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C. P. Lahan

PREFACE

This book is not another text. It is intended as a manual for those who either direct or intend to direct debating in high school and college. An attempt has been made to present a maximum of practical suggestions, growing out of several years' active direction of high school and college forensics. No claim to originality is made for many of the suggestions offered, but at the same time actual experience with most of them leads to the hope that others may profit from them as well. Aside from use as a coach's manual, this handbook should prove useful for members of college debate squads and for those preparing to teach speech in secondary schools.

Throughout the book there is an emphasis on coaching to which some may object, or if they do not object to the emphasis, they may object to the term "coach." Let those who object to "coaching" substitute "directing" or "supervising" or "teaching." Change of wording will not invalidate the principles set forth or the suggestions offered.

To the possible charge of being repetitious I plead guilty in advance. It has seemed best to make the discussion of a given point or a given step complete even though some of the items considered must be taken up again in another connection. Furthermore, such repetition is of matter whose importance may well be emphasized by this method. The entire book has been written with the thought of immediate usefulness constantly in mind.

Grateful acknowledgement for permission to use copyrighted material is extended to the following authors and publishers: Marshall Jones Company for a
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II. WHAT GAINS FROM DEBATING?

Are these debates held merely for school advertising and because they offer another opportunity for indulging inter-school rivalry? These motives are undoubtedly present, but in themselves they cannot justify the time and labor and money expended. Indeed if participation in interscholastic contests in any sort of speech work means the crowding out of intramural activities and of class work in speech whereby the many rather than the few star performers profit, then the emphasis, most educators would agree, is clearly wrong. However, it is often true that these contests so motivate speech work in the high school that there is increased demand for and interest in class instruction.

What, then, are the attributes and benefits of debate that warrant its inclusion among the activities of high school and college? They have been listed and discussed so often that only brief treatment is necessary here. It of course is understood that these advantages come from good debating, and that usually means competent faculty direction, though, as will be indicated later, such direction can be overdone.

A. Training in Straight Thinking and Original Thinking

No student, be he in high school or college, can study and discuss a debate subject for several weeks or months without in some measure learning to sort the important from the trivial, to reject the superficial and fallacious, to have a better understanding of what constitutes sound reasoning on his own part and that of others. At the same time he learns to analyze and synthesize arguments and points of view with some originality. Says John Stuart Mill in his Autobiography: "I have always dated from these conversations [in a discussion group similar
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B. Open-mindedness

The debater must study both sides of his question. Again quoting Mill: "No man understands his own side until he understands the other side." Despite the fact that training in debate should make for open-mindedness, it is unfortunately true that we sometimes find debaters who are opinionated and contentious. Hence there arises the criticism that contest debating is unscientific in that a debater starts out with a ready-made viewpoint; he is either "affirmative" or "negative" and so bends all his energies, not to discovering the truth, but to "proving" his side of the proposition.

It must be admitted that there is some justification for this criticism. At the same time, the condition at which it is levelled is not a necessary accompaniment of debating. If the student carefully canvasses his own mind and reads as widely as possible before deciding on the side of the question he wishes to uphold, then his attitude is not an unscientific one, but quite the reverse.

It should be noted, too, that there is a definite tendency, even in formal debating, to get away from the unyielding, pugnacious attitude of insisting that you are all right and your opponent is all wrong. Throughout this book runs a plea for encouragement of that tendency. "Cooperative controversy" is the term used in a recent book, and a happy phrase it is. Not merely in so-called discussion, which is considered in the next chapter, but in all forms of debating, there can be more of reasonable commonsense yielding, admitting, cooperating. Debaters need not make of their activity a martial exploit of clouting each other with broadswords. As a


game it will not suffer in interest if the controversy becomes less antagonistic and more cooperative.

However, if a student is found who has deep-laid convictions on a question, such as prohibition, pacifism, imperialism, for example, and after studying both sides feels that there is only one side that he can honestly uphold, then, in the writer’s opinion, he should not be asked to argue, before a public audience, the side he does not believe. Even if the moral issue be waived, the chances are that he will not carry conviction when speaking for the side he thoroughly disbelieves.

The case is quite different for practice debates in preliminary squad preparation, for there no moral issue is involved as relates to dishonestly influencing an audience, and the necessity of developing a case for the side one does not believe, as already pointed out, means valuable training for the debater.

C. Thorough Study of an Interesting, Worth-while Question

What constitutes a good debate question will receive consideration in Chapter III, but it may be pointed out here that too often questions are used that are entirely outside the interest and experience of those who must debate them. This is particularly true, of course, in high schools. As Philip M. Hicks of Swarthmore College points out, “The thorough investigation of an important public problem acquires value with the assimilation, not the mere collection, of the materials of proof.”

D. Training in Public Speaking

This training, motivated as classroom instruction seldom can be, offers increasing genuineness and usefulness as memorized speaking is abandoned and the extempore method adopted.

E. Good Sportsmanship

Although there is still plenty of room for the development of this attitude on the part of both coaches and debaters, it is patent, since contest debating is a game, that when it is engaged in properly it offers the same sort of training in good sportsmanship commonly accredited to athletics. Perhaps the training is even more severe in the forensic field, for opportunities for subtly unsportsman-like conduct are even greater than in athletics.

F. Preparation for After-school Activities

The following quotation from Alexander Meiklejohn, formerly president of Amherst College, is so fitting that I let it speak for itself:

If we view college life fairly, we can not fail to take account of the constantly repeated statement of graduates that they count certain “activities” as having been of far greater educational value than the studies given and taken in the classroom. I am sure that this statement contains more of falsity than of truth. But there is a truth in it, and it behooves us to isolate it and look it squarely in the face.

As I look back on my own experience of teaching and disciplining, I seem to see what these graduates mean. I see it most clearly when I try to single out from the long list of students one group which shall stand forth as intellectually the best—best in college work and best in promise of future intellectual achievement. Much as I should like to do so, I cannot draw the line round my own favorite students in philosophy, nor the leaders in mathematics, nor those successful in biology; nor could I fairly award the palm to the Phi Beta Kappa men who have excelled in all their subjects. It seems to me that stronger than any other group, tougher in intellectual fiber, keener in intellectual interest, better equipped to battle with coming problems, are the college debaters—the boys, who, apart from their regular studies, band themselves together for intellectual controversy with each other and with their friends in other colleges.”


III. THE TRUE NATURE OF
CONTEST DEBATING

So much for the characteristics of debating that make it a valuable educational activity. Poor debating has often been criticized; two major objections have already been considered. Others, dealing largely with the alleged uninterestingness and artificiality of forensic contests, will be answered, directly or indirectly, later. The point is that all of these objections are seen to be more apparent than real when the true nature of contest debating is understood.

A debate is a contest, and so a game. At the same time it should be an intelligent, interesting discussion of a live question. As both these things it possesses definite educational values.

Again I quote from Professor Hicks of Swarthmore College, who puts the matter so well in his article on The New Spirit in Debating in the syllabus prepared under the direction of the National Association of Teachers of Speech.

In recognizing the necessity of discipline as a part of the business of preparation for life we have been too prone to overlook the fact that discipline can be gained as well in the pursuit of a desired as of a required end. When students engage willingly in an activity which, like debate, requires application, thought, and expression, it is possible to emphasize these values without seeming to do so, with the resulting advantage that the lesson will seem self-taught. When it [debating] is so organized that educational values are sacrificed to the mere winning of decisions, it forfeits its claim to academic support. It should be possible to preserve both the sport and the educational values without compromising either. [Italics mine].

If the natural joy in discussion is to be preserved in debating, the freedom and naturalness which make discussion a pleasure must be, as far as possible, maintained. If debate is to continue a sport, it must remain a free expression of opinion and of the grounds to that opinion. Too often it becomes

a mere catalog of reasons for opinion upon a subject that does not in any real sense enter into the consciousness of the speaker...

Not knowledge but thought is the end of education. Educational values lie not so much in knowledge of subjects in themselves as in the processes of investigation, judgment, and expression by which the debater strives to win an audience to his opinion. This end can be attained only when the student is working with material which is of genuine interest both to himself and to his audience. The discussion of such a question, if engaged in voluntarily, enlists the earnestness and enthusiasm of the student in an effort to learn and weigh the facts, to balance evidence, and to make the results of his own thoughts clear and interesting to others. Those are truly educational values.9

Throughout the following pages an earnest attempt is made to keep the discussion concrete and practical as well as theoretically sound. Special emphasis, sometimes expressed, sometimes implied, is laid everywhere upon the importance of the audience, in choosing the question, gathering material, constructing outlines, in reasoning, in refutation, in delivery of the speech. Debating is applied logic and applied persuasion, facts which too often have been lost sight of in treatises on argumentation and debate.
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1 Attention is called to Appendix V, A National Survey of High School Debating, and to Appendix VI, Surveys of Intercollegiate Debating for interesting facts on the practice of representative institutions in handling contest debates.
I. What is a Typical Debate?

In the typical college or high school debate, as we think of it, a definite, matter-of-fact proposition dealing with the institution of a new policy is under discussion. Examples of this sort of proposition on which considerable factual material is available, are: "Resolved, that all electric utilities in the United States should be governmentally owned and operated," "Resolved, that a judge or a board of judges should be substituted for the jury in all criminal trials in the United States."

Discussing this question are two teams of two or three members each. Each member is allowed eight to twelve minutes for the presentation of his constructive argument and, after the constructive speeches are finished, is allowed four to seven minutes for rebuttal.

When the debate is over, a decision is rendered by three judges, or possibly one, as to which team has won.

II. Recent Modifications

The last few years have seen the rise of numerous variants in the arrangements and the style of debating, induced by a desire for variety, for greater participation on the part of the audience, or for the remediying of weaknesses and abuses in prevailing forms.

To hold the attention of the audience, speeches are often reduced in number or length. For six speakers each to have a ten minute and a five minute speech means an hour and a half of actual speaking, which is quite long enough. Consequently, twelve minute speeches, though still used, are not considered very desirable.

Speeches are frequently reduced in number by cutting the team to two members or by having only one rebuttal speech. The first arrangement is becoming increasingly the rule among both high schools and colleges. The total time consumed in a debate may or may not be less than when six people speak. It is pretty generally agreed, however, that an hour’s discussion by four speakers is more interesting and less tiresome than one by six speakers that lasts for an hour and a half. The objection to the two-man team is that such an arrangement necessarily limits the total number of students participating.

Similarly, there is a drawback to having only one rebuttal speech, for ability in rebuttal is commonly considered the best earmark of good debating. Each member of the team, most coaches feel, should have the training that rebuttal gives and should be forced to show what he can do. As we adopt a style of debating that is increasingly extemporaneous, there will doubtless be more and more rebuttal material in the main speeches, thus making separate rebuttal speeches less essential.

Numerous other departures from the so-called typical debate are indicated in the following pages.

The most inclusive division of types is on the basis of how they are judged. Following a discussion of judged, audience-decision, and decisionless debates, various other types, which can be classified under one or another of these three headings, will be treated.

III. Decision by Judges

A. A Board of Judges

The decision rendered by three persons has been, until the last few years, the most common of the various forms of judging a debate. There was a time when the judges retired for consultation at the conclusion of the debate, but of late years this feature has been done away with, and now each judge casts his vote for the affirmative or negative purely on the basis of his own judgment.

Although the qualifications of a debate judge are taken up later, it should be pointed out here that the
V. Voice On The Debate

Argumentation is the most effective way to express ideas and influence others. The audience is the key to effective argumentation. In order to influence the audience, one must be able to express ideas clearly and logically. The audience must be convinced that the arguments presented are valid and persuasive. If the arguments are not convincing, the audience will not be swayed by the speaker's position. Therefore, it is important to present arguments that are strong and well-supported.

In conclusion, argumentation is a powerful tool for influencing others. By presenting strong and well-supported arguments, one can persuade people to accept a particular position. Argumentation is a critical component of effective debate and public speaking.
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decision on the merits of the debating is valueless. A school or home-town audience is pretty sure to be prejudiced for the home team and in addition is not qualified to judge contest debating. If the debate is staged on a so-called neutral floor, though the audience may not be prejudiced toward one team or the other, it is usually even less qualified to pass on the merits of the debating.

B. Vote On The Question

The usual method of securing a so-called audience decision is to have members of the audience indicate whether their views on the question have been changed by the discussion. This may be done in various ways, but the best method is to use printed ballots. One type provides for marking both before and after the debate, the other simply for voting afterwards. For explanation of how audience ballots are tabulated see Chapter VII.

These ballots may or may not be used to decide which side "won." The shifts of opinion are interesting, and they may be significant, depending on the audience. To make shifts of opinion determine which team won in a debate on prohibition before the average church audience would probably be folly. Opinions are too thoroughly established, and counter arguments would be minimized while supporting arguments would be magnified. On the other hand, shifts of opinion might be quite significant in a debate on the direct primary before a Kiwanis Club. It is interesting to note, as Professor Woodward of Western Reserve University points out, that in ninety-four debates where both judge and audience votes were used the record shows sixty agreements between audience and judge, as compared with only thirty-four disagreements.3

Even in this type of audience voting there is a chance for "loading," though there is little danger of that before a neutral audience. A team supporter may vote before the debate for a position contrary to that upheld by "his" team so that he can vote for its position at the close—and this regardless of his own views. However, it is not usually difficult to educate even student audiences to play the game fairly.

Naturally the question for debate makes a difference as to how well the audience participates in voting. A group of farmers would vote eagerly on an equalization-fee farm relief bill; on the cancellation of Allied debts they might hesitate. As Professor Woodward says:

Audience opinion is an elusive thing. Shy at times; at times graciously pliable and accommodating; sometimes stolidly indifferent, emotionally effervescent sometimes, sometimes vociferous and belligerent; intelligent, informed, and self-expressive, or uninformed and averse to exposing its ignorance; generally revealing a high state of inertia when asked to use pencils as well as minds.4

The results should be tabulated as quickly as possible, so that they can be announced before the audience leaves. Since an open forum is usually combined with this type of debate, it is often possible to do the tabulating while the forum is being conducted. The ballots will be found to be much clearer, too, if considerable care is taken before the debate to explain carefully just what the audience is to do. The chairman may give the explanation or turn the task over to someone else more familiar with the details.

Whether audience voting is used to determine decisions or whether it is used merely to vitalize the discussion and secure greater participation on the part of the audience, it can be agreed that on the whole it attains the latter goal. And right there, in the writer's mind, lies a danger, perhaps not serious, but still a danger. The greater communicativeness and adaptability that speakers

---

3 From article Measurement and Analysis of Audience Opinion, by Howard S. Woodward. Quarterly Journal of Speech. 14:97. February, 1928. Those who are interested in audience voting will find some interesting tabulations and conclusions in this article based upon a large number of contests.

will tend to develop when asking for an audience’s vote may degenerate into cheap popular appeal and the submersion of straight facing of facts. Effective persuasion has too often been lacking in American debating, but care must be taken lest in our desire to become persuaders we become demagogues.

Despite its possible dangers, audience-voting has many virtues and much promise. Professor Woodward’s conclusion puts it well:

The popular hypothesis that opinion on public questions is generally poorly grounded must be accompanied by the hypothesis that usually there is not strong conviction in these opinions, except as emotional urges come into play. Speakers of all sorts, even college debaters, then, should be expected to cause considerable change in the attitude of their hearers. They may even do their audiences a service of enlightenment. The shift-of-opinion ballot seems to offer a technique that may yet throw some light on the problem of how best to perform this service.”

V. The Decisionless Debate

This type is largely self-explanatory. Constructive and rebuttal speeches are given as usual, followed customarily by an open forum, but not by a decision from judge or audience.

A large number of colleges use this style of debate either exclusively or in part. The argument is that decisions make for stiffness and artificiality, encourage unsportsmanlike tactics, and in general defeat the educational ends of debate. By doing away with the decision—whether by judge or audience—the discussion is made more genuinely a “thinking together” on a public question, with consequent value to both speakers and hearers.

On the other hand, it is argued that most discussions in real life are aimed at securing, and are followed by, a decision of some sort, that no-decision debating leads to careless preparation, that the rendering of a decision gives greater zest to the contest for both audience and participants, and that school audiences fall off where decisions are given up.

Here again, it should be pointed out that audiences alter cases. In a debate before a radical audience at the Labor Temple in St. Paul on our Latin American policy, two college teams had a most enjoyable evening without a decision of any sort. An audience decision would have been meaningless, and it could not have improved on the rapt attention given the speakers. A decision by a critic judge would have bored the audience and perhaps have been misunderstood.

A good chairman is indispensable for a decisionless debate whether or not an open forum follows, for otherwise the whole affair will be left up in the air and everyone will feel unsatisfied.

VI. The Open Forum

The open forum may be used with almost any style of debate, though it is most commonly combined with the decisionless and audience-decision types. The open forum simply provides that when the formal discussion is finished, members of the audience may ask questions of the speakers or make brief comments on the topic under discussion.

Such an arrangement tends to make the audience take greater interest in the whole discussion and so makes it a more genuine affair. Needless to say, it furnishes a real test for the debaters to face and answer such cross-questioning. When the proposition is a thoroughly live one, the open forum may prove to be more enlightening and exciting than the formal argument.

To be successful, however, certain requirements must be met. As just indicated, the question should be one


in which the audience will have real interest aroused by the preceding discussion. There must be a good chair-
man—quick and fair, with a sense of humor. To him all questions are directed. Questions and comments on the
part of the audience must be short and pointed. Conversely, answers must be short and straightforward, with no attempt to equivocate. Often admissions can be made then that, from the standpoint of strategy, would be ill-advised in the formal debate. A final requisite for a successful open forum is that it must not be allowed to drag. Since people are usually a bit reticent about starting the discussion, it is a good plan to have a few in the audience primed in advance to start off with pertinent questions.

VII. The Split Team

Here we have another attempt to prevent rigidity in organization and presentation and to counteract prejudice for the home team. The mechanics is simply this. Suppose high schools A and B are going to debate at B. Each school may have been working on the question for some time. Prior to the debate, perhaps an hour or longer, one of A’s debaters meets with two of B’s debaters and the three constitute a team. Similarly, one of B’s men and two of A’s make up the other team. The respective sides are usually agreed upon previously.

In the ensuing debate, high school A does not oppose high school B. Each school is represented on each team. It is possible, of course, to have equal division of team members by having just two on a team, one from A and one from B.

The device of the split-team practically guarantees extempore debating and is an interesting exercise now and then. It will probably never have a wide vogue as an exclusive type, for it does not adapt itself to decision debating, and unity and team work are apt to be weak.

A decision can be secured even here, if it seems imperative, by having judges give percentages to individual speakers and then totaling grades for the three representatives of each school. Or, since there is no "home" team, a student audience may vote as to which is the better team.

VIII. Cross-Questioning

Since the cross-question procedure was first introduced into contest debating at the University of Oregon about 1925, thereby getting the name of the Oregon Plan, it has been widely used and as widely modified in a variety of ways. Numerous forms of debate and discussion, altho not primarily built on the Oregon Plan, employ cross-questioning to a greater or less extent.

Writing in the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education for April, 1926, J. Stanley Gray points out that the Oregon plan was devised "to get away from the decision debate and its attending evils, and yet to escape the above mentioned fault of the no-decision debate"—that of slipshod preparation.

The plan is explained and supported by Professor Gray as follows:

1. The first affirmative speaker presents the entire affirmative case in a speech of twenty minutes length.

2. The first negative speaker presents the entire negative case in a speech of twenty minutes length.

3. The first affirmative speaker returns to the platform and is cross-questioned concerning his case by the second negative speaker. This period is ten minutes in length. The questioner is in charge and the answers must be short and definite. The chairman is the final authority in any dispute regarding the relevancy of questions, the completeness and definiteness of answers, the interpretation of the resolution, etc.

4. The first negative speaker returns to the platform and is similarly cross-questioned by the second affirmative speaker,
5. The second negative speaker is then given ten minutes to refute the arguments of the affirmative case and to summarize the debate for his side.

6. The second affirmative speaker is given ten minutes for similar refutation and summary.

The entire length of the debate is one hour and twenty minutes. These periods can be altered as desired but we have found them to be very satisfactory with time allotted as above.

In this method, which we have called the "Oregon plan" for want of a better name, we have combined all the benefits of both the decision and the no-decision debate and yet we have retained none of the evils. We have no judge prejudice; no over-emphasis of winning; no refusal of a debater to admit a fact because it may cause him to lose a judge's vote; no sacrificing of the welfare of the student for the sake of a winning a debate; no dry academic and technical speeches; and finally, no shirking in preparation. This period of cross-questioning is sufficient stimulus for thorough preparation. Aside from the first two speeches, memorized speaking is impossible. The debater must learn to adjust himself and his ideas to the new situations which every debate presents.‘

As indicated at the beginning of this section, various modifications have been developed during the past decade. Here are some illustrations:

1. In line with the general tendency to reduce the length of debates, time limits for the respective speeches are often shortened.

2. The entire team may be subject to cross-examination instead of only the speaker who presents the constructive case.

3. There may be two constructive speeches on each side instead of only one, each such speaker being subject to cross-examination immediately after he has spoken.

4. The plan may be used with three-member teams. Two possible arrangements in such cases are as follows:
   a. Six constructive speeches are given as in the conventional debate. Then, instead of the usual rebuttals, each team is cross-examined, the cross-examiner


or the team members deciding who will answer a given question. There is a final rebuttal and summary for each side.

b. First affirmative gives constructive speech; first negative gives constructive speech; second negative cross-examines first affirmative; second affirmative cross-examines first negative; third negative summarizes; third affirmative summarizes.

Whether in original form or modified in any one of various ways, the Oregon plan has interesting possibilities. Not the least of its requirements is the possession of considerable shrewdness and the ability to follow up significant questions and answers on the part of the cross-examiners. A certain number of possible questions, and even series of questions, may profitably be worked out more or less definitely in advance, but the most satisfactory results will be obtained if technical and legalistic questions are avoided.‘

Because there are indubitable advantages in the cross-question debate, students and directors should not be blind to its dangers and weaknesses. Audiences, whether in high school, college, or off-campus, enjoy the dramatized battle of wits. Therein lies the danger that the questioning will be showy, superficial, and tricky, designed to trap opponents rather than illuminate the subject. Answerers, too, even though there is no decision, may evade and stall for time.

A writer in the Quarterly Journal of Speech sums up the requirements for good cross-question debating rather well:‘

‘The cross-examination plan will not operate well unless certain principles are clearly understood by all speakers. During the cross-examination, the cross-examiner is in charge. His task is a test of tact and good judgment. He must avoid

‘Two sets of illustrative cross-examination questions are given in Appendix IV.

‘Readers are also referred to a section on cross-examination methods in Handbook of Argumentation by Russell H. Wagner. Thomas Nelson and Sons. New York. 1936.
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offending his opponent or the audience, and yet he must not be timid in his questioning. ... If he expects to be most effective, his questions will deal very largely with the speech just concluded by his opponent. He should observe the rule of brevity. Long and complicated questions are confusing to the audience and unfair to the opposing speaker. ... The examiner should be allowed to insist that answers be brief and to the point. He should be allowed to interrupt a long-winded answer that threatens to usurp his time, though in fairness the opposing speaker should be allowed a reasonable opportunity to explain his answers. The examiner should be allowed to comment briefly on answers made to his questions. ...

The speaker being questioned may insist that questions be relevant and intelligible. Only a moment is required to point out the reasons for objecting to a question, and in the majority of cases that will suffice to cause the examiner to restate the question in an acceptable form. Occasionally it will be necessary to refer an objection to the chairman for a decision, but in practice this happens very seldom. [Objection may legitimately be raised to unreasonable insistence on "Yes or No" answers] ... .

The cross-examination debate is precisely what the speakers make of it. If they take the view that they are expected to imitate the narrowly technical and quibbling methods of some lawyers in the courtroom, it will not be satisfactory. On the other hand, if they realize that it is an informal process of give and take, that it is a two-way discussion which has been expanded to bring in the entire audience as silent participants, the use of this plan will enliven and intensify debate.10

IX. THE DIALECTIC DEBATE

Altho this type might be considered in the previous section, it is given separate treatment because of the way the constructive case is developed. It has not been widely used, but it has interesting possibilities in variety and audience appeal, although there is a problem of maintaining unity and continuity.


TYPES OF DEBATE

In a debate of this sort between Albion College and Western State Teachers College in 1935 on the question of munitions control, the following arrangements, suggested by Albion, were followed. The affirmative used fifteen minutes to develop their constructive case by having one man question his team-mate in such a way as to bring out the central emphases of their argument. (In fact, there may be reciprocal questioning and answering by the two men.) The affirmative team were then cross-examined by the negative for ten minutes. Following this twenty-five minutes, the negative similarly developed their case and were cross-examined. Finally, the negative summarized for five minutes, and the affirmative concluded the debate with a summary of equal length.

