. Mere talking is not sufficient. Evidence and the source of the evidence should be cited for every piece of refutation. Reasoning is essential in debating, but it does not replace evidence, as some debaters seem to think. One may and should reason, explain, and illustrate in all possible ways, but evidence must rank first. If one cannot find the evidence for a certain point in the argument, it is better to drop the point.

7. Present the original sources for some of your evidence. It is customary to have most of the evidence which one is to use in rebuttal written on cards, because the cards can be handled easily. However, it is sometimes advisable to quote directly from a book, a magazine, a pamphlet, or a government bulletin. This is especially effective when a certain piece of evidence has been questioned repeatedly by the opposition. To read the evidence in question directly from its original source proves to the audience and judges that such evidence really exists and that one’s case is sound.

The wise debater will not read all his material from original sources, because this takes too much time and because it distracts the attention of the audience from the speaker’s words. Twice, or three times at the most, are sufficient for the reading of original material. When the reading has been finished, the book should be laid on
the table or the speaker’s stand, so that the hands will
again be free for cards and gestures.

8. **Avoid the excessive use of one authority.** When a de-
bater uses one authority or one source to the exclusion of all others, his audience draw one of two conclusions: either that there is a very limited amount of evidence to substantiate his views or that the debater himself has prepared his case superficially by reading only one or two authorities. Either impression is destructive of the force-
fulness of one’s case. To use the same authority once in one rebuttal speech is sufficient, and to use him three or four times in an entire case is enough.

9. **Connect your refutation with the argument which has been presented by your colleagues.** Often a point which has been considered in the constructive argument must be answered in refutation. If the point is important it should be answered, by all means; but one must be sure to connect his answer with what his team has already said. This procedure presents two advantages: it shows the foresightedness of the team and it proves their knowledge of the entire case. Some debaters are familiar only with their own part of the case. A skilled debater is ready to apply any part of his team’s case to any part of rebuttal. Such adaptability is vital to good debating.

After a speaker has shown how a certain point has been answered earlier in the case, it is advisable to present still further evidence on the point. If the refutation is limited to material which has already been stated, the audience gain the idea that the evidence presented is all that the debater has. The best refutation connects a point with what has already been given, and then advances a step farther by adding new evidence. For example:

10. **Answer points directly.** It is wise to answer those points which come nearest one’s own argument in point of time; in other words, the refutation at the beginning of a constructive argument should be on the speech just preceding. If this policy is pursued by each speaker, and if each has three or four minutes for refutation at the beginning of his constructive argument, the main points of the opposing case will have been answered by the time the second rebuttal speaker for each team takes the floor. The rebuttal of the last two speakers for each team should be devoted almost exclusively to refutation of rebuttal. When the third rebuttal speaker goes back to the first constructive argument for a point to refute, it looks as if his rebuttal were “canned,” as if he were limited in his knowledge of the subject, as if he had run out of material, or as if his colleagues had failed to cover the points that they should have covered. All points should be answered as quickly as possible after they are presented, so that the audience will hear them refuted before they have decided to accept them.

11. **No new points should be introduced in refutation.** New evidence may and should be presented to refute points that have been introduced in the constructive arguments, but new points are not acceptable. The
usual practice in debate demands that all one's constructive case be presented in the constructive arguments. Rebuttal is for refutation, and should never be used to drag in left-over points. At the best, such procedure indicates poor planning; at the worst, it means that the debater is too ignorant to handle rebuttal, and hence is filling up his time with new material. This is not real debating, and must always be condemned.

Especially should the last affirmative rebuttal speaker be careful to introduce no new arguments. The final rebuttal speaker for the affirmative may give new evidence to answer points raised by the final negative rebuttal, but never may he introduce new points. It is unfair to his opponents, since they have no opportunity to answer him, and it is misleading to an audience. The final affirmative speaker in rebuttal will find that he has all he can do well if he answers the points raised by the last negative rebuttal speaker and also spends two minutes or more in giving a complete summary of the whole debate.

12. The best preparation for the delivery of rebuttal is practice. A debater can learn to present his constructive argument well by individual training, but skill in rebuttal demands team practice. Let the debate squad be divided into two teams, so that they may practice with each other. Arrange practice debates with other schools. Some of the most enjoyable and profitable debates ever held are those which are held solely for practice, without a decision by judges. Everyone is free from the strain that exists in the presence of judges, and the teams feel free to try new methods. Practice debates are the road to skill in rebuttal.

13. Have variety in the introduction of rebuttal points. Too often every member of a team introduces every point with the same expression, until it becomes monotonous. The writer has heard debates in which every rebuttal point was preceded by the words "The opposition have told you . . ." Instead, debaters should be trained to use a variety of openings; as:

"The affirmative have stated . . ."
"The first speaker of the negative declared . . ."
"Our opponents."
"Our friends of the opposition."
"Our friends from . . ." (naming the city from which the opposition come).

Many consider this a minor rule, but variety is always more desirable than monotony.

14. Humor has a place in rebuttal. Those who would emulate the English style of debating morn over the lack of humor in American forensics. It is true that humor is too often neglected in American contests, but it is equally true that most English debaters display humor and little else. They overdo the matter. Humor does improve one's effectiveness. It puts the audience in a much more receptive state of mind. Therefore each member of a team should try to use at least one bit of humor in his rebuttal; a story, a joke, or an analogy will quicken the interest of one's audience and thus make debating more effective.

15. Avoid duplicating the points presented by your colleagues. Often a team wastes three minutes of its fifteen minutes for rebuttal in answering points unnecessarily. If the first negative rebuttal speaker has refuted a point, and if no answer was made to this refutation by the first affirmative rebuttal speaker, it is a waste of time for the second negative debater to cover the ground a second time. Besides wasting time, this practice is detrimental,
for it creates the impression that the first refutation was worthless or that the second negative speaker was careless about checking his colleague's points. It is a debater's business to keep himself informed about what his colleagues do, so that he will not waste his precious time repeating something which has already been presented.

These fifteen points give the essential rules for successful refutation. The practice of these simple suggestions, combined with the knowledge of what refutation really is, where it should be used, and how it should be worded, along with care in the division of points among the members of the team, will greatly improve a debater's skill in rebuttal.

Methods for rebuttal. The first half of this chapter has been devoted to the statement and delivery of refutation; the last half will concern itself with the even more important problem of the attack itself. What points one shall attack and how these points should be attacked are questions which will be answered in the following pages. Twenty-six methods for rebuttal will be considered for your use.

1. **Attacking the truth of a statement.** When a statement is made that one knows is false, it should be refuted as something untrue. To say "This is not true" is neither good manners nor sufficient refutation. It is far more courteous to say: "This evidence presented by our opponents seems exaggerated. We of the affirmative have found quite the contrary to be true. For example, ..."

When a debater attacks the truth of a statement, he must be able to offer better evidence than his opponents, and evidence from a better source. For example, in debating the question of independence for the Philippine Islands, the negative stated that the Filipinos were only 32 per cent literate. The affirmative denied the truth of this statement by pointing out that the literacy of the islands is 64 per cent, according to the report of the governor general of the islands for 1923. The affirmative further pointed out that their statistics should stand, because their authority was the official government report for 1923, whereas their opponents had cited only one or two private citizens who were inclined to be prejudiced. The affirmative also stated that such a statement coming from Major General Leonard Wood, whose sympathies were on the negative side of the question, was all the more reliable.

When one expects to attack the truth of a statement it is wise to have eight or ten reliable authorities to support the attack. One should seldom make a direct attack with a solitary piece of evidence to support the assertion. If the point is worthy, numerous authorities can be found who will defend it. Then, if the opposition insist on repeating their statement, one will have plenty of material left for attack. A wise debater never fires all his ammunition at once: he saves part of it for future attack.

Thus in attacking the truth of a statement the following suggestions should be borne in mind:

a. Be courteous in statement.

b. Have a better piece of evidence.

c. Show that you have better evidence.

d. Have seven or eight authorities for defense.

2. **Attacking authority.** Some students who call themselves debaters think that they are very clever if they spend much of their time attacking authorities. Just the opposite is true. An audience comes to a debate to learn something about the question, not to listen to a mud-slinging contest on authorities. Although authori-
ties are important, they are, after all, subordinate to the main issues of the debate.

The best rule in debate is to go slowly in attacking the authorities presented by the opposition. In this way much valuable time is saved for the real issues of the question. If the opposition attack one's authority, it is one's duty to defend the references which have been used, briefly and directly. Then one may continue by pointing out that certain authorities cited by the opposition are not above reproach. Authorities may be attacked in the following ways:

a. For being prejudiced.
b. For being unimportant.
c. For not being expert in the field cited.
d. For being used too frequently in the debate.

Sometimes a team will use one authority as the sole basis for their argument. In this event attack is warranted.

Another suggestion is not to attack unless one's own authorities are free from the four objections just cited. It is absolutely imperative to have one's own house in order before criticizing other people's. Another way to be effective in debate is to avoid attacking the president of the United States or other prominent citizens. Such attacks merely arouse antagonism in the minds of the audience and often lose the decision of the judges. The following true illustration ought to be sufficient warning. In a debate on the question of universal military training one of the negative speakers spent two minutes attacking General Leonard Wood, whom the affirmative had five times quoted as an authority. The debater of the negative said that Wood was militaristic, narrow-minded, prejudiced, and unreliable as an authority. It happened that one of the judges at that debate was a man of national prominence who was a personal friend of General Wood and who had been his biographer. He was so antagonized by the negative's statements against Wood that he took no further notes on their case. He might have voted for the affirmative in any case, but the criticism of his friend turned him completely against the negative. To summarize:

1. Do not attack authority unless the opposition have attacked yours.
2. Never attack authorities unless your own are sound.
3. Never attack authorities unless they are
   a. Prejudiced.
   b. Unimportant.
   c. Not experts in the field.
   d. Used too much.
4. Never attack persons who are greatly esteemed by the nation.

3. Inconsistencies. Some inconsistencies are real; some are apparent. To find and point out those that are real is genuine fun for the debater. Once in a while inconsistency is found in the main arguments. More often, however, a statement in the constructive case is inconsistent with something which is given in rebuttal. For example, in the question of the Federal prohibition amendment the affirmative invariably talk about the failure of Federal enforcement of Federal laws. Then the negative ask how the affirmative propose to have the state laws enforced. Almost invariably the affirmative reply, "By the cooperation of state and Federal officials." This gives the negative just the chance for which they have been looking, and so one of the negative speakers says in rebuttal:
The first affirmative speaker told you at length how bad *Federal enforcement* is. Then the second speaker in rebuttal recommended that the Federal government help the state government in the enforcement of state laws. Obviously, the affirmative are inconsistent in their statements. If Federal enforcement is as good as the second affirmative speaker stated, it cannot be so bad as the first speaker claimed. The affirmative must abandon either one or the other of these contentions, if they are to be consistent.

4. *Evidence that is out of date.* Usually the best evidence, all else being equal, is that which is most up to date. If opponents cite evidence which is for the year 1900 or 1910 when it should be for 1925, they should be taken to task for so doing. Statistics that are taken from the various encyclopedias are almost invariably ancient in date.

Old evidence may be used under two conditions: for purposes of comparison, or if the evidence is of such a nature that its date is immaterial. Very often the best way to prove a point is to compare conditions in the current year with those ten, twenty, or fifty years ago. In such a case old statistics are as vital as the new. Sometimes the evidence is of such a nature that material of an old date may be used. For example, in debating the question of government ownership of the coal mines, the statements of the Encyclopædia Britannica (Eleventh Edition), Vol. VI, p. 592, about the special dangers of coal-mining are equally true today, in spite of the fact that the material was printed in 1910. The date makes no difference in the authenticity of this particular kind of evidence. Dangers which were peculiar to the coal industry at that time remain peculiar to that business in our day.
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With these two exceptions, if opponents use ancient evidence one may attack them on this ground. The attack should be followed through by showing that one’s own evidence is of later date. It is not sufficient merely to attack the dates given by the opposition: it is also necessary to show that one’s own evidence is free from such criticism.

5. *Lack of evidence.* A case that is built up with almost no evidence to support it should be attacked on this basis. As was pointed out in Chapter V, evidence is the backbone of argument. Nevertheless, some debaters, either because of ignorance or because of indolence, present a third or even the whole of their case without any evidence at all. In this event their opponents should point out that “the negative have completed two thirds of their case without presenting any evidence to support their assertions,” or “the third affirmative speaker spoke for ten minutes on the economic factors of the question without presenting even one piece of evidence. On the contrary, we have presented to you —— pieces of evidence to support our contentions. We ask our opponents to state their evidence for the following points:

a. . . .
b. . . .
c. . . .”

6. *Evading the main issues.* Sometimes one’s opponents try to conceal the real weaknesses of their case by trying to evade the main issues. The following plan will prevent any debate from degenerating into a mere quibbling over unimportant details:

a. Have the three or four main issues clearly in mind.
b. Hammer them home to your audience. Keep repeating them until your listeners can never forget the essentials of the case.
c. By constant questioning compel your opponents to face the main issues.

7. Isolated examples. Many debaters are guilty of choosing isolated examples to prove their case instead of typical ones. Examples are the most interesting evidence that one can offer. However, when you can find only one example to prove your point, it is very likely to be a poor point.

Two illustrations of isolated examples follow; they are taken from a debate on the question of the Federal child-labor amendment. The negative declared that Federal legislation was unnecessary because the states are enforcing their laws so well. Their evidence was the example of Wisconsin, where the enforcement of state child-labor laws is 95 per cent perfect. As the affirmative hastened to point out, Wisconsin is an isolated, not a typical example: no other state has so high a percentage of enforcement for its state child-labor laws.

The affirmative also presented an isolated example to prove that industries move from states with good child-labor laws to those with poor laws. The example was the —— Chair Company of Detroit, which twenty-five years ago made money by employing child workers of eight, nine, and ten years. Then Michigan prohibited the labor of these children; so the —— Chair Company moved to Kentucky, where it is now doing a prosperous business at the expense of the health and happiness of dozens of child laborers. It is almost impossible for the affirmative to find another example like this. As the negative stated, it is an isolated example, and hence weak evidence. One should compel his opponents to choose typical, not isolated examples.

8. Asking questions. Asking questions is a vital part of debating. Questions are asked in order to reveal the opponents’ weaknesses, to draw them into an inconsistency, to demand evidence, to demand the source of a piece of evidence, and to emphasize the main issues in the debate. Sometimes debaters ask questions so that their opponents will spend all their time answering queries instead of attacking their case. This practice is to be condemned. It is not good debating.

It is a mistake to spend an excess of time on questions. If one’s opponents fail to present some evidence which they ought to give, one may ask them for it. Aside from this, three or four questions are sufficient. Every question should be followed up until it is answered. If eight or ten are asked, both the debaters and the audience lose track of them. Ask two or three questions and continue asking them until they are satisfactorily answered.

Furthermore, the questions should be directly connected with a specific part of the argument. To make it effective, the question should be directly connected with the argument in a manner similar to the following:

The first affirmative speaker told you that Federal legislation is necessary because the state laws are badly enforced. We ask the affirmative to show how Federal legislation will work any better. What plan of enforcement do the affirmative advocate for Federal legislation?

The debater who would ask questions should bear in mind the following rules:

a. Ask only two or three important questions.

b. Hammer home every question that is asked.

c. Connect each question definitely with the argument.