X. THE HECKLING DEBATE

A somewhat similar type that has been tried in some cases and one that has possibilities for practice purposes, is the heckling debate. Here, under certain prearranged conditions, team members may interrupt opposing speakers, to demand proof or evidence or to challenge reasoning. Altho such an arrangement is good training for the control of temper, a good deal of time is apt to be consumed and the audience may be confused in following the cases.

XI. THE CONGRESSIONAL-STYLE DEBATE

This form, a combination of the conventional procedure, cross-questioning, and heckling, was developed at Purdue University about 1931. Its sponsors have prepared the following outline.

1. Number of speakers. Flexible. Two-speaker team recommended.

2. Constructive Speeches

A. 12 minutes—of which time 4 minutes may be utilized by the opposition in heckling and questioning the speaker.
XII. THE DIRECT-CLASS DEBATE

For intangibles and speaker
are used different colors but used
are more easily if numbered cards
are used, because the cards
are placed in an envelope, the
speaker can be heard more clearly.

5. The order of speakers shall be the same as that used.

4. The proposition in which is continued

3. The proposition to which is continued

B. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

A. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

C. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

D. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

E. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

F. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

G. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

H. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

I. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

J. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

K. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

L. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

M. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

N. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

O. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

P. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

Q. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

R. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

S. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

T. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

U. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

V. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

W. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

X. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

Y. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.

Z. The conclusion of the proposition
in Section 3, and.
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If the debate is non-decision, there will of course be no judging committee. Each side shall present 2 or 3 issues each (depending on the desire of the debate directors). Each clash shall go the full seven speeches.

If an audience-vote is desired, the audience may vote its convictions concerning the proposition both before and after the debate to show shift in opinion. Or the members of the audience may vote to determine which team won each clash. That team which receives the most audience votes shall become the winner of each particular clash, and that team which wins a majority of the clashes shall be declared victor in the debate.

H. Suggested Variations in the Rules:

a. The time of the speeches in each clash shall be lengthened and the number reduced. Practice will probably demonstrate that the debaters will soon be able to adjust themselves to the shorter speeches with profit to themselves and the audience. But some coaches who have used the Direct Clash debate believe that there should be one 4 minute speech and four 3 minute speeches to each clash.

b. As soon as the spokesman of the judging committee gives the signal that any clash is to continue, the member of the team about to speak shall be allowed to ask the preceding speaker from one to three questions which must be answered by the speaker without delay, the time used in reply not to be taken from the 2 minute periods allowed each speaker. This innovation, some believe, will introduce some of the training values of the Oregon Plan.

c. At the end of each of the debates, or at the end of each clash, in a non-decision or audience-vote debate, the members of the audience shall be allowed to question in alternating order the members of each team.

6. The Direct Clash debate may also be used in a one-man-per-side debate before luncheon clubs, school assembly programs, etc.

XIII. THE MULTI-SIDED DEBATE

There has been extensive experimentation in this field since the 1930 edition of this book asked: "There are times when a question has not two sides but three or more, as, for example, three alternative solutions for a given problem. Then why not have a discussion of all three from the same platform?" The experiments carried on and the forms devised have been affected in no small degree by the constantly repeated criticism that debate, with its presentation of ready-made points of view and its emphasis on competition, is not an ideal method for the public discussion of current problems in a democracy. In the present section we shall consider certain modifications that are less controversial than the conventional debate and that make possible the consideration of several aspects of a given problem rather than only two.

A. The Symposium

The symposium has long been used as a means of having several aspects of a problem or several points of view presented from the same platform. It is of particular interest to us here because it is being increasingly used as an inter-scholastic discussion form. Western Reserve University, which has pioneered in having audiences vote before and after debates, thus reports experience with the symposium in the Quarterly Journal of Speech for February, 1935.20

1. No attempt is made to select and phrase an exact and rigid debating proposition. A general subject is selected, the problem involved is agreed upon by all the speakers and is stated for the audience by one of the speakers, whose sole task is to state the problem for which solutions will be offered.

2. In the balloting for expression of opinion-change, each member of the audience is permitted to select one of several proposed solutions for a stated problem, rather than express a choice for or against a specifically phrased proposition representing but one solution for the problem. In each case, however, there is opportunity to indicate indecision.

3. Speakers do not represent teams and have no "col leagues." Each presents his individual views.

4. Each speaker has a different function: one states the problem for discussion; three or four propose different solutions; three or four cross-examine the advocates, to ascertain both strength and weakness in the plans suggested; one summarizes the problem, the solutions, and the results of cross-examinations. All speakers had opportunity to examine the statement of the problem posed by the first speaker before delivery.

5. The total time of speaking is one hour and forty minutes rather than one hour and thirty.

The exact speaking procedure [in a given symposium] was as follows:

1. An Exposition of the Problem of Economic Reconstruction for the United States—20 minutes—Western Reserve University.
2. A Proposal of the National Recovery Act as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Western Reserve University.
3. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in the National Recovery Act—5 minutes—Wooster College.
4. A Proposal of Socialism as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Oberlin College.
5. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in Socialism—5 minutes—Ohio Wesleyan University.
6. A Proposal of Fascism as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Wooster College.
7. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in Fascism—5 minutes—Western Reserve University.
8. A Proposal of Laissez Faire as a Possible Solution—15 minutes—Ohio Wesleyan University.
9. Cross-Examination to Ascertain Strength or Weakness in Laissez Faire—5 minutes—Oberlin College.
10. A Summary of the Problem, of the Solutions, and of the Results of Cross-Examination—10 minutes—Western Reserve University.

B. The Parliamentary Session

Altho similar to the Symposium, this type has more of the debate element about it in that it carries through to


a final vote by the audience. It is also similar to Convention Debating, described in the next section, in that the various proposals may be the result of committee consideration. As used at Pennsylvania State College, however, where this adaptation of Convention Debating has been made, it is also employed for regular inter-collegiate contests.

In the Parliamentary Session the chairman, who should be well versed in parliamentary procedure, introduces the topic for discussion in the form of a question. Four speakers, two from each college, then present an analysis of the problem and various alternative solutions, these solutions being advanced as motions and substitute motions for adoption eventually by the assembly. At the conclusion of the four speeches the audience, in which there are usually a number of squad members, is given a chance to participate with short talks supporting or attacking the proposals that have been suggested. During this phase of the discussion primary emphasis is on content, and the four team speakers may take part. When the chairman senses that the audience is ready to go on, he announces that votes on the pending motions will soon be in order and encourages the group to employ the various practices of parliamentary law in disposing of the motions. A period of brisk parliamentary skirmishing ensues, and the group finally goes on record as favoring or disapproving the various proposals.

It is probably unnecessary to point out that a by-product (Or is it more than that?) of this type of debate is some well motivated practice in parliamentary usage.

Perhaps the best way to make the procedure clear is to outline a specimen discussion. The outline given here is taken from the agreement covering the Parliamentary Session between Pennsylvania State College and Western State Teachers College in the spring of 1936.
C. **Conclusion of Debate**

The conclusion of the debate is the final stage where the debaters summarize their arguments and present the final statement to the audience. The conclusion should be clear, concise, and effective in reinforcing the debaters' main points and persuading the audience.

**TYPES OF DEBATE**

- **Impressionistic Debate**
- **Argumentative Debate**
- **Analytical Debate**

**DEBATE COACHING**

Coaching involves guiding and training debaters to improve their skills and performance. Coaches provide feedback, strategy, and tips on how to deliver effective arguments and engage with the audience.

**AS INTELLECTUAL COMMERCIALS**

Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce as well as intrastate commerce. Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the several States, which commerce includes the power to regulate transportation, commerce, trade, and business. This power is granted to Congress to ensure the smooth functioning of commerce and to prevent unfair practices.

**AS LEGISLATIVE COACHING**

When a debate is being heard, the debate coach should guide the debaters on how to present their arguments effectively. The coach should ensure that the debaters are clear, concise, and persuasive in their presentations.

**AS LEGISLATIVE COACHING**

When a debate is being heard, the debate coach should guide the debaters on how to present their arguments effectively. The coach should ensure that the debaters are clear, concise, and persuasive in their presentations.

**AS LEGISLATIVE COMMERCIALS**

Congress has the power to regulate commerce among the several States, which commerce includes the power to regulate transportation, commerce, trade, and business. This power is granted to Congress to ensure the smooth functioning of commerce and to prevent unfair practices.

**AS LEGISLATIVE COMMERCIALS**

Congress has the power to regulate commerce among the several States, which commerce includes the power to regulate transportation, commerce, trade, and business. This power is granted to Congress to ensure the smooth functioning of commerce and to prevent unfair practices.
whole, a course of action toward each problem being adopted by formal vote.

Countless modifications in Convention Debating, as here outlined, suggest themselves. Topics may deal with educational problems, with national issues. High schools as well as colleges may profitably experiment with this sort of realistic discussion. There are great possibilities here of motivated study and extemporaneous speaking.

XIV. Discussion

Although this is a book on debating, a section dealing with Discussion is not out of place inasmuch as both procedures have their contribution as means of exploring the facts, stimulating thought, and arriving at conclusions. Multi-sided debating is a sharp modification of the conventional form, in the direction of broadening the field of inquiry and lessening the danger of over-contentiousness. Discussion, as advocated by its proponents, goes further. Although representatives of different schools can participate, true discussion is scarcely conceivable as a contest form, for it is a process of cooperative group thought and action in which the competitive element is taboo.

The Indiana High School Discussion League, the constitution of which is given in Appendix XI, is an example of attempts being made at a certain type of discussion as a contest form. Actually, however, the result is a special form of extempore speaking contest, which, no matter how great its value in motivating effective purposeful speaking, is scarcely typical of true discussion procedure and attitude."^{18}


Whatever form true discussion takes, it is urged by its proponents\(^{19}\) that the various participants, by give-and-take discussion, finally arrive at a so-called "consensus," which is neither majority domination nor compromise, but rather an harmonious composite of individual views. "The process . . . seems mainly one of mutual help in seeing better. The special sensitivities and outlook of each member stir new awarenesses in the others until all experience an enrichment of social insight in the matter."\(^{20}\)

Instead of "debating" the proposition that the Federal Government should develop the principal sources of hydro-electric power still in its control, under this system speakers would "discuss," each from his own viewpoint, what ought to be done as to the future of electric power generation in the United States. Out of several speakers on the platform and in the audience, no two might agree exactly when they started, but at the close, provided the proper "discussion" attitude was maintained, they would be considerably nearer agreement, and the audience would be more intelligently informed and actively interested then if the two teams had limited themselves to two aspects of the question.

Such are the claims for the discussion method in group conference. A. Craig Baird, in a concise and stimulating treatment of group discussion, points out its limitations:

Where the issue becomes sharply drawn, as it almost always does in legislatures, court rooms, or on the political platform, group discussion must give way to debate. Majorities must be determined; noses must be counted. Otherwise deadlocks and stagnation would follow. Because our democracy must get on, we cannot linger during the months or years that might be necessary for a group to arrive at a consensus of opinion regard-


\[\text{\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Alfred Dwight Sheffield in Appendix XIV.}\]
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ing the issue. As a preliminary to formal debate and as a device to be used where sharp differences of opinion and prejudice may not develop, the group discussion is of great value.¹⁹

The individual discussion, despite certain weaknesses and dangers, has possibilities of genuineness, possibilities so alluring that it should be experimented with, if not between different schools, then within the squad and between teams from the squad before outside audiences. It should lack at least some of the contentiousness and refusal to yield that are too often found in ordinary contest debating.

As in the case of the ordinary open forum, a chairman who stimulates the discussion attitude, directs the thinking, and summarizes progress from time to time is essential.

Since the discussion (Or is it a debate?) brings out the differences between debate and other discussion forms so clearly, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of each, extensive excerpts from two recent articles in the Quarterly Journal of Speech are given in Appendix XIV. In connection with these articles by Professors Sheffield and McKean, attention is also called to a recent book on the use of forums and public discussion in a democracy by John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.²⁰

A. Panel Discussion ²¹

Because this type most completely exemplifies the true discussion procedure as distinguished from debate, it seems wise to explain it somewhat in detail. The following explanation is by Dr. S. A. Courtis of the University of Michigan, based on an article in the Jour-

nal of the Progressive Education Association for February, 1933.²²

1. Definition

The panel discussion is a mode of organizing meetings which is designed to promote mutual understanding and the cooperative solution of common problems. It was developed primarily by Professor H. A. Overstreet, of the College of the City of New York.

2. Need

Increasingly in our civilization there is need for cooperative thinking, planning, and acting. The panel discussion affords opportunity for training people in cooperative techniques. Moreover, the discussion itself is very stimulating to understanding, creative thinking, sympathy, and other desirable outcomes. Panel discussions, properly guided, furnish a form of vital and enjoyable activity which at the same time is richly educative.

3. Description

The elements of a panel are four:
A. A chairman.
B. A panel of four to eight persons.
C. An audience.
D. A topic for discussion.

The entire panel is seated in a semi-circle facing the audience, the chairman in the center. No speeches are made, but a free-for-all discussion takes place between the members of the panel exactly as though no audience were present. The chairman coordinates and interprets this discussion, attempting to weave the separate strands and items of thought into a complete design in which each finds its place. There must be no debate, no conflicts; instead, the spirit which dominates the discussion is that any and every view is a contribution and has a place in the completed pattern. The activity of bringing unity out of the diversity of ideas and viewpoints is the peculiar function of the chairman; the function of the individual members is to supply creatively the diversity of ideas and elements. When the general pattern of the discussion is clearly seen,

opportunity is given for the entire audience to contribute. Finally, the chairman summarizes the discussion and indicates the general benefits accruing from the discussion activities.

4. Chairman

The most important factor in the success of a panel discussion is the chairman. He must have "hospitality of mind" to a very high degree and resourcefulness in selecting, harmonizing, and combining different points of view. He must be a good judge of personalities, be a tactful, socially minded, witty individual with a background of broad culture to enable him quickly to seize upon the valuable element of each offering. He offers very few ideas himself, confining his contributions to emphasizing significant elements and to the weaving and organizing process. In the final summary, he has the opportunity to integrate the products of the discussion into a worthwhile whole.

5. Members

Panel members should be ready thinkers, facile speakers, interested in the topic, and representatives of a wide variety of viewpoints and interests. Above all, they must be cooperative in attitude. Ordinarily, the selection of the panel will be made by the chairman. In school work, the selection will at first be made by the teacher, then by the chairman, finally, as the class grows in power, by the group as a whole.

6. Selection of a Topic

The topic chosen for selection should be one about which conflicting or different views are held by members of the panel. It should be specific in that it deals with a narrow, single topic but it should be general in its form of statement.

ILLUSTRATIONS:

"What is generalization and what is its function in classroom teaching?"

"What is the meaning of culture in present day civilization?"

"How far should teachers go in letting pupils set their own lessons?"

There should be sufficient preliminary stimulation of experiences or thought to insure an adequate supply of ideas in the audience and panel. Panel discussion might well be the second step in a study of a chapter in a text, the first step of which was the assignment to read the chapter for a given purpose. The formulation of a topic for discussion would itself be a good subject for a panel discussion. Another method of stimulating thinking is to give a reaction test and tabulate the responses to bring out differences in opinion just before discussion.

7. Preparation of Panel

Ordinarily, the first step in the discussion is a preparatory meeting of the chairman and panel before the discussion that the chairman may get acquainted with the panel, may acquaint them with each other, and may make them familiar with the conditions of the discussion. The chairman asks each member to give a brief biographical account of himself and of his interest in the topic. Almost any subject will do as a basis of comment. The purpose is to have the panel members become accustomed to speaking to each other, and used to the direction and control of the chairman. Also, it enables the chairman to size up the panel and adjust himself to them.

The chairman should emphasize the fact that no one is to stand, or to make a speech, but to think creatively, and to contribute. He should emphasize both the undesirability of opposition to another's contribution, and the need to entertain any thought or viewpoint, however irrelevant it may at first thought appear. He should also emphasize the importance of each individual's contributing with perfect freedom every aspect of his own personal thinking and viewpoint. He should make clear that the spirit of friendship and good will should be consciously and systematically maintained without any way limiting freedom of thought and expression.

In classroom discussions or in groups which know each other fairly well, there is no need for a preliminary meeting. The first few times, the directions may need to be repeated to panel and audience together, but as soon as the members know the technique, the discussion can go forward without preparation.

8. Preparation of Audience

The second step is the explanation to the audience of the method of conducting the discussion. This explanation should
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repeat the instructions to the panel and make it clear that the panel is serving as the mouthpiece of the group because an informal discussion is too cumbersome in a large audience. The audience is asked to listen only until the general pattern of ideas is established and the promise should be made that ultimately the discussion will be thrown open for all. The chairman should stand while making this explanation and should emphasize the fact that speeches are taboo. He should conclude by clearly stating the problem for discussion, and then sit down and begin the discussion.

9. The Discussion

The third step is to call upon some panel member for the expression of an opinion on the selected topic. The chairman should listen thoughtfully to the ideas expressed, mentally select the essential elements of the contribution, restate them in slightly different words, and ask some other panel member what he thinks about the matter. In this way, the discussion continues.

10. Duties of Chairman

The chairman's specific duties are:

A. To stimulate contributions.
B. To repeat or reformulate contributions enough to give the audience and panel time to rethink for themselves the point made.
C. To supply illustrations when a panel member states a principle, or to generalize when a panel member gives specific illustrations. This also provides time and opportunity for understanding.
D. To give recognition by name, systematically but subtly, for each contribution made.
E. To emphasize aspects of contributions significant for the pattern or design which develops. The chairman may guide by asking questions and by emphasis, but should not dominate or direct the discussion to a specific and predetermined outcome.

F. To interpret the interrelations of diverse contributions, both to each other and to the general pattern.
G. To summarize and to integrate from time to time, and at the close of the discussion.
H. To decide when the contributions of the panel have been sufficiently brought out to include the audience in the discussion.

11. Conflicts

One peculiar and important function of the chairman is to prevent emotional clashes and tensions. The best means of doing this is the interjection of humorous or whimsical comments immediately following the slightest indication of opposition or tension. The interruption gives time for the members involved to regain rational control, and the laughs that follow humorous comments automatically aid relaxation. On the other hand, the chairman must exhibit the utmost toleration for conflicting ideas and have a genuine interest in each point of view presented. Members should be encouraged to contribute conflicting points of view but not to assume an antagonistic or argumentative attitude.

12. Control

Another important function is the control of obstreperous individuals who disregard the conditions under which the discussion is being conducted, and egotistically and aggressively insist on making speeches. Here again, humorous interruption and the passing of the question to a panel member is an effective means. With pupils, exclusion from participation is sufficiently severe penalty.

13. Outcome

In general the chairman is to build bridges from mind to mind and out of aggressive, creative, atomic thinking to manufacture by emphasis and redirection a rich, comprehensive and consistent view of the whole topic, with each element in its proper place and relationship. Sometimes it is sufficient if opposing views and reasons are brought to light and arrayed in opposition. It is not essential to success in this type of discussion that a decision be reached. The goal is the clarification of thought.

*In a personal letter, May 22, 1936, Dr. Couris writes: "I should like to suggest that our experience shows that it is far better to start the panel with short two-minute speeches by the panel members presenting their points of view. It gives the other panel members and the audience a chance to get acquainted with the speaker and saves a great deal of fumbling around at the very beginning."
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humor throughout to keep the whole discussion entertaining as well as instructive. There may or may not have been an audience vote and an open forum.

Why is it that men from British universities debate so differently from their American cousins? Largely because of the great difference in training. The following paragraph from an article by Professor A. Craig Baird, formerly of Bates and now of the University of Iowa, is illuminating.

The Oxford Union Society, from whose members the team in America was selected, is a literary-social club founded a century ago, the most important and famous of the numerous Oxonian societies; it includes several hundred students from the twenty-odd colleges. The Union, with the presiding officer’s dais, the benches for the government and the opposition, the party leaders, and the “aye” and “no” exits, duplicates the House of Commons. Each of the four speakers for the evening is assigned to the side that represents his convictions. He wears evening dress and takes his subject seriously. With little or no reference to his colleague he gives his individual argument, usually some fifteen minutes long. If he persists, no bell shuts him off. A polite note from the secretary may remind him of the time. He follows no formal brief, reproduces no carefully wrought manuscript. The constant heckling may inspire him to unexpected power in argument. He tries to be natural, informal, conversational; he scores with his wit, invective, and persuasiveness, more than with statistics and frowning evidence. No stiff-necked judges pass on the “merits of the debate.” The aim is to establish conviction rather than to gain a technical decision; to arrive at the truth rather than to play a game. An open forum, with perhaps fifteen or twenty speeches from the floor, follows. Finally, not long before midnight, the three or four hundred members divide and vote on the merits of the question, usually a problem of national or international policy. Thus the British system is a judgeless, open-forum, parliamentary discussion rather than a competitive sport,—not entirely dissimilar to the open forum debates with which American universities of the Middle West have experimented. In his purpose, style, and delivery the Oxford collegian thus differs sharply from the conventional American debater."

Few American debaters get any such vital, invigorating training as this, especially since the decline of "literary" societies. But the difference extends further than to forensic practice. It goes back to the educational systems of the two countries. It is well known that the English boy when he enters the university has a far better general-culture background than do boys entering American colleges. Not only that; the cultural emphasis is continued throughout the university course. Independent thinking is encouraged by a system of instruction that varies widely from ours in the United States, where we insist on text absorption, assigned readings, and compulsory class attendance. Furthermore, the older British universities have commonly been regarded as training schools for Parliament and the public service, and this tradition naturally leads to an interest in the discussion of public affairs. And finally, formal contest debating is practically unknown abroad. Discussion, as indicated by Professor Baird, is between individuals rather than between teams.

Among the many propositions that have been used in international debates in this country these are illustrative:

That this house is opposed to the principle of prohibition.
That democracy has failed.
That the world has more to fear than to hope from science.
That co-education is a failure.
That the radio should be a public monopoly.
That the increase of advertising is a menace to modern society.
That unemployment is a national responsibility.

In this country there are strong admirers and advocates of the English style of debating; there are also those who can see little of value in it. The view is gradually prevailing, however, that, as usual, the truth lies somewhere between the two extremes. It is undeniable that American debating has been definitely affected, perhaps for both good and ill. We are realizing that English debating cannot simply be grafted in toto onto an entirely different background with any hope of real success. Very few American college students, to say nothing of high school pupils, can discuss with penetration or originality broad philosophical questions. That is, our college students cannot do it so easily in either content or manner as can English university men. That does not mean they should not try. The English style of question calls forth more exercise of original thinking than the investigation of many a more definite question. Then by all means let us use both methods.

Already American teams are doing it, within the same institution and with other institutions. Let us emulate the ease, the informality, the originality, the interestingness of the English debaters and thank them for the lesson.

On the other hand, let us avoid the glib superficiality, the sweeping generalizations, the attempts at humor substituted for substance that even they sometimes exhibit. With all its faults, American debating has had a wholesome insistence on thorough-going preparation and on respect for evidence. These values and those inherent in the English style are not incompatible.

The greatest values in the visit of foreign teams have not been mentioned. They are the cultural value for both Americans and foreigners of having direct, friendly contacts between the young men and women of the various nations, and the advance in international understanding and goodwill thus made. Not even the most hostile critic of debating methods would decry these returns.
and figures, to say nothing of digesting them. The general nature of the debate renders of doubtful wisdom the use of judges.

XVII. Debates on Neutral Floors

The debate on a neutral floor is not a type in the sense of those previously discussed, for almost any sort of debate may be held on a neutral floor. It has often been felt that even when judges are used the home team has an advantage, especially if the audience is enthusiastic. Hence the staging of the contest before an outside audience—Rotary club, church, high school, et cetera.

Even stronger reasons for the development of this scheme are the fact that it is often easier to take the debate to a ready-made audience than to bring an audience to the debate, as many a debate coach will testify, and the value of giving debaters a chance to discuss a public question before a group of people who are interested in hearing it discussed.

It is not necessary to have all these debates with opponents from other schools; many colleges send out two teams from their own squads, often preparing special questions to meet local problems and interests. Naturally, some questions are more pertinent and of greater interest than others. For example, scores, and perhaps hundreds, of debates were held before deeply interested rural audiences on the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill during the school year 1926-1927. The next year the Latin-American policy of the United States was particularly timely, since the Pan-American Congress was meeting during the winter at Havana. Similarly, in 1930, discussions of disarmament attracted wide attention because of the London Conference.