9. Answering questions. Questions should be answered, and answered briefly. If one’s opponents present a list of ten questions, it is a waste of valuable time to answer each of them in detail. A far better method is to answer
quickly the one or two that one's case has not met, and then to dispose of the remainder by saying: "The remainder of the questions asked by the opposition have been adequately answered in our constructive arguments and rebuttal."

Questions must be quickly disposed of, to make way for the more important issues in the debate. The wise debater will lose very little time in answering questions.

10. **Attacking analogies.** Analogies are important, not because of their soundness but because they stand out clearly in the minds of one's audience. They must be answered, not because they are important to the case but because they are so effective with an audience.

Analogies may always be proved false. Their inherent nature makes them unsound. They may be shown false by pointing out that the differences between the objects in the comparison overbalance the likenesses. Sometimes it is more effective debating to accept the analogy, and then carry it farther until it is evidence for one's own case instead of for the opposition. For example, the analogy is given that the French war debt is like an anchor and chain round the neck of the French nation, dragging the people down, down, down. The opposition may meet this analogy in two ways: First, they may point out the falsity of the analogy in that anchors do not hold a ship permanently: anchors may be lifted by human strength and ingenuity. That is exactly what the French are doing with their war-debt anchor: gradually lifting it. Secondly, the opposition may accept the analogy and point out its benefits to their side of the argument in the following manner:

We admit that the French war debt is an anchor which is holding down the French people. We contend that France needs just this kind of an anchor. If it were not for the anchor of her war debts, France would be spending even more than she is today for a large army, more submarines, and military preparation. The debt anchor is good for France to protect her against an orgy of armament spending.

Thus analogies may be answered by rejection or acceptance; but they must be answered, because they are effective with the audience, and they must be answered briefly, because other parts of the argument are more important.

11. **Citing the authority used by the opposition.** It is effective to cite the authority which one's opponents have used, if it is not overdone. To say that "even the negative's own authority, . . . , admits that such a point is true" shows that even a prejudiced authority upholds one's case. However, if this is done more than three or four times in a debate, the impression is created that one is hard pressed for evidence and thus is driven to use that of the opposition. Opponents' evidence should be used sparingly.

12. **Choice of points.** Since one's rebuttal time is limited to five minutes, care must be taken to choose the most essential points for refutation. Which points a team will choose to refute depends upon three things:

a. Their importance in the case.

b. Their effectiveness in a community.

c. Their effectiveness with an audience.

A team's first consideration is to meet the main points of the opposition, whether they are three, four, or five in number. The main contentions should be answered as early as possible in the debate, so that they will surely be disposed of.

Secondly, points must be answered if they are especially connected with the state or the city in which the
debate takes place. When points concerning Detroit are brought into a debate in that city, those points must be answered not because they are so important to the case, but, rather, because they make a special appeal in that particular community. Teams that are debating the direct primary in Michigan must meet all points raised about the primary in that state.

Thirdly, sometimes points which are neither important to the case nor of special interest to the community happen to be unusually effective with an audience. Jokes, analogies, and examples which please an audience tremendously must be picked up by a team, simply because the audience temporarily considers them of importance.

13. **Keep the argument related to the audience.** Always keep the argument connected with the lives of the audience. In debating the question of government ownership of railroads in Michigan, if one’s opponents cite examples in Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama, one may ask them to come nearer home and consider questions in their own state.

If one is debating the question of a ship subsidy, and one’s opponents place their argument entirely in far-away places, the debater can answer them by bringing the question home. He can show the audience how much a ship subsidy is going to cost each of them as taxpayers. The most effective debating is that which is clearly connected with one’s immediate audience. In rebuttal there is always an excellent opportunity to make such connections.

14. **Refuting comparisons.** When a comparison used by the opposition is unusually effective, it should be refuted. This may be done by pointing out that the cases compared are more different than alike. It may be shown that there is a difference in the number of people involved, in the time of year, in the ages of the persons compared, in nationality, or in sex. A comparison between countries may be proved erroneous by showing the difference in the area, population, wealth, climatic conditions, or form of government. One argument that the affirmative sometimes advance in favor of government ownership of public utilities is that all the countries of Europe deal with this problem in a national instead of a local way. This comparison is erroneous, because European nations are much smaller than the United States in territory and population; therefore they can handle national legislation more effectively. Furthermore, European nations have their power much more centralized than have we in the United States, for the same reasons. Therefore a comparison between Europe and the United States is poorly drawn.

Comparisons may often be refuted by a difference in dates. Sometimes comparisons are made which are supposedly based on one certain year, but in reality they are based on widely differing dates. In attempting to prove that the literacy of the Philippine Islands was sufficient to warrant independence, one debater compared it with the literacy of other small independent nations. However, this particular comparison was false, because the literacy statistics cited for the Philippines were for the year 1923, whereas those given for the other countries were of a much earlier date, when the countries were poorly developed.

When the proper years are compared, the comparison may be refuted by pointing out differing circumstances for the dates given.
Thus the refutation of comparisons involves a great variety of attacks, and hence is one of the most interesting methods in rebuttal.

15. Revealing fallacies. A fallacy is any weakness in an argument which destroys its validity. There are three steps in dealing with this phase of rebuttal: (1) find the fallacy, (2) state it definitely, (3) and answer it.

Fallacies occur in numerous forms. Sometimes they appear in a textbook of logic or of debating, but more often their form is entirely different from any statement which the listener has previously heard. The statement of fallacies is a constant surprise. Their form is so varied that persistent effort is required to detect them. It is such thinking as this that tests one’s forensic powers and makes debating a real science.

After the fallacy has been detected, it must be stated definitely. How often do debaters say, “Something is wrong with that argument, but I don’t know exactly what it is.” That is a debater’s business: to know exactly, to state definitely, what the weakness is. There is no room for vagueness here. Constant practice will train one’s mind to be keen in discerning fallacies.

The following fallacies comprise only an introduction to the subject, but they will serve as a foundation for further study.

Fallacies of begging the question:
  a. Simple iteration.
  b. Argument in a circle.
  c. Assuming the point at issue.
  d. Generalization.

Argument beside the point:
  a. Argumentum ad populum.
  b. Argumentum ad hominem.
  c. Argumentum ad ignorantiam.

The fallacy of begging the question is a very common one. It consists of assuming that a point is true, in spite of the fact that no proof has been offered.

a. There is the fallacy of begging the question by simple iteration. An audience is led to believe that proof is being offered, when the debater is merely repeating his point in slightly different phraseology. An illustration of the fallacy of simple iteration occurs in the following:

I. The United States should adopt a ship subsidy, for
   A. It is the duty of the United States to adopt a ship subsidy.

Argument A, which ought to advance a step beyond argument I, is in this case a simple iteration of I.

Sometimes the fallacy of simple iteration is presented in the form of a rhetorical question, as in the following:

I. The United States should adopt a system of universal military training, for
   A. Is it not our duty to adopt such a system?

b. There is the fallacy of begging the question by argument in a circle. In this type a given argument is used first as a reason for another point and then as the conclusion of the point itself. It differs from the fallacy of simple iteration by having several statements inserted between the first part and the last. The following will illustrate this fallacy:

I. The Filipinos are ready for their independence, for
   A. They have a high standard of literacy.
   B. Their schools are in good condition.
   C. Their government is stable, for
      1. They have proved themselves ready for their independence.
c. There is the fallacy of begging the question by assuming the point at issue. It is a very common fallacy for debaters to assume the truth of a sweepingly broad proposition which includes the one under discussion. Very often we hear students declare, “Our debating team will win the championship, because our teams always win.” Such reasoning as this is fallacious, for it begs the point at issue by assuming the truth of the general statement that “our teams always win.”

d. There is the fallacy of begging the question by generalization. In this form of fallacy the conclusion to be proved is used to prove itself by repetition in a more general form. The following is an illustration of the fallacy of generalization:

I. The state of New York should abolish capital punishment, for
   A. All states should abolish capital punishment.

   Another group of fallacies includes those of argument beside the point. This fallacy occurs whenever the debater appeals to the personal prejudices of his audience instead of to their reason. Some common varieties follow:

   a. *Argumentum ad populum* means “argument to the people.” It is used much too frequently in debate, and occurs when the speaker attempts to prove not that the proposition is true or false, but that people are for it or against it. It is assumed that no proposition is false if the people are for it and that no proposition is sound if the people are against it.

   To argue that all the states in the United States should adopt a system of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes because people want this system is *argumentum ad populum*, and thus argument beside the point.

b. *Argumentum ad hominem*, which means “argument to the man,” is in evidence when a proposition is rejected or praised because some man associated with it has or has not faults; for example:

   I. The directors of the Emergency Fleet Corporation should not criticize the United States Shipping Board, for
      A. The directors of the Emergency Fleet Corporation themselves have been guilty of extravagance and waste of the people’s money.

   Argument A does not prove Argument I, but merely asserts that the Emergency Fleet Corporation is guilty of misconduct.

   c. *Argumentum ad ignorantiam* is the fallacy that occurs when proof is offered, not for the truth or the falsity of a proposition but merely to show that people are ignorant concerning it. In other words, if one cannot prove a proposition true, it is false, and if one cannot prove a proposition false, it is true.

   When a debater is cornered he is quite likely to be guilty of this fallacy, which is illustrated below:

   I. Propaganda defeated the World Court issue in the election of 1924, because
      A. No one of you can prove that it did not.

   Only seven common fallacies have been presented, but there are many more in numerous guises to catch the unwary and stimulate the interest of those skilled in detecting them. A further study of fallacies in ordinary conversation and in speeches will prove valuable.

   16. *Turning the tables.* This is one of the most fascinating methods in rebuttal. It means accepting one of your opponent’s arguments and, from this, drawing the opposite conclusion.
The following illustration took place in a debate on the question of independence for the Philippine Islands:

The second affirmative speaker spent all her time in proving that the Philippine Islands have a stable government at the present time. We of the negative accept that statement. However, this proves not that the islands should have immediate independence, but rather that the United States, the power solely responsible for the governmental stability, should continue in the archipelago.

17. Reductio ad absurdum. This method of refutation should be used sparingly, if at all. It usually wins a laugh from the audience, but it does little to advance one’s case. It invariably ends in a fallacy.

Reductio ad absurdum almost inevitably appears in any debate which concerns government ownership of a public utility.

The following is taken from a debate on government retention of Muscle Shoals:

If we adopt the plan of the affirmative and have the Federal government make nitrogen at Muscle Shoals, we shall only be taking one more step toward complete government control of every industry in the United States.

Evidently the gentlemen of the opposition would have the United States own and operate every railroad, street-car line, mine, telephone company, oil well, shipyard, and even the automobile industry of this country. Government operation of Muscle Shoals means eventually government operation in all industry.

The obvious fallacy in this refutation is that it is assumed that if the government owns one business it must own all. One might as well argue that if I drink a glass of water at a meal I shall eventually drink a barrel at a meal. Reductio ad absurdum usually contains this fallacy.

18. Method of residues. The method of residues is very useful in debate. It helps the debater to reduce the argument to the simplest possible terms, and it gives the audience a chance to see the argument as a whole. Care must be taken to see that all the possible points have been considered before the elimination can be called complete.

The method is to consider every possible argument, to eliminate each as worthless, and then to show that the proposition which your team supports is the only one tenable.

In 1775 Edmund Burke gave us one of the best examples of this form of refutation in his “Speech on Conciliation with America.”

In outline form what the great British orator said was this:

I. There are three ways of dealing with America:
   A. To change her spirit by removing the causes.
   B. To prosecute her as a criminal.
   C. To comply with that spirit of liberty.

Burke then proceeded to show that A would not work, because none of the six causes of the spirit of liberty could be changed; that plan B would not work for four reasons. Therefore, plan C was the only method left.

19. The dilemma. The dilemma is an excellent means of cornering one’s opponents, as well as a splendid method of limiting the main points of contention to the small number of two or three. A dilemma is the presentation of two alternatives, either one of which leads to disaster if the plan of the opposition is followed. For example, an affirmative team debating the proposition “Resolved, That the adoption of a ship subsidy by the
United States would be a wise national policy” declared that if the negative rejected the proposition of a ship subsidy, they must either let the merchant ships be sunk at the docks or have them sold for scrap iron. Either of these policies meant tremendous waste and financial loss. The other alternative, of selling the ships for use, had previously been disposed of by pointing out that six years of effort by the United States Shipping Board had failed to sell the fleet.

There are two methods of answering a dilemma. First, one may find a third horn, or possibility of escape. This method takes less time and is usually the easiest. The second method is to destroy one or both of the horns of the dilemma. Time is a requisite for this procedure, but the dilemma is completely destroyed if both horns are eliminated.

20. Refuting an argument before it has been advanced. Many debaters employ the terms “Our opponents may tell you” or “The opposition may bring up the point” so often that one wonders when they will answer what their opponents actually have brought up, instead of surmising what they may say.

Arguments should not be refuted before they are advanced, for four sound reasons:

a. At the beginning of each constructive argument time is given to each speaker to refute arguments already given; therefore it is unnecessary to anticipate any argument.

b. It is confusing, because the audience constantly wonders whether the argument is a part of one’s constructive case. The main issues are obscured by constant answering of what the opposition have not presented, but may present.

c. It creates the impression that material for the constructive case is so hard to find that the time must be employed in refutation, whether there is anything to refute or not.

d. It often puts into the minds of the opposition points which they had not planned to use. Thus the case is made more complex, and the team presenting the material have created extra work for themselves.

21. Plurality of causes. One of the first principles which the debater should learn is that of plurality of causes. Not one cause alone, but many, exist for each condition in society. To know and to apply this principle is a long step toward success in rebuttal.

An illustration occurred in a debate on the question of the Federal prohibition amendment. The affirmative declared that the amendment would eliminate poverty, and they created the impression that it would eradicate all poverty. The negative answered them by the principle of a plurality of causes. Alcoholism is not the only cause of pauperism. It is true that some poverty is caused by alcoholism; but the greater amount of it springs from such other factors as unemployment, low mentality, too many children per family, crime, ignorance, laziness, and ill health. Thus the passage of the Federal prohibition amendment does not mean the elimination of all poverty, because the liquor traffic is only one cause of this social evil.

22. Burden of proof. The burden of proof is borne by the team that is advocating a change. It is the affirmative who advocate an alteration of existing conditions.

In the proposition “Resolved, That the United States should join the League of Nations” the affirmative has the burden of proof, because at present the United States is not a member of the League.
Often in refutation the negative team keeps reminding
the audience that the affirmative has the burden of
proof. It is time and energy wasted to cry constantly,
"The affirmative have the burden of proof in this
debate!" unless a connection is made between the
burden of proof and the issues of the controversy.

One should always make clear how much burden of
proof the affirmative must bear. For example, in debat-
ing the Federal prohibition amendment the affirmative
claim that state laws are not enforced, and hence we
should have Federal legislation. Here the affirmative are
not assuming the burden of proof which is theirs. Conse-
quently the negative should reply by saying: "The
affirmative have not assumed the burden of proof which
is theirs in this debate. To win their case, they must
prove not only that conditions are bad, but that their
plan will improve them; they must prove not merely
that state liquor laws are badly enforced, but that Fed-
eral legislation will be enforced better. Until they meet
this issue the affirmative have ignored the burden of
proof which is theirs."

23. Admitting the truth of an opponent's argument. One
may admit the truth of an argument of the opposition,
provided that one does not indulge in the practice too
frequently or too far. The debater must be very careful
about admitting too much. To admit three points of the
opposition is a generous allowance. It is better to limit
the admissions to two or even one.

When admissions are made in rebuttal, one's col-
leagues should be consulted to make sure that the
admission will not contradict anything in their construc-
tive arguments, and that it will not hamper their plans
for refutation. What may be admitted should be thought
over before the debate takes place, so that no complica-
tions will be caused or fatal admissions made.

24. Quibbling. After a point has been tossed back and
forth between the teams for several speeches, the argu-
ment may degenerate into quibbling. In order to gain
time for the remaining issues of the debate, such quib-
bling may be stopped by either of two methods: (1) The
debater may pile up evidence to meet the point. He
may present a list of a dozen authorities, or he may
name six or seven examples. This, in addition to the
material previously presented, ought to clinch the point
sufficiently. (2) The debater may appeal to the judges
and the audience in words similar to the following:
"We have presented a dozen pieces of evidence to prove
our point about the percentage of literacy in the Philip-
pine Islands. Because of this we feel that the point
has been adequately answered. Therefore we leave this
question to the decision of you, our audience and judges."

After such an appeal to the judges has been made, the
team that again introduces the moot question is put in
the position of doubting the ability of the audience and
judges.

25. Too few specific instances to support the assertion.
Very often one's opponents give too few specific examples
to support an assertion. Sometimes a major issue is sup-
ported by only one example. In debating the question
of independence for the Philippine Islands the negative
claimed that the islands were on an unsound economic
basis. The sole example which they cited as proof was
that of the failure of the Philippine National Bank.

The affirmative replied that this was only one specific
example to prove a large issue in the debate. They cited
other economic factors, such as a favorable trade balance,
a large gold reserve, and the enormous increase in industry, which more than offset the one example of the bank failure.

26. Ignoring the question. Ignoring the question is fatal to the purpose of debate. If people talk beside the point, the discussion is practically worthless. Debaters should be careful never to ignore the question themselves; they should also attack their opponents when the latter are guilty of the offense.

Four of the most common methods of ignoring the question follow.

a. An appeal to prejudice and emotion. Debaters too often try to win by an emotional appeal the support which they have failed to gain through intellectual effort. These emotional appeals are known by such titles as “flag-waving,” “hot air,” and “patriotic pleas.”

In a recent debate on the question of the Federal child-labor amendment the third speaker of one team never mentioned the subject under discussion; instead, she ranted about the Stars and Stripes, Americanization, good citizenship, and what Lincoln said seventy-five years ago, all of which would have applied equally well to a discussion of military training, ship subsidy, the World Court, the League of Nations, or prohibition. When this debater had finished speaking, one of the audience remarked, “Well, she certainly waved the flag, didn’t she?” Such ranting is not sound argument, but merely an emotional appeal.

b. Personal attacks on those in the controversy. The proposition for debate is the subject which should be discussed. Personal attacks on those in the controversy are a phase of ignoring the question. Some people cannot debate the subject of the League of Nations without attacking Woodrow Wilson. Such attacks contribute nothing to the real subject for discussion — the League of Nations. Others cannot debate the question of prohibition without slandering the Anti-Saloon League.

c. The appeal to tradition. Debaters frequently appeal to the conservative element of an audience by claiming that their plan has been good enough for the past hundred or more years, and therefore it is good enough to stand now. Their plea is “let well enough alone.” This is one of the points which is always advanced against every attempt to add an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

It is pernicious, because it ignores the real issues in the debate, and at the same time it leads the audience to believe that they are hearing a sound reason. Fortunately this stock appeal to tradition is being heard less frequently than it once was. When it is used, it may be advantageously attacked by the method of reductio ad absurdum.

d. Shifting the ground to a related proposition. One of the easiest methods of ignoring the real question at issue is to shift one’s argument to a related proposition. Constant vigilance is necessary to prevent students who are debating the proposition of the World Court from shifting to the League of Nations. In a debate on motion-picture censorship, speakers inevitably drag in arguments about the regulation of other theatrical enterprises. Debaters on the question of the Japanese exclusion act are in constant danger of talking more about our other immigration laws than about the one relative to the Japanese. It is difficult to keep a debate on the Mitchell air-service plan from becoming a discussion of pros and cons of disarmament.
Shifting ground to a related proposition is an easy way of ignoring the question. This and the three others cited must be constantly warded off. The debater should attack opponents for ignoring the question in any of the ways previously mentioned, because such practices confuse the audience, confuse the issues, and retard both cases. In debate we are always bound for a definite goal, which will never be reached by ignoring the question in any form.

To become skillful in debate it is necessary to become skillful in rebuttal. This requires a knowledge of the principles of refutation, and experience in applying them. Practice — thoughtful, painstaking practice — is necessary. One should accept every opportunity to gain rebuttal skill. He should debate in the classroom, in the debating society, and in interschool contests. He should learn from the criticisms of colleagues, opponents, judges, teachers, and friends. These are the means of acquiring skill in rebuttal.

Conclusion. The more one studies the art of debate, the more one realizes how tremendous the subject is. It necessitates a knowledge not only of the field of public speaking, but also of history, English, rhetoric, logic, and psychology. In debating the various subjects one needs a knowledge of politics, science, engineering, law, sociology, mathematics, the languages, and economics; in fact, it is hard to name a single phase of human knowledge which is not useful at some time or other in the art of debate. For this reason the skillful debater must be a well-read individual. He must also keep his knowledge up to date by a constant study of current affairs.

To this fund of knowledge the debater must add an ever-increasing fund of experience. Demosthenes did not gain his forensic powers over night. Hours of thought, hours of practice, were back of his achievement. Remembering this, every debater must keep in mind that patience and painstaking practice are the cornerstones of his future success.

The eight chapters of this book have for their aim the training of skillful debaters. Those who will follow its precepts will find themselves rewarded a hundredfold. Debating means development of personality in all its phases; it means intellectual combat of the keenest sort; it means a mind that is alive to the teaching of the past and alert to the problems of the present; it means readiness in grasping quickly what is being said in one's presence; it means the ability to face an audience with poise under all circumstances; finally, because it does mean such rich rewards, the art of debate means also the greatest possible mental exhilaration. At its best the development of a sound constructive case, combined with the rapid fire of rebuttal, arouses a feeling that is seldom found elsewhere. Because the art of debate is so vitally alive, those who follow it gain much for themselves and for their fellow citizens.

EXERCISES

1. Point out the methods of refutation that may be used at the beginning of the constructive arguments which are given in Appendix D.

2. Criticize your next class debate on the basis of the fifteen rules for the delivery of refutation.

3. What methods of refutation did Lincoln use in his speech at Peoria, Illinois, on October 16, 1854?

4. What methods of refutation were used by Daniel Webster in his famous reply to Senator Robert Y. Hayne, which was given in January, 1830?
5. What methods of refutation were used by Demosthenes in his oration "On the Crown"?

6. Study, name, and criticize the methods of refutation that are used in the debates which are recorded in "Intercollegiate Debates for 1924-1925," Vol. XI.

7. Name the methods of refutation which your classmates use in their next debate. Criticize them, and point out how better results may be achieved.

8. Prepare a five-minute refutation of the charges which are commonly listed against the following historical characters:

   a. Alcibiades
   b. Lucretia Borgia
   c. Titus Oates
   d. Aaron Burr
   e. Nero
   f. Shylock
   g. Benedict Arnold
   h. Lord North
   i. Andrew Johnson
   j. Mary Tudor

9. Prepare a five-minute refutation of the charges which are being brought against some prominent political leader.

10. Prepare a five-minute refutation of the attacks which have been made against the following:

    a. The World Court
    b. Prohibition
    c. The direct primary
    d. The League of Nations

APPENDIX A

PROPOSITIONS FOR DEBATE

The following list of two hundred and fifteen propositions is given to aid the debater in selecting interesting topics for debate. The subjects are stated in proposition form so that the material may be used for criticism in connection with the exercises in Chapter II and so that the debater may have the practice of restating the proposition to fit his own needs. Time will make some of the propositions undebatable, but most of them will, with slight wording, be timely for years. All these questions have been tested in classroom debates or interschool contests.

I. Propositions pertaining to School

1. Resolved, That modern literature should be studied to a greater extent in our English courses.

2. Resolved, That girls are better students than boys.

3. Resolved, That students who accept offices should retain the office until the end of the term. Sickness or death should be the only excuse for resignation.

4. Resolved, That the system of honor points at ——— High School should be abolished.

5. Resolved, That intercollegiate football should be abolished.

6. Resolved, That all schools should be closed on Armistice Day.

7. Resolved, That the students of our school should maintain a higher moral standard than they now do.
8. Resolved, That the girls of —— High School should wear uniform dress.
9. Resolved, That the Student Council is a success.
10. Resolved, That our school should have a new auditorium.
11. Resolved, That all extra-curricular activities should be abolished.
12. Resolved, That the eight semester rules for athletes in interschool competition should be abolished.
13. Resolved, That the interschool debates scheduled for this term should be judgeless.
14. Resolved, That the complete segregation of the sexes is desirable in secondary schools.
15. Resolved, That coeducation is more desirable than segregation in college.
16. Resolved, That our school should adopt the honor system for examinations.
17. Resolved, That in high schools the commercial course is more beneficial than the literary course.
18. Resolved, That English classes should devote one day of each week to speech-making.
19. Resolved, That four years of physical education should be required of every student in college.
20. Resolved, That every boy should be compelled to take military training for two years of his high-school course.
21. Resolved, That students who receive an average of A should be excused from final examinations.
22. Resolved, That the senior-class memorial should be in the form of a scholarship.
23. Resolved, That at least one third of the faculty of our state university should be women.
24. Resolved, That fraternities and sororities should be legally permitted in high schools.
25. Resolved, That at least one third of the members of the board of regents of the state university should be women.
26. Resolved, That our state university should build a much larger football stadium than it now has.

II. PROPOSITIONS PERTAINING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. Resolved, That our city should adopt a zoning system.
2. Resolved, That —— should be elected mayor of our city.
3. Resolved, That citizens of the United States who fail to vote at three successive elections should be deprived of their franchise.
4. Resolved, That our municipal court has proved successful.
5. Resolved, That our city should have a subway system immediately.
6. Resolved, That our city should adopt the city-manager form of government.
7. Resolved, That —— should be elected to fill the vacancy in the city council.
8. Resolved, That —— should be elected to fill the vacancy on the board of education.
9. Resolved, That our city should build an elevated-railway system.
10. Resolved, That —— is the best newspaper in our city.
11. Resolved, That we should build a new city hall.
12. Resolved, That municipal ownership and operation of the street railways has proved successful.
13. Resolved, That our city is morally better than the newspapers picture it.
14. Resolved, That our city should own and operate the gas plant.
15. Resolved, That the prohibition laws should be better enforced in our city.
16. Resolved, That our city should annex the suburb of ——.
17. Resolved, That municipal elections should be conducted without reference to the national political parties.
18. Resolved, That our city should establish a municipal flying field.
19. Resolved, That New York City should be made a metropolitan area apart from the remainder of the state.
20. Resolved, That our city should establish a new municipal market.
21. Resolved, That our city should build a combination ice-skating and roller-skating rink.
22. Resolved, That our city should immediately build a new jail.
23. Resolved, That our city would be better under the open-shop system than under the closed-shop system.
24. Resolved, That the short ballot should be adopted in county elections.
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25. Resolved, That more women should be chosen for jury service.
26. Resolved, That a vote of only three fourths of the jury should be necessary for conviction.
27. Resolved, That Sunday moving pictures should be prohibited in this community.
28. Resolved, That jail sentences should be the sole penalty for guilt in serious automobile accidents.
29. Resolved, That our city needs more women on the police force.

III. PROPOSITIONS PERTAINING TO STATE AFFAIRS

1. Resolved, That voting in state elections should be made compulsory.
2. Resolved, That the system of nomination by primaries should be retained.
3. Resolved, That the initiative and referendum should be adopted by our state.
4. Resolved, That our state should adopt capital punishment.
5. Resolved, That the system of the recall of judges should be adopted by our state.
6. Resolved, That the cabinet-parliamentary system of government should be adopted by our state.
7. Resolved, That the budget system of appropriations is successful in our state.
8. Resolved, That our state legislature should meet annually instead of biennially.
9. Resolved, That our state legislature should be unicameral.
10. Resolved, That all deer-hunting should be prohibited in our state for five years.
11. Resolved, That all pheasant-shooting should be prohibited for ten years.
12. Resolved, That the pardoning power of the governor of our state should be greatly restricted.
13. Resolved, That representation in the state legislature should be on the basis of territory rather than population.
14. Resolved, That the state police are beneficial to our state.
15. Resolved, That the state income tax should be abolished.
16. Resolved, That the state inheritance tax should be abolished.
17. Resolved, That the system of a single tax should be established.
18. Resolved, That our state should adopt a sales tax.
19. Resolved, That the gasoline tax should be adopted in our state.
20. Resolved, That our state should reforest its waste lands.
21. Resolved, That our state should limit the cutting of evergreen trees for Christmas purposes.
22. Resolved, That our state should adopt state censorship of the motion pictures.
23. Resolved, That our state should adopt a system of old-age pensions.
24. Resolved, That our state should adopt compulsory health insurance.
25. Resolved, That our state should give government aid to the unemployed.
26. Resolved, That our state should adopt a system of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.
27. Resolved, That our state should adopt a minimum wage for women in industry.
28. Resolved, That prohibition has proved successful in our state.
29. Resolved, That all automobiles in our state should be equipped with governors.
30. Resolved, That the short ballot should be adopted in all state elections.
31. Resolved, That the Criminal Syndicalism Law of California should be repealed.
32. Resolved, That the states of the United States should limit the right of suffrage to persons who can read and write.
33. Resolved, That —— should be the next governor of the state.

IV. PROPOSITIONS PERTAINING TO NATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Resolved, That the adoption of a ship subsidy would be a wise national policy.
2. Resolved, That —— should be given the Republican nomination for the presidency in the next election.
3. Resolved, That —— should be given the Democratic nomination for the presidency in the next election.
4. Resolved, That the United States should adopt the British plan of unemployment insurance.
5. Resolved, That the term of office of the president of the United States should be six years, with no re-election.
6. Resolved, That the presidential electoral college should be abolished.
7. Resolved, That the cabinet-parliamentary system of government should be adopted by the United States.
8. Resolved, That the United States should construct the St. Lawrence waterway jointly with Canada.
9. Resolved, That the United States government should own and operate Muscle Shoals.
10. Resolved, That lobbying in Congress should be restricted.
11. Resolved, That the Sherman Anti-Trust Act should be repealed.
12. Resolved, That debate in Congress should be further restricted.
13. Resolved, That the date of the presidential inauguration should be changed to December of the year when election takes place.
14. Resolved, That the diplomatic and consular service promotions should be on the basis of merit and years in the service.
15. Resolved, That the United States should have a Federal inheritance tax.
16. Resolved, That the proposed child-labor amendment to the national Constitution should be adopted.
17. Resolved, That our national parks should be protected from all encroachments of private interests.
18. Resolved, That all super-power projects should be developed by the Federal government exclusively.
19. Resolved, That the McNary-Haugen Bill for the marketing of farm produce should be adopted.
20. Resolved, That the Federal government should own and operate the coal mines of the United States.
21. Resolved, That the United States should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law.
22. Resolved, That the Federal government should own and operate our merchant marine.
23. Resolved, That the Federal government should own and operate the railroads of the United States.
24. Resolved, That the United States should restrict all immigration for a period of five years.
25. Resolved, That the Federal government should have an air service separate from the army and navy.
26. Resolved, That the United States should continue its present immigration policy.
27. Resolved, That the United States should adopt the Mitchell plan for an air service.
28. Resolved, That the United States should exclude all political agitators.
29. Resolved, That the United States should compel all aliens to become United States citizens after ten years' residence, with the penalty of deportation.
30. Resolved, That the United States should adopt a system of compulsory military training.
31. Resolved, That the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Law is desirable.
32. Resolved, That the United States should adopt a system of free trade.
33. Resolved, That justices of the United States Supreme Court should be retired at seventy-five years.
34. Resolved, That the Adamson Railroad Law should be repealed.
35. Resolved, That employees of the Federal government should be unionized.