During 1935-36 people were interested in the nationalization of munitions because of the Nye Committee's disclosures, and in the proposal to curb the power of the Supreme Court because of its invalidation of numerous "New Deal" laws.

Among the pioneers in this movement of taking Mahomet to the mountain, Western Reserve University of Cleveland and the University of Pittsburgh have been especially active.

The colleges of Wisconsin stage all, or most, of the debates between themselves before high schools and feel that it is a very successful arrangement. The hearing of good college debates should stimulate debating among high school students, and from the standpoint of the colleges it probably serves as desirable publicity. There are some dangers in a high school assembly at which attendance is compulsory; at the same time it imposes a real test on the speaker's ability to hold an audience's attention by adapting his material and style of presentation to its needs. Under such circumstances the debate should be shortened from the conventional hour and a half by reducing the number of speakers, by shortening the speeches, or by eliminating some rebuttal speeches.

Nothing has been said specifically as to what high schools can do with this plan. They are using it some and should use it more, both for training and as community service. The almost inevitable result will be that in the interest of audience attention high school debaters will get away from memorized speeches into a more genuine type of thinking and speaking.

XVIII. The Radio Debate

Like debates on neutral floors, the radio debate is not strictly a type but rather a means of presentation. The form may range from a panel discussion to a conventional debate with judges. There may be an actual audience present, or, as is usually the case, the scene is the broadcasting studio. Sometimes the radio audience is
asked to mail in ballots as to which team "won" or as to their views on the question.

Whatever the particular style, the general requirements of good radio speaking hold: voices must be pleasant and distinct; communicativeness and projection of personality are at a premium; vividness, humor, and originality hold an audience; abstractions, assertions, statistics, and academic phraseology are sure to be tuned out; the discussion must be made interesting to the average listener who doesn't have to listen.

Rigid time limits almost necessitate written manuscripts. Often this means the exchange of constructive arguments in advance so that rebuttals may be similarly prepared. Such procedure, added to the necessity of reading one's remarks, is a definite handicap to spontaneity and audience contact. The student who participates in a debate over the radio, if he is to hold his audience, must make every effort to overcome that handicap. The thoroughly experienced, ready speaker can do it by speaking extemporaneously, at least in rebuttal, but the risks involved are so great that the average radio management will not allow the practice.

Participation in radio debates is excellent experience for the college or high school student. Nowhere else will he find so large a potential audience.

XIX. TOURNAMENTS

The tournament is not a type; rather, it is an epidemic of debating. In the tournament a number of teams representing two or more colleges meet at a central point and hold several debates simultaneously. There may be one debate for each team entered, as in the annual tournament of the Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League; there may be several rounds extending over two or more days. The debates may run through an elimination series until a final champion is determined, as in the biennial national convention of Pi Kappa Delta; all teams may have the same number of contests, win or lose, as in the Manchester College Invitational Tournament. Usually tournament debates are judged and are of the conventional form with teams of either two or three members. Beyond such general statements it is unsafe to go, for the variations are numberless.

Although Pi Kappa Delta, national forensic fraternity, has long held tournaments in connection with its national conventions, the current prevalence of tournaments is a recent development. Many things have been blamed on "the Depression"; let tournaments be added to the list. Straitened budgets have led to economies, and chief among them is the tournament, where, in the course of a day or so, as many intercollegiate or interscholastic debates are held as formerly comprised a year's schedule.

To this advantage should be added others: participation of the less experienced squad members as well as a few star performers; fellowship among the representatives of various institutions; wholesome rivalry between teams from the same institution to make good records; intensive practice in meeting varied cases, arguments, and judges' comments, even to the extent of reconstructing an entire case between debates.

There are also disadvantages, so serious that some critics see little good in tournaments: the usual lack of an audience other than a chairman and the judge; judging that is too frequently of poor quality; undue emphasis on the competitive element, making for artificiality, contentiousness, unethical practices, and general tension and strain. Inasmuch as faculty directors are usually busy acting as judges throughout the tournament, they can be of little help in offering comments and criticisms to their own teams.

It is a far cry from the panel discussion to the decision tournament. Both have their place. The wise
director, whether in college or in high school, will see to it that his students see the value of both and get practice in both—as well as many other forms of public debate and discussion.

XX. Summary

There is no perfect type of debate or system of debating. All have merits, all have weaknesses. Then why be wedded to any one style? Within the class, the school, the squad, the interscholastic or intercollegiate schedule, try out the critic judge, the no-decision debate, the open forum, the split-team. Vary the number of speakers, the length of the speeches, the rebuttal arrangements. Even the forms discussed in this chapter do not exhaust the possibilities. Numerous are the combinations and variations that can be tried if there seems good reason for doing so. Even the high school in a league with set rules can have other contests outside the league. All can certainly have informal floor debates to give something of the training that the Oxford Union gives.

Perhaps some sort of decision is more important in high school than in college, even though it be in terms only of audience shifts of opinion, for at the high school age an interscholastic debate without a decision is hardly distinguishable from a football game without a score.

But whether in college or secondary school, we can all set our faces against debating merely for decisions, and can view new forms with interest and try them when opportunity offers—to the end that contest debating may become increasingly valuable to participants and hearers and education in general.
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I. Who Should Act as Coach

In any high school, normal school, college, or university there ought, of course, to be some one who is teaching argumentation and debate as an academic subject. Such a person ought to
III. HOW MUCH SHOULD THE COACH DO?

An interesting question, and one that has occupied much discussion. In the discussion, it is often argued that the coach should take a passive role, merely providing guidance and support. However, a critical examination of the role of the coach reveals that there are many high-profile instances where the coach's active involvement is necessary for success. The coach's role is not just to provide guidance, but to actively engage with the athletes and help them develop their skills and understanding of the game. This active approach is crucial for fostering a competitive spirit and ensuring that the athletes are not just content with their performance, but always striving to improve.

It was once said that a coach's role is to "prepare the team for the match." However, this statement is too simplistic. A coach's role is much more complex, and involves not just preparing the team for the match, but also preparing the team for the season, the next season, and beyond. The coach's role is to instill a culture of hard work and dedication, and to create an environment where the athletes feel supported and encouraged to achieve their goals.

Ultimately, the role of the coach is to help the athletes develop into the best versions of themselves. This requires not just technical skill development, but also mental toughness and emotional resilience. It is a role that requires a deep understanding of the athletes, and a commitment to their personal and athletic development.

In conclusion, the role of the coach is not just to prepare the team for the match, but to prepare them for life. By fostering a culture of excellence, the coach can help create a team that is not just successful on the field, but also successful in life.
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that student, that is the director's opinion. He or she is the director's opinion. He or she is the director's opinion. He or she is the director's opinion.

1. The coach should not work in the library.

2. Let us go back even more specifically. Says Professor Brown, "There is no better way to work than to allow the students to work in the library."

3. The coach should not work in the library. This is something more than a collection of ideas and suggestions. It is a collection of ideas and suggestions.

4. "I think the coaches have the wrong idea about work. They should not work in the library."
I. INTRODUCTION

The current system of education is based on the idea that educational attainment is measured by scores on standardized tests. This system has been criticized for producing a narrow focus on test scores and for not adequately preparing students for the real world. Some educators argue that a more effective approach to education is needed that focuses on developing critical thinking skills and fostering creativity.

II. INTERESTING

The question: What makes a good question for debate?

A. WHAT MAKES A GOOD QUESTION FOR DEBATE?

A good question for debate should be thought-provoking, open-ended, and challenging. It should also be relevant to the topic at hand and have the potential to stimulate discussion and debate. It should not be too easy or too difficult, but rather strike a balance that encourages participation and engagement.

B. METHODS OF CHANGING A QUESTION

When changing a question, it is important to consider the context in which it will be used. The question should be clear and concise, and it should address an issue that is relevant to the audience.

C. SUBSTANTIAL

And finally, it is important to consider the potential impact of the question on the debate. A question that is too easy may not challenge the participants, while a question that is too difficult may frustrate them. A good question should be challenging enough to stimulate thinking, but not so difficult that it is inaccessible.
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3. Choice by a League Manager

In centralized state high school leagues the question is announced by the state manager. The individual member schools should, and usually do, have a chance to express their preferences, and the manager should consult these preferences before announcing the question.

V. Formulating the Proposition

A “question” for debate is not enough. Obviously a contest debate cannot be held on the topic: “Mussolini,” for it may be attacked from any number of angles. A discussion is possible, but not a debate. Something must be declared concerning the policy on which two opposing positions are possible. An example is “Resolved, that Mussolini’s governmental principles should be condemned.”

A. Kinds of Propositions

“Propositions may be classified as (1) those of fact, (2) those dealing with proposals advocated as theoretically sound, and (3) those dealing with matters of practical policy.”

(1) Propositions of fact are concerned with the question “Is this true?” Examples are:

Resolved, that prohibition is unsound in principle.
Resolved, that too many people attend college.
Resolved, that a high protective tariff does the American farmer more harm than good.

Partly as a result of the visits of British debaters to this country, this type of proposition is being more widely used than previously.

(2) Propositions advocated as theoretically sound fall between propositions of fact and propositions of policy. They frequently have the weakness of trying to separate theory and practice. The following examples illustrate the type:

Resolved, that a new political alignment on the basis of liberal and conservative parties would be desirable in the United States.
Resolved, that a requirement of two years of Latin for every student in high school would be desirable.

(3) Propositions of policy deal with the question: “Should this be done?” They are the most definite and concrete of the three types, and for that reason are most widely used. To illustrate:

Resolved, that a Federal Department of Education, headed by a cabinet member, should be established.
Resolved, that interscholastic athletics should be abolished.
Resolved, that—should adopt the city manager form of government.

B. What are the Tests of a Good Debate Proposition?

I. It Must Be a Single Assertion

By an assertion the position of the affirmative is made definite, as it often could not be by a question. Only one subject should be debated at a time. Otherwise there is uncertainty and confusion. From this standpoint, the following proposition is unusable: “Resolved, that ———— High School should adopt the honor system and abolish final examinations.” The
honor system and final examinations are both excellent subjects for debate, but they cannot be debated at the same time with much hope of getting anywhere with either.

2. **It Must Be Debatable**

By "debatable" is meant that it must not be obviously one-sided; there must be sound argument and evidence on both sides. For example, who would wish to uphold the negative of "Resolved, that laws against speeding are imperfectly enforced"?

A proposition is rendered less fair to both sides if it contains prejudiced wording. The question is begged by the word "undesirable" in the statement: "Resolved, that undesirable movies should be closed on Sunday."

Finally, a proposition is not truly debatable if it is concerned largely with a matter of personal opinion or with a question that should be settled by measurement, and investigation, not argument. Consider "Woodrow Wilson was greater than Theodore Roosevelt" and "Street cars are making money in this city." A distressingly large amount of energy is used daily on street corners, in offices, and elsewhere heatedly arguing such questions.

3. **It Must Be Clear in Its Meaning**

To that end, ambiguous terms should be avoided. Though of course there are few terms that are entirely free of ambiguity, care must be taken to make the meaning just as clear as possible. Misunderstanding often arises through using terms that are too broad in their scope.

The custom is sometimes followed of having an agreement with opponents in advance as to meanings of doubtful terms. This is probably done less often than formerly, but it is a good way to avoid unhappy quibbling over terms in the debate.

4. **It Must be As Brief and Specific as Possible**

This requirement is related to the preceding and is self-explanatory.

5. **It Must be So Worded as to Place the Burden of Proof on the Affirmative**

By "burden of proof" is meant the obligation of influencing hearers to accept the proposition. Such being the case, it is important to know what prevailing public opinion is on a given question. The proposition should be so worded that the affirmative runs counter to public opinion. This rule holds for all types of proposition.

In the case of the proposition of policy, the affirmative is the side advocating a change from the established order. It is they who attack the present, who advocate a departure from the old to the new. The proposition should be so worded that the affirmative of the proposition and the actual affirmative coincide.

A good example is found in two propositions used by the Michigan High School Debating League, both dealing with ship subsidy. That for 1923-1924, when we did not have a subsidy, was: "Resolved, that the adoption of a ship subsidy would be a wise national policy." The affirmative had the burden of showing that we ought to depart from our practice concerning a merchant marine and adopt the new policy of subsidization.

The proposition for 1928-1929 concerned exactly the same question, but it was worded: "Resolved, that Federal subsidy for the development of an American merchant marine is unwise." This wording followed the passage by Congress in May, 1928, of a law providing for a form of subsidy. Now the affirmative's burden is to show that Congress erred. With a subsidy provided for and so become the established order, they must attack it.

It is sometimes said that a proposition should not be worded negatively. Often the use of the word not is awkward, but it is not necessarily wrong. The real test is that just given: Is the proposition so worded that the burden of proof is on the affirmative?

VI. Selecting the Squad

As debating is conducted in the average high school and college, the number of questions used during a season is quite small: there may be only one. Especially useful, and indeed essential, for this situation, is the squad system; and even where numerous questions are used as the season progresses, the squad system possesses undoubted advantages.

By the squad system is meant the practice of choosing a group of people who have possibilities in thinking and speaking, to constitute the squad. All of these people work during the season, and from time to time from their number teams are chosen to represent the school in contests with teams from other institutions.

A. When Should The Squad Be Chosen?

It depends somewhat on local conditions, on the experience of those who will probably constitute the group, and also on the difficulty of the question. In general, choose your squad in time to allow thorough preparation but not so far in advance of the opening of the season that they will dawdle or become stale. The usual period will vary from one month to two months. Six weeks is usually quite satisfactory.

B. How Many Should Constitute The Squad?

Again, it depends on the size of the schedule and on the qualifications of those who try out. It may be highly desirable to choose a fairly large group even though there is a limited number of contests on the schedule, because the people are very promising. They should have the training given by squad work, and though some of them can be used little or not at all in inter-school contests this year, the training will make them valuable members of the squad another year. If the final number is an even multiple of three, or two, depending on whether teams consist of three or two speakers, the squad will function most smoothly when divided into teams. Squads can be so large as to be unwieldy and so small as to give very few people the training. The minimum should be six, or two complete teams; twelve or eighteen is a good number.

Most colleges follow the practice of having separate squads and separate debates for men and women. Mixed teams will probably always be the rule in high school.

C. How Should The Squad Be Selected?

The suggestions that follow are based on the personal experience of numerous coaches in both high school and college. At the same time there is no idea of setting them forth as the only possible methods, for methods should vary with individuals and with local conditions.

(1) Get the widest possible publicity for your call for squad candidates. Use the school or college paper. Get out some posters and bulletin-board notices. Give a talk in assembly or have it done by some one else who carries weight—student or faculty member. Enlist the aid of other teachers in spying out likely material. See people personally, but use judgment as to how much you urge; a student's future usefulness can be impaired by much coaxing. Trying-out is a privilege for him, not a favor to you. Enlist the aid of those who have been on the squad before in getting out new candidates. If there are literary societies, work through them. But get out the vote!
(2) Do not have a formal tryout at first. There may be inexperienced students who will be frightened away by it. Get all those who are interested to come together at a designated time and place, and there explain the nature of the work—and the fun.

(3) Shortly thereafter hold preliminary tryouts in the form of a short talk (5 minutes is enough) on the debate proposition or possibly some other controversial topic, having each student take a position pro or con. On the basis of these talks eliminate those who are clearly unsuited for debating.

(4) Divide those who remain—and the number may well be two or three times as large as the final squad—into teams for practice debates. These debates may be shortened by having briefer speeches than usual. More than one round is desirable gradually to reduce the number on the squad, but one round is imperative in order to get some idea of a speaker's ability in rebuttal. I believe it is possible to extend the series so long that people become tired of the process, but of course it is better to have an automatic elimination of the lazy and incompetent than to have a final squad with liabilities where assets are needed. Try to have these teams as evenly balanced as possible. It is a good plan to use an experienced debater as captain of each team and make him responsible for it.

(5) On the basis of the practice debate or series of debates pick your final squad. It pays to consider potentialities as well as actualities. Here is a lower classman, awkward and halting but willing to work and possessing promise. Here is a senior who had no time to come out before: he will never be a Demosthenes, but he has a splendid social science background and can make a real contribution. And here is a junior who possesses the "gift of gab." He is popular among his fellows but is the biggest bluff in school. Which of the three will you choose?

Ruth E. Huston, writing in the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, adds: "Even after debaters have outdistanced their fellow-students on the platform, there are several other necessary tests. Is the student physically strong enough to carry such an activity in addition to his regular [academic and outside] work? Is his scholarship record high enough to recommend him? Is he dependable? Is he capable of hard work?"*

And it may be added, is he teachable? Can he and will he respond to constructive criticism?

(6) If you do not pick the squad alone, at least hold the final word as to who goes on it. If only eighteen people are going through one round of debates, it means several hours of listening, and often it is hard to secure two other faculty members to act with you as judges. A combined judgment is very often better than the judgment of one, but if you do have assistance, get teachers who are pretty well acquainted with the student body; as already pointed out, it is not merely platform performance that is significant. If you act alone, extreme care must be taken to prevent any appearance of bias or favoritism.

(7) In colleges and high schools where academic credit is allowed for debating, the squad often constitutes a regular class once it is chosen. To this arrangement there are different variants. For example, the varsity squad may be made up of the most promising people chosen from a regular argumentation class. Or the squad and an argumentation class may run concurrently, and as people in the class develop they are promoted to the squad.

*From article Debate Coaching in High School. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:137. April, 1944.
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cards should be written as legibly as possible, in ink, or, better still, they should be typewritten.

But a note on a card is not enough in itself; it must be documented if it is to have the maximum usefulness. In general each card should contain one point, though in the case of long quotations or summarized articles there may be exceptions. Concerning the note, we need to know three things: What is it about? Who said it? Where was it found? These questions are answered on the sample evidence card shown below prepared for a debate on the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill, under the respective headings Topic, Authority, and Source. Because of space requirements, it may be more satisfactory to indicate the source at the bottom of the card.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price-fixing not involved</td>
<td>Frank O. Lowden</td>
<td>Quoted in Congressional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Gov. of Ill.</td>
<td>Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special student of problem.</td>
<td>Feb. 8, 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 3316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Neither the govt. nor the govt. board would determine the price. Nor would even the cooperative itself fix the price... It, like every other industry, would study all the conditions affecting the particular commodity and from time to time decide on a price which conditions would seem to warrant. It would merely enjoy advantages which come from organized selling."

A definite topic is necessary. All of the cards of course fall under the general heading of the question for debate, but that is not specific enough. In the course of his reading the student should accumulate a great number of cards, for it is only after he has done much reading that he really gets his bearings; he cannot tell what is important. Although in the very early stages of reading it is just as well not to take many detailed notes but rather to browse intelligently, in general one should err on the side of too many notes rather than too few; what at the time of reading may seem almost too trivial to make a note on, may prove of the greatest value later. The worthless cards are easily sorted out and rejected later.

As the number of cards increases, it is essential to have some way of identifying them. Therefore the index box, and a heading on each card which tells in a word, accurately and specifically, what the card deals with. By glancing at the Topic section one decides whether he should read the whole card.

The Authority heading gives the name of the author of the article containing the note or of the person making the statement quoted. Unless such authority is so well known that his name in itself carries weight, there should be a brief notation as to his position, et cetera,—his pedigree, as it were. Who's Who in America is the standard reference work on prominent living Americans. Various magazines contain in each issue brief notes about their contributors. If an editorial or news dispatch is the source of the note, the Authority space may contain some such notation as "Editorial" or "A.P. Dispatch."

The Source is important, for it establishes authenticity; it enables one to find a reference again and re-read it; and in case an opponent challenges one's evidence it is "a very present help in time of trouble." The date is important, as is also the page number.

As to the note itself, it should be as brief and pointed as possible. If it is a direct quotation, in whole or in part, quotation marks should be used in simple accuracy and honesty. Omissions should be indicated by leaders... as indicated in the sample card illustrated.

In all this gathering of material, students of course should do the work, but in high school, at least, they
need some direction. Squad members will do well to keep note of useful articles as such, to the end that as the season progresses a composite bibliography may be developed. If the services of a librarian are available, often a bibliography can be prepared for the squad at the outset of their preparation which will be of great assistance, especially in getting started.

D. Assimilation

It is not the mere accumulation of facts, quotations, and statistics that should be the aim of the reader and note-taker. These are simply the raw materials.

To have strength and vitality in proof, the ideas and arguments of other writers and thinkers must be so fused with one another and with the ideas of the student himself, that the final product bears little if any resemblance to any one of the parts of which it is made; it is not the idea of this book or that, nor the idea of the reader, but an indivisible composite of all.*

Such an "indivisible composite" is the result of a student's weighing each piece of evidence as he finds it and bringing it into relationship with his previous body of knowledge and ideas. He must assimilate facts as he assimilates food,—not in great undigestible masses at long intervals, but continuously in small amounts. If debaters only followed this practice more widely, we should avoid much of the spewing forth on long-suffering audiences of vast quantities of statistics and quotations, unintelligible because undigested and unasimilated.

E. Where to Look*

I. Bibliographies

Specially prepared bibliographies have already been referred to. On many subjects ready-prepared bibliographies are available. One of the best sources is the Library of Congress, which on request sends out gratis, or for a very small charge, extensive bibliographies on a great number of subjects. By addressing the Bibliographical Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. these compilations can be secured by any teacher, though they will be received more easily and more quickly if the request goes through a school or public library.

Some of the larger public libraries such as the Pittsburgh Carnegie Library, have printed or typed bibliographies which they distribute either free or for a nominal charge. In all of The H. W. Wilson Company publications, mentioned below, appear very useful bibliographies. Many books on specific topics contain lists of references to other works on the same subject.

2. Books

Whether or not there is a bibliography, students should be directed to consult the card catalog of the local library under various headings. For example, in searching for material on child labor, they might look under such headings as Child labor, Children's bureau, Social legislation, Labor. Books are usually listed under title, author, and subject.

If the coach wishes to discover other books not in the library, he should consult the United States Catalog with its monthly supplements, where he can find what has been published on a given subject over a given period. By consulting such publications as the Book Review Digest and the American Library Association Booklist, found in most libraries, he can find comments by reviewers of these books which will help him to decide whether he wishes to buy them in case they are not in the library.

Special debate reference books are published by the H. W. Wilson Company of New York. They consist of the Handbook Series, each volume of which is de-
voted to a specific public question and contains a short brief, reprints of articles pro and con, and a bibliography; the Reference Shelf, published irregularly, each issue of which is on a different subject, of current debate interest, made up as are the handbooks but containing less material; and the University Debaters' Annuals which contain stenographic reports of a number of representative intercollegiate debates on various subjects, a brief and bibliography accompanying each debate.

An annual debate handbook is published on the interstate high school question by the National University Extension Association,* and on the same question a volume by Noble and Noble, New York, in their Debaters' Help Book Series. The same publishers issue a similar volume in the college field on widely used questions under the title of University Debaters' Help Book.

Beginning in 1927, appeared the first of a new series of Intercollegiate Debates, edited, as was the former series, discontinued several years previously, by Egbert Ray Nichols. The publishers are Noble and Noble, New York City. Several specimen college debates are given, together with bibliographies and certain notes.

Specimen debates may be of great value, but they can easily be used over-much by the immature debater, at the expense of his honesty, originality, and industry.

There are, of course, numerous general reference books in all libraries that the debater can consult with or without the aid of the librarian, such as general and special encyclopedias and various yearbooks. Among the most useful of the special encyclopedias may be listed the following: Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences by Seligman and Johnson, Moore's Cyclopaedia of Education, Cyclopaedia of American Government by McLaughlin and Hart, and the New Encyclopedia of Social Reform by Bliss and Binder. The following yearbooks are likewise valuable: the World Almanac, the

* Cf. Appendix XII.

Statesman's Yearbook, the New International Yearbook, the American Yearbook, the Statistical Abstract of the United States. In the field of biography Who's Who and Who's Who in America give, respectively, the salient facts about living British and American men and women. For prominent men and women who are no longer living there is the many-volumed Dictionary of National Biography for the British Empire and the equally pretentious, although not yet complete, Dictionary of American Biography for the United States.

General economics, history, political science, and sociology text books often furnish the very best sort of background reading for the usual debate question, and it is unfortunate that these sources are too often neglected or overlooked entirely.

3. Periodicals

The standard index for magazine articles is the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, found in nearly all libraries. As in the case of library card catalogs, material is listed under the headings of subject and author with title references for fiction and poetry. The more scholarly periodicals are indexed similarly in the International Index to Periodicals. There are also special indexes in such fields as art, agriculture, education, and industrial arts.

For information on debate questions, besides the more popular magazines such as the News-Week, the Nation, the New Republic, Current History, the Literary Digest, To-Day, the Forum, and the American Review of Reviews, there are especially valuable publications on social science such as the Survey, Foreign Affairs (one American, the other English), the National Municipal Review, the American Labor Legislation Review, the Journal of Political Economy, the American Political Science Review, the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, the American Economic
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5. Material Issued by Organizations
A. A Regular Meeting Time

Reasonable consideration for their work.

Suspend practice if you show

support from your colleagues on the faculty or if you show

enough evidence of your cooperation and

effort. If you ever feel you need more cooperation on

your part, let your coach know. If you can't make the decisions on your own, then you

need to discuss them with your coach. There will be times when special

periods, i.e., before or after practice. The schedule may be

interrupted by a single practice or a

day. Some coaches need to be reminded at the outset that,

II. Suspended Practices

A. Days and Practice

Suspended practices can be suspended over the holidays in the case of day

can be made by a date which has been

 freshmen, and every effort should be made to

in the previous year. In the case of day practices, this is not necessarily

value in academic and professional life. Such practice is often

important in academic life. This material is

which you need to know. The material is

more frequently referred to the extension list.

informative, and the "college library" is

informative. Many sources do not call for the use of such
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C. Issues and Conclusions

The main issue that arises when evaluating the effectiveness of the argument is whether or not the conclusion is supported by the premises. If the conclusion is not supported by the premises, then the argument is invalid. If the conclusion is supported by the premises, then the argument is valid. However, even if the conclusion is supported by the premises, the argument may still be flawed if the premises themselves are not true or are not relevant to the conclusion.

For the argument to be valid, all the premises must be true, and the conclusion must be a valid consequence of the premises. If any of the premises are false, the argument may be invalid. If the conclusion is not a valid consequence of the premises, the argument may be invalid.

In some cases, an argument may be valid but still be unsound. This happens when the premises are true, but the conclusion is not. In such cases, the argument is still valid, but the conclusion is not supported by the premises.

D. Group Discussion

To avoid repetition, the following discussion is presented in a composite form. The discussion is divided into sections, and each section is devoted to a specific issue or conclusion.

1. Group a: The claim that the argument is valid is incorrect. The argument is invalid because the conclusion is not a valid consequence of the premises.

2. Group b: The argument is sound because the conclusion is a valid consequence of the premises.

3. Group c: The argument is not valid because the premises are not true.

4. Group d: The argument is not sound because the conclusion is not a valid consequence of the premises.

5. Group e: The argument is not valid because the conclusion is not a valid consequence of the premises.

6. Group f: The argument is not sound because the premises are not true.

E. Debate Coaching

In preparing for the debate, it is important to identify the main issues and to develop strong arguments to support your position. It is also important to anticipate the arguments of your opponents and to prepare counterarguments to address their points.

The debate should be conducted in a respectful and fair manner, and the goal should be to present the strongest arguments possible.
concerned, are the same for both affirmative and negative, the contentions are necessarily widely different. They may be the same in number as the issues; they often are more numerous, as it may take two or three contentions to meet a single issue. For contentions, besides the requirement of sound analysis, there enter audience psychology and team tactics. In general, the smaller the number the better, for the audience saturation point is very low. For three-member teams it is convenient when there are just three contentions, one for each member of the team. And it is an even happier arrangement when there are also three issues, each answered by a contention—happy for speakers and happy for audience. And therein lies a danger, a danger that cases for all debates on all questions shall be thrust into this mould, which sometimes fits and sometimes does not. There is no iron-clad, fool-proof system.

Not merely in number but also in wording, contentions should be formulated with the audience in mind. If possible, they should be worded so that they appeal to human wants—leadership, wealth, honor, and a host of others, to which we may legitimately look for response without sacrificing logic to persuasion.

A final word. Avoid, if possible such stereotyped contentions as the following:

**Affirmative**

1. There is a need.
2. The proposal is right in principle.
3. It is practicable.
4. It is desirable.

**Negative**

1. The proposed plan is theoretically unsound.
2. It is unworkable.
3. It is harmful in effects.
4. It is undesirable.

All of these may be valid and cogent arguments, and it must be admitted that their brevity aids retention. However, they may still be valid, cogent, and brief but dressed up in fresh and attractive wording, adapted to

the particular question and showing some regard for audience response.

D. Briefs and Outlines

On this topic, too, any extended discussion would be out of place here. A model brief and a model outline are given in Appendix IV.

The brief, of course, is a team project and not that of any one speaker, although the preparation of complete briefs may be a valuable exercise for individual members. In high school it is often not worth the time and energy to insist on briefs that meet every technical requirement. At the same time, because of its simplicity and clearness of arrangement, the brief is quite indispensable, at least in an adapted form. When teams are required to work briefs out as teams, the members will naturally do part of the work individually after the main headings are agreed upon.

Not only teams, but larger groups, may profitably work together in the drawing up of briefs. Suppose there are eighteen on the squad, nine affirmative and nine negative. Let the affirmative and negative groups meet separately and, possibly with one of their number as leader at the blackboard, draw up a brief in its larger headings. The coach, if he keeps himself merely one of the group and does not force his own ideas, may act as the leader if his time allows. The group will probably accomplish more if he is there!

To bridge the gap between the logical presentation in the *brief* of all the facts and the effective adaptation of the speech to the audience, the individual *outline* is needed. For its content the speaker can draw on the brief, selecting, rejecting, arranging, always with the audience in mind. He can reword contentions so that they appeal more directly, can arrange arguments and illustrations in climactic order, and take various other liberties with the material contained in the brief.
Although the discussion in Chapter X, entitled "The Art of Public Speaking," is in terms of the presentation possibilities of each for a general audience, the principles discussed apply to the different situations in which a person finds himself as a public speaker, whether that person is scheduled to speak at a conference, a meeting, or a social event. The key to effective public speaking lies in understanding the audience and adjusting the presentation to meet their needs. The same principles apply to both informal and formal speaking engagements.

**Introduction:**

In connection with their personal viewpoints and the expression of their own opinions, speakers should always be aware of the audience's needs and expectations. A speaker's role is not only to inform but also to entertain. The goal is to engage the audience, making the message both informative and enjoyable.

**Case:**

The effectiveness of a speech depends on the speaker's ability to communicate clearly and effectively. The speaker must understand the audience's perspective and adapt the speech accordingly. This requires a deep understanding of the subject matter and the ability to convey the information in a way that is accessible and interesting to the audience.

**Conclusion:**

In summary, public speaking is an art that requires practice and refinement. By following the principles outlined in this chapter, speakers can improve their craft and deliver effective speeches that engage and inspire their audiences.
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F. The Methodism From Practice to Debates

1. The Methodism From Practice to Debates

- Consistency cases: cases influence audiences.
- Consistency cases: issues sets down arguments and emphasizes, in their worth, their relationship and complicity.

2. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

3. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

4. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

5. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

6. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

7. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

8. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

9. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

10. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

11. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

12. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

13. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

14. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

15. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

16. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

17. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

18. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

19. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

20. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

21. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

22. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

23. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

24. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

25. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

26. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

27. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

28. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

29. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

30. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

31. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

32. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

33. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

34. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

35. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

36. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

37. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

38. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

39. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

40. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

41. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

42. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

43. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

44. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

45. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

46. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

47. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

48. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

49. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

50. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

51. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

52. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

53. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

54. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

55. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

56. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

57. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

58. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

59. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

60. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

61. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

62. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

63. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

64. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

65. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

66. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

67. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

68. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

69. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

70. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

71. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

72. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

73. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

74. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

75. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

76. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

77. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

78. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

79. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

80. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

81. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

82. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

83. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

84. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

85. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

86. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

87. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

88. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

89. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

90. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

91. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

92. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

93. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

94. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

95. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

96. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

97. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

98. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

99. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.

100. Consistency cases: issues set down arguments and emphasize their intrinsity and significance.
given may not be purely extemporaneous,\textsuperscript{10} practice contests should furnish training in speaking from assimilated knowledge of the subject, where the precise wording is not prepared and memorized in advance. Only by use of the extemporaneous method will the debater learn to think on his feet, to adapt himself to opposing arguments, to contribute to a debate rather than an oratorical contest. In this way he will learn to speak from notes, constructive and rebuttal, without being tied to them and also without losing contact with his audience.

(3) After the squad has had a chance to do some preliminary reading on both sides of the question, the director should find out on which side the members prefer to work. On most questions there will be a surprisingly even division. Always there are some who have no particular preference, and they can be assigned to one side or the other as their experience and abilities make desirable. As pointed out in Chapter 1, not only will the cause of intellectual honesty be served by encouraging students to work and debate on the side of the question that they believe; such procedure makes for better debating, for one is more convincing, more persuasive when arguing for something that he believes. On many questions high school and college students hold no decided views and find so much to be said on both sides, that, without stultifying themselves in the least, they can conscientiously uphold either affirmative or negative.

In the same chapter mention was made of the fact that a different practice may profitably be followed in squad debates. Here you will do well to shift sides and thereby make one who believes strongly in the affirmative find arguments against his own position. Such training enlarges his viewpoint and makes him a more intelligent advocate of his own views.

\textsuperscript{10} Cf. \textit{Writing Speeches}, pages 120-3.

\textbf{SQUAD WORK}

(4) Not only should sides be changed from time to time, but the line-up and personnel of teams should be changed. Suppose there are twelve on the squad, two affirmative teams—A and B—and two negative teams—C and D. Let team A meet team C this week and team D next week. Similarly with team B and the negative teams.

As the teams as a whole are shifted, so should the members take different positions. If in the practice debate today Brown speaks first, Green second and White third, in the next encounter let White speak first, Brown second, and Green third. By thus shifting speakers the director often discovers and develops new qualities, qualities that make for all-round development of the individual and for a balanced team.

And still other shifting should be done. Don't always use Brown, Green, and White as a team. Practice-debate teams should be as evenly matched as possible, and to that end put White on a team with Baker and Carpenter and bring Taylor over on the team with Green and Brown. Such shifting makes for interest in the squad, necessitates cooperation with new associates, and, most important of all, it brings forth new ideas.

I do not wish to give the impression of advocating continual shifting; more will often be gained by allowing the personnel of a practice team to remain the same for some time. The principle so constantly stressed holds here: the teacher must suit his methods to his particular problems.

(5) One thing, however, is certain. Even though the line-up and personnel of teams remain as fixed as the law of the Medes and Persians, the arguments, individually and as cases, must not. Practice debates become practically valueless, to say nothing of being an insufferable bore, unless each time they bring forth new arguments, new evidence, new organization of case. This means that teams must work between debates, both
as individuals and as teams—reading, assimilating, conferring, organizing. And work without the coach, though he should be available for advice if really needed.

(6) Should there be team captains? For practice debates, yes, if by "captain" is meant one of the team members temporarily designated by the coach as leader, responsible for getting his team together for conference and planning of case. Appoint the member who is experienced and dependable so far as possible. If to pass this slight honor around does not interfere with getting results, it is not a bad idea to do so.

For the final contest team a captain may be desirable for the same reasons as for the practice team, although the designation of one is by no means essential. If there is one, he should be "king for a day" only, preferably named by the coach. Although he should never be allowed to get the idea that he is a Mussolini, arbitrarily assigning tasks to his colleagues, his teammates need to understand that because of experience he is the leader and that his suggestions are not lightly to be thrown aside.

(7) If practice debates are to contribute their maximum value, they should not be too frequent. As suggested earlier, there are times when the entire squad need not meet to listen to a practice debate. This device lessens the pressure (on everybody but the coach) when the squad is large and contains a good many who are inexperienced and so need the practice. However, even in such a situation it is sometimes desirable to omit a regular meeting so that the time may be given to library work. There is no use in going through the motions of a practice debate when the debaters simply rehash the same ideas and facts used in the last one.

(8) If you are teaching in a small town with poor library facilities, rather than spend all the time in practice-debating with the material you have received from the State University Library—material which every other high school has received—why not take your students to the library of a nearby city where they can get fresh and interesting material? Often colleges and universities are glad to have small groups of high school pupils use their facilities and extend every courtesy to them. It will be remembered that in the discussion of Gathering Material it was urged that funds should be available for the purchase of especially valuable material. Even though this happy condition prevails in the small high school, bound volumes of periodicals, especially the more specialized ones, are usually not available; and it is here that visits to the city or university library may be of great help.

(9) When a squad contains members who are unfamiliar with the technique of contest debates, perhaps never having heard one—and such a situation is not unusual even in college—it is a good plan to take them to hear a contest at another high school or at some not-too-distant college if the opportunity offers. Even though the intercollegiate schedule may not have been opened, there are often intramural debates of one sort or another to which outside visitors are welcome.

(10) To come back to the conduct of the practice debate, the coach may profitably debate once in a while himself, either upholding one side alone or taking the part of one speaker on a team. Do it, not necessarily to furnish a perfect model, but to appreciate more directly the students' problems, to contribute a bit of variety, and to show the students that you are willing to try your hand at what you ask them to do. The squad will enjoy the experience, and so will you.

(11) What should follow the practice debate? Criticism and discussion, and lots of it. The coach is critic, of substance, organization, teamwork, rebuttal, delivery—everything. Although some of his comments will be largely individual, most of them should be of value to the entire squad. This criticizing and suggesting is about the most important thing the coach has to do, and he should be thoroughly constructive. Here's
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DEBATE COACHING
Teachers are going to adopt it;

...
3. Working Suggestions

Since rebuttal is so important and is effective only as the result of the most careful preparation, the director has a real responsibility in seeing that such preparation is both thorough and sensible. I add "sensible" to "thorough" because in actual practice that element is not always present.

(1) All the main opposing arguments need to be considered and definite answers worked out for them, but don't let your students memorize or read answers unless you want them to seem like parrots. Should there be written rebuttal cards, then? By all means, but in outline, not complete speech form.

Here are reproduced two rebuttal cards, the first an inclusive affirmative card meant to cover the various possible things opponents of the McNary-Haugen Farm Relief Bill may say regarding cooperation as a substitute. All of the points listed may not be used in rebuttal, but they are there, ready to be drawn on and elaborated, depending on what points opponents emphasize.

The second card, dealing with the control of railroads, is specific, corresponding to the individual evidence card.

**REBUTTAL**

Argument: Encouragement of cooperation preferable.

Answer:

1. They favor cooperation in which only members share cost. (Majority Cong. Rept. p. 11)
2. Coop. among such unified specialized groups as citrus growers not analogous.

The team rebuttal box will receive most attention after the team for a given contest is pretty definitely known, for while teams are shifting in practice debates it is not so usable. Once the box is prepared (of course it never ceases to be added to), all members of the team should familiarize themselves with its complete contents, so that any one of them could get up in debate rebuttal and handle intelligently and effectively any point there.

(5) Does this mean that there should be no specialization in rebuttal? Not at all. Unless there is a definite plan in advance, rebuttal will almost inevitably be scattered and ineffective. There should be a definite division of main points, so that each man knows exactly what he is responsible for defending and attacking. But when that is said, it must immediately be qualified, for one can never be sure that an opponent's case will develop as he expects it to.

In general, a debater should be responsible in rebuttal for the points he has made in his main speech, defending them and attacking arguments advanced by his opponents that fall under the same general headings. There are always some miscellaneous anticipated arguments to meet, and those should be divided among the team members as seems most promising. Since the "best laid plans" of debaters and coaches "gang aft agley" because opponents do the unexpected or unusual, too great specialization in rebuttal may seriously cripple a team. Each member, though a specialist on certain parts, must know the whole case and the complete rebuttal plans so that he can handle points with intelligence that he had expected his colleagues to take care of, and so that he can buttress them if their arguments are seriously attacked, when they no longer have an opportunity to reply.

(6) Not only should the possible arguments of opponents be considered and answers carefully worked out for them; all the possible opposing cases that can be thought of should be worked out and plans devised for meeting them in case they appear in an actual contest. Because this point appears here does not mean that the coach should furnish all the brain work in devising possible cases. He will do some of it, just as a football coach figures out new plays, but the students will offer many valuable suggestions if encouraged in the least.

(7) More than one debate has been ruined and more than one audience has been disgusted by wrangling over the meaning of terms and, less frequently, over the issues. If a debate concerns a technical subject on which serious disagreement is possible, prior agreement as to definitions will eliminate the possibility of misunderstanding. This may be done between the opposing teams or among all the members of a debate league. For example, some years ago, when Drake University and Colorado Agricultural College debated the proposition: "Resolved, that the closed shop should be adopted in American industry," definitions of both closed shop and open shop were agreed upon some weeks in advance, and the debate programs had these definitions printed on them. The contest was close and exciting, unmarred by any quibbling over terms.

In some high school debate leagues the state manager sends to all member schools, early in the season, an official interpretation of the question.

One of the best forms of insurance against disagreement over terms is to avoid highly technical or far-fetched interpretations. Better a common-sense view which seems sensible to the hearers. Then, if opponents give a far-fetched interpretation to the question, refuse to quibble repeatedly but leave it with the audience as to which is the more reasonable view.
(8) Try your people in various speaking orders in rebuttal just as you do in main speeches. There is no necessary reason why three men should speak in the same order both times. As a matter of fact, it is often desirable to change the order. A team rarely consists of three members of equal ability, equal experience, and equal audience effectiveness. Though, as pointed out elsewhere, it is usually well to use the weakest speaker second in constructive speeches, in rebuttal a climactic order is generally most effective, the three speakers increasing in power as one follows another. Not only that—the inexperienced man, whether affirmative or negative, can give his best if his turn in rebuttal comes first, before argument and counter-argument have become too badly snarled.

(9) And finally, practice. Nothing will take its place. Practice debates, squad meetings for informal practice in arguing points back and forth, practice in meeting new cases presented by other squad members, individual or team practice in answering succinctly arguments thrown out by the coach.

But withal, practice that is thorough and sensible. Remember that you are training not merely for one contest but for life; hence aim not at letter-perfect parrots but at boys and girls, men and women, who can think on their feet and speak extemporaneously.

With thorough, systematic rebuttal preparation supplementing constructive preparation, any team should go to the platform knowing equally well two things: its own case and how to defend it, its opponents’ case and how to attack it.36

III. Writing Speeches 36

Should debaters write speeches? In many cases, yes. There is much that the student may gain, in the way of conciseness, accuracy, and the persuasive use of English, by writing a debate speech. At the same time the coach is enabled to use the manuscript as a basis for specific criticisms and suggestions. If a student never writes out his ideas in orderly speech form, he will almost inevitably lessen his effectiveness by rambling incoherence, the use of vague general statements, and a lack of unity and balance.

Naturally there is a difference in the abilities of different individuals, but there are few high school or college debaters, even though they have had considerable experience, who do not profit by carefully committing their ideas to writing.

Should debaters memorize these speeches? No. If you subscribe to the proposition that we are “teaching” debate in the sense of training for life rather than merely “coaching” for an immediate decision, you can see the reason for an emphatic negative answer. Public speaking situations in life seldom call for the memorized oration; they do, however, call for organized communicative extemporaneous speaking. The memorized debate speech is too frequently stiff, uncommunicative, and declamatory. You will note that I have not said that it is always so. I have heard speeches, thoroughly committed to memory, that were conversational and communicative and that were so well in hand that they could be departed from and returned to at will, whenever adaption to what opponents had said was necessary. A device, not infrequently used, to combine delivery of a set speech with extemore adaptation is that of initial rebuttal. If the time limit is ten minutes, two minutes, for example, at the outset may be set aside for extemore refutation of opponents’ arguments, and then an eight minute set speech is delivered. Such an arrangement is far better than having no adaptation at all, and it may be a useful expedient for an inexperienced speaker. It does not produce a unified result, however,
either in subject matter or in presentation, for there is apt to be an obvious break between the extemperor and memorized sections. The initial-rebuttal device should be regarded as a make-shift, never as a final method.

It is not necessary to wait until college days to train boys and girls to debate extemporaneously; high school students with a little encouragement and training become quite proficient. Better have some slight stalling and stumbling coupled with evidence that the student is actively thinking at the moment of utterance than to be compelled to listen to an oration in the guise of a debate speech that runs blithely on without regard to what opponents have said and, so far as audience contact is concerned, plainly shows that the speaker has "set his mouth going and has then gone away and left it."

To avoid the rigidity and lack of communicativeness of the memorized speech and, at the same time, to secure unified organization and elegance of diction frequently lacking in the purely extemporaneous style, a compromise or combination method known as the block system is sometimes used. In this system the speech is memorized in blocks, between which the speaker extemporizes. Thus he may have an introduction and a conclusion and certain salient intervening sections committed to memory.

This method has some advantages but furnishes a poor standard inasmuch as the result is apt to be a patchwork of fluent declamatory sections interspersed with less confident extemporaneous passages.

What method, then, is best? In general, the extemperor—growing out of thorough study, constructive thought-provoking squad debates and discussion, and written speeches, criticised and carefully rewritten more than once but not memorized word for word. Now you have a speech with the merits of both the memorized and the extemperor methods: (1) unified organization, (2) smooth diction, for many phrases and expressions in the written drafts will stick, and (3) the prime essential, adaptability—to opponents, colleagues, and circumstances. Inexperienced students can get much help as to constructing and phrasing speeches by hearing debates and reading debate speeches, preferably on subjects other than that with which they are working.

A final specific suggestion may not be out of place here. Don't have speeches so long as to require every available minute allowed for their delivery. No matter what style is used—extemperor, memorized, or block—some time should be saved for refutation and adaptation. If a surprise case is met, it may be necessary to go further and throw over large parts of one or more speeches. Such a situation for the extemporaneous debater is a challenge; for the debater who slavishly memorizes it is a catastrophe.

IV. Practice Debates With Other Schools

The practice debates we have been considering, practice debates within the squad, are essential. At the same time, there is a danger that they will become more or less stale and mechanical as arguments pro and con become increasingly familiar. Hence the device, employed by many colleges and high schools, of practice debates with other teams. An important league debate is approaching. More or less informally by letter or telephone you arrange with a third institution for an extra contest. In it you use the same team you expect to use in the contest with your league opponent. The training they receive in meeting a new case of an actual opposing team is often worth several times that received in a squad debate. These outside debates necessarily are not used at the beginning of the season; the squad debates are an essential prerequisite. They may be judged, though if both teams are interested in the practice rather than the outcome, there is more freedom to try new arguments and new devices when there is no formal de-
cision. On the other hand, if at all possible one or more outside critics should be invited in to hear the discussion and criticise both teams afterwards. In Michigan, where there is a rather rigid state-wide high school debating league, more and more member schools are engaging in these practice debates, sometimes as regular audience affairs, sometimes as afternoon meetings when only the two squads are present.

There is another use for these "practice" debates. If a high school is a member of a league from which it will be eliminated if it loses a debate, it takes more nerve than some coaches have to give the less experienced members of the squad a chance in an interscholastic contest. Other coaches feel the same way. Why not arrange an extra debate or two, real "varsity" audience debates, in which it is agreed both schools will use their "second" teams or will at least use partly "second" teams? There may or may not be a decision; it is easier on the green debater to omit it, for he has plenty of trouble without the spectre of "losing."

These extra debates, judged or decisionless, with green teams or veterans, for practice or otherwise, furnish to the progressive coach a chance to try out various experiments in argument, organization, and style of debating.

Colleges, too, as already indicated, are using outside practice debates, for the same reasons and with the same returns as apply to the high schools. Often they arrange to take such contests before off-campus audiences, as before the assembly of a high school located between the two colleges.

V. THE FINAL TEAM

Round table discussion, individual conferences, practice debates—the time at last comes when the members of the teams must be chosen who will represent the school in the real contest. This is clearly the coach’s business, for he has been working with the various people on the squad and knows what they can do. Rarely, if ever, should faculty colleagues or other outsiders make the selection on the basis of a given practice debate. Such an arrangement, though sometimes used, is fair to none of the parties concerned.

A. Don’t Pick the Final Team Too Early

The whole squad should be kept on its toes, working for a place on the team, and that can’t be done if you announce a month in advance that A, B, and C will constitute the team. Let-down in the efforts of the other squad members is inevitable, even though later debates are on the schedule. As to what is "too early," no final statement can be made. That depends on the length of time the squad has been working, the nature of the question, other debates on the schedule, experience of debaters, and various local and personal considerations. "Too early" must necessarily be a relative term. and each director must decide for himself how to meet the problem so as to secure maximum efficiency from those chosen for and those temporarily rejected from the final team. In the tentative time schedule at the end of this chapter, certain definite suggestions are offered as to when to choose the team.