36. Resolved, That the United States should fortify the Panama Canal.
37. Resolved, That the United States should have reciprocity with Canada.
38. Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission should be abolished.
39. Resolved, That the president's cabinet should have the right to participate in congressional action.
40. Resolved, That the Volstead Act should be amended to permit the sale of light wines and beer.
41. Resolved, That the prohibition laws should be better enforced.
42. Resolved, That a decision of the United States Supreme Court may be overruled by a two-thirds vote of Congress.
43. Resolved, That the United States would be benefited by the existence of a third political party.
44. Resolved, That the United States should adopt a system of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes in public utilities.
45. Resolved, That the excess-profits tax should be repealed.
46. Resolved, That the United States should have a labor party in politics.
47. Resolved, That the power of the Federal Supreme Court shall be limited to declaring statutes unconstitutional.
48. Resolved, That the United States should have a secretary of education in the president's cabinet.
49. Resolved, That the Federal government should supply work for the unemployed.
50. Resolved, That the Federal government should own the telegraph and telephone lines of the United States.
51. Resolved, That no income tax should be levied on incomes under five thousand dollars per year.
52. Resolved, That the House of Representatives should not exceed five hundred members.
53. Resolved, That present tax-exempt securities shall be subject to taxation.
54. Resolved, That in time of war the material resources of the nation shall be subject to draft.
55. Resolved, That more women should be seated in both Houses of Congress.

56. Resolved, That Thomas Edison is the greatest living citizen of the United States.

57. Resolved, That the president of the United States should be elected directly by the people.

58. Resolved, That the United States should treat the American Indians more fairly in respect to land, money, and schools.

59. Resolved, That all laws which restrict freedom of speech in the United States should be repealed.

60. Resolved, That the United States government should lease Muscle Shoals to a private company.

61. Resolved, That national political parties are justified in receiving large financial contributions from corporations and private individuals.

62. Resolved, That the United States postal employees should receive a minimum annual salary of twenty-five hundred dollars.

63. Resolved, That the forty-four-hour week should be made universal for women in industry.

64. Resolved, That the United States navy should be kept up to the standard set by the Washington Conference in 1922.

65. Resolved, That participation of the United States in the Olympic games should be discontinued.

66. Resolved, That trade unions have proved beneficial in the United States.

67. Resolved, That the Curtis Bill for a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights for men and women in the United States and its territories should be adopted.

68. Resolved, That ex-presidents of the United States should have seats for life in the Senate.

69. Resolved, That the United States government is unsuited to the administration of colonial dependencies.

70. Resolved, That foreign-built ships owned by American citizens should be granted American registry.

71. Resolved, That the prison system in the United States should be revised so that it will be more reformatory and less punitive than it now is.
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V. PROPOSITIONS PERTAINING TO INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Resolved, That the United States should join the World Court.

2. Resolved, That the United States should join the League of Nations.

3. Resolved, That the United States should abandon the Monroe Doctrine.

4. Resolved, That Germany should be compelled to pay her reparations.

5. Resolved, That the United States should abandon her policy of political aloofness.

6. Resolved, That the Fascisti are a menace to Italy.

7. Resolved, That the French war debt to the United States should be canceled.

8. Resolved, That the American marines should be withdrawn from Nicaragua at once.

9. Resolved, That the countries of the three Americas should organize a Pan-American League of Nations.

10. Resolved, That the Locarno compact will be beneficial.

11. Resolved, That the Philippine Islands should be given their immediate and complete independence.

12. Resolved, That the United States should guarantee the integrity of China in respect to her customs and courts.

13. Resolved, That self-determination is a wise principle in the control of nations.

14. Resolved, That the people of India should be granted their independence.

15. Resolved, That the open-door policy should be retained in China.

16. Resolved, That the establishment of mandates over small nations has proved successful.

17. Resolved, That the United States should take the initiative toward further disarmament.

18. Resolved, That the United States should refrain from practicing military maneuvers in the Pacific Ocean during the next ten years.
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19. Resolved, That the United States should recognize the Soviet government of Russia.
20. Resolved, That poison gas should be prohibited in warfare.
21. Resolved, That the use of submarines should be prohibited in warfare.
22. Resolved, That the Dawes plan has proved beneficial.
23. Resolved, That war should be outlawed as an international crime.
24. Resolved, That France was justified in her occupation of the Ruhr.
25. Resolved, That the Nationalist movement in China is a good thing for the world.
26. Resolved, That Japan is justified in retaining a military hold on Manchuria.
27. Resolved, That Syria should be freed from the occupation of a foreign power.
28. Resolved, That a nation advanced in civilization is justified, in the interests of humanity at large, in enforcing its authority upon an inferior people.

VI. PROPOSITIONS OF A LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL NATURE

1. Resolved, That the study of Latin and Greek should be compulsory in high school.
2. Resolved, That all professors in the colleges of the United States should have complete academic freedom.
3. Resolved, That contemporary American poetry is superior to that produced in the United States before 1900.
4. Resolved, That contemporary American literature surpasses contemporary British literature in quantity and quality.
5. Resolved, That ——— is the greatest living American orator.
6. Resolved, That ——— is the greatest living European orator.
7. Resolved, That Edith Wharton is the greatest living American novelist.
8. Resolved, That Shakespearean plays are ruined by production in modern settings and costumes.
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EXERCISES IN PRONUNCIATION AND ENUNCIATION

The following list gives the words which are habitually mispronounced by both high-school and college debaters. Most of the words are used so frequently in public speaking, that it behooves the amateur debater to familiarize himself with the list, until he is sure that he will never again be guilty of mispronouncing any of the words. The most common errors in pronunciation are stated in parentheses after some of the words.

1. because (becuz) 19. for (fur)
2. statistics
3. affirmative (firmative)
4. evidently
5. Detroit (De'troit)
6. Monroe (Mon'roe)
7. La Follette
8. aviator
9. maintain
10. just (jist or jest)
11. against (aginst)
12. let me (lemme)
13. everybody (ev'erybudy)
14. company (compy)
15. educate (ejiccate)
16. immediately (amediate or emediate)
17. financiers
18. Philippines (Philippines')
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38. revere
39. rural
40. Lincoln (Lin-kun)
41. colleagues (colleagues')
42. government (goerment)
43. civilization
44. probably (probly)
45. well (wal)
46. get (git)
47. men (min)
48. parental
49. yet (yit)
50. dispatch
51. literature
52. economics
53. one of them (one of um)
54. told them (told um)
55. tradition (tra'dition)

Many debaters are careless about enunciation. Especially do they ignore the vowels and final consonants. Drill on the following words will train debaters to sound all of a word that should be sounded, and to end the words decisively and distinctly. Lip laziness is unpardonable in debating.

I. Words with Long Vowels

1. breed
2. dream
3. seem
4. street
5. free
6. queen
7. teach
8. snow
9. feed
10. bleed
11. blame
12. gay
13. graze
14. day
15. grave
16. rate
17. made
18. grow
19. loom
20. drove
21. noon
22. soon
23. loop
24. brave

II. Words ending in k or d

1. block
2. rock
3. stack
4. lack
5. trend
6. weld
7. lend
8. tend
9. mend
10. dock
11. shrink
12. tick
13. dusk
14. husk
15. tuck
16. cloak
17. stock
18. luck
19. truck
20. stuck
21. quick
22. brick
23. wick
### III. Words Containing s and Ending in s

1. statistics
2. wasps
3. claps
4. disks
5. dusts
6. rusts
7. nests
8. tests
9. rests
10. guests
11. lips
12. deeks
13. masks
14. gabs
15. tasks
16. barks
17. asks
18. hasps
19. masts
20. lasts
21. risks

### IV. Words ending with the Sound of t

1. hit
2. rate
3. late
4. date
5. trot
6. spot
7. lot
8. skate
9. migrate
10. loft
11. raft
12. cleft
13. gate
14. mate
15. fate
16. hate
17. ate
18. bait
19. cat
20. daunt
21. emulate
22. inflate
23. innate
24. zest

### V. Words ending with Dental Sounds

1. breathed
2. rubbed
3. loved
4. lisped
5. debt
6. robed
7. moved
8. mused
9. clothed
10. loathed
11. rowed
12. load
13. hazed
14. coached
15. broached
16. touched
17. pitched
18. hitched
19. writhed
20. bathed
21. raised
22. gazed
23. amazed
24. blazed
25. dazed
26. clasped
27. gasped
28. arrived
29. abused
30. fused
31. used
32. bleached
33. reached
34. housed
35. dived
36. shoved
37. husked
38. hustled
39. hurried
40. laughed
41. lived
42. sighed

### VI. Words with Nasal Sounds

1. pumpkin
2. run
3. skunk
4. hen
5. pen
6. lung
7. wrung
8. link
9. hyphen
10. haven
11. happen
12. dozen
13. length
14. monk
15. thank
16. ninth
17. tenth
18. eleventh
19. seventh
20. tongue
21. seven
22. loosen
23. raise
24. cousin
25. singer
26. triumph
27. trunk
28. flagon
29. solemn
30. crowned
31. mound
32. drowned
33. blazon
34. mason
35. lessen
36. opposition
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MODEL BRIEFS ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

It would be a fairly simple matter to give here a pair of briefs made out by one person, joining issues exactly and covering the whole case of the League of Nations, affirmative and negative. But when two teams meet in debate in actual practice, they do not have such model briefs. Each side makes out its own brief, and the result is that the issues do not necessarily join directly but have to be joined by the two teams as the debate proceeds. This process of joining the issues is in large part a matter of adaptation, in both the constructive and rebuttal speeches. It is part of the task of the good debater to learn the process.

It therefore seems best to give here such briefs as two teams, each working independently, might evolve in the preparation for actual debate. It also seems best, in the interest of clearness, to leave out of the briefs all material for refutation, since this type of material is treated elsewhere in this book. The following briefs do not, then, constitute a complete debate on the League of Nations. Rather they attempt to show how two teams, working in preparation for a debate quite independently of each other, may organize their cases in brief form.
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AFFIRMATIVE BRIEF OF THE CONSTRUCTIVE ARGUMENTS FOR THE PROPOSITION

Resolved, That the United States should join the League of Nations.

INTRODUCTION

I. Origin of the question
At the present time the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations is being discussed with rapidly increasing interest. Citizens of the United States have this renewed interest in the League because of its study of economic conditions, of disarmament, and of the causes of war. Interest in the League of Nations is shown by the rapid growth in the United States of such organizations as the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association.

II. History of the question
The League of Nations was organized as a result of the World War. The armistice with Germany was concluded upon the basis of the Fourteen Points enunciated by the President of the United States on January 8, 1918. The Fourteenth Point was "A general association of nations must be formed . . . for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." January 25, 1919, the Preliminary Peace Conference passed the following resolution:

A. "It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement, which the associated nations are now met to establish, that a League of Nations be created to promote international cooperation, to insure the fulfillment of international obligations, and to provide safeguards against war.

B. "This League . . . should be open to every civilized country which can be relied upon to promote its objects.

1 Handbook of the League of Nations (March 1, 1923), p. 226.
C. "The members of the League should periodically meet in international conference, and should have a permanent organization and secretariat to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the conferences." January 10, 1920, at 4:15 P.M., the League of Nations formally came into being by the official deposit of the ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles at the French Foreign Office at Paris. Thus nineteen nations became members. Within two months, forty-two states had become original members.

III. Definition of terms

A. The League of Nations is an organization of fifty-four nations. The only ten eligible countries in the world which are not members are Afghanistan, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Nejd, Mexico, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (Russia), Turkey, and the United States. All of these except the Sultanate of Nejd participate in some activities of the League.

B. The League consists of an Assembly, which meets annually, and in which each nation has one vote, though its delegation may consist of three representatives. The Assembly acts on such questions as the admission of new members and the election of temporary members of the League Council, the adoption of the budget, and on resolutions expressing the desire of the member states to have many questions examined or acted upon by the Council, committees, or special conferences. Once in nine years the Assembly, acting jointly with the Council, elects the judges of the Permanent Court. The last Assembly met in September, 1928.
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C. The Council of the League consists of fourteen member states. The British Empire, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan are permanent members. The other nine are elected by the Assembly. Each state determines its personal representative in the Council. The Council is capable of enlargement, originally having consisted of eight and later of ten members. It deals with most of the League business. It may meet whenever necessary; it has four regular meetings annually. Up to August, 1928, it had met fifty times.

D. The Secretariat consists of over four hundred persons of forty nationalities, under international civil-service rules, performing duties of a secretarial nature, collecting and publishing information and reports, and executing decisions of the Assembly and Council.

E. Action is taken (1) by resolutions of the Assembly or Council; and (2) by conferences of member and nonmember states, which produce international conventions, subject to ratification by each state.

F. Entry into the League in this debate means either with or without reservations to the Covenant.

G. "The League stands for world peace, social improvement, and justice."  

IV. Admitted matter

A. It is admitted that all the world wants to abolish war and its causes.

B. It is admitted that to achieve this some form of organization is necessary.

C. It is admitted that the present Covenant of the League of Nations may be changed by reservations which will satisfy the United States.

V. Main issues

A. Can the United States much longer keep out of the League of Nations?

B. Has the League of Nations worked?

---

1 Handbook of the League of Nations (March 1, 1929), p. 225.
2 This statement was corrected to March, 1929.
3 Eighth Yearbook of the League of Nations, Record of 1927, p. 2.
4 Lucia Ames Mead, in the Woman Citizen, July 28, 1928.

---

1 Yearbook of the League of Nations, 1925, p. 297.
2 Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, December 30, 1927.
C. Will the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations increase the League’s power to undertake measures which will benefit the whole world?
D. Does public opinion demand that the United States enter the League of Nations?

VI. Division of the issues among the speakers
A. First speaker
B. Second speaker
C. Third speaker
D. Third speaker

ARGUMENT

I. The United States cannot much longer keep out of the League of Nations, for
A. The United States has increasingly felt that it was necessary to be represented in many League conferences and commissions, for, among others,
1. The United States had unofficial observers at the Brussels Financial Conference in 1920.
2. The United States had official observers on the Anthrax and Emigration Commissions of the International Labor Office.
3. The United States has an official member on the Health Committee of the League.
4. The United States had an unofficial observer and for several years has had an unofficial member on the Advisory Committee on Opium, and sent an official delegation to the Second Opium Conference.
5. The United States has participated officially in the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference since its beginning in 1925.
6. The United States sent an official delegation to the International Conference on the Control of the Traffic in Arms and Munitions, the conventions of which were signed by our representatives.
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B. Over one hundred and fifty prominent citizens of the United States, who may be considered to show the trend of intelligent public opinion, have been actively engaged in League of Nations work, for, among many others,
1. John Bassett Moore was elected a judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice in 1921, and Charles Evans Hughes was elected to succeed him in 1928.
2. Dr. Hugh S. Cumming and Dr. Josephine Baker have been on the Health Committee.
3. Mrs. Hamilton Wright has been Assessor of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium.
4. Emma D. Cushman has been on the Committee on Deportation of Women and Children.
5. Manley O. Hudson, Professor of Law at Harvard, has been a member of the Legal Section of the Secretariat.
6. Huntington Gilchrist has been a member of the Administrative Commissions Section and of the Mandates Section of the Secretariat.
7. Jeremiah Smith, Jr., was commissioner for the financial construction of Hungary and is a member of the Financial Committee.