B. Characteristics of the Respective Speakers

The question of when, however, is not so serious for many coaches as the question of how and what to choose. What are the characteristics of ideal speakers for the various team positions? Altho the following discussion deals with three-member teams, adaptation can easily be made for teams consisting of two speakers.

In general, it may be said that in a three-member team the weakest speaker should be placed second. It is, of course, understood that the weakness or strength
of a speaker should be judged in terms of his or her probable effect on the audience. A good thinker may be quite ineffective in establishing a dynamic contact with his hearers. Against the general principle of putting the weakest speaker in the middle, it should be pointed out that there may be times when a climactic order is desirable, the speakers increasing in power as they follow one another. In the great majority of cases, however, the general psychological principle holds: the most emphatic places are at the beginning and the end; hence put your best speakers in those positions.

Having laid down these general principles, I hasten to add a qualifying suggestion. Not merely in practice debates, but in actual contest debates, it is well, so far as practicable, to give your people a chance to speak in different positions. Because a boy seems to be an excellent opening speaker for the affirmative, don't always use him there. Give him a chance to develop his powers by speaking last; or even second, so that a second speaker may try his hand as opener. Debating is for training as well as decisions!

Though there is much similarity in the make-up of the ideal affirmative team and the negative team, still there is sufficient difference to warrant their separate treatment. It will, of course, occur to all teachers that the ideal team will rarely, if ever, be found. The best that one can do is to come as near the ideal as possible with the material at hand.

*The First Affirmative Speaker,* since he opens the entire discussion, must be able to present the subject, which is often one concerning which the audience knows very little, in such a way that his hearers will be informed and interested. To do that he must adapt and must talk in terms of their experience. He must give an impression of absolute fairness, and to that end, he must not argue too soon. Of course he cannot spend all his time in an impersonal introduction of the subject for discussion, but usually he advances his team's case farthest by not being noticeably controversial for the first part of his speech. In delivery, he should be smoothly conversational and persuasive. Since nothing precedes to which he must adapt, his speech may well be memorized, provided it does not sound "canned."

Inexperienced speakers are sometimes put in the opening position because it is felt that they are safer where they can use a memorized speech and do not have to adapt. At the same time, it must be remembered that to break the ice is a difficult task, one that is often difficult for speakers who are used to appearing before audiences. The green speaker too often has a severe case of stage fright and as a result is anything but informal and communicative. Consequently his team's side of the argument gets away to an unfortunate start. These counterbalancing considerations the coach must bear in mind.

*The Second Affirmative Speaker* should excel in arguing, in clear, cogent thinking, and in the ability to express himself simply and to the point. He must be able to think on his feet so as to adjust to what the opening negative speaker has said and to support his preceding colleague, if the latter's arguments have been heavily attacked. The material with which he deals is often less inherently persuasive than that falling to the lot of the opening and closing speakers, and consequently his delivery may often be less smoothly persuasive. At the same time, it should be straight from the shoulder, direct, and communicative.

In general—of course no hard and fast rules can be made in such matters—the inexperienced speaker will fare best in second position. He does not have to break the ice, the exhilaration of the debate well started spurs him on, and opposing arguments are not yet numerous and complicated enough to be over-confusing.
The Third Affirmative Speaker, as closer of his team's constructive case, should be the strongest of the three speakers, both in delivery and in command of his subject. He should have a sense of values and should be able to see the debate as a whole. He must be able to adapt at will, to attack and defend, and at the same time he must be fluent and powerful in delivery. He must have the ability to marshall facts and arguments convincingly, and, most important of all, he must be able to summarize with completeness and conclude with persuasive appeal that moves his hearers.

As compared with the affirmative, who present the new and defend it against attack (It is assumed that a proposition of policy is used), the negative team should be constantly on the offensive, attacking and offering objections to the affirmative proposals. Since the negative can never be sure just what sort of case the affirmative will present, they must be ready at all times to adapt. This fundamental difference in the tasks of the two teams influences the characteristics needed in the members of the respective teams. Affirmative speakers must be good salesmen; negative speakers must be good prosecuting attorneys.

The First Negative Speaker, combined with courtesy and good sportsmanship, of course, must have the ability to make a telling attack at the outset. He must carry the fight to his opponents. He must be able to analyze the affirmative position as outlined by their first speaker and to set forth such serious objections as to raise grave doubts in the minds of his hearers, doubts which his colleagues never allow to subside. This can very seldom be done without intelligent, dynamic, extemporaneous adaptation. So far as delivery is concerned, he may possibly be somewhat less smooth than the first affirmative, but he must be an effective speaker, to avoid an unfavorable contrast with the preceding opponent.

SQUAD WORK

It may be wise, at times, to use an inexperienced man on the negative team in first place rather than second, inasmuch as by the time the second speaker appears the conflicting arguments of the two teams may have become confusingly criss-crossed. This observation holds even truer for rebuttal speakers.

The Second Negative Speaker's characteristics are similar to those of the corresponding affirmative speaker so far as ability to adapt and to think and speak straight are concerned. He must also be an effective attacker, raising new objections and re-establishing his colleague's arguments if attacked.

The Third Negative Speaker, like the third affirmative, should be the strongest member of his team. He, too, must have the ability for summary and final persuasive appeal, but his summary stresses weaknesses and evils, and his appeal is for rejection rather than acceptance. He as well as his colleagues, however, must usually avoid giving the impression of being purely destructive in criticism and opposition.

Even in the case of a counterproposition, which the last speaker usually presents, the attack on the affirmative proposals never lets up. The negative speakers must all be on the offensive, and this offensive comes to a climax with the last speaker.

C. Alternates

In the squad system, where all the members are actively trying for a place on the team, there is no place for the old-fashioned alternate, who, by a process of tryouts was assigned to this innocuous and incentiveless place for the season. No matter what plan he follows, a coach should never put all his eggs in one basket and have no reserves upon whom he can call in case one of the speakers he expected to use falls ill or is otherwise prevented from debating. My point is that it is better to
The possibilities are numerous. The skilled speaker and the coach in a personal conference...
the coach should interrupt a speaker to offer suggestions, even to the extent of having the speaker go over the point again. Much can be accomplished by striking while the iron is hot.

Although such practice is unnecessary with mature, experienced speakers, with most high school and many college debaters it makes for increased effectiveness in fluency and pointed accuracy of statement. Every debater, no matter how experienced, may profitably practice rebuttal aloud to himself.

Need it be added that all of this is training in extemporaneous, not memorized, speaking?

VI. A Suggested Coaching Schedule

As already emphatically pointed out, no iron-clad rule can be laid down as to when this or that particular step should be taken. Each director must adapt his course of procedure to circumstances, and they are legion, of bewildering variety. For the usual American-style debate six weeks after the squad is chosen is perhaps an average preparation period. It may well be as much as three weeks longer in high school, it may be as short as a month in college.

Whatever the period, the main point for the coach to remember is this: Don't let things pile up at the last. Six weeks looks like a long time, but after it is half gone, the remainder vanishes with frightful rapidity. Many a poor debate can be traced to too much leisure at the beginning and too much hurry at the end.

The following outline, which is purposely very general, is offered as a suggestion, nothing more. It is assumed that the squad is already chosen and that the first debate is six weeks distant.

First Week—Individual reading, round table discussion, possibly practice debates.

Second Week—Reading, discussion, practice debates, tentative issues and contentions formulated.

Third Week—Round table discussion, practice debates, cases tentatively outlined.

Fourth Week—Round table discussion, practice debates, cases pretty definitely settled, work started on written speeches.

Fifth Week—Round table discussion, practice debates, final team chosen, intensive work on speeches.

Sixth Week—Discussion and practice debates intensively centered about final team, individual and team work on delivery and rebuttal.

VII. Other Plans

A Debate-Training Schedule

How can I organize and conduct an effective training schedule so as to assure the attainment of the objective of debating?

This is a question that confronts every debate coach, whether he be new to the work or a veteran. The one is desirous of starting right, the other is endeavoring to improve his methods as a result of his experience.

The objective that every debate coach should strive for is the development in each debater, to the extent of his capacities, of the ability to analyze and reason on his feet in public speech, preparing him for the most influential, practical participation in the argumentative and persuasive phases of life.

In presenting the following suggestions and model debate-training schedule, I do not hold it out as a cure for all evils, but

---

17 In addition to those offered here, Ruth E. Huton offers similar suggestions, though more detailed, in an article entitled Debate Coaching in High School, Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. 10:137-43. April, 1924.

18 Quoted by permission of the author, Clarence E. Dameron of Purdue University, and the publishers, from the Supplement of the Quarterly Journal of Speech. 15:45-54. November, 1929.
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Squad Work

In order to secure the best possible departures from the steps outlined below, it is essential to ensure a proper understanding of the concepts involved. Understanding is crucial for effective learning and application of knowledge.

The first step is to ensure that the student has a clear understanding of the fundamental concepts involved. This is achieved through a systematic approach that involves:

1. Reviewing the material thoroughly:
   - Make sure the student understands the basic principles.
   - Encourage questions and discussions to clarify doubts.

2. Practicing with examples:
   - Provide ample practice questions to reinforce the concepts learned.
   - Ensure the student can apply the concepts in different contexts.

3. Assessing progress:
   - Regular assessments to track progress and identify areas for improvement.
   - Encourage self-assessment tools to help the student identify their strengths and weaknesses.

Following these steps will help the student progress through the course smoothly and efficiently.

In conclusion, Dubate Coaching believes in providing comprehensive support to ensure that students achieve their goals. We are committed to helping students reach their full potential through guided learning and personalized support.
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entire approach to the main question. The easiest way to get at the facts and arguments on these points, placing them before the whole squad at once, is by having informal debates between two or four of the members. This will also introduce them to active debating in a non-deliberative manner. It might be well not to tell them that they are going to debate, but simply that you want them to discuss the disputed questions pro and con before the squad. If told that they are to debate, they are quite likely to become stiff and formal. That is the last thing that is wanted. Above all we want them to enjoy debating. There is no more opportune time to get them to do so than when they are in the heat of an argument as to whether this fact or situation is true or not true. Then is the time to put them on the platform and tell them to go to it. The last meeting of this phase should be spent in general summary of the question in the light of the extensive research. It is always interesting at this point to compare the opinions now held and facts known with those that were expressed at the first meetings of the exploration phase. This will bring home to the debaters how far they have gone from that point to which they will have to revert in order to pick up an average audience and bring them to the same point at which the debaters have arrived.

The fourth period is that of the organisation phase. Eight meetings should cover the work. The debater gathers up all of his material and constructs an outline in which the argument is developed in logical and convincing order. The debater is forced to assemble his thoughts and focus them upon a clear expression of his understanding of the question. He is now expressing what he has acquired. The first five meetings should be spent in organizing the material into an affirmative and negative case. This is done by the group as a whole. One member goes to the blackboard, and as the group develops the issues and case, he places them down in brief form. At the fifth meeting the two completed cases are compared and discussed. In this way, all profit by the work, and a case that has been thoroughly tested is the result. It has to stand any challenge that any debater desires to advance. Often one debater, seeing a weakness in the case in the light of something that he has found in research, takes a stand and fights for his position. He proves his contention and saves the whole squad from a fallacy. The last three meetings of this phase are given over to the debaters for

the purpose of working out the speeches that have been assigned to them. This is done individually and speeches are not written out, but are outlined in detail. These outlines are gone over carefully in private conference with the coach. He puts the debater through a severe test to determine whether or not he can prove every stand that he has taken in his outline.

A word might be said here about the assigning of speeches. The coach should divide the squad into teams and assign every debater to a speech on each side. Of course one cannot set a definite rule for this; much depends upon the capacity, ability, and personality of the individual. The whole objective is that every debater should be ready to debate on either side of a question with only a moment's notice, and be able to produce an acceptable piece of debating. For the sake of an example to be given in the outline program to follow, I have selected a squad of twelve and the (A) and the (a) respectively represent Affirmative and Negative (B-b) (C-c), (D-d). The numbers represent the individuals. This gives an idea of the model interchange of speakers from one side to another.

Finally we have the recitation phase. This should contain approximately ten meetings. The objective here is the acquiring of experience in expression. Up to this time there has been an acquisition of a thorough understanding, and an assimilation of a large body of facts. Now he is to give expression to his individual understandings in the form of speeches and complete debates. He is forced to arrange his material in a logical and coherent order on his feet. He must develop the power to set forth intellectual content in language forms on his feet. This objective is attained by a series of full debates and also of dialectical debates. I agree with Everett Lee Hunt of Swarthmore College that the "neglected method of argument, the dialectical debate, is of great value. It makes clear the unity of the process in the variety of the material and brings in the testing element of the cross-examination." Taking it for granted that two teams are to meet in interscholastic debate, the last meeting will be a conference between the two teams chosen and the coach for general discussion.

A feature which might not appeal to some, but which has proved of inestimable value, must be mentioned here. During

---

the last ten days, arrangements are made for an extra half hour
of practice. If you trust the debater to go over his outline and
talk it through aloud in his room, nine chances out of ten it never
will be done. No man can do credit to himself unless he is
thoroughly familiar with what he is going to say and how it is
to be said. It does not have to be memorized, but there must be
a thorough familiarity with the sequence of thought to be fol-
lowed.

This appeals to me as an ideal organization for a debate-
training schedule. One can quickly sense that we have discarded
the old system of exposing the debaters to a bulk of debate
 technique and then giving them a question on which to apply it.
Instead we give them the question, and as they work on the
research and analysis of it, we create a demand for a knowledge
of the debate technique, and then proceed to inject it. The whole
process becomes purposeful. It is nothing new or fantastic. It
has proved successful in training a large group of unselected
pupils without any short-cut methods.

A Debate Training Schedule

Basis:
1. Seven weeks; thirty-five meetings, each one hour long.
2. Five meetings a week.
3. Five phases of the Morrison teaching cycle.
4. A squad of twelve debaters.

Meetings:
First week

Exploration Phase:
1. Informal discussion of the background that each stu-
dent has on the question.
2. Continuation of discussion to determine what the public
attitude and conception of it is.
3. Instruction by the coach as to how the research should
be carried out. Present the five questions of issue.

Presentation phase:
4. This period should be spent in reading the most im-
portant articles and sources that will give a general
acquaintance with the scope of the problem.

Second week
1. Further research and discussion.
2. Further research and discussion.
3. A summary of the whole question should be made by
the coach, further instruction in research given, and the
general direction of the research determined.

Assimilation phase:
4. A designation of the various fields or divisions into
which the material might be logically divided.

Third week
1. Set each man to work to do research on special divi-
sions of the question and accumulate all possible infor-
manation on that particular part.
2. Discussion of research and switching of divisions.
3. Continue research and discussion.
4. Discussion of any disputable questions and arrange-
ment for informal discussion by two or four of the
debaters.
5. Informal discussion of disputed questions.

Fourth week—
1. Informal discussion. Instruction by coach in logic.
2. General discussion of the question as a whole in the
light of the extensive research.

Organization phase:
3. Arrangement of the affirmative arguments worked out
by the group. Brief.
4. Continue work on the affirmative.
5. Work on the negative case.

Fifth week:
1. Continue work on the negative.
2. General discussion of both cases. Instruction in debate
technique, especially of constructive work.

The following is a typical assignment of debaters to
speeches and arrangement of the teams for a workable schedule
of debates. The large and small letters represent the Affirmative
and the Negative respectively. The numbers are for the individuals.

Affirmative: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The individuals prepare outlines for the assigned speeches in detail.
4. Same as 3.
5. Same as 4.

Sixth week

Recitation phase:
1. Combination A-a in debate.
2. Dialectic between D-c. These are chiefly for rebuttal practice; instruction in refutation should be given at the same time.
3. Combination B-b in debate.
4. Dialectic between C-d.
5. General rebuttal practice and arrangement.

Seventh week
1. Combination C-c in debate.
2. Dialectic between A-b in debate.
3. Combination D-d in debate.
4. Selection of those who are to compose the teams in the interscholastic clash. General rebuttal and cross examination of anyone by anyone.
5. Conference with the coach by the selected teams.

Coaching Debates: Purpose and Method

(Note: This article in its full form can be found in the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education for March 1918. At that time it had been used with much success

21 From article by H. N. Wells. Quoted by permission of the National Association of Teachers of Speech.

for several years at the College of Law of the University of Southern California. What are probably its distinctive features are its emphasis on squad "wrangling," the extremely large number of practice debates, and the close coaching with the end of winning debates. It will be noted that the views here expressed differ at various points from those held by the author of this book.)

The true function of argumentation and debate is to supply the crucible, wherein the student shall test his knowledge and foment his creative impulsions. . . In other words, it is in debate that the student is forced to use his entire mental equipment to practical purposes.

Since democracy represents the right and opportunity for mutual expression, it connotes strife. Essentially, it means the inherent and reciprocal right to fight for ideals. It follows, therefore, that the larger conception of the business of the debate coach is the training of men for intellectual combat. Debaters must be fighters. That method of coaching which develops the best fighter is the correct system, for, while it is calculated to win debate contests, it is also calculated to excite and hold the interested attention of the general student body for the reason that it is real preparation for intense and useful life.

(1) Establish a preliminary squad for rebuttal training.

These classes in rebuttal should wrangle (I use the term advisedly) over every conceivable subject of current interest. The coach should enter into the fray, and, while directing thought into the most interesting and legitimate channels, excite by every wile the most spirited interchange of ideas.

(2) The "try-out" should be a test of rebuttal strength.

Construction and organization will develop as the training proceeds; power in rebuttal requires constant practice. Select the rebutters from the try-outs. Select no teams at the try-outs. Let the try-out judges select every contestant who shows promise for the ensuing year, giving no grades; ranking of the contestants should be prohibited. Every man selected is placed
Formal process. Of course, the individual debaters will brief
their research before they go upon the debate.
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their arguments, perhaps daily, to aid their individual constructions...

Do we write our constructive speeches? Yes, nearly always, but we are prepared by the shifting daily contest to throw them away, and extemporize, frequently to the improvement of the debate...

The system tends to establish certain definite lines of attack and defense in which the language becomes very familiar through repetition. But this is not analogous to what is ordinarily termed a "memorized" or "set" speech; ... if set in any sense, it is a condensed and corrected substance of argument first extemporized in actual debate, and tested in the cross-fire of actual contest...

The University of Nebraska “Think Shop” 22

Professor Miller Moore Fogg, for twenty-five years, carried on the direction of the Debate Seminary or “Think Shop” at the University of Nebraska, until his death in May 1926. His method was always to center attention on a thorough preparation of the facts in every case, and yet his did not overlook the essentials of speaking or delivery. For years Professor Fogg trained teams which gained a wide reputation for clear, logical, and accurate thinking. He never allowed his men to appear on the platform until they had ransacked all the libraries on the topics under debate. Great quantities of information were usually collected, carefully filed away for use of all his students, and revised from time to time. Altogether the material rather than the method was stressed.

About 1920 Professor Fogg also introduced into the method of Nebraska the non-decision debate. He was one of the first to take attention away from preparing to win a case or decisions of the judges and to substitute a forum of public discussion open to all shades and varieties of opinion. Following his method, Nebraska has not engaged in judged debates of the conventional type in a decade. More recently the forum debate, on invitation of some club or other group, has almost entirely replaced the regular campus contest between college teams. Professor Fogg never claimed that his type of debate was superior to all others, but he found it most convenient and most productive of interest under local conditions.

22 Quoted from a personal letter from Professor H. Adelbert White, in charge of forensics at the University of Nebraska.

CHAPTER V
THE COACH SPEAKS

I. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS
A. Take Nothing for Granted on the Part of the Audience
B. Do not Use Authorities Too Frequently
C. Do not Try to Do Too Much

II. REBUTTAL SUGGESTIONS

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NEGATIVE

V. DELIVERY: SOME DO’S AND DON’T’S

VI. STRATEGY

A. Some Strategic Devices
B. Strategy of Putting One’s Best Foot Forward
C. Strategy of Attacking At The Weakest Point
D. Strategy of Staying Off Thin Ice
E. Strategy of Leading Opponents On
F. Strategy of Admitting
G. Strategy of “Assuming For the Sake of Argument”

H. Strategy of Stealing Opponents’ Thunder
I. Strategy of Not Showing One’s Hand
J. Strategy of Raising Objections
K. Strategy of Playing Opponents Off Their Feet
L. Strategies of Special Refutation Devices
M. Strategy of the Unexpected Case.

VII. ANOTHER COACH GETS THE FLOOR

This chapter is designed as a practical help for the director in offering suggestions to his debaters. It consists largely of such suggestions, worded so as to apply directly to the student. In this connection, the study of specimen debates is recommended, such as those appearing each year in the University Debaters’ Annual published by The H. W. Wilson Company, New York.
I. General Suggestions

A. Take Nothing for Granted on the Part of the Audience

(1) The more you know about a question, the more danger there is of talking over the heads of your audience. You are a specialist; the usual debate audience has, at best, only a very general idea of what the whole question is about. Remember that fact constantly and talk in terms of your hearers' experience. Proceed on the assumption that if they can possibly misunderstand, they will. Therefore be clear, make plain arguments, explanations, evidence. Use simple phraseology. Repeat important points that you especially wish to have stick.

(2) Organize the material you present definitely about issues and contentions. Such organization may be obvious or it may be indirect. The important point is that you know clearly yourself where you are going and what steps you will use to get there, and that you so organize what you have to say that your hearers can follow you in the steps and arrive at the destination you plan for them. Such organization is imperative both for the individual speaker and for the team.

(3) Don't be afraid to use plenty of partitions, transitions, and summaries, but avoid having them unnecessarily bald. A contention is a statement in advance of what you intend to establish or present. A transition is a word, phrase, sentence, or even paragraph that bridges the gap between the concluding of one point and the taking up of another more or less closely related. A summary, of course, is a brief statement in review of what has been done. Let your hearers know where they are going, take them with you from point to point, summarize what has been accomplished. An especially effective form of summary is the contrasting or balanced summary. It is particularly effective in concluding rebuttal speeches for the entire debate but may be used for a single issue earlier. In this form of summary a speaker magnifies, within the limits of truth of course, what he or his team has established and minimizes the arguments and evidence of opponents. It can be organized about cases, arguments, or speakers.

(4) In establishing a point, make clear its relationship to your entire case, and possibly to that of opponents. Show how the whole case is strengthened, or weakened, as may be, by the establishment of this point. Similarly with the evidence you present to prove the point itself. Remember that the audience will get lost if you give them half a chance. In a summarizing sentence, connect argument and supporting evidence.

(5) Don't wear your audience out with abstractions and detailed statistics. Be concrete and graphic. Instead of declaring that "a battle costs a vast amount," be concrete and say that "it costs $50,000,000," and then be graphic as well as concrete and show what $50,000,000 will do in terms of schools, roads, or hospitals. It is much more telling to show an audience that establishment of state unemployment insurance will cost "every person in this audience" ten dollars than to say it will take $40,000,000 from the state treasury.

Note that round figures have been used in the foregoing examples. Except under very special conditions, avoid detailed figures. The audience's saturation point for figures is soon reached, even for round figures. Don't make your hearers dizzy and disgusted by reeling off detailed figures. Instead of 13,451,324 say 13½ million; instead of 148,369 say 148,000; instead of 4,461 say forty-five hundred; instead of 3.62 say 3-3/5.

(6) Similarly, avoid too frequent and too detailed references. It is not necessary to give page references unless you are challenged. Such wording as this is suf-

1 For a detailed outline of what each speaker should do, see the final section in this chapter.

2 An illustration of the balanced summary, from a recent intercollegiate debate, is found in Appendix IV.
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C. Do Not Try to Do Too Much.

DEBATE COACHING
(3) This means that you will definitely organize your rebuttal around issues and main contentions. Don’t leave it for your hearers to do this organizing; do it for them in so many words. The following opening sentence of a rebuttal speech is an illustration: “One of the main points of disagreement seems to be that of whether the Filipinos have shown real capacity for self-government. Let us consider, under this head, various conflicting arguments that have been advanced by the two teams.”

A corollary is this general principle: The fewer the points in a rebuttal speech the better. Though it is not a hard and fast rule, as discussion of the duties of respective rebuttal speakers in Chapter VI will disclose, it is fairly safe to say that not more than three or four points should be attempted in a rebuttal speech of five minutes. Better only one or two, under which others fall as sub-points. Consideration of many points without refuting any of them is evidence of poor debating. Bird shot has its place, but it is too scattered for rebuttal.