C. The United States is actively interested in the international health work of the League, for
1. Representative officials of the United States government have allied themselves with the League, for
a. The Surgeon- General of the United States Public Health Service is a member of the Health Committee of the League.
b. Through the League of Nations, the Rockefeller Foundation, an important American philanthropic institution, appropriated thirty-two thousand dollars annually for five years for an

1 American Cooperation with Other Nations through the League of Nations, 1919–1926, p. 12.
1 Ibid. p. 14.
epidemiological intelligence service, and sixty thousand a year for three years for the interchange of public-health officials.1

2. The League provides the United States with information which is indispensable, for
   a. The valuable plague-reporting service of the Epidemiological Intelligence Bureau at Singapore, which the Rockefeller Foundation made possible, is vital to the national health of the United States.2
   b. The findings of the conferences held by the League during 1926 on infant mortality, cancer, health insurance, malaria, and the sleeping sickness are instances in one year of work vital to the national health of the United States.3
   c. The findings of the International Anti-Rabies Conference, sponsored by the League at Paris in 1927, are vital to the national health of the United States.3

II. The League of Nations has worked, for
   A. It has provided machinery for the consideration and study of international problems, for
      1. It has determined, through its Committee for the Progressive Codification of International Law, two series of eleven questions as ripe for codification, including such matters as nationality, diplomatic privileges, procedure of international conferences and procedure for the drafting of treaties, and the status of government ships engaged in ordinary commerce.4
   B. The International Economic Conference in 1927 laid down a program of policy and reform accepted throughout the world as of basic importance, and its

2 Seventh Yearbook of the League of Nations, Record of 1926, p. 292.
3 Eighth Yearbook of the League of Nations, Record of 1927, p. 142.
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4. The International Anti-Rabies Conference, with representatives from anti-rabies institutes in twenty-seven countries, was sponsored by the League at Paris, in 1927.1

F. It is promoting the teaching in schools of the aims of the League in order to promote an understanding among the nations.3

G. It is accomplishing splendid humanitarian work, for

1. The League prepared an International Slavery Convention in 1926, which has now been generally ratified.3

2. The League repatriated 430,000 prisoners of war at a cost of $5 per person.4

3. The League is settling 1,500,000 refugees on the land in Greece and Bulgaria, and has aided hundreds of thousands of Russian and Armenian refugees.

4. The League is making progress in controlling the opium menace, for

a. The Opium Commission in eleven sessions has been able to collect much information as to the illicit traffic and to make war against the traffickers.5

b. "Colonel McCormack, an American representing the Persia government, stated that Persia was prepared as a result of the League's inquiry to cut down her poppy-growing 10 per cent a year for the next three years." Persia is one of the most important opium-producing countries.6

H. It has settled many disputes in the past eight years, for

1. The dispute between Finland and Sweden over the

Åland Islands was settled by the Council and the Islands neutralized by treaty as a consequence.1

2. The Mosul dispute between Turkey, Iran, and Great Britain, involving 35,000 square miles and 800,000 people, was referred to the League of Nations on August 6, 1924, and settled on December 16, 1925.3

3. The Vilna dispute between Poland and Lithuania was referred to the League by Poland on September 5, 1920, and the decision of March 15, 1923, established a condition which has prevented war between those two states.5

4. The dispute over Upper Silesia between Poland and Germany was settled on August 25, 1925, and a special régime established under treaty.1

I. The Permanent Mandates Commission examines annually the administration of mandatory states in fifteen backward territories formerly under the control of Germany and Turkey, and insures justice to the natives.4

J. It provides machinery for the registration of treaties, for

1. From 1920 to 1928 over 1700 treaties were registered with the Secretariat and published by it, for

a. The ratifications of conventions signed at diplomatic conferences held under the auspices of the League are deposited with the Secretariat.

b. The ratifications of the Locarno treaties were deposited by Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Poland on October 16, 1926.4

2. The United States files her treaties at Geneva for publication.

1 American Journal of International Law (April, 1927), p. 318.
2 Quinley Wright, American Journal of International Law (July, 1926), p. 453.
3 American Journal of International Law, July, 1926.
5 Ibid. April, 1927.
6 Ibid. April, 1927.
7 Ibid. (April, 1927), p. 324.
III. The entrance of the United States into the League of Nations will increase the League's power to undertake measures which will benefit the whole world, for
A. The economic, humanitarian, and hygienic matters with which it deals touch the whole world, including the United States, and her cooperation is needed if the handling is to be satisfactorily planned and executed.
B. The reduction of armament, a step toward abolishing war, could be more effectively carried out under the League if the United States were a member, for
1. The United States admits this by participating in the work of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.
2. The United States called the Washington Conference on disarmament in 1921.¹
C. Although the nations which are members of the League have come very near abolishing war among themselves, not until all nations are pledged to the "cooling-off period" will fear of another and far more terrible war subside.²

IV. Public opinion demands that the United States enter the League of Nations, for
A. Qualified citizens participate in the work of the League because they believe it to be the best organization through which to get available results of world-wide scope.
B. Leaders of thought are in favor of American entrance into the League, for
1. Elihu Root, international-law expert and statesman, declared in December, 1926: "For these years the League in the political field and the Court in the judicial field have been rendering the best service in the cause of peace known to the history of civilization; incomparably the best."³
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2. William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, said, "Labor believes that the rank and file of our citizenry want our government to do its full part for the development of agencies to deal with issues concerned with international relations."¹

C. Many national organizations advocate joining the League, for
1. The Federal Council of Churches, representing twenty million church members and twenty-nine denominations, has declared: "The supreme hope for the future is in the League of Nations. The United States must join."²
2. "At its convention which closed July twenty-first [1928] at Portland, Oregon, the American Association of University Women adopted a resolution endorsing the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations."³
3. The League of Nations Non-Partisan Association has developed active branches in the states and many localities.
4. Organizations such as the National Federation of Women's Clubs and the National League of Women Voters include study of the League in their programs.

D. In the Republican party, formerly opposed to the League, sentiment for entrance into the League has increased, for
1. In the election of 1920, thirty-one prominent Republicans, including two who later became members of the Harding cabinet, urged that a vote for their candidate should be a vote for the League.⁴
2. The political controversy of 1919-1920 about entering the League no longer existed in the election of 1928.

³ Ibid. p. 28.
⁴ Samuel Colcord, The Great Deception, p. 119.
II. History of the question

The League of Nations was organized as a result of the World War. The armistice with Germany was concluded upon the basis of the Fourteen Points enunciated by President Wilson on January 8, 1918. The Fourteenth Point was "A general association of nations must be formed ... for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." January 25, 1919, the Preliminary Peace Conference passed the following:

A. "It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement, which the associated nations are now met to establish, that a League of Nations be created to promote international cooperation, to insure the fulfillment of international obligations, and to provide safeguards against war.

B. "This League... should be open to every civilized country which can be relied upon to promote its objects.

C. "The members of the League should periodically meet in international conference, and should have a permanent organization and secretariat to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the conferences." January 10, 1920, at 4:15 P.M., the League of Nations formally came into being by the official deposit of the ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles at the French Foreign Office at Paris. Thus nineteen nations became members. Within two months, forty-two states had become original members.

III. Definition of terms

A. The League of Nations is an organization of fifty-four nations. The only ten eligible countries in the world which are not members are Afghanistan, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Nejd, Mexico, the Union of

---

1 Handbook of the League of Nations (March 1, 1923), p. 226.
2 This statement was corrected to March 1, 1929.
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Socialist Soviet Republics (Russia), Turkey, and the United States. All of these except the Sultanate of Nejd participate in some activities of the League.1

B. The League consists of an Assembly, which meets annually, and in which each nation has one vote. The Assembly acts on such questions as the admission of new members and the election of temporary members of the League Council, the adoption of the budget, and on resolutions expressing the desire of the member states to have many questions examined or acted upon by the Council or committees. Once in nine years the Assembly, acting jointly with the Council, elects the judges of the Permanent Court.2 The last Assembly met in September, 1928.

C. The Council of the League consists of fourteen member states. The British Empire, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan are permanent members. The other nine are elected by the Assembly. Each state determines its personal representative in the Council. The Council is capable of enlargement, originally having consisted of eight and later of ten members. It deals with most of the League business. It may meet whenever necessary; it has four regular meetings annually.3 Up to August, 1928, it had met fifty times.

D. The Secretariat consists of over four hundred persons of forty nationalities, under international civil-service rules, performing duties of a secretarial nature, collecting and publishing information and reports, and executing decisions of the Assembly and Council.

E. Action is taken (1) by resolutions of the Assembly or Council; and (2) by conferences of member and nonmember states, which produce international conventions, subject to ratification by each state.
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F. Entry into the League in this debate means either with or without reservations to the Covenant.

G. "The League stands for world peace, social improvement, and justice."1

IV. Admitted matter

A. It is admitted that all the world wants to abolish war and its causes.

B. It is admitted that to achieve this some form of organization is necessary.

C. It is admitted that the present Covenant of the League of Nations may be changed by reservations which will satisfy the United States.

V. Main issues

A. Should the United States join the League of Nations simply because it would be beneficial to participate in some of the League's activities?

B. Should the United States join the League, thereby giving up her traditional policy of political isolation?

C. Can the United States work as effectively for peace outside the League?

D. Should the United States enter the League, considering that the League was designed as an instrument of power rather than an instrument of justice?

E. Is the independent position of the United States advantageous both for itself and for the League?

VI. Division of the issues among the speakers

A. First speaker

B. First speaker

C. Second speaker

D. Second speaker

E. Third speaker

ARGUMENT

I. The United States should not join the League of Nations in order to participate in some League activities, because she is already a participant in such activities as she finds beneficial, for

1 Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, December 30, 1927.
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A. The United States actually does cooperate in matters affecting scientific, economic, and social welfare and limitation of armament.

B. The United States pays its share of the Secretariat expenses incurred by the League when it does participate, for

1. In 1925 and 1927 the United States paid such expenses in the total amount of over twenty-two thousand dollars.¹

II. The United States should not join the League of Nations, thereby giving up her traditional policy of political isolation, for

A. This policy has always been considered essential for the peace and safety of the country, for

1. President Washington, the founder of the policy, and his successors warned against entangling alliances with other countries and particularly with European nations.

2. President Coolidge, in 1927, said, "It is recognized that we are independent, detached, and can and do take a disinterested position in relation to international affairs," ² for

a. Our policy is based upon retaining freedom of action and avoiding obligations "to act under circumstances quite beyond our power to foresee or control." ³

b. "We have consistently refrained from intervening except when our help has been sought and we have felt it could be effectively given, as in the settlement of reparations and the London Conference." ⁴

B. In joining the League we should be embroiled "in all the racial, religious, traditional, and economic [and
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political] disputes and antagonisms of Europe, Africa, and Asia,"¹ for

1. The League is a political institution, for

a. The Council and Assembly which control it are political, for

(1) They are made up of the representatives of member states.

(2) Their members are responsible to their governments.

b. "The Covenant created a military and political alliance, primarily of the victors in the war, but soon augmented by smaller neutral powers seeking its protection, which had for its object the maintenance of the status quo thus imposed."²

2. The League is an institution standing for internationalism and interdependence of nations in contradistinction to nationalism and independence.³

C. The Covenant aims a serious blow at the Monroe Doctrine, for

1. "The League Covenant, while affirming the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, would compel us to arbitrate or submit to the Council or Assembly of the League any question that might arise between us and a foreign country in regard to the application of that doctrine, and all members of the League could participate in and intermeddle with its enforcement."⁴

2. "The instant that the United States, who declared, interpreted, and sustained the doctrine, ceases to

² President Coolidge's Annual Message, December 6, 1927.
⁴ President Coolidge's Annual Message, 1925, p. 10.
¹ David Jayne Hill, The Problem of a World Court, chap. xiii.
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be the sole judge of what it means, that instant
the Monroe Doctrine ceases and disappears from
history and from the face of the earth."  1

III. The United States can work as effectively for peace out-
side the League, for

A. If we are independent, we may remain neutral when
other countries are at war; whereas the League of
Nations is a bold enunciation of the principle that
neutrality is no longer permissible. Nations are
challenged to take sides in case a nation places itself
outside of court.  2

B. Even though we are independent of the League, our sen-
timent against war is a force within the League, for
1. The members realize that we have no desire for
aggrandizement.  3
2. Our great material power is an essential factor to be
reckoned with by any disturber of the peace.
3. The members realize that, because the extent of our
interests renders us extremely sensitive to the
effects of any disturbance throughout the world,
we therefore strongly desire peace.

C. Our Constitution already permits us to make inter-
national covenants against war; therefore we can
continue to promote peace by our example and to
fortify it by such covenants in the future as we have
in the past.  4

D. In the Paris pact for the renunciation of war, signed
August 27, 1928, we made a contribution toward
peace, for
1. Acting on M. Briand’s original suggestion, Secretary
Kellogg successfully negotiated this far-reaching

1 Henry Cabot Lodge, The Senate and the League of Nations, p. 399.
Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1925.
2 Philip Marshall Brown, International Realities, p. 131; David Jayne Hill,
American World Policies, p. 166; Edward A. Harriman, The Constitution
at the Crossroads, p. 151.
3 President Coolidge’s Annual Message, December 6, 1927.
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treaty with fifteen nations and invited forty-eight
others to adhere to it.
2. In that pact all civilized states, “in the names of
their respective peoples,” were brought by us to a
peace agreement, for
a. They renounced war “as an instrument of national
policy in their relations with one another."
b. They agreed “that the settlement or solution of
all disputes or conflicts...which may arise
among them, shall never be sought except by
peaceful means.”  1

3. We secured a more workable basis, one impossible
under the League, since “the formula and methods
of the League could not be the same as those to
which it has been possible for us to have recourse
for such a general and absolute agreement as the
pact provides.”  2

IV. The United States should not enter the League of Nations,
because the Covenant was designed as an instrument of
power rather than an instrument of justice, 3 for

A. The Covenant provides for using force as a means of
enforcing its provisions, for
1. Article 10 states that the Members of the League
“undertake to...preserve as against external
aggression the territorial integrity and existing
political independence of all Members of the
League.”
2. Article 16 states that they undertake to sever all
relations and prevent all intercourse with any
Member which disregards its agreements to leave
its disputes to methods of pacific settlement.
3. Article 11 states that “the League shall take any
action that may be deemed wise and effectual to

2 “Briand’s Speech on the Anti-War Treaty” (August 27, 1927), Current
History (October, 1928), p. 125.
3 David Jayne Hill, The Problem of a World Court, p. 90.
safeguard the peace of nations" and "for this purpose it is pledged to use its 'preponderant power.'"