On the other hand, it may be effective, in both main and rebuttal speeches, to take up separate minor points in your opponents’ presentation and briefly dispose of them. Such head-on refutation may have an audience effect out of all proportion to the importance of the point or to the time spent in refuting it. Such minor-point rebuttal may be especially effective when used at the opening of a constructive speech.a

(4) In general, avoid “straw-men;” don’t set up an opposing argument for the sake of knocking it down. If you are giving a talk, alone, in favor of Philippine independence, there may be questions in the minds of your hearers so prominent that you must definitely mention and answer them, such as danger of foreign aggression and capacity for self-government, but in a debate, leave it to your opponents to bring up their own argu-

saying this . . .” or “We of the negative disagree for two reasons . . .”

It is sometimes possible to quote an opponent verbatim. Such a device is quite effective.

For the sake of clarity, it is often well to indicate what your method of attack will be: say “The argument is fallacious;” “The evidence will not bear analysis;” or “Where can proof be found for such a statement?”

(8) Take careful notes as the debate progresses. It is very easy to jot down just a catch word or two regarding a given argument, for at the time it seems entirely clear, as does the answer to be made. Other points pile up, however, until the first one is decidedly blurred. Get the exact opposing argument as given and below it indicate your answer. As your time to speak approaches, don’t make a wild clutch and carry with you an unassorted collection of important, unimportant, and worthless cards. Nothing is more embarrassing than to be in the midst of a rebuttal speech and pick up a card that, so far as meaning anything to you, might just as well be written in Choctaw. Or to reach confidently for a card, discover it isn’t there, begin to shuffle the pack, and eventually find it after the loss of precious seconds and several ounces of perspiration, or lamely pass on to another point that happens to be on top. Take time to assort, discard, and arrange. Take only the few cards that contain the really significant points that it seems likely you will have time to cover. When your time is up, you will probably be horrified to discover that you still have a goodly number of cards whose wisdom cannot be shared.

(9) Summarize and clinch your points. It takes practice and criticism to acquire the ability to say just enough to answer an argument adequately and to know you have said just enough. Students usually err on the side of too little rather than too much. Familiar with the subject themselves, they are prone to take too much for granted on the part of the audience’s reason-

ing ability. Don’t do it. Show them exactly how your answer disposes of the argument and what the effect is on the issues of the discussion. On the other hand, it is a waste of time to keep on striking after the argument is killed. To repeat, the ability to know what is just enough to clinch a point comes from practice and friendly criticism.

(10) If the type of debating is such as provides for separate rebuttal speeches, all plans and main arguments should be presented in the constructive speeches. The rebuttal period is allowed for the attacking of arguments previously presented. It would be obviously unfair for the last negative speaker in rebuttal to come forth with an elaborate new objection to the course of action proposed by the affirmative or for the last affirmative rebuttal speaker to present a plan carefully concealed until then.

On the other hand, rebuttal should be something more than a mere rehashing of arguments and evidence presented earlier. Though important new arguments in support of a case are out of place, alert thinking and reasoning is essential and from it should emerge arguments that are new, new so far as main speeches are concerned and often new so far as their having been previously thought of are concerned. Quite as important is the use of new evidence in rebuttal. It is often desirable to call attention again to evidence presented earlier, but debaters should always reserve ammunition for the rebuttal speeches. Not infrequently it is wise to hold back the most striking evidence, as is pointed out in the discussion of strategy.

One other point in this connection. Although you are now concerned with the two cases as they have been presented, since one of those cases is yours, you need to defend it. Hence, in connection with your attack on your opponents’ arguments and evidence, you should defend your own. When a gang of boys is besieged in a hillside shack by another gang which is rolling stones
III. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE ARGUMENTS

Counterarguments—theses are the tasks of the rebuttal speaker.

In summary: refute opposing arguments; re-argue your own. Use concession to soften the blow. Don't forget to use your audience's objections to your advantage. Keep your arguments clear and concise. Don't be afraid to admit weaknesses in your argument, but show how you overcame them. Always be prepared to adapt your arguments based on the opposition's responses. Keep your audience engaged by asking rhetorical questions. Use evidence, statistics, and examples to support your claims. Always be mindful of your time constraints.

1. VICE-PROFESSOR'S DEPARTMENT: 
2. Don't feed the suicide. If you wish to refute an argument, don't try to tear it down; instead, try to show why it is weak or misleading. Use counterexamples to illustrate your point.
3. Don't nag, don't browbeat; be respectful and polite when arguing. Remember that your audience may have valid points, even if you disagree with them.
4. Remember that the coach's role is to help you improve. They are not there to win the debate for you. Be open to feedback and suggestions from your coach.

DEBATING COACHING
cure the ills of agriculture. Show just how overproduction is the heart of the farm problem, what the McNary Haugen Bill provides to solve that problem, and just how the equalization fee will actually work to raise the price of a bushel of corn or wheat. Take nothing for granted.

In the event that the negative presents definite suggestions for reform, put back on it as much burden of proof as possible. (This does not mean childish reiteration of the words “burden of proof.”) Don’t let your opponents make suggestions in general terms or without being willing actively to sponsor them. Make them stand up to their suggestions and defend them and supply them with some definiteness. They must show that these suggestions will fill the bill.

Similarly with the counterproposition. Demand, and get the audience’s backing as to the reasonableness of your demand, that the negative show that its plan meets the admitted need in detail better than does yours.

(4) If it is feasible, quite as effective a procedure as that of demanding that the negative shoulder burden of proof with its suggestions is to take over the suggestions and show that the heart of the problem is still untouched. Unless a counterproposition is really counter, you may even be able to accept it, thus leaving your opponents high and dry. No more effective way of disposing of opponents’ proposals can be found.

(5) If the way in which the argument has gone allows it, contrast the affirmative standing for progress with the negative standing for the status quo as defined by a negro preacher: “De status quo is de mess we am in.” Contrast constructive suggestions of the affirmative with impeding objections of the negative. Such tactics, of course, cannot be followed unless the negative speakers content themselves with a largely rebuttal case.

(6) Don’t let the last negative rebuttal speaker overwhelm you with questions and demands. This is not an uncommon negative strategy, and the concluding affirmative speaker must not allow himself to be rattled by it. Simply remind the audience that most of these questions have been answered and these demands met during the progress of the debate; that it is obviously impossible to consider them all again in the space of five minutes when the two cases must be finally compared; but that you will consider such as seem important as time permits.

IV. Suggestions for the Negative

(1) Adapt to the affirmative case and issues but hold to your own contentions. If you feel that the affirmative debaters are quite wrong in their analysis of the issues, you should point out the grounds of your disagreement. Avoid disagreement over definition of terms, unless the need is imperative, imperative to a vital discussion of the question.

If the first affirmative speaker does not present adequate explanation for an understanding of the question, the first negative should capitalize on that omission and do it.

Don’t be afraid to change your plans radically to meet an unexpected affirmative case, even to the extent of changing order of speakers or discarding a pre-arranged case entirely.

(2) In general avoid being purely destructive, but constantly and consistently attack. Keep doubts and questions uppermost in the minds of your hearers.

If the affirmative speakers are quite clearly on the offensive, do not hesitate to point that fact out to the audience.

(3) Make the affirmative side establish a definite need and show in detail how its plan meets it; this rather than repeatedly iterating the stereotyped phrase, “The affirmative has the burden of proof.”

(4) Anticipate in the last rebuttal. Often when the last negative rebuttal speaker comes to speak there are still important points that the affirmative speakers have not considered. Either they are going to say nothing or they have waited until the last speech. The last nega-
The speaker needs to watch for such points, including significant arguments advanced during the debate and definite questions asked by the negative for the affirmative to answer. He should then remind the audience of these matters, pointing out that the affirmative speakers have failed to consider them when there was plenty of time, suggesting that any answer made in the concluding speech should be discounted inasmuch as the negative will have no chance to analyze it.

If it can be done with tact, a general exhortation to remember this or that point, regardless of what may be said in the last affirmative speech, may be effective. Care must be taken to avoid giving the impression that you are misused because you can’t speak last. Don’t sob about the rules of the game.

V. Delivery: Some Do’s and Don’ts

There is so much in common in the delivery of debate speeches and other types, and there are so many standard speech texts that discuss at length the matter of delivery, that merely outline treatment will be essayed here. At the same time, it will be noted that attention is given to more than the mere manner of standing and uttering audible sounds. Delivery, in its broader aspects, is concerned with the speaker himself and the effect that he consciously and unconsciously produces on his hearers. People are moved to believe or to act, not by facts and figures and cold logic, at least not by them alone, but by appeals, direct and indirect, to their feelings—their sense of right and wrong, their love of fair play, their desire for social recognition, their longing for personal gain and advancement. The effective debater must be able to plead as well as explain and argue. The persuasive appeal is often needed in overt form. It should always be present indirectly as the result of certain attitudes and characteristics on the part of the speaker.

(1) Use the conversational method. That means, feel that you have something worth while saying and give it to your hearers directly, without affectation or any other impediment to free man-to-man communication. Do not hesitate to be animated and enthusiastic for your subject.

This essential element of communicativeness can be had in a memorized speech provided you do not perform parrot-like, but think vitally while you are speaking. It is much more likely to be present, however, when you speak extemporaneously out of a thorough knowledge of the subject. Such extemporaneous delivery, with practice, can be nearly, if not quite, as fluent as that which results from memorizing. The conversational method insures adaptation to opponents’ arguments and to the experience of the audience, and it avoids noticeable distinction in style between constructive and rebuttal speeches.

(2) Avoid an over-controversial attitude and manner. Don’t proceed on the assumption that you must argue with the audience. They are usually friendly; knowing little about the subject, they want to be enlightened. As regards subject and opponents, remember the two terms, “comparative values” and “cooperative controversy.”

A simple little device for securing cooperative attention and attitude on the part of your hearers is to vary assertive statements of facts and assertive falling inflections of the voice by frequently putting matters up to them: “Don’t you think so?” “Doesn’t it seem reasonable that?...” “Do you see how it is?” “It is quite simple after all, is it not?” Many a debater will vastly increase his persuasive powers by laying aside some of his assertiveness and cultivating the use of cooperative questioning.

(3) However, don’t hesitate to show real earnestness and conviction in your speaking. The good salesman is the man who believes in his goods and is not afraid to

*Cf. discussion of debating against one’s convictions. Ch. I.
Consider Lincoln again, in his first debate with Douglas at Ottawa, in arguing the existence of a con-
Unionism in America. In his first debate with
Douglas, Lincoln spoke of the existence of a con-
Strictly, no candidate, no
Douglas, Lincoln spoke of
strictly, no candidate, no
Douglas, Lincoln spoke of

To win the debate, Lincoln needed to set forth a clear and
persuasive argument that would
win over the audience. However, he
failed to adequately address the
weaknesses of Douglas's argument,
resulting in a loss for Lincoln. The
next debate would be crucial for his
future in politics.

Douglas was a more skilled orator,
and he was able to appeal to the
emotions of the audience more effec-
tively. Lincoln, on the other hand,
failed to connect with the masses
as effectively. This would be a
recurring theme in his campaigns.

Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg
demonstrated his ability to
unify the nation and
address the
broader issues of the
civil war. This speech
became a symbol of his
committment to the
Union.

In conclusion, Lincoln's
debates with Douglas
highlighted his
growth as a
carrier. He learned from
his mistakes and
would use these
trials to become a
more effective
leader.
THE COACH SPEAKS

The coach's notes on the art of public speaking:

1. Use the best decision of which you are capable.
2. Speak distinctly and clearly, even if the audience is not listening.
3. Don't be afraid to make mistakes, as long as you learn from them.
4. Always prepare, but don't be afraid to improvise.
5. Use examples from your own experiences to illustrate your points.
6. Be concise and to the point.
7. Avoid using jargon or technical terms that your audience may not understand.
8. Practice your delivery in front of a mirror or with a friend.
9. Use pauses to emphasize important points.
10. Be aware of your body language and how it affects your audience.
11. Listen actively to your audience and respond accordingly.
12. Be open to feedback and willing to make adjustments.
13. Remember, the audience is there to listen to you, so speak with confidence.
14. Use pauses to create tension and build suspense.
15. Use your voice to convey emotion and emphasis.

DEBATE COACHING

A few tips for delivering a compelling argument:

1. Start with a strong opening statement that captures your audience's attention.
2. Use evidence and statistics to support your arguments.
3. Anticipate and counteract your opponent's arguments.
4. Stay calm and composed, even when under pressure.
5. Be ready to adjust your strategy based on your opponent's responses.
6. Practice your delivery multiple times to refine your timing and pacing.
7. Use rhetorical devices like metaphors and analogies to make your points more memorable.
8. Avoid being defensive, as it can come across as weak.
9. Be open to constructive criticism and use it to improve your arguments.
10. Remember, the goal is to persuade, not to win an argument at all costs.
quickly and thoroughly as does monotony. As meaning and mood in a debate speech change, so should the voice change in force, now loud, now soft; in quality, now stating facts, now ringing in challenge; in pitch, now high, now low; in rate, now fast, now slow.

(19) Stand easily erect and don't be afraid to move about. Physical action should assist the voice in carrying meaning. From the way one stands to the way his face responds to thought and feeling, "every little movement has a meaning all its own" to the audience. Stand easily erect. Don't slouch; don't strut. Show forth in physical poise your mental poise arising from modesty and assurance.

Movement on the platform furnishes what is known as visible punctuation. What more natural than that the speaker should step forward when he says, "I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen;" that he should take a step or two across the stage on "But let us go a little further;" that he should walk around the speaker's stand to indicate one of his main transitions? Use plenty of physical movement about the platform, movement that is purposeful rather than random, movement at significant intervals rather than distracting constant pacing about. In general, the greater the change in thought, the wider the transition, the more steps you should take.

How should one walk? Don't rush, don't stroll. Walk simply and unaffectedly as though you have somewhere to go and wish to get there in a business-like way. But don't scuff your feet! Such a habit is unbelievably distracting.

Should one talk and walk at the same time? This is a question for movement accompanying important transitions. You will naturally start to walk during the pause following conclusion of the point just presented. Inasmuch as the general principle for all bodily action, that it should not call attention to itself, applies here, you will probably not do all the walking in silence. You will start to utter the transitional phrase, whatever it may be: "That is not all, however; we have yet to consider..." By the time you have reached your new position you will be ready to go on with the new argument.

(20) Be master of the speaker's stand, if there is one. It is not a lounge, as some English debaters have seemed to think, but it may be leaned on effectively now and then. On the other hand, don't get anchored behind it, afraid to venture forth and stand free. It is very useful to walk around when making important transitions, but don't beat out a race track pacing back and forth around it. Too much action can be quite as monotonous as not enough.

Stand well downstage. Get as physically near your audience as you can, without making them speculate as to whether you will fall off the platform. You will not only make them hear better but will establish a more direct contact. It is not an unknown practice for the home team to place the speaker's stand well back, hoping that the visitors, unaccustomed to the peculiar acoustics of the auditorium, will speak from it and consequently will not be heard well, while the members of the home team speak from well down front. If you are ever faced by such a situation, or if for any other reason the stand seems too far back, either move it downstage or else speak there without it.

Rather than carry an armful of books, magazines, and pamphlets from your table to the speaker's stand, you should reduce your baggage to a minimum. If you find you need an evidence card or other reference material during the progress of your remarks, walk naturally to your table and get it. Similarly, if you find your mouth is getting too dry to function, excuse yourself or pause and step to the water pitcher. These minor matters are sometimes the best test of your poise.

(21) Use simple, communicative gestures. Don't take as your speaking model the old-fashioned wooden
Indian that used to stand in front of cigar stores. When you converse with your friends, you use hands, arms, shoulders, facial muscles. Why not carry this same spontaneous activity, somewhat modified of course by the demands of a more formal occasion, into your work on the platform? Gestures should grow naturally out of thought and feeling, thus being just as real a part of the speaking as voice or language. They should not call attention to themselves. However, this last principle should prevent no one from practising with gestures by himself even though they are a bit stiff and awkward. If gesturing comes hard for you, do all you can to limber up, and remember that no one ever learned to swim without getting into the water.

Cultivate a normal rest position when you are not gesturing. Try to feel comfortable or at ease with your hands hanging naturally at your sides. There is no reason why for short periods you should not do other things with your hands—putting one in your pocket, or clasping them behind your back, but don’t become wedded to such positions.

Don’t overdo gesturing. For every one who needs this injunction there are ten who should work for more gestures. However, it should be borne in mind that constant gesturing defeats its own purpose, distracting the audience’s attention or becoming so monotonous as no longer to give emphasis. A moving electric sign attracts our attention for a time, but we finally get so accustomed to it that it goes unnoticed.

Avoid pounding the table, stamping your feet, or otherwise displaying your lack of appropriate reserve. Be courteous to your audience as well as your opponents.

Some inexperienced speakers who have difficulty in gesturing find it helpful to recite or read aloud, as to an audience, selections from other debate speeches, using what seem to be appropriate, natural gestures for various expressions. Warren Choate Shaw in his History of American Oratory, p. 690-1, has culled some useful expressions from great speeches for practical purposes.

(22) Use notes sparingly. Notes for rebuttal, whether in separate speeches or in running rebuttal, are necessary for most people. Should one use notes for his prepared speech, however? Yes, if he is their master and can use them unobtrusively; no, if he is their slave.

(23) When you read, do it fluently and communicatively. A speech gives the impression of being more extemporaneous if quotations and detailed statistics are read rather than recited from memory. But keep in contact with your audience, and don’t stumble. That means—practice carefully what you are going to read. You must know the material so well that you need not keep your eyes glued to the page or the card.

In rebuttal it is often most effective to read from an original source rather than from a card, provided, of course, that you have the necessary reference material with you at the table.

(24) Finally, use variety. No one element or style or method or quality is so good but that it can become monotonous. Variety in structure and variety in manner are both needed. All sentences should not be declarative; short sentences as well as long should be used; periodic sentences as well as loose. Similarly with voice, physical posture and movement, attitude,—these must change widely and often during the course of a speech if it is to get hold of the hearers.

Particularly important is variety among the larger divisions of the speech, variety which, through content, wording, and especially manner, produces a series of climaxes climbing steadily higher to the final conclusion. Even though such an ideal arrangement of mounting peaks is not possible, there must be some peaks, some

11 Published by the Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, 1928.
12 Cf. Briefs and Outlines, Ch. IV.
elevations that keep the speech from running monotonously along on a dead level.

Whether the sub-climax is brought out by increased vocal energy or by vocal restraint or by appropriate gestures or by movement on the platform or by a combination of these means or by other means, whatever the method, when the peak has been reached, descent should follow in terms of decreased emphasis and tension. A plateau may be as monotonous as a valley. The effective speech has peaks of major emphasis that stand out for the beholder.

(25) A Miscellaneous Don’t or Two.

Don’t run out of things to say. It is a practically sure sign of weakness to have to stop before your time is up. Knowledge of the question, thinking, ability to adapt—something is definitely wrong.

Don’t say “my constructive speech.” This expression is too rigid and stereotyped, and it sets first speeches off too sharply as something quite different from second speeches. Say, rather, “earlier,” “previous remarks,” or “other speech,” and don’t always use the same expression.

Don’t say “we have proved” or “our opponents have proved.” In the first case, such expressions as these are preferable: “We have shown,” or “explained,” or “pointed out.” Proof is an indefinite something in the minds of your hearers, and you don’t convince them by assertion any more than the Chicago Tribune becomes the “world’s greatest newspaper” by admitting it. On the other hand, be careful how you say, “We have tried to show.” It is easy to give an impression of uncertainty and apology.

In the second case, when you refer to opponents, it is both logically and psychologically foolish to refer to their having proved a point unless you are really admitting the point. It is better to say “asserted,” “maintained,” or “argued.”

Don’t demand that opponents “must prove to us.” It is in the minds of the audience rather than of an opposing team that proof must be established. As a matter of fact, even laying aside the contest element, is there much hope of convincing one’s opponents? Since such a demand is foolish, avoid it yourself and ridicule its use by opponents.

VI. Strategy

Strategy may be defined as using one’s resources in such a way as to gain an unexpected advantage over opponents.

Its use is condemned by some as being unethical and as contributing to an artificial style of debate that antagonizes the general hearer. It must be admitted that there is some justification for this criticism. Is it not true, however, that the hearers enjoy the contest element as well as the discussion of the question, and that cleverness which does not take unfair advantages contributes to their enjoyment? Some fans like to see two prizefighters stand up and maul each other into insensibility; real sportsmen prefer an exhibition of clever, heady boxing.

The only sort of strategy whose use is recommended here is that which does not take unfair advantage, either of the audience in following the discussion or of opponents. Many readers may not consider some of the methods mentioned as strategy at all, but rather as mere common-sense use of one’s material and opportunities. Those who shy at the term “strategy” may substitute “debate technique” if that is more acceptable. There can be no exhaustive discussion, for the possibilities are

---

numberless, depending on question, audience, opponents, and debate developments. The methods and types discussed here are general.

One requirement is essential if one is to use almost any sort of strategy. That is the ability to extemporize and adapt quickly and effectively.

A. Some Strategic Devices

(1) Changing the order of speakers. As pointed out elsewhere, it is frequently desirable to have speakers appear in different order in rebuttal from that which they followed in main speeches. For example, the first affirmative speaker may be the most experienced member of the team and should speak last in rebuttal.

This may apply to a change from the announced speaking order for constructive speeches, made desirable by the way in which the opposing case is developing. Suppose each negative speaker has a main contention. The second affirmative speaker presents arguments with which the contention of the third negative speaker directly clashes. Other things being equal, he who is scheduled to speak last for the negative should speak second. If a team has a sliding schedule of this sort, the chairman should be informed in advance so that he will await word before announcing the second speaker.

(2) Use of questions. Questions may be asked for a variety of reasons—to disconcert opponents, to throw them off the track, to cause loss of time in answering, to secure answers disadvantageous to the opposition, to force into a dilemma, to help clarify the discussion. It is obvious that, from the viewpoint of ethical justification, there is great difference in these types, so obvious, in fact, that detailed comment seems uncalled for. Let this suffice. When you ask questions, eliminate those that are designed to becloud and delay. When questions are directed to you, look before you leap. You

need not regard your opponents as tricksters, as guilty until proved innocent, but at the same time, do not be unduly trustful. Consider the question carefully before you answer.

One hard and fast rule can be laid down. Don't ignore questions your opponents ask. If they are trivial or irrelevant or ulterior in motive, tactfully point that out. If they are bona fide, meet them straightforwardly. Beware of "yes" or "no" answers. You can be sure that your opponents intend to capitalize on your answers if you give them the chance. Categorical "yes" and "no" answers are the most vulnerable.

Don't ask too many questions and don't ask them too fast. Both audience and opponents must have time to take them in. To insure accuracy it is not uncommon to have questions typewritten on a card in advance, and as soon as they are read aloud the card is handed over to the opposing team.

Here is an illustration of how questions may be legitimately introduced, taken from the middle of a first negative speech on the proposition, "Resolved, that this house endorses Mussolini's governmental principles."

Compared in these two essential points of principle, we find, then, that the principles of Mussolini as compared with those of democracy, hold no hope for the world. They are a flat denial of those principles that man has found in his struggle through the centuries to guarantee him the most self respect.

So right here we should like to ask the gentlemen two questions: First, do you advocate the principles of government of Mussolini or those of democracy for the United States? Second, do you advocate the governmental principles of Mussolini or those of democracy for Italy under normal conditions? We are not asking these questions as a blind, ladies and gentlemen, but we believe that you are entitled to a statement of the stand of the affirmative regarding them. We wish that the next speaker from the opposition would give us his answer to them."
Just as the team questioned must not ignore questions, so the questioning team must follow up its questions. If they are answered, comment and rebuttal is needed; if they are ignored, that fact must be pointed out to the audience, often more than once with profit. If a question or a series of questions is asked in the very concluding sentences of a speaker, the opposing speaker who immediately follows him should not be penalized if he does not take up the question and answer it fully. It may be very much wiser for him to say that inasmuch as his opponents have taken the trouble to formulate a question, doubtless they desire a careful answer. This he cannot give because of insufficient time for consideration, but a later colleague will consider it fully. Even though ample time for answering is given, it may be wise to allow one opposing speech to ignore a question. If two speeches pass it up, however, the audience should be reminded.

It is decidedly unethical for the affirmative to delay answering a question until their last rebuttal, when the negative have no come-back. The concluding negative rebuttal speaker should warn the audience in advance against such unfair tactics, though considerable tact is needed to avoid the appearance of impugning opponents' motives.\(^{15}\)

3. Challenges. Avoid challenges. They smack of mock heroics and are decidedly dangerous. “We challenge our opponents to produce one example” collapses like a pricked balloon with the production of just one example.