B. The results may be deplorable if the United States subscribes to an instrument which would use force in order to maintain peace, for
1. The Covenant implies maintenance of the status quo, thus assisting the continuance of injustice.
2. Since force may be used there is no guaranty that actions of the League will be based on law and justice, for
   a. No adequate criteria exist defining the conditions under which resort to force would occur.
   b. No rules of international law assure that application of Articles 10, 11, and 16 would be solely for the attainment of justice.
3. Since the Covenant would be above the constitution of any member state, the United States might be drawn into wars to enforce the provisions of the Covenant, disregarding the present safeguards in our Constitution, for
   a. "If the United States assumes treaty obligations which contemplate force for their execution or performance, there is danger that the president without consulting Congress may take action which will irrevocably commit the nation to war and all its incalculable consequences." ¹
   b. "The powers of the American government are delegated powers.... There is in the Constitution of the United States no delegation of power to any organ of government to declare and carry on war,.... for the purpose of guaranteeing the peace of Europe, or of preserving the territorial integrity and political independ-
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ence of all the signatories of the Covenant of the League." ¹

V. The independent position of the United States is advantageous both for itself and for the League, for
A. Faults in the fundamental structure of the League have been more clearly perceived as a result of the attitude of the United States, for
1. Effort has been made to interpret Article 10 so as to make its application dependent solely on the judgment of member states.
2. Article 16 has been amended and interpretations of it have clarified its meaning.
3. The fact that the United States was not participating affected the decision to give up the Geneva Protocol. ²
B. The League has made special overtures to the United States, for
1. It has sought to push solution of the opium problem to gain our full cooperation.
2. It regularly includes Americans in its committees or invites the government to associate itself with new phases of its work.
3. It makes use of all obtainable information from the United States, as, for instance, that contained in the Armaments Year Book and the Memorandum on Public Finance.
C. As a nonmember we can select those activities in which we choose to participate.
D. As a member we should be under obligation to compromise our views on all League business so as not to appear obstructive, for
1. All important decisions in the League are taken by unanimous vote.
2. We should either be obliged to accept decisions only partially satisfactory or bear the whole responsi-

¹ David Jayne Hill, The Problem of a World Court, chap. xv.
² Sixth Yearbook of the League of Nations, Record of 1925, p. 174.
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bility for defeating the will of other states or abstain from voting entirely.

E. The United States has found it most satisfactory to conduct her foreign relations on the basis of bilateral treaties with particular states rather than on that of multilateral treaties with many states, many of which are only slightly interested in the subject matter, for

1. The bilateral system makes for simplicity of relations.
2. It makes for definiteness of engagements.
3. It makes for careful adjustment of the agreement to the problem at issue.

F. As a member of the League we should have to deal with many things which do not particularly concern us or do not concern us at all.

CONCLUSION

I. Summary

A. The United States should not join the League of Nations in order to participate in some of the League’s activities, because she is already a participant in such activities as she finds beneficial.

B. The United States should not join the League of Nations, thereby giving up her traditional policy of political isolation.

C. The United States can work as effectively for peace outside the League.

D. The United States should not enter the League, since the League was designed as an instrument of power rather than an instrument of justice.

E. The independent position of the United States is advantageous both for itself and for the League.

II. Appeal

We feel sure that you will agree with us that the United States should not join the League of Nations.

APPENDIX D

SPEECHES OF HIGH-SCHOOL DEBATERS ON PRECEDING BRIEFS

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Instead of giving here speeches covering all the material available on the question, it seems best to insert speeches such as high-school debaters, working under a time limit, might write from the briefs in Appendix C. Part of the material of a brief exists to clarify the subject in the speaker’s mind and does not necessarily go into his speech. Other parts may have to be left out of the speech because of time limits. Thus the “History of the Question” is very necessary in a brief, in order that the speaker may be sure of his own ground. It may or may not be necessary in his speech. The same is also true of “Admitted Matter.” Having only a limited number of minutes to speak, the speaker must decide for himself what is most necessary to include. He may profitably experiment by extemporaneous speaking from his brief, having someone time him as he speaks.

Further, a speaker may have to change his speech materially when he comes to speak. Much depends on what previous speakers on the other side have said in their speeches. A prepared speech is, at best, only an attempt to foresee the progress of the debate. It is the best preparation that a debater can make in advance, not knowing just what the opposition may do. Hence the
following speeches are not to be thought of as final "cut-and-dried" speeches, but only as material organized in advance, to be adapted in the best way possible when the debate starts. Skill in this process of adaptation is one of the greatest assets of a debater, and its acquisition is one of the major objectives of work in debate.

Only the speech of the first affirmative speaker and that of the first negative speaker are given. These speeches are enough to indicate the method by which a debater develops his speech from the brief.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

As you know, we are gathered here tonight to debate the proposition: Resolved, That the United States should join the League of Nations.

The question of the United States' joining the League of Nations has been much discussed during the past nine years. Today it is of special importance because of the fact that economic, social, and political questions are constantly drawing all the nations of the world together, whether they desire it or not.

Since the League is discussing and studying such problems as disarmament and the causes of war,— problems very near to the United States,— the people of the United States are becoming more and more interested in the League. This interest is shown by the rapid growth in the last few years of such organizations as the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association.

Let us look for a moment at the history of the League of Nations. The League of Nations was organized as a result of the World War. The armistice with Germany was concluded upon the basis of the Fourteen Points, enunciated by the President of the United States on January 8, 1918. The Fourteenth Point was "A general association of nations must be formed

...for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike."

January 25, 1919, the Preliminary Peace Conference passed the following resolution: "It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement, which the associated nations are now met to establish, that a League of Nations be created to promote international cooperation, to insure the fulfillment of international obligations, and to provide safeguards against war. This League... should be open to every civilized country which can be relied upon to promote its objects. The members of the League should periodically meet in international conference, and should have a permanent organization and secretariat to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the conferences."

January 10, 1920, at 4.15 P.M., the League of Nations formally came into being by the official deposit of the ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles at the French Foreign Office at Paris. Nineteen nations ratified this treaty and thereby became members. Within two months twenty-three other states had become original members by acceding to the Covenant without reservations, making forty-two members in all.

Let us look for a moment at the organization we are discussing. The League of Nations is now an organization of fifty-four nations. The only ten eligible countries in the world which are not members are Afghanistan, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Nejd, Mexico, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (Russia), Turkey, and the United States. All of these except the Sultanate of Nejd participate in some activities of the League.

The League consists of an Assembly, which meets annually, and in which each nation has one vote, though its delegation may consist of three representatives. The Assembly acts on such questions as the admission of new members and the election of temporary members of the League Council, the adopt-

1 Handbook of the League of Nations (March 1, 1923), p. 225.
2 This statement was corrected to March, 1923.
3 Eighth Yearbook of the League of Nations, Record of 1927, p. 2.
tion of the budget, and on resolutions expressing the desire of the member states to have many questions examined or acted upon by the Council, committees, or special conferences. Once in nine years the Assembly, acting jointly with the Council, elects the judges of the Permanent Court.1

The Council of the League consists of fourteen member states. The British Empire, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan are permanent members. The other nine are elected by the Assembly. Each state determines its personal representative in the Council. The Council is capable of enlargement, originally having consisted of eight and later of ten members. It deals with most of the League business. It may meet whenever necessary; it has four regular meetings annually.2 Up to August, 1928, it had met fifty times.

The Secretariat consists of over four hundred persons of forty nationalities, under international civil-service rules, performing duties of a secretarial nature, collecting and publishing information and reports, and executing decisions of the Assembly and Council.

Action is taken (1) by resolutions of the Assembly or Council; and (2) by conferences of member and nonmember states, which produce international conventions, subject to ratification by each of the participating states.

Two other definitions are necessary before we go on to outline the admitted matter.

One, in this debate entry into the League means either with or without reservations to the Covenant.

Two, "the League stands for world peace, social improvement, and justice." 2

For the purpose of this debate it is admitted, in the first place, that all the world wants to abolish war and its causes. It is admitted, in the second place, that to achieve this some form of organization is necessary. It is admitted, in the third place, that the present Covenant of the League of Nations may be changed by reservations which will satisfy the United States.

There are four major reasons why the United States should join the League of Nations.

The first is that the United States cannot much longer keep out of the League.

The second is that the League of Nations has worked.

The third is that the entrance of the United States into the League will increase the League's power to undertake measures which will benefit the whole world.

And the fourth is that public opinion demands that the United States enter the League of Nations.

I shall try to prove to you point one, that the United States cannot, in fact, much longer remain outside the League. I am going to give three main reasons why this is true: first, that the United States has had representatives at various League conferences; secondly, that many prominent citizens of the United States have already been engaged in League work; and thirdly, that the United States is actively engaged in health work under the League.

In the first place, proof that the United States cannot much longer remain outside the League lies in the fact that the United States has often found it necessary to be represented at various international conferences, both by official and unofficial observers.

As our first example, let us cite the fact that our government had unofficial representatives at the Brussels Financial Conference in 1920. Our unofficial delegate to the Reparations Commission, Roland W. Boyden, acted as our unofficial representative at Brussels. Mr. Boyden had three assistants.1

A second example is that in 1921 the United States government appointed Dr. Marion Dorset, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, as member of the Anthrax Committee to serve in an "unofficial and consultative" capacity.3

1 Lucia Ames Mead, In the Woman Citizen, July 28, 1923.
2 Yearbook of the League of Nations, 1925, p. 397.
3 Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, December 30, 1927.
Again, in 1924, the International Labor Office set up a Permanent Emigration Committee. Although the United States has had no official representative at any of the Labor Conferences since 1919, many Americans helped in the work of the Emigration Committee.1

Now we come to another line of activity in which the United States has participated more and more; namely, health work. In no work of the League has the cooperation of the United States been more extensive than in the field of international health work. From the very beginning United States citizens have been active in this work. Dr. Rupert Blue, formerly surgeon-general of the United States Public Health Service, and Dr. Richard P. Strong, director of the League of Red Cross Societies, participated in 1920 in the work of the first conference held to draw up proposals for a permanent health organization under the League.2 Does not the fact that we were unofficially interested in forming a health organization to work under the League show pretty conclusively that we believe that health work can be carried on successfully under the League?

In 1922 Dr. Hugh S. Cumming, of Washington, director of the United States Public Health Service, and Dr. Josephine Baker, of New York, became members of a Provisional Health Committee.2

In 1924 this Provisional Health Committee became the Permanent Health Committee, and once more the United States was sufficiently interested to have representatives thereon. Dr. Cumming was made vice president, and Dr. Alice Hamilton, of Chicago, was made a member of the committee. And here is a point worthy of your especial attention. Dr. Cumming is not acting merely as an individual; he acts in his official capacity, since "he officially represents the United States on the International Office of Public Health, which named him to the Permanent Health Committee."3

Not only this, but ever since the Rockefeller Foundation made it possible for the Health Organization of the League to make exchanges in the public-health personnel of different countries, Americans have taken part in these exchanges.1

Now let us turn for our fourth point to the work of the United States in the control of the traffic of opium and other dangerous drugs. The United States has always been interested in trying to control this traffic; but when the investigation into this traffic was to be carried on under the League, the United States Senate drew up reservations to the effect that the United States should have nothing to do with any such investigation.1 However, when in 1922 the United States was invited to send a representative to the fourth session of the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Drugs, the government again sent Dr. Rupert Blue, in an "official and consultative" capacity.4

Furthermore, in 1923, we sent a delegation in an "advisory capacity" to attend the fifth session.3

At the seventh session, the American consul at Geneva, Pinkney Tuck, represented the United States.4

In 1926 the Council appointed Colonel Arthur Woods, formerly police commissioner of New York City and assistant to the Secretary of War, as an assessor to the Permanent Advisory Committee.4 It rather looks, does it not, as if in spite of the Senate, the United States government had already participated to a large extent in the fight of the League against opium?

But this is not all. In 1924 Congress appropriated $40,000 to pay the cost of American representatives at the Second Opium Conference. In 1925 an American, Frederic A. Delano, formerly a member of the Federal Reserve Board, was made president of the commission; an American is secretary; and finally, the conference is partly financed by the American Social Hygiene Association.4 You certainly will agree with us that, as far as the work on opium traffic is concerned, the United States is already deeply involved.

---

1 American Cooperation with Other Nations through the League of Nations, 1919-1926, p. 37.  
2 Ibid. p. 28.  
3 Ibid. p. 29.  
For our fifth point we come to the participation by the United States in the Disarmament Conference. In 1925 the Council invited us to send representatives to a Preparatory Commission to investigate the subject of disarmament. Congress appropriated $50,000 for the expenses of our delegates, and consequently we were well represented at the commission in Geneva in 1926.

And finally, for our sixth point, let us consider the fact that the United States has already participated in the International Conference on the Control of the Traffic in Arms and Munitions. In 1925 when the Council of the League called this conference to meet at Geneva, nine men represented the United States. The convention, drawn up by this committee, for the prohibition in warfare of the use of asphyxiating gases and of bacteriological methods was signed by two United States representatives on behalf of the government. Is it not evident from these facts that the United States is definitely concerned with the question of disarmament and control of methods of warfare as they come up for consideration under the League of Nations?

We feel sure that you will agree with us that the United States has increasingly felt that it was vital to her interests to be represented in various conferences and committees of the League. In fact, she has participated in the various work of these committees to such an extent that she is, in spite of herself, working as if she were a member of the League in the particular conferences mentioned.

A second proof that the United States cannot much longer stay out of the League lies in the fact that over one hundred and fifty prominent citizens of the United States have been actively engaged in various kinds of work directed by the League of Nations. These one hundred and fifty men and women may fairly, we believe, be considered to show the trend of intelligent public opinion in favor of the League.

Some of the important positions held by Americans follow:

1 American Coöperation with Other Nations through the League of Nations, 1919–1926, pp. 17–18.
2 Ibid. p. 17.
represented by prominent citizens is interested and involved not merely in one phase of the work done by the League, but in all its phases. Although many of these representatives were not chosen officially by the United States, their participation reflects honor on our nation as a whole. The administration at Washington calmly assumes credit for the work which these citizens did as employees of the League. How much longer can our country continue in such inconsistency, persistently refusing to join the League and yet taking to herself credit for the accomplishments of the League?

Now we come to our third and final reason why the United States cannot much longer stay out of the League. She cannot stay out because she is actively interested in the international health work of the League. This work is so important to our national health that we are bound to give it serious consideration, whether we are in the League or not. This interest is shown by the fact that representative officials of our government have allied themselves with the health work of the League. For example, as we have already pointed out, Dr. Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon-General of the United States Public Health Service, was not only a member of the Provisional Health Committee, but was later made vice president of the Permanent Health Committee. As we brought to your attention before, Dr. Cumming acts in his official capacity.1

Moreover, the Rockefeller Foundation, an important American philanthropic institution, appropriated $22,000 a year for five years for the establishment of an epidemiological intelligence service to be carried on by the Health Organization of the League.2 We have noted before the interest of this Foundation in the exchange of public-health personnel: for this purpose it gave $60,000 a year for three years.3 Many American doctors have participated in these interchanges. For example, in 1923, doctors from the United States joined the group which was investigating the methods of fighting malaria in Italy.

---

1 American Co-operation with Other Nations through the League of Nations, 1919–1925, pp. 28–29.
3 Eighth Yearbook of the League of Nations, Record of 1927, pp. 142–143.
can derive some particular benefit, if we take the findings of this committee and that, without going to the trouble or expense of joining the League?

I'm sure that by now you will agree with us of the affirmative that because the United States has found it necessary to be represented at so many conferences of the League, because so many of our prominent citizens are actively engaged in work of the League, and because the League is directing many international health projects in which we have a vital interest, it is impossible for the United States to remain outside the League.

FIRST NEGATIVE SPEAKER

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We of the negative hope to prove to you tonight that the United States should under no consideration join the League of Nations. We have five main reasons to advance why the United States should not join the League.

One, the United States should not join the League in order to participate in some League activities, because she is already a participant in such activities as she finds beneficial.

Two, the United States should not join the League, because in so doing she would be giving up the traditional American policy of political isolation.

Three, the United States should not join the League, because she can work as effectively for peace outside the League.

Four, the United States should not enter the League, because the Covenant was designed as an instrument of power rather than an instrument of justice.

And five, the independent position of the United States is advantageous both for itself and for the League.

I shall endeavor to prove the first two points to you. We come now to the first point: the United States should not join the League of Nations in order to participate in some League activities, because she is already a participant in such activities as she finds beneficial. Our opponent has shown you to what extent the United States actually does cooperate in matters affecting scientific, economic, and social welfare, and the limitation of armament. What more could we do if we actually belonged to the League? We are already deriving all the benefits from these various conferences and committees which we should derive were we a member of the League.

Moreover, we pay our share of the Secretariat expenses incurred by the League when we do participate. We paid in 1925 and 1927 over $22,000.1 The argument which our opponent advances that we should join in order to save our self-respect is no argument at all when we realize that we pay our way as we go. In no sense are we accepting charity from the League.

We of the negative maintain, and we feel sure you will agree with us, that since we are now deriving all the benefits from the League which we should derive were we members, there is no need of our joining the League.

We now come to our second point. The United States should not join the League of Nations, because by so doing it would be giving up the traditional American policy of political isolation. This policy has always been considered essential for the peace and safety of the country. President Washington, the founder of this policy, and his successors have warned us against entangling alliances with other countries, particularly with European nations. If we joined the League we should immediately be forced into all sorts of alliances with the nations of Europe. Then our troubles would begin.

Coming down to modern times: President Coolidge said in his Message of December 6, 1927, "It is recognized that we are independent, detached, and can and do take a disinterested position in relation to international affairs." This position of ours has been one of our strongest policies in years past. Let us hold to it, for our policy is based upon retaining freedom of action and avoiding obligations "to act under circumstances quite beyond our power to foresee or control."2

the League, no longer would our government be free to act as it thought best; we should be ruled by the policies of European nations. We have seen the constant turmoil into which these policies have thrown the nations of Europe. Do we want to join them in their disputes and wars? Assuredly no! Then we must remain outside the League.

Moreover, we have consistently refrained from intervening except when our help has been sought and we have felt it could be effectively given, as in the settlement of reparations and the London Conference.\footnote{President Coolidge's Annual Message, 1925, p. 10.} If we join the League we shall have to interfere in international affairs whether we feel we have anything to contribute or not.

We feel sure you agree with us so far, that the United States in giving up her traditional policy of political isolation would be giving up her strongest policy for peace and safety.

We now want to show you that in giving up our political isolation we should become embroiled "in all the racial, religious, traditional, and economic [and political] disputes and antagonisms of Europe, Africa, and Asia."\footnote{William D. Guthrie, The League of Nations and Miscellaneous Addresses, p. 28.} For the League is a political institution. This fact is made evident when we consider that the Council and the Assembly, which control it, are made up of the representatives of member states who are responsible to their governments. Not only is the League political in organization, but it was created for a political purpose. David Jayne Hill says, "The Covenant created a military and political alliance, primarily of the victors in the war, but soon augmented by smaller neutral powers seeking its protection, which had for its object the maintenance of the status quo thus imposed."\footnote{David Jayne Hill, The Problem of a World Court, chap. xiii.} The fact that the League is a political institution is proof enough that we should be involved in all sorts of European troubles.

But not only is the League a political institution, it is an institution standing for internationalism and interdependence.\footnote{William D. Guthrie, The League of Nations and Miscellaneous Addresses, p. 19.} Certainly we who stand for nationalism and independence do not want to join a League which contradicts this very policy of ours.

We have endeavored to show you that in giving up our policy of isolation we should, in the first place, be giving up our peace and safety, and in the second, we should be sure to become involved in European affairs. We now want to prove to you that, in the third place, we should be giving up the Monroe Doctrine. There is no question that the League aims a serious blow at the Monroe Doctrine, for "the League Covenant, while affirming the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, would compel us to arbitrate or submit to the Council or Assembly of the League any question that might arise between us and a foreign country in regard to the application of that doctrine, and all members of the League could participate in and meddle with its enforcement."\footnote{Ibid. p. 57.} This means, of course, that the Monroe Doctrine would lose all its force. As the late Henry Cabot Lodge said, "The instant that the United States, who declared, interpreted, and sustained the doctrine, ceases to be the sole judge of what it means, that instant the Monroe Doctrine ceases and disappears from history and from the face of the earth."\footnote{Henry Cabot Lodge, The Senate and the League of Nations, p. 399. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.} As we believe in the Monroe Doctrine and what it has done for this country in the past, so must we guard it against the attacks of the League.

We believe now that you will agree with us of the negative that because we should be giving up our peace and safety, and because we should be embroiled in European disputes, and because we should be aiming a blow at the Monroe Doctrine, we should not give up our traditional American policy of political isolation. This means, of course, that we should not join the League. We are wondering exactly what our opponents will have to say on these various points. Of course
they will not even try to prove that if we join the League we shall not be giving up our traditional policy of isolation. It will be of interest to us as well as to you to see just how they handle this point.

I have now shown you two main reasons why the United States should not join the League. First, the United States should not join the League in order to participate in some of the activities of the League, because she is already a participant in such activities as she finds beneficial; and secondly, we should not join the League, because by so doing we should be giving up our traditional policy of isolation.

APPENDIX E
JUDGING A DEBATE

There have been many complaints from all sources that debating is a gamble, and that there is no commonly accepted standard for judging; therefore it seems wise to set down a few words on this much discussed subject. The task is entered upon with fear and trembling. The subject of judging is the "black beast" of debating. What follows is not meant to be final. Something should be left to the judge.

Judging a debate is not like refereeing or umpiring a football game. The judge's whole function is different. In athletic games there are definite, set rules, and he who judges must keep these rules strictly in mind. Our conception of debate includes the idea that it is not a game at all, but rather an orderly, rational, and clear presentation of arguments with the attempt to demonstrate the wisdom of some definite action in the case of a question of public policy. If the judge sees the activity that he is called upon to judge in this light, his whole attitude will be more sane. Let us eliminate at once the notion of debate as a game and look upon it in a more dignified way. Debaters are not out primarily to "whip their enemies." They are out to prepare themselves for one of the most important phases of their later life: to take part in the discussion of public questions rationally and honestly, and so to clarify and argue the issues of these questions
that they and their fellows can act upon them intelligently, instead of in a prejudiced and passionate way.

Therefore the question will naturally arise, Why judge a debate at all? The only answer is that debaters, like other people, exert themselves harder and do better work if something definite is at stake. The average student finds it a rather vague and uninspired task to "prepare himself for later life." But if this preparation for later life can be given a definite objective, if an immediate and tangible goal can be set, and if suggestions and criticisms that will serve toward guidance can be given, debaters find the task easier and more full of incentive. This is the justification, and the only justification, for debate-judging: it does furnish a definite incentive for hard work, and it does give opportunity for criticism. As such, we believe it is greatly worth while.

What is it, precisely, that the judge is called upon to do? Manifestly, he is not asked to give his opinion on the question. That would not furnish any incentive to debaters. Rather it would kill incentive. If the debater gets the idea that the judge has his mind all made up in advance, he loses interest in the debate. Why should he work to convince someone who is not open to conviction? And a modest high-school debater is not apt to think that he can change the opinion of men and women of mature years, with opinions well established. It is necessary, then, for the judge to get firmly fixed in mind that he is not judging the question.

The only alternative is that he must be judging the debate itself, and this is precisely what he is doing. The judge is to give an opinion as to which team has done the most effective debating. Let us therefore consider how to judge effective debating.

Debating may be considered from two angles: argument and delivery. It is a mistake to separate these two factors definitely, as they are complementary and neither one alone makes a debate. Professor Winans defines a speech as "an essay standing on its hind legs." In a general way this definition holds for debate. It must be a good essay, using that word in its meaning of "attempt" in composition, but it must also "stand on its hind legs." A mere essay is not a debate, and of course standing on the hind legs does not constitute debating. In other words, argument and delivery are both necessary, each to the other, and a judge who tries to separate them too consciously will find himself hopelessly mixed up in trying to decide the relative merits of two teams. Let us think of them, then, as parts of one process: the process of convincing others of the wisdom of one course of action over another on a question of public policy. Merely for convenience of discussion let us consider argument and delivery separately.

Good argument consists of three things: analysis, proof, and refutation. In judging, notice first the analysis of the two teams. Which team seems to have analyzed the question more accurately and fairly? Analysis ought to bring out the issues — those considerations on which the proposition rests, those points which it is necessary to prove in order to establish the main proposition. Merely a division of ground among debaters is not analysis. Such conventional divisions as necessity, practicability, and justice give no evidence of discriminating analysis. Have the debaters found the real underlying issues? We believe in public or in private ownership of public utilities, for example, because of considerations of rates, service, and so forth, not because of considerations of necessity, prac-
ticability, and justice. In other words, see that the analysis gets down to bed rock, and judge whether the debaters are arguing the question on a concrete basis instead of on a general basis.

After the analysis comes the proof. Since a debate always simmers down to a comparison of the relative merits of two possible lines of action, proof consists simply of making a logical case for one or the other of these lines. Test the arguments presented for fallacies. If the argument involves causal relations, do the debaters actually show relations of cause and effect? Do they demonstrate clearly that one thing alleged as the cause of another is actually the cause, or that a thing alleged as the effect of another is actually the effect? If they argue from example, is their argument fair? Is the example given a fair example, measuring up in essential points? Then watch the use of evidence. Are the quoted facts and authorities reliable, unprejudiced, and convincing? Is the evidence recent? As far as you can judge, are the debaters honest and fair in their use of evidence? Is their evidence cited definitely, or is it weak because of loose citations and generalities? Do they support all assertions with evidence, or do they use much unsupported assertion?

Of course, in all this, the judge must lay aside his own prejudices and opinions on the question under discussion. He must remember that the question has two pretty well-balanced sides or it would not be debated. And he must be prepared to give the decision to either side, in strict accordance with the principles of effective debating, regardless of his own personal bias or opinion on the question. It is not a question of convincing the judge on the question; it is a question of which team has best supported its case.

Then, further, the judge should watch the refutation with especial care. It is here that the metal of debaters is really tried. Remember that it is much easier to get up a good case in the quiet of preparation than to deal intelligently with the case of the opposition in the heat of debate. Notice how well the debaters detect the important points raised and how well they meet them with sound argument and evidence. Are they easily led off on unimportant points, thus wasting time, or do they go right to the heart of the question by centering on the main issues?

Do not be overconcerned about debate strategy. This has been greatly overdone in the past. A team that relies on strategy often does so to cover up weaknesses in argument and evidence. It is true that the affirmative has the burden of proof, and that they are expected to sustain their proposition reasonably over that of the negative, but they are not compelled by the rules of debate to make an air-tight case. Neither is the negative. Neither side can hope to prove conclusively. A debate is a discussion of the relative merits of two possible lines of action, and the side that can make the best case should be given the decision. If strategic questions are asked, judge as to whether these questions go to the heart of the issues or whether they are asked merely to waste the time of the opposition. Either side may be absolved from answering foolish questions, but real questions, pointing to the heart of the question, should be answered. In all this the judge must use his own judgment and discrimination. The best strategy is clear analysis, convincing proof, and an abundance of good evidence well handled. Do not be led off by little technical questions of debate strategy. Knowledge of the question and ability to use that knowledge are the most important things to be kept in mind.
From the side of delivery consider, first, clearness, both as to meaning and as to utterance. Here is where the speech "stands on its hind legs." The debater must be understood. His meaning must be clear to be given credit. The judge is not expected to argue the question or to supply arguments for the debaters. They stand on their own feet. Because of his own knowledge of the question he may be able to see what they are driving at, but he must insist that they do the work. If they are not clear, do not give them credit for clearness.

Debaters should also be persuasive. They should not antagonize the audience. Remember that they are preparing themselves for something later on in life, and be sure to give credit to those qualities that will help them later. Persuasiveness is one of these. This involves courtesy to opponents. A debate should be conducted as a perfectly friendly discussion. It should be given forcefully and convincingly, but it should also be given courteously. A sense of humor should be rewarded if it is not overdone and if it is kindly.

Directness and simplicity of presentation should be graded high if the speech is at the same time animated and forceful. Good public speaking is conversation with a large group, and extravagance of all kinds interferes with effectiveness. Do not be too much concerned with technique of delivery, but judge the debaters on general effectiveness of presentation rather than on technical details. And by general effectiveness we mean clearness, forcefulness, and persuasiveness of style. If the debater speaks well, he will be understood, and he will tend to convince and persuade people by his manner as well as by what he says. This is the essence of good delivery. There is a technique, of course, but the debate judge is not asked to judge this. He is asked only to be a judge of what the technique accomplishes, to pass judgment on the relative effectiveness of the teams.

When the debate is over, the judge is asked to make up his mind and to pass judgment. Dismissing little things, he should now sit back and ask himself one question: In view of what he has heard and seen, which team has, on the whole, made the more effective case? in other words, which case stands out above the other? If the affirmative case stands out, he will usually find that the negative has in general failed to overthrow it either by direct refutation or by proposing an alternative plan that seems to be better; if the negative stands out, he will find that the affirmative has in general failed to sustain its case in the face of the direct opposition or of an alternative plan. Thus, in a way, the question becomes this: Has the affirmative reasonably sustained its case over the opposition of the negative? His answer to this question, in one of its forms, determines his decision.

Perhaps the brief outline on page 232 of the foregoing discussion will aid the judge. He can use some simple system of grading as the debate progresses, such as a scale of ten.

In using such an outline care should be taken not to allow the simple total of grades given on 1, 2, 3, and 4 to determine 5, which is really the decision of the debate. The reason for not doing this is that grades on the various points do not all have the same weight; consequently their simple total is not necessarily the final grade for the debate. Grading on the first four is simply a guide to the judge's memory as he looks back over the debate. His final decision should be made as suggested in the foregoing discussion.
criticism of both teams by the judges, with an opportunity for the members of the teams to ask such questions as they wish to ask for future guidance. The debate instructors should be present. Each judge should give frankly the reasons for his decision, together with such criticisms of each individual debater as he thinks it worth while to give. Every effort should be made by all concerned to remove this discussion from the realm of the personal and put it on strictly educational grounds.

And, finally, we give it as our opinion that wherever it is possible to have a single expert judge instead of three laymen, the advantages are all with the single-expert-judge system. This judge should be paid a small fee in addition to his expenses—a fee comparable to the fee that is paid referees in athletic contests. This puts the whole thing on a business basis. And it is coming to be generally felt that those who are capable of judging a debate well should not be asked to give their time and energy without some recompense. Paying a single expert judge will also tend to develop in any given section a group of judges who will better understand debate and who will make it their business to become better and better informed on the technique of judging a debate. The educational advantage of this is obvious, and we believe that fairer decisions will result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Logical analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness of issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from fallacies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In causal-relation argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In argument from example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refutation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticking to main issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking and answering questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of evidence in refutation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of presentation (language, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom from extravagance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General effectiveness of cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

NOTES FOR TEACHERS OF DEBATE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following books are recommended for class use because they have been found most helpful to the authors. The list does not pretend to be complete; it is only an introduction to the field, presented with the expectation that each reader will find more material for himself.