If confronted by a challenge, don’t ignore it unless obviously absurd, but kill it with kindness.

4. Protests. The occasion must be extreme indeed to warrant a protest to the chair in an ordinary debate. Suppose you are on the negative and the last affirmative produces a damaging conclusion to an important quotation which you have read, making it appear that you have deceived the audience. You can prove that that alleged conclusion is faked. Under such circumstances, a protest might be justified in theory. Actually, even then there would be a doubt from the standpoint of actual effect on the audience. The case must be very clear and the protest must be skillfully handled to prevent an impression of poor sportsmanship.

On the other hand, if your procedure is ever the cause of protest, don’t get flustered or angry. Hold your poise and lend your best efforts to straightening out the misunderstanding.

5. Charts. There is considerable difference of opinion as to the value and admissibility of charts. Their use seems to be declining. Debaters should be able to put their ideas into words clear enough to carry the desired meaning without the use of charts. Employ them only when they seem the sole way of making particular figures or arguments graphic. They should be charts for diagrams and not bulletin boards for printed arguments. Whenever charts are used, it should be in a manner fair and aboveboard, and they should always be available to opponents for analysis and refutation.

The following main types of strategy will be taken up in outline form. These points will be considered under each: which team, affirmative or negative, can use it; its characteristics; how to meet it. In some cases examples will be given. “You” means both the team and the individual member.

When to use this or that or a combination or none must be decided in the light of the particular situation.

The reader, on analyzing, will discover that the various types may be classified under two headings: those suited to the strong, aggressive case and those useful in defense of the weak case.\(^{16}\)

\(^{15}\) Cf. Suggestions for the Negative earlier in this chapter.

B. Strategy of Putting One’s Best Foot Forward

(1) Used by either side.

(2) Emphasize your strong arguments, soft-pedal your weak ones. If your weaker arguments are attacked, admit them or refute with a quick telling blow and revert to your strong points and the case as a whole. Refuse to be drawn from your impregnable main points.

(3) To meet. Attack strongly, emphasizing points being soft-pedaled, especially if they seem really important.

C. Strategy of Attacking at the Weakest Point

(1) Though this is particularly a negative device, it may be used by the affirmative also.

(2) Using all your knowledge of both sides of the question, pick out the important points in your opponents’ argument that seem weakest and then constantly hammer. Affirmative teams are not infrequently deficient in establishing a definite, serious need for a change in existing conditions and in showing specifically how their plan actually meets the need. When your opponents exhibit this weakness, there is a place to attack.

(3) To meet. Adapt the strategy of Putting One’s Best Foot Forward. If attacked points cannot be admitted, bolster them with the most effective refutation you can command.

D. Strategy of Staying Off Thin Ice

(1) Used by either side.

(2) Avoid attacking an opposing argument if you are weak there. You must not give your hearers the impression, however, that you are afraid of the point.

If your opponents make much of it, then face it honestly, raising doubts or even admitting. Remember that a weak, half-hearted answer re-emphasizes the argument to the advantage of your opponents.

As discussed elsewhere, it is quite unfair for an affirmative team to withhold consideration of an important point on which it is weak until the last rebuttal speech.

(3) To meet. Point out to the audience the strange silence of your opponents. Make them face the music if you can, but beware of being the victim of

E. Strategy of Leading Opponents On

(1) Used by either side.

(2) In constructive argument, withhold some important argument or evidence so as to call forth from your opponents a demand that you produce it. Then in a late rebuttal speech (but not the last affirmative, when your opponents have no come-back) you produce the missing material overwhelmingly and crushingly.

When you use this strategy in refutation, in either main or rebuttal speeches, deliberately refrain from attacking a point until your opponents have called the attention of the audience, perhaps more than once, to your silence. Then give it both barrels.

An example may be found in arguing the McNary-Haagen Farm Relief Bill. An affirmative team establishes a need for remedial legislation and outlines the provisions of the proposed law. It deliberately fails, however, to show specifically how the law would operate to raise the price of farm products. After being taken to task by the negative for this omission, the team proceeds to spend an entire rebuttal speech in presenting proof.

The procedure involved here is definitely strategy and may be objected to by some as being unfair. It can
be abused, of course, as can many debate practices, but if the general spirit behind the debating is one of fair play, this strategy may make the discussion more lively and interesting for audience as well as participants.

(3) To meet. Use caution in swallowing your opponents' bait. If there is an obvious lack of proof on the part of an otherwise well-prepared team, look out. The more you emphasize the lack, the more telling their supplying it when the time comes. In the second place, be ready to consider the argument or evidence vigorously and head-on, just as soon as it is presented. And, finally, if you are the last negative rebuttal speaker, and the affirmative speakers have not yet presented significant proof that your team has demanded, point out that such presentation is out of place in their last speech when your team has no chance to analyze the material.

F. Strategy of Admitting

(1) Used by either side.

(2) This may not be strategy, as such, at all. It may simply be a bona fide effort to exclude certain matters so as to get at the real heart of the question.

An admission preceding an opponent's expected argument or attack tends to confound the opposition and derange their planned procedure. An admission following an argument or attack on which opponents have spent considerable time has the effect of virtually wasting that much of their total time allowance. In either case, time is saved for the team making the admission.

Let us again take an example from debates on the McNary-Haugen Farm Relief Bill of 1927. Suppose the first affirmative has spent most of his time portraying the urgent need of legislative help to American agriculture. The first negative speaker says, "You have heard the preceding speaker paint a vivid picture of agricul-

tural distress in this country. So far as we are concerned he might well have saved his time. We are in complete agreement with him as to the need." And then he goes on to indicate that the point of disagreement is not the existence of a need but how the need should be met.

If you admit an important point, it means that you must concentrate on the essential points remaining. On these contentions you must take a fixed stand and drive them home. It is the strategy of the military commander who withdraws from positions he is afraid he cannot successfully defend, to central, well fortified positions.

There is one type of admitting that you should usually avoid, even as a strategic measure, and that is progressive admitting, falling back from first one position and then another as the fight gets too hot. This strategy is sometimes recommended for the affirmative, but unless it is handled with consummate skill, the almost inevitable effect on the audience is an impression of apology and retreat. Canvass the situation thoroughly in advance and know pretty well what you can do and what you had better surrender. Then, always proceeding, of course, on the principle that one must adapt to situations as they develop, stick to your guns.

(3) To meet. Depending on whether an admission seems dictated by tactical necessity or by a genuine attempt to discuss only essentials, point out that your opponents are on the defensive or meet them in the effort to get at the real issues.

G. The Strategy of "Assuming for the Sake of Argument"

(1) Used by either side; especially effective for final constructive speakers.
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The Russian

an influential influence in the internal affairs of
Russia in 1922-1929. The historian, who
was also a politician, was friendly with
Russia's political leaders.

1. The Lusitania's Employees
2. The sale of properties to
3. The defense of the nation.

Russian consists of the following:

(Russian) "Assuming for the sake of argument,
the Lusitania's Employees possessed the property
situated in an international manner, were not
owed in any way for the benefit of the people and
that they can be used elsewhere in connection with the

The device of "The Lusitania's Employees"
are presented below:

throughout the period of their agreement.

Note the conclusions that Maxwell's ideas are

Another way in which the strategy may be employed

Usual objection,

If you are on the affirmative side,

H Strategy of Staying Opponents Thunder

Strategies and procedures with the discussion
need to be discussed as those of the question.

When needed, however, it is important to

point out that the discussion

When you use this device, instead of admitting
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When you use this device, instead of admitting
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Strategies of Rising Opitions

1. Used by the Negative

2. Strategies of Not Showing Our Hand

3. To meet the smart and ready to act at once

4. For us to stand out, not only fingers the do-
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Conclude by re-emphasizing the importance of memory, logic, and audience engagement.

A strategy of the unexpected case

I. Strategy of the Unexpected Case

1. Reÿen of the special relaxation devices

Stand-off objections: the opening of the mind to consider the other important factors may lead to an interest in other factors as well.

2. To meet the critic, keep cool and handle the significance

The principal evidence. Other speakers have brought up the concept of the principle. Often it is desirable to present much of the principle in the new order, and in light of the principle...
The other speakers must develop the principal sources of hydraulic power in this country more than you have been discussing. It is not fair to say that hydraulic power is an example of this sort of case. It is, I suppose, the principal source of hydraulic power, but it is not the only source. There are other sources of power that are just as important.

(9) The Direct Primary is the best way of getting the people to vote. It is not the best way of getting the best people to vote. The best people are not always the ones who want to vote. They are sometimes the ones who want to be left alone.

(10) Mr. Smith's argument is not valid. He assumes that the government should not have the authority to develop the resources of the country. This is not true. The government has the authority to develop the country.

(11) The Direct Primary is not the best way of selecting candidates. It is not the best way of selecting the best candidates. The best candidates are not always the ones who want to be selected. They are sometimes the ones who want to be left alone.

(12) The Direct Primary is not fair. It is not fair to the people who do not want to vote. They are sometimes the ones who want to be left alone.

(13) The Direct Primary is not effective. It is not effective in getting the people to vote. They are sometimes the ones who want to be left alone.

(14) The Direct Primary is not workable. It is not workable in any country. People are sometimes the ones who want to be left alone.

(15) The Direct Primary is not fair. It is not fair to the people who do not want to vote. They are sometimes the ones who want to be left alone.
be able to adapt and extemporize, using much of their time for running rebuttal and the presentation of additional evidence.

(7) **Counterproposition.** A negative case which takes this form is usually unexpected in itself. It is doubly unexpected if presented in the opening, rather than the third, speech. On the other hand, you must decide whether such presentation loses more in giving the opponents time to prepare an answer than it gains in unexpectedness and in illuminating the audience.

In summary, then, it is plain that strategy is a matter of individual and team judgment. Whether a particular type or a combination or none at all should be used depends on questions, opponents, team members, audience. The goal is a contest that is at the same time an interesting public discussion. Strategy, like many other matters, must always be kept in its place as a means to the attainment of this ideal.

**VII. Another Coach Gets the Floor**

Not because the author necessarily agrees with all of the perhaps too rigidly outlined tasks for the various speakers, but because these instructions are pretty inclusive and have been used with success by their compiler, there is here presented an outline used by Professor Robert B. Huber of Indiana University. Mr. Huber furnishes mimeographed copies to all debaters.

**GENERAL DEBATE OUTLINE FOR THREE-SPEAKER TEAM**

**Affirmative**

First Affirmative Constructive Speaker

I. Introduction
   A. Show why the audience should be interested in this subject.

**THE COACH SPEAKS**

B. Show why the subject should be debated (This should be a relation of recent events leading to the discussion.)
C. State the question.
D. Define the terms.
E. Partition the affirmative case.
F. Partition your own speech.

II. Discussion

A. The first affirmative speaker should present the evils in the present system which constitute a need for a change.
B. Prove your first point.
   1. Summarize the point fully in your own words.
   2. Back it up by evidence or proof.
      a. Use examples.
      b. Cite statistics.
      c. Quote authorities.
   3. Make a conclusion on the point.
C. Prove your other points in the same fashion.

III. Conclusion

A. Summarize your points.
B. Conclude your speech.
C. Announce what your colleagues will prove.

Second Affirmative Constructive Speaker

I. Introduction

A. Adapt to or refute the first negative speaker.
B. Repeat points presented by first affirmative.
C. Partition your own speech.

II. Discussion

Prove your constructive speech in exactly same manner as first affirmative program. The subject matter of this speech deals with either additional evils or the affirmative plan and how it will remove the evils, or a combination of both.

III. Conclusion

A. Summarize your speech.
B. Conclude your speech.
C. Announce what your colleague will prove.

Third Affirmative Constructive Speaker

I. Introduction

A. Adapt to or refute the second negative speaker.

---

*Quoted by permission of the author.*
B. Repeat what your colleagues have proved.
C. Partition your own speech.

II. Discussion
This discussion is proved in the same fashion as first affirmative discussion. The third affirmative may deal with any of the following arguments:
1. Show how the plan of the affirmative will remove the evils or
2. Take the new and greater objections of the negative and state them affirmatively as benefits of the affirmative's proposal; that is, "our plan will have a very small cost" or
3. Point out benefits of the affirmative proposal or
4. Show that the affirmative's proposal is merely an extension of the system already in use.

III. Conclusion
A. Summarize your own speech.
B. Conclude your own speech.
C. Summarize the affirmative case.
D. Conclude the whole affirmative case.

First Affirmative Rebuttal Speaker
I. Introduction
A. Point out the issues of the particular debate.
B. Announce the issue with which you will deal.

II. Discussion
Use the same methods of proving your points as in your constructive speech. This speech should be a strong attack against the negative's stand on need. If they are defending the present, point out how they have failed to answer your specific evils. If they have offered a plan of repairs or a substitute plan, point out how their plan fails to remove evils that the affirmative pointed out. If they have admitted the evils, but have offered nothing to remedy them, attack them on the weakness of this position.

III. Conclusion
Summarize and conclude what you have done in the rebuttal.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal Speaker
I. Introduction
Announce the issue with which you will deal.

II. Discussion
Using the same method of proving points as you did in your constructive speech, see that the new and greater evils of the negative team are answered. If these have already been taken care of, then deal with the main issue of the debate and be sure to establish it for your case.

III. Conclusion
Summarize and conclude your rebuttal speech.

Third Affirmative Rebuttal Speaker
There are two types of rebuttals that the speaker may make. First he may make a running summary of the whole debate, keeping the arguments under the big issues. In this type of rebuttal you show how you have established your case in spite of what the negative has said. In other words you show how you have answered the negative arguments on these issues. Any argument left unanswered must be taken care of as you go thru the summary. In other words, this whole rebuttal will be a gathering of threads of the debate leading down to the conclusion of the question you are debating. This type of rebuttal is possible when most of the arguments of the opposition have satisfactorily been taken care of.

The second type of rebuttal is the type to use when the debate is close and there seems to be more to do than you can get done. Take the two or three big issues of the debate and not adapting particularly to that which has gone on before (establish plenty of evidence to support your arguments), establish these in a persuasive manner for the affirmative. Under either type make a complete summary of the issues for the affirmative and a conclusion over the whole debate.

NEGATIVE

First Negative Constructive Speaker
I. Introduction
A. Adapt to or refute the first affirmative speaker.
B. Announce specifically the stand of the negative team as far as the need issue is concerned.

C. Partition the negative case.

D. Partition your own speech.

II. Discussion

A. Prove your first point.
   1. Explain it fully in your own words.
   2. Back it up by proof or evidence.
      a. Use examples.
      b. Cite statistics.
      c. Quote authorities.
   3. Make a conclusion on the point.

B. Prove your other points in the same fashion.

III. Conclusion

A. Summarize your points.

B. Conclude your speech.

C. Announce what your colleagues will prove.

Second Negative Constructive Speaker

I. Introduction

A. Adapt to or refute second affirmative.

B. Repeat what the first negative proved.

C. Partition your own speech.

II. Discussion

Prove your speech in same manner as first speaker.

III. Conclusion

A. Summarize your own points.

B. Conclude your speech.

C. Announce what your colleague will prove.

Third Negative Constructive Speaker

I. Introduction

A. Very briefly adapt to or refute the third affirmative speaker.

B. Repeat what your colleagues have proved.

C. Partition what you will prove.

II. Discussion

Prove your points in the same fashion as first negative.

III. Conclusion

A. Summarize your own speech.

B. Conclude your own speech.

C. Conclude the whole negative case. The case of the Negative may have the following organization of arguments:

1. There is no need for the affirmative proposal.

2. The purpose and value of the present system in contrast to the proposed system.

3. New and greater objections to the affirmative proposal.

These three points may be used interchangeably among the three speakers with any of them coming first, but the most logical order is the order named. Another possible organization is for all three speakers to talk on the same point: such as the need for a change, or objections to the affirmative proposal. Still another organization is this: first speaker—no need for a change, the last two speakers—new and greater objections to the affirmative plan. There are many other negative possibilities. When a substitute plan is offered by the negative, the first speaker may point out the objections to the affirmative plan; the second speaker—the substitute plan and how it will remove evils; the third speaker—a comparison of the two plans.

First Negative Rebuttal Speaker

I. Introduction

A. Point out the issue of the debate.

B. Announce the issue you will prove.

II. Discussion

Using the same method of proving points as in your constructive speech, make a strong attack against the weakest point in the affirmative case. It may be specific objections to the particular affirmative plan offered in the debate or it may be against their need argument.

III. Conclusion

Summarize and conclude the arguments in your rebuttal.

Second Negative Rebuttal Speaker

I. Introduction

Announce the issue with which you will deal.
II. Discussion
Using the same method of proving points as in constructive speech, establish for the negative side the issue which is the heart of the debate.

III. Conclusion
Summarize and conclude the points of your rebuttal speech.

Third Negative Rebuttal Speaker
This rebuttal is very similar to third affirmative. *First type:* Make a running summary of the whole debate pointing out just what the affirmative have failed to do and must do yet to establish their case. Point out particularly those objections of the negative that the affirmative have failed to answer. Any loose ends of the debate which have not been taken care of should be dealt with throughout the summary. The purpose of this type is to make it seem hopeless to the affirmative to establish their case and answer your arguments. This is most effective when the affirmative have much yet to do.

*Second type:* If the affirmative have done what they are supposed to do, if the debate has been close, organize the rebuttal under the two or three big issues of the debate. Make a persuasive attempt to establish those against the affirmative.
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I. THE DAY OF THE DEBATE

Active preparation should not last into the actual day of the debate, though of course individual speakers cannot be expected to banish the whole affair from their minds. Relaxation and freedom from worry are essential. A good night’s sleep the night before (not a debate meeting that lasts until midnight, and better none at all!), regular classes until noon to keep minds off the debate, some brisk exercise after lunch, a nap and perhaps a movie, a quick invigorating bath, a light easily digested supper—this regimen for the last day has shown itself to be trustworthy in most cases.

Such an eleventh hour preparation of mind and body will avail but little, however, if debaters are already fagged by late hours,—no matter whether the reason be studies, outside work, debate meetings, or “dates”—and bad habits of eating and general hygiene. A debater needs to be in training as does an athlete, and debate directors,
whether in high school or college, might well be more
insistent on some common-sense training rules. A coach
may himself be the worst offender in keeping his debaters
long and unreasonable hours.

Many coaches insist that their debaters try out the
acoustics of a strange auditorium before the debate. This
is a very sensible procedure, for though it is unnecessary
in the majority of cases, now and then a hall will be
found that has such peculiar acoustic properties that the
strange team is, at least for a time, at a disadvantage. It
goes without saying that the home team should have
some practice in delivery in the hall where they expect
to speak.

Finally, debaters should not arrive at the place of
the debate sooner than is necessary to allow ample time
for them to meet chairman and opponents, and judges if
that be desired. A long wait is both tiresome and nerve-
wracking. It is equally bad for them to dash in at the
last minute and hurry immediately to the platform.

It is a perfectly sensible arrangement for the debaters
to meet the judges in advance, and they certainly should
meet the chairman and their opponents. A brief, in-
formal chat with members of the opposing team does
much to remove the atmosphere of stiffness and suspicion
and hostility. A debate should be a friendly discussion,
not a battle to the death. The day is past when a good
coach herds his protégés off into a room and keeps them
there incommunicado until he receives word to release
them for the arena. Teams should have separate rooms
in which to meet, and the coach may wish to give his
team a final “fight talk,” but let them meet their oppo-
ents in friendly fashion before the visors are lowered!

II. DURING AND AFTER THE DEBATE

Once the debaters take their places on the platform
they must go it alone; the coach must sit on the side-
lines. Coaching from the audience is decidedly bad form,
and a director should never indulge in it. He need not
keep his face expressionless as the debate progresses, for
approval naturally expressed may give considerable en-
couragement to his students. On the other hand, there
are coaches who show disapproval of what a student
is doing by such violent facial contortions that they make
themselves ridiculous to other members of the audience
and disconcert the students. As coach, make yourself
just one of the audience as nearly as you can in your
various responses.

This advice is not incompatible with the taking of
notes during the debate. Each debate should prepare for
the next, and one of the best ways to make it serve that
end is for the coach to jot down useful points while
they are fresh. These serve as a starting point for dis-
cussion at the next squad meeting, which should follow
as soon as possible, preferably the next day.

Criticisms and suggestions should be secured from
the judges. As pointed out elsewhere, a single critic
judge should briefly state to the audience the reasons
for his decision, but in addition he should be expected
to give a detailed criticism of the debate to the teams and
coaches afterward. When three judges are used, they,
too, should be willing to offer suggestions. In these
“post-mortems,” as they have been called, the coach
should set an example of good sportsmanship. Never
should he “crab” a decision, never should he let his de-
baters do it. The after-debate discipline may be more
valuable than that secured in the contest itself.

And finally, be careful how you react to the debaters
themselves. If the decision has gone against them, they
feel worse than you do; so don’t upbraid them. Praise
the green man, encourage them all; the next day is soon
enough for detailed adverse criticism. On the other
hand, a team that has won sometimes needs to have its
self-complacency jarred a bit. Use your best judgment
in proceeding for the forensic and general development of your students.

III. Platform Conventions

A. Stage Furniture

The customary furnishings are tables for each team large enough to accommodate the necessary number of chairs comfortably and of such shape and dimensions as to be used for writing purposes, chairs for the debaters, a chair for the presiding officer, and a speaker's stand of some sort. This stand should be placed far enough down stage, that is, toward the audience, that one standing by it is in the best place for being heard.

On each table there should be a pitcher of water and glasses. The contest debater is not unique in being afflicted with a dry mouth at times. The story is told of a man who, after listening to an address by William Jennings Bryan, unsympathetically remarked, “Well, that’s the first time ever I heard a windmill run by water!”

The matter of lighting is important. There should be sufficient light to enable the speakers to read notes easily.

Despite the fact that clothes can scarcely be considered stage furniture, a word should be said concerning them. How should debaters dress? With no desire of issuing fashion dicta, the question can be answered very briefly. Dress neatly and attractively without ostentation; clothes should not call attention to themselves. Girls on a team will do well to wear dresses somewhat similar. Likewise with boys' suits and neckties. One light suit and two dark ones do not make a pleasing impression; let neckties be all bows or all four-in-hands.

B. Speaking Arrangements

It is customary, though not necessary of course, for the affirmative team to sit on the right side of the platform, the negative team on the left side. These directions are from the standpoint of the speakers; from the standpoint of the audience, the affirmative sits on the left side, the negative on the right. The two teams should take their places on the platform at the same time and sit down at the same time.

Formerly the usual number of speakers was three, but during the last few years two-member teams have become perhaps even more common. When there are three speakers on each side the constructive speeches are usually eight to ten minutes long, the rebuttals four or five minutes long. If the number of speakers is smaller, the length of speeches may, or may not, be increased. All sorts of variations are possible, even in the orthodox, American-style debate, extending as far as the elimination of separate rebuttal speeches altogether.

The affirmative always speaks first in constructive speeches, the negative speaks first in rebuttal. Hence the affirmative opens and closes the debate. Speakers from the two teams alternate. When there are only two members on a team, the second constructive negative speaker may speak first in rebuttal, combining the two into one speech for which he is allowed time equal to the sum of the lengths of a regular constructive and a regular rebuttal speech.

In high school debating an intermission of from three to five minutes is sometimes allowed between the last constructive speech and the first rebuttal to allow the debaters to gather their forces for the final siege. If the contest is a real give-and-take affair throughout the main speeches, as it should be, this intermission, it seems to me, tends to slow up the discussion rather than add to its effectiveness. It does, of course, give the audience chance for brief relaxation.

C. The Chairman and His Duties

The presiding officer should be a man or woman who puts both audience and speakers at their ease and
PRESENTING THE DEBATE

declared unanimously for the negative. Hence, you must have the ability to tell forthwith points, and judge whether the speaker's

are made or is it a question of argument? The main point is to appeal all the evidence and announce

advice of addressing the audience. The customarily working

stand and the debate of after they have reached the speaker's

and adjourn the matter, when they arise from their chairs

should address the chairman while standing erect at ease.

should not do so on the floor clincher whilst they are working from their places in the

Many debates make the mistake of addressing the

is matter of single issues.

is always addressed as "Madam Chairman," whether she

proposition, when a woman is speaking, she should

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. President," or "Mr.

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. Chairman," whether there may

on the resolution of the question presents into the

Chairman can be particularly expressive when it

there are no other points, do not the speakers will follow one another without issue.

proposition, when a woman is speaking, she should

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. President," or "Mr.