2. Practical English Composition, Book IV, by Edwin L. Miller.
3. Intercollegiate Debates, Vols. II, V, VI, IX, X, XI.
4. The Congressional Record for April, 1924.
7. The Life of Barnum, by M. R. Werner.
9. The Story of a Pioneer, by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw.
10. The Life of Frances E. Willard, by Anna A. Gordon.
12. The Best American Orations of To-day. Compiled by Harriet Blackstone.
14. Speech on Conciliation with America, by Edmund Burke.
19. American Speech, by Calvin A. Lewis.

VARIETY IN CLASS WORK

If every day were devoted exclusively to debating for practice, the class would soon lose its zest for debate. Variety is the keynote of the successful debating class. There are so many ways in which it may be achieved that there is no excuse for its absence in the classroom.

Variety achieved by alternating the various types of debate. One day use the customary, formal type with three speakers on each team; another day have two speakers for each team; at another time have a one-man-team contest. At least once a month discard formal debating completely and schedule an open-forum debate before an invited audience. In high school a class enjoys being invited to a program that is prepared for its special benefit.

Variety achieved by trying different methods of judging. Let the class experiment with the single expert judge until they know whether or not they prefer that method. Invite three members of the faculty to judge one debate; at other times experiment with three, five, seven, or nine
members of the class officiating; or, again, let the vote of the whole class decide the winner. Then, too, the class may experiment with judgeless debates. These eight possible methods of judging will create interest and promote variety.

Variety achieved by having five-minute arguments presented by each member of the class. Once in three or four weeks it is excellent practice for each student to present a sound argument on the subject nearest his heart. Many propositions which are not two-sided enough to be suitable for debate are interesting and provocative of thought when they are handled as independent arguments. At the conclusion of the speeches ten or fifteen minutes should be allowed for general discussion. Experience has proved that the wisest course is to limit each speaker to two minutes so that all the class may have a chance to participate in the refutation. Sometimes it is also necessary to limit the number of times that each student may speak.

Variety achieved by letting different members of the class act in turn as chairman of the day. A different student should preside at each class debate until all the class have officiated. The advantages of this procedure are threefold: the instructor is free to write criticisms and observe the debate, the students gain experience which they will utilize often in the future, the audience has the privilege of observing the different manners of the various chairmen.

Variety achieved by holding a heckling contest. A student is allowed to talk on any subject he chooses for one minute, at the expiration of which time his classmates start heckling him by bombarding him with questions either relevant or irrelevant to the subject with which he began his talk.

Obviously the heckling contest is not a very dignified type of argument. Its chief purpose is to provide amusement. Incidentally it is a valuable means of disposing of clever remarks which the super-sophisticated might otherwise drag into formal debates, and it also trains a student to retain poise under annoying circumstances. Once a term is often enough to have a heckling contest.

Variety achieved by having book reviews. Once a term students gain much by presenting brief reviews of some of the best books and magazine articles on the subject of debate. Such articles as the one on debating in Bates College, which was printed in the American Magazine for September, 1923, and that on public speaking which appeared in Collier's Weekly for February 5, 1916, present interesting class material. Criticisms of debate, such as those published in the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, are provocative of discussion. The following numbers contain articles illustrative of the material that interests the debater:

Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, April, 1924:
"Debate Coaching in High Schools," by Ruth E. Huston.
Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, November, 1924:
"Debate and the World we Live In," by Joseph A. Mosher.
"Two Years of Open Forum Debating," by Phillip M. Hicks.
Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, February, 1925:
Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, April, 1925:
"Skill in Debate," by Emerson W. Miller.

Variety gained by reviewing the lives of our great orators. Once a term each student should prepare a brief biographical sketch of one of our greatest debaters. The report should emphasize the orator's physical qualifications for success in speaking, his mental equipment, his
training, the length of time that he spent in preparation of his speeches, the books which he read most, his faults as an orator and the methods which he used to overcome them. The report should also note his rank in history and oratory and the names of his greatest speeches. The study of the oratory of the world's greatest speakers is a never-failing source of inspiration.

Variety achieved by letting each student prepare an argument on the subject of the greatest debater or the greatest speech in the history of oratory. It is true that such argument is useless from the point of view of reaching a decision, but it is valuable because it arouses interest in our great speakers, presents information about them, provokes thought on the subject, and gives each student a chance to present his individual opinion. He is free to extol or condemn to the limit of his enthusiasm.

Such arguments may be prepared about the following great orators of the past:

- a. Demosthenes
- b. Cicero
- c. Saint Chrysostom
- d. Savonarola
- e. Burke
- f. Lincoln
- g. Webster
- h. Bosseu
- i. Calhoun
- j. Pitt the Younger
- k. Sheridan
- l. Henry Woodford Grady
- m. Henry Ward Beecher
- n. Wendell Phillips
- o. Phillips Brooks
- p. Frances E. Willard

Eminent modern orators of the past quarter-century who are worthy of discussion are the following:

- a. William Jennings Bryan
- b. Senator Robert M. La Follette
- c. Senator Albert Beveridge
- d. Ex-Vice-President Thomas Marshall
- e. Dr. Russell H. Conwell
- f. Dr. Marion LeRoy Burton
- g. Corinne Roosevelt Robinson
- h. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw
- i. Judge Florence Allen
- j. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt
- k. Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale
- l. A. Maude Royden, of England
- m. David Lloyd George
- n. Ex-Premier Joseph Caillaux, of France
- o. Jane Addams
- p. Dr. Mary E. Woolley

The following speeches are some that may be defended as being the greatest in history:

- b. Cicero's Orations.
- c. Speech on Conciliation with America, by Edmund Burke.
- d. Lincoln's speeches in the Lincoln-Douglas debates.
- e. Address at Cooper Union, by Lincoln.
- g. Reply to Hayne, by Webster.
- h. The New South, by Henry W. Grady.
- i. Speech in the Virginia Convention, March, 1775, by Patrick Henry.
- l. The Outlawry of War, by Judge Florence Allen.
- m. Speeches on temperance, by Frances E. Willard.
- n. Speeches on woman suffrage, by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw.
- o. Acres of Diamonds, by Dr. Russell H. Conwell.
- r. The World at the Cross-roads, by A. Maude Royden.

A discussion of these orators and famous speeches will contribute inspiration and variety to any class.
Variety achieved by alternating the study of delivery and the study of subject matter with actual practice. The most enthusiastic debaters tend to become tired of having a debate every recitation period. Furthermore, some class time must be allowed for criticism, as well as for a study of the theory and practice of debate, as they are presented in the preceding chapters. Therefore certain recitation periods must be allotted to the study of the principles of debate, and others must be set aside for practice. The class which has three recitation periods weekly may wisely spend one day for theory and two days for actual debating. When a class meets five times weekly a good plan is to devote Monday and Wednesday to textbook study, with the remaining three days set aside for platform work.

That variety is the spice of life is a truism which no debating instructor can afford to forget.

How to gain an audience. Some instructors claim that they can train debaters but that they are unable to gain an audience to listen to their contests. Debating is primarily an intellectual contest. It must be admitted that the American mind is being trained to be industrial and mechanical, and that it is becoming anything but intellectual in its outlook. However, in spite of this handicap, audiences can be secured. The suggestions that follow have proved useful in gaining audiences that paid dividends in money and enthusiasm.

1. The spirit of the instructor and business manager must be optimistic. The instructor who continually whines, "We can't get anyone out to a debate," never will get anyone out. In the days preceding an interschool contest the debating coach comes in contact with dozens of students and with the faculty and townspeople. A little debating enthusiasm expressed in these chance meetings is carried on and on through other chance meetings, until everyone has the idea that the debate will be a pleasant thing to hear. Notes of pessimism are carried even more rapidly. So, if you want a big crowd, think, act, and talk optimistically.

2. The debating team must be well prepared. School spirit will sometimes drive people to debates, but they will not attend season after season unless the home team is worth hearing. People never travel far to hear debaters who struggle through their constructive arguments and wabble miserably in rebuttal.

The home audience likes a winning team. However, victory is not the only essential with them. The reputation of having well-prepared debating teams will draw an audience, because they have the assurance of hearing a worth-while contest, even though the visiting team may win the decision. Although both are helpful, it is good team preparation more than victories that attract an audience.

3. The debate must be advertised. Whether we like it or not, everything that we do is controlled by advertising. The clothes we wear, the houses we build, the fuel we burn, the food we eat, the automobiles we buy, the theaters we attend, the books we read, all are determined either directly or indirectly by advertising that is clever, original, persistent, conspicuous, and omnipresent. Yet, in the face of this competition, many instructors weakly lament the small debate audiences, although they have done almost nothing to increase them.

Posting one or two notices the day before a debate cannot be called advertising in the twentieth century. Intensive advertising should begin two or three weeks
before the debate, according to the size of the community. Preparation for advertising by the committee must be commenced a month before the contest. Advance notices should be given from time to time throughout the year. Whenever anything of special interest happens in the realm of debating, whether it applies directly to your community or not, have it published in the school paper or in the local press. Let people know what many of them do not realize: that debating — interschool, intercollegiate, international, or political — is going on the whole year, that it is not limited to one or two midwinter contests.

Advertising for debates as well as for anything else should be clever and original. Each school must work out its own stunts. The following have been tested and found practical:

a. Colored balloons, each of which bore the word "DEBATE," were hung from electric chandeliers in the school halls.

b. Pieces of cardboard were hung in conspicuous places from the ceiling. Two weeks before the debate the cardboard bore only the date, next was added the word "DEBATE," and finally the name of the subject.

c. Stickers bearing the words "DEBATE, December 12," were pasted on the glass of each door at school, so that anyone passing through could not fail to read them.

d. Several students prepared a dialogue of questions and answers which they presented in each of the assembly rooms.

e. Attractive posters in gay colors were made by the art class and displayed in conspicuous places throughout the halls.

f. Printed handbills were distributed to every house in one community of three thousand inhabitants to announce an especially important debate.

g. School rallies, with yells, songs, the presentation of the team and coach, speeches about previous successes, and the story of debate trophies previously won, have often gained enthusiastic rooters.

Debate-advertising must be omnipresent. It is not sufficient to use one or two plans. Announcement speeches that are full of pep and enthusiasm should be delivered in every assembly room. Notices should be given two weeks, one week, and a day before the debate. Notices should be printed in colored chalk on the blackboards. Student speakers should carry the news to such organizations as the Woman’s Club, the League of Women Voters, the W. C. T. U., and the Kiwanis, Rotary, and faculty clubs of the community. The pastors of local churches are always glad to read announcements of debates, because the debates have civic value and because the students of their churches are represented on the team. Stories about debate, about members of the team and the coach, and about the school’s forensics, should be printed in the local press and the school papers. Pictures of the team are good advertising.

One reason why the oratorical contests on the Constitution of the United States drew such large crowds in Detroit in 1925 was that the Detroit News had given the contest every conceivable kind of publicity. For three months before the first contest at least one article relative to it was printed daily. People were literally saturated with the idea before they had a chance to attend the event. The result was auditorium after auditorium filled with people to hear an intellectual combat. Advertising pays in debating, and it is one remedy for small audiences.

4. Tickets must be sold for debates. Some of our large universities have debate audiences of three or four thousand without selling tickets, but for the high schools and most of the smaller colleges the sale of tickets does much to increase attendance at debates. The tickets may be
plain cardboard bearing the word "Debate," or they may be in the form of tags to promote advertising. High-school students especially enjoy tagging each other with squares of green, red, or yellow cardboard which bear such phrases as the following:

| It's Worth a Dime to Beat | (Name of rival school) |

or

| I am going to the DEBATE January 12 Are You? |

or

| Eastern versus Western DEBATE |

The ticket committee should never start its sale until the way has been paved by persistent, clever, omnipresent advertising.

5. Many students should be used in the management of the debate. One of the best means of gaining debate supporters is to utilize the talents of as many students as possible. Every student who is asked to do one definite thing for the debate has his own interest increased in the contest, and he also passes this increased interest on to his associates. A dozen different students may sell tickets, and others may make posters, display posters, inflate balloons, write feature stories, make assembly-room speeches, plan the debate rally, and deliver notices about town.

The night of the debate still other students should be invited to be responsible for the visiting team, the arrangement of the platform, the meeting of the judges, time-keeping, cheer-leading, ticket-selling, ticket-taking, ushering, and music. In this way at least fourteen students aside from the orchestra or glee club are invited to participate. They enjoy doing it, and find themselves interested in debating for that night and the future.

6. Debates should be made attractive. Debates should be "dressed up." It is all very well to sit back and say smugly that people should attend debates to improve their minds, but, whether we like it or not, the world does not move that way. Debates must be presented attractively if we want large audiences for them. The major football games of a large university often display no better football than is displayed in the smaller contests, but at least one third of the mobs that flock to the big games go to see the trappings of the show. It is true that many who go first because of the bands, the yells, the gay clothes, the flags, songs, and the thrill of the mob become so interested in the game that they attend it later for its own sake.

The same principle works in securing debate audiences, especially in high schools. Let the school orchestra or band play one or two selections in the half-hour preceding the debate. Let the school cheer-leader dressed in his
uniform lead yells for both teams. Have the debaters’ tables decorated with the colors of their respective schools. These are small items in themselves, but they accomplish wonders in creating an audience that is enthusiastic and alive. Such an audience will return for the next debate.

If these six methods are applied thoroughly and intelligently, enthusiastic audiences will surely follow. However, results do not come overnight. In some places one well-planned campaign will achieve lasting results, whereas in other communities persistent effort is necessary for several years.

Balloting by the audience. Interest is added to many debates by letting the audience vote on the question. The object of this is fourfold: (1) to stimulate thinking on the part of the audience; (2) to see the tendency of public opinion on the question; (3) to see how effective debating is in changing people’s minds; (4) to see which team won in the opinion of the audience.

In the fourth respect part of the result must be discounted, because prejudice will often win votes for the home team. However, the home team does not always win the support of its audience, as was proved by the fact that when the University of Michigan debated against the team from Cambridge University, England, at Ann Arbor in October, 1925, the audience gave Cambridge five hundred and seventy-three votes and Michigan only two hundred and five. The proposition was “Resolved, That this house pities its grandchildren.”

The following ballot was used recently in an interschool debate with interesting results:

Resolved, That the proposed child-labor amendment to the national Constitution should be adopted by the United States.
2. The declaration. For a student to memorize and deliver parts of the world's best orations is excellent training in delivery. In debate one must constantly think of the subject matter to be expressed. As the declaration is memorized the student's mind is entirely free from worry about words. Consequently he may devote himself exclusively to a study of his delivery. Practice in delivering declarations is excellent training for the debater for smoothness in delivery.

3. Extemporaneous-speech contests. The debater must be fluent in extemporaneous speaking. He must be able to think a point through to its conclusion while he is facing an audience. At least 50 per cent of debating should be of this type. Accordingly, there is no more profitable training for the debating class than speaking extemore. Class contests in extemporaneous speaking produce excellent results. From these the debater gains poise, agility in thought, fluency, and self-confidence.

For variety and contrast in class work the wise instructor will devote some debating-class periods to the oration, to the declaration, and to extemporaneous speaking, all of which contribute to a student's smoothness in argument and his skill in presentation.
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