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. Chairman," whether there may

on the resolution of the question presents into the

Chairman can be particularly expressive when it

there are no other points, do not the speakers will follow one another without issue.

proposition, when a woman is speaking, she should

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. President," or "Mr.

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. Chairman," whether there may

on the resolution of the question presents into the

Chairman can be particularly expressive when it

there are no other points, do not the speakers will follow one another without issue.

proposition, when a woman is speaking, she should

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. President," or "Mr.

more specifically, addressed as "Mr. Chairman," whether there may

on the resolution of the question presents into the

Chairman can be particularly expressive when it

there are no other points, do not the speakers will follow one another without issue.
PRESENTING THE DEBATE

When referring to opponents during the debate itself:

"When referring to opponents during the debate itself, it is important to always address them respectfully. It is not appropriate to use derogatory language or make unfair attacks. Instead, focus on presenting your arguments and defending your position with evidence and logic."

THE DEBATING CHAMBER

The debate chamber is often referred to as the "debating chamber," "the forum," or "the chamber of discourse." It is a place where ideas are exchanged and arguments are tested. Speakers and listeners are expected to conduct themselves with decorum and respect, treating each other with kindness and understanding.

"The debate chamber is a space for open dialogue and critical thinking. It is an environment where we can explore different perspectives and come to a better understanding of complex issues."

E. Timekeeping

The conclusion should conclude with a statement of the main points. It should be clear, concise, and offer a final perspective or reminder of the key arguments presented.

After the conclusion, the floor is open for a question-and-answer session. This is an opportunity for the audience to clarify any points or to seek further clarification on the issues discussed.

The question-and-answer session is an important part of the debate, allowing for a more interactive and engaging experience. It is an opportunity for the audience to engage with the debaters and to ask questions that may have been overlooked during the debate.

"Question-and-answer sessions are a valuable part of the debate process. They allow the audience to clarify any points or to seek further clarification on the issues discussed. It is an opportunity for the audience to engage with the debaters and to ask questions that may have been overlooked during the debate."
obliged to follow the second hand of a watch. Furthermore, time-keepers must sit close in front of the speaker’s stand so as to be sure of being seen by the speakers, and if a coach sits there, he must have a “poker” face indeed not to prove disturbing to the equanimity of his debaters.

A stop watch can be used, but an ordinary watch, with which that of the other time-keeper is compared, is perfectly satisfactory.

When it comes to giving the signals, various methods are used. In general, it may be said that the best method is one that is definite for the debaters without being over-obtrusive and distracting for the audience. Judged by such a criterion, bells and gavels are out of place.

Probably the most common system is for one time-keeper to rise in warning at the end of eight minutes, for both to rise as a final signal.

Another system that much use has proved satisfactory is to employ time cards. One of the time-keepers is supplied with a number of white cards, each bearing a large black numeral running from one to nine. The tenth card bears the fraction one-half. When a debater has spoken for one minute the card bearing the numeral nine is exposed so that he, but not the audience, can see it. This card is kept in sight until card eight is exposed, and so on through the speech. From minute to minute the speaker knows exactly how much time he has left, even down to the last thirty seconds. When the full ten minutes is gone both time-keepers rise, remain standing only long enough to be sure they have been seen by the speaker, and sit down.

It may be objected by those who have never tried this plan that it is apt to confuse the speakers. So it seems, but actual experience proves that they very quickly get used to it and like its precision, precision if the time-keepers are on the job every second! It is urged that time-keepers stand for the final signal, because that needs to be definite and patent to the audience and judges, but that they stand only briefly. It is most disconcerting to a speaker and distracting to the audience to have two wooden Indians standing down front when the speaker is trying to clinch a telling point with a final sentence or two.

There is no reason why the members of both teams in a debate should have the same system of time signals. One team may use the cards; the other, not accustomed to them, should not adopt their use without practice and so can have their time-keeper rise or rap for a warning. For the final signal, however, rising of both time-keepers is probably the most common and most satisfactory.

Confusion sometimes arises because warning signals are not seen or heard. Speakers, by a glance or nod, largely unnoticed by the audience, should indicate that they have got the signal; and time-keepers, on their part, should make sure that their signals have been received. If a speaker runs over his final time limit to such an extent that it seems likely he has not seen the signal, it should be repeated. In the case of a speaker who, like Gladstone, in Disraeli’s words, is “inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity,” and refuses to stop, both time-keepers should again rise and remain standing until he subsides.

And that brings us to the question, How much is it permissible to exceed one’s time limit? How much may one say after the final signal? The usual answer is; Finish the sentence you are on. Such a rule seems to me a bit too narrow. I should say, rather; Bring the immediate point under discussion to a close within fifteen or twenty seconds. The result will probably be about the same, but there is less tendency to put a paragraph into a sentence by means of numerous conjunctions. A rule should be followed that steers between the extremes of artificial rigidity and a laxity of which advantage is taken. As a matter of fact, if a speaker runs over more than a fourth or third of a minute, what he says after
that is of less than no value, for the audience, including the judges, is restless and resentful.

F. Judges and Ballots

Judges should be seated in different parts of the hall, far enough forward so that they can hear and see, far enough back so that it will be some test of the speakers' ability to make them hear distinctly. They should be supplied with something in the way of a board or other stiff writing pad, with blank cards or paper on which to make notes, with printed instructions, and with a prepared ballot.

As soon as the debate is over, each judge prepares his individual ballot. There is no conference as in the case of a jury, for a unanimous verdict is not necessary. An usher or other student should be selected in advance to collect the ballots and take them to the presiding officer. So that he will not waste time in hunting for the judges, they should be pointed out to him before the debate.

Judges vary in the length of time they require to make their decision, and they should not be unduly hurried. Above everything else, the person designated to collect the ballots should not hover over them waiting for the fateful envelope. If he finds a judge is not ready, he should retire considerably farther than the judge's elbow.

During this period while the judges are preparing their ballots there may be music or remarks by the chairman to fill in the time, or the audience may simply visit. Often its members are glad of a chance to cease the role of listeners for a while.

A debate will run off smoothly if details are planned. The total result will be anything but smooth if advance arrangements are lacking.

IV. Working at the Tables

It has been said that there should be the necessary number of chairs at each table. Infrequently an alter-

cate sits with the speakers, but such an arrangement is not common. He is apt to be more bother than he is worth, making suggestions to speakers that they do not appreciate and searching in the rebuttal box for cards they do not want when they do wish to use the box themselves.

Depending on whether there is a team captain and on how much responsibility is placed on him, the team may be seated so that the captain is between the other members of the team, to facilitate conference. Or they may simply be in one, two, three order, the order of speaking.

Rebuttal boxes, reference books, brief cases, and other implements of war may well be committed to some camp follower to deposit on the platform in advance of the entry of the teams. Few debaters can make a favorable initial impression when burdened down with a brief case, a rebuttal box, a bound volume of the Annals of the American Academy, and two volumes of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. In general, the fewer books that clutter up a team's table the better, but if it is felt that a considerable quantity of such heavy artillery is needed, then let it be ranged in place beforehand so that the audience will recover its equanimity before the debate opens. There is, of course, no objection to a debater's carrying in with him a rebuttal box or a book or two.

Question may well be raised, however, as to the practice of each speaker's having a rebuttal box on the table. They make a formidable array and give a formal, rigid atmosphere. Even though each debater has a box for the filing of material, all need not necessarily bring them and all the contents to the debate. A team rebuttal box, on the other hand, may be very useful and not over-conspicuous. There was a time when college teams regularly used boxes for every speaker; the tendency is definitely away from this practice to-day.

Whether there is a definite captain or not, there

* Cf. page 90.
There's a general issue around how self-importance affects decision-making. This can lead to clouding one's judgment and lead to poor decisions. It's important to be aware of one's own biases and to seek out diverse viewpoints.

In this scenario, the role of the prosecutor is crucial. They must present their case in a way that is clear and persuasive. One strategy is to focus on the evidence and use it to support their argument. This can be done by organizing the evidence logically and highlighting key points.

Another strategy is to appeal to the audience's emotions. This can be done by telling stories or using metaphors to make the case more relatable. It's important to be genuine and to connect with the audience on a personal level.

Overall, the key to successful decision-making is to be aware of one's own biases and to seek out diverse viewpoints. By doing so, one can make more informed decisions and avoid making poor choices.
Negative Suggestions
1. Keep constantly attacking; don’t let them ever put us on defensive.
2. Adapt to case of opps. but hold to our own contentions if at all possible.
3. Press home questions.
   a. Parliamentary govt. b. List of authorities.
4. Stress
   a. Congress would be supreme; able to pass law depriving Court of review power.
   b. Judicial power given Congress; final judge of constitutionality.
5. Rebuttal
   a. Re-emphasize constructive arguments and watch for those ignored.
   b. Buttress one another.

One final mechanical device should be mentioned. The last rebuttal speaker, from the outset of the debate, may profitably make a parallel outline of the two cases as presented. For this purpose he should use, not evidence cards, but sheets of paper. He may have an outline of his own team’s case ready beforehand and during the debate make an outline only of the opposing case. The important thing is that he arrange his notes in such a way that he have a birdseye view of the two cases as they develop side by side, so that he may give the audience a final similar understanding. Such an outline is also useful for the other members of the team to refer to as the debate progresses.

V. OPENING AFFIRMATIVE SPEECH

The opening and closing speeches, whether affirmative or negative, are most important from the standpoint of persuading the audience to respond in the desired fashion. The opening speeches should enlighten the hearers and prepare them for the rest of the discussion. They should not be feints to draw opponents out or to throw them off the track. Such tactics have played a very considerable part in alienating popular regard for contest debating.

On the other hand, they may or may not contain a partition of the entire case. There is an audience advantage of clarity in thus presenting an outline of contentions in advance. There is a serious opponent disadvantage of telling in advance the trail to be followed. The nature of the question and of opponents enters in here, but the audience must be remembered too. They want to know what it was all about when the “shouting and the tumult dies.”

Since most of the points mentioned here have already been discussed in one connection or another, a simple listing is deemed sufficient.

(1) It should contain a simple, unaffected expression of satisfaction at welcoming visiting opponents or at participating in the debate.

(2) Time may be saved by not repeating the proposition if it appears on printed programs or has been clearly stated by the chairman.

(3) There is no objection to having this speech memorized if direct conversational contact can at the same time be maintained with the audience.

(4) It is essential to create an impression of utter fairness and frankness in presenting such preliminaries as history, definitions, waived and admitted matter, and issues.

(5) Direct argument should not start too early in the speech, but an adequate proportion of the total time should be devoted to definite advancement of the affirmative case.

* Cf. The Final Team, Ch. IV.

* As an example of a speech in which terms are simply defined and issues are presented as common-sense questions, attention is called to Appendix IV.
VI. Opening Negative Speech

The first negative speech likewise has definite functions and characteristics.

(1) It should contain an informal, unaffected welcome, or response, as the case may be.

(2) It should definitely adapt to the issues, definitions, etc. as given in the first affirmative speech. Quibbling is to be avoided if possible, but if the negative cannot accept certain points as presented and terms as defined, the first speaker should make clear on what grounds they disagree. On the other hand, if the first affirmative speaker plunges into argument without sufficient explanation to enlighten the audience, the first negative should capitalize on this weakness. The audience will appreciate this explanatory material as an aid to getting their bearings, and the speaker can use the opportunity which the first affirmative lost—of presenting the material fairly but in such a light as to predispose the audience favorably toward his side of the argument.

(3) The first negative speech should raise numerous doubts and objections as to the wisdom of the affirmative plan. This may be done in various ways, including the laying down of more or less definite tasks for the affirmative and the asking of questions, rhetorical and direct. Opening sentences of a first negative speech that illustrate such raising of objections are given on page 156-7, in the discussion of the strategy of Raising Objections.

(4) It should meet the first affirmative speech head-on. It should serve notice in no uncertain terms that here is a negative team that proposes to adapt throughout the debate.

(5) At the same time, it should not be too pugnacious. Because the first negative speaker opens the attack, it does not necessarily follow that he should do it with a machine gun. All speakers, whether affirmative or negative, need to remember that debate is “cooperative controversy.”

VII. Final Speeches

Closing speeches, constructive and rebuttal, affirmative and negative, should bring together the loose ends and give an impression of completeness.

To secure this result, it is a good device to come back in the concluding sentence to a wording that bears directly on the proposition. Suppose that the proposition is: “Resolved, that the system of trial by jury should be abolished.” The last affirmative speaker may conclude: “It is for these reasons that we of the affirmative urge the abolition of trial by jury.” Or the negative arguments may be brought to a close with: “Weighing gains and losses, we still maintain that the system of trial by jury should be retained.”

The tone of concluding speeches should be distinctly persuasive, aimed to secure a final favorable response from hearers.

Of one particular device mention should be made. It concerns phraseology, designed to create a cumulative effect, an effect of doing more than is necessary to win one’s case. Although I mention it in connection with final speeches, it may be effectively used elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the example given here is from an opening speech for the affirmative on Russian recognition.

There is but one way to protect American investors and that is by recognition, for without recognition Russia has no responsibility to us, and consequently we can make no claims on her.

To attain this end would yield sufficient benefits to warrant recognition, but it is not all. We of the affirmative maintain that recognition will open an investment market for American capital and will increase our trade with Europe in general...

This bit of technique is given for what it may be worth as a persuasive device. In connection with it,
attention is called to another method of peculiar value in final speeches, discussed on page 153 under the Strategy of Assuming for the Sake of Argument.

VIII. DUTIES OF THE RESPECTIVE REBUTTAL SPEAKERS

The order in which the members of a team should speak is determined by the relative effectiveness of the speakers and by the way in which the discussion develops. In general, the climactic order is best, the strongest speaker coming last.

Regardless of the speaking order, every member of the team should take as his own the watchword of the Three Musketeers, "all for one and one for all." Individual stardom is not the proper goal. Teamwork is essential.

When it comes to offering more or less definite suggestions as to what each speaker should do in rebuttal, it needs to be remembered that there is no hard and fast rule to follow. One debate director uses this plan, another follows that. Two plans are presented here in the hope that they may contain practical suggestions. Although different, they are not irreconcilable. That there be a plan of some sort is the important thing. Otherwise rebuttal is pretty sure to be "a haphazard game of give and take."

(1) Collins and Morris in their Persuasion and Debate suggest the following plan.¹

THE PART OF THE FIRST REBUTTAL SPEAKER

The first speaker in rebuttal should be held responsible for a number of the opposition's minor propositions. He should attack briefly but effectively a number of his opponent's lesser propositions. His speech should give the impression that the opposing case is full of countless flaws. This speaker should be


a man of rapid-fire type, who can "nose out" his opponents' weak points with machine gun speed and force.

THE PART OF THE SECOND REBUTTAL SPEAKER

Entirely different should be the method of the second rebuttal speaker. He should devote his attention to the one vital and essential issue of the opposition, or the two most important opposing issues, preferably the former. He should use the ammunition of refutation in a smashing broadside to crush the opposition.

THE PART OF THE THIRD REBUTTAL SPEAKER

The third speaker in rebuttal, holding unquestionably the keynote position in the forensic contest, should combine all forms of attack. He is first the observation officer who at the start of his speech points out to the audience the exact constructive clash of opinion. He next reduces the opposition's case to not more than three or four main issues—the strongholds of his opponents. He mentions next to last that issue which he needs most to attack, and mentions finally that issue which he can most effectively attack. If he is well prepared these are likely to be the same issues.

Briefly, and in a quick, forceful light-artillery attack, the third speaker should demolish the first two or three of the opponents' major issues. With unmistakable effectiveness, he should direct his final destructive fire against the issues which he needs most to attack and the issues which he can most effectively attack. But he should not yet reach his climax.

His final attack should be constructive and offensive. The third speaker's climax should come in the last minute or two of his speech. Then he should summarize, with all the persuasive ammunition he can muster for his own team's case, closing with a final plea for the acceptance or rejection of the resolution.

Other plans than this may be more suitable to particular debates, but some such plan as the one given will safeguard the rebuttal from dwindling into a haphazard game of "give and take."

(2) A plan which the author has used with satisfactory results is one that is based rather closely on the constructive case. Each man is responsible in rebuttal
for the points he has handled in his main speech. He defends them against attack and refutes opposing arguments that can logically be grouped under these same headings. Such a method makes for clear organization and for refutation that is pointed.

As in constructive arguments, however, too close specialization is disastrous. Opponents may not strongly attack a point until after the particular sponsor of that point has spoken in rebuttal. Hence, every member of the team must be able to handle any and all points in rebuttal, either originally, or to buttress a colleague when he can no longer speak.

Possible opposing arguments that are not directly counter to the contentions that this team will present are carefully considered and assigned to different speakers, with the understanding that some one else may have to handle them, depending on how the debate and the rebuttal speeches develop.

The complete division of points is jotted down on a card and kept for reference, in the lid of the rebuttal box if one is used. A sample affirmative card for a debate on condemnation of our present Latin American policy might read something like this:

**First Speaker**
- Imperialism
- Economic exploitation
- Monroe Doctrine

**Second Speaker**
- Haiti
- Santo Domingo
- Nicaragua
- "White Man's Burden"
- Denial of ideals

**Third Speaker**
- Ill will

Suggested remedies
DANGER OF EUROPEAN AGGRESSION

Of course there are always a number of miscellaneous points presented by opponents, some important, some minor but producing considerable effect on the audience. Some of these may not have been foreseen. The only thing to do is to confer at the table as to answer and answerer.1

The first negative speaker at the outset briefly summarizes the debate as it has developed, pointing out to the audience what are the significant points of disagreement between the two teams, naturally amplifying what his own team has done and diminishing what his opponents have accomplished. If he amplifies for the latter, it is the number and size of the remaining tasks before them. If the negative speaker fails to summarize, the first affirmative, who follows him, does so, thereby securing the gratitude of the audience for his side for thus summarizing and simplifying. Such summary should center about issues if possible. It is very easy to say: "You have heard many arguments passed back and forth here tonight, and now as we start our rebuttal I believe we will all profit by reviewing briefly what the two teams have said and by trying to see what are the important points of disagreement between them."

The last rebuttal speakers, both affirmative and negative, in addition to refuting opponents' arguments, so apportion their time and emphasis as strongly to re-emphasize their side's constructive arguments. Always there is a final persuasive appeal for adoption or rejection of the proposition, as the case may be. The last negative leaves unanswered objections piled high. The last affirmative surmounts the objections, emphasizes what the negative have failed to do, and pleads for constructive attitude and constructive action. Each must be careful not to exaggerate what his team has done and to "forget" what his opponents have done.

1 Cf. minor-point rebuttal, p. 125.
IX. A Matter of Comparative Values

Throughout this book it has been constantly emphasized that debate is discussion, genuine, two-sided discussion; that it is not a question of one side's being wrong and the other side's being right; that discussion of any debatable question should consist of a weighing of values, a balancing of strengths and weaknesses. As in preparation, so in presentation, this idea and ideal should be kept uppermost.

In an article on “No-Decision Debates” in The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho for January 1929, Ewald T. Grether quotes the concluding remarks of a University of California debater in a no-decision contest with Stanford University. Because it so well illustrates the spirit that should animate both decision and non-decision debating, the excerpt is reproduced here:

We have not attempted to convince you that we alone are correct. However, we have attempted to present what we consider to be as sound a case as can be made for the affirmative of the proposition. [In print this may sound apologetic; the voice and manner of the speaker would have prevented such an impression in actual delivery.] It is your privilege to draw your own conclusions after weighing the complete case as presented by both sides.
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No question in the field of debate is fraught with more high-power explosives than is that of judges and judging. Students and teachers, debaters and coaches, authorities and those who admit they are—all have argued on whether debates should be judged, and if so, how.

There was a time when all contest debates were judged by a board of judges. Then, because it was difficult, if not impossible, to secure three people qualified to act, the single expert or critic judge was introduced in many schools. However, it was argued in some quarters that to gain the decision remained the chief goal, resulting in artificiality and questionable practices. Hence developed sentiment for audience votes and decisionless debating.

1 Ct. Ch. II.
To-day all of these various forms are in use and will probably continue so. Judges will probably always be used, even in schools where other types of debating are also found. This is particularly true of high schools, but that fact does not mean that high schools should confine themselves exclusively to this type. They will improve the training they give their students if they give them practice in other forms.

In the following discussion it is assumed that either a board of three judges or a single critic judge is used.

I. Nature of the Judge’s Vote

The debate judge, whether he acts alone or is one of three, should vote as a critic. It is his business to decide which of the two teams, in his estimation, has done the better debating. He does not vote as a member of a legislature does, on the basis of everything he knows about the question and of his own views as to the correct course of action. Personal views must be laid aside and a decision rendered on the basis of what the two teams say and how they say it. It is entirely possible and proper for a judge to believe in private operation of Muscle Shoals and still vote for a team that advocates government operation.

As a matter of fact, though personal bias on a question may be laid aside quite successfully by the conscientious individual, judges will always differ more or less widely in their reactions to a given speaker, a given argument, or a debate as a whole. One feels that one type of delivery is best; his colleague may abominate it. The personal element will always be a factor, and one that is largely intangible.

However, it is undoubtedly true that, by and large, there is greater uniformity of opinion to-day on the part of those who act frequently as debate judges than ever before. It has been the aim of this book to outline qualities and methods that are commonly agreed to characterize effective debating.

Before passing on to a consideration of who are qualified to cast valid ballots as judges, let us pause long enough to mention one thing that the judge’s vote never should be. I refer to the so-called consolation vote. It is not unheard of even in otherwise enlightened communities. When the judge casts a consolation vote, he votes deliberately for the weaker team because it is the weaker team. He usually figures that the debate is so one-sided that both of his fellow judges are sure to vote for the stronger team, and that he will take the sting out of a unanimous defeat by giving the weaker team his one vote. Comment is unnecessary except to point out that our soft-hearted judge may not be the only one of the three so afflicted. Though the judges could not be expected to admit it, two or even three consolation votes explain some otherwise inexplicable decisions.

II. Who is a Good Debate Judge?

Obviously no one who does not understand the true nature of the judge’s vote, as just explained. But let us go further. A good debate judge should possess the following qualifications:

A. He Should Be Informed And Alert

Unless he is reasonably abreast of current affairs, there is a danger that, like the uninformed coach, he cannot successfully evaluate the facts presented. On the other hand, a person who is really an authority on the subject under discussion not infrequently holds such positive views one way or the other that he is unable to give a fair hearing to both sides of the argument.

To show that this is no idle, hypothetical situation, 

* Cf. How Much Should the Coach Do? Ch. III.
let me instance the case of a prominent university dean a few years ago when asked to judge a debate on the ship subsidy. Though a former college debater and an experienced judge, he declined on the ground of bias that he feared he could not shelve.

B. He Should Be Fair and Open-minded

The necessity of laying aside one's own views on the question under consideration has already been sufficiently discussed.

C. He Should Be Familiar with Contest Debating

Neither here nor elsewhere is the implication intended that contest debating is an academic, esoteric thing as distinguished from genuine public discussion. The emphasis throughout has been quite the reverse. At the same time, it is obvious that, since it is a game, there are certain rules and regulations that the umpire needs to know.

So much in general. The question now arises: What sort of people have these qualifications? Before an answer is suggested, let it be clearly understood that it, too, can be only in general terms. A man who by training and experience seems ideal may be quite out of the question for a given debate because of bias of some sort or for other reasons.

In general, then, debate coaches, other teachers of speech who understand debating, former college debaters who have maintained an interest in the game (this includes members of honorary forensic fraternities), and various others who by training and by experience in judging are competent—these groups constitute good sources for debate judges. For many high school debates nowadays college and university intercollegiate debaters are being used. It is good practice for these students, and usually they are entirely competent. The sort of debating which the particular college encourages is, of course, significant. Is it necessary to say that sex is not a distinguishing qualification? Other things being equal, women are as competent judges as men.

If the members of certain groups are especially good judges, are there any corresponding groups that should be avoided? Yes, but, again, in general. To make an inclusive classification, avoid those who are not familiar with contest debating and those whose bias will prevent a fair decision.

Regarding knowledge of debating, it is not enough that a man should be an outstanding citizen or even a public speaker of some experience. Because the local banker plays a good game of golf does not seem to qualify him to referee basketball games in adjoining towns. The analogy can be safely carried over into debating.

As to bias, we are less suspicious to-day of alumni of an opposing school who otherwise are thoroughly qualified and are less afraid that an opposing coach will "slip over on us" a former teacher or a personal friend. While one should not be too gullible and ingenuous, still these matters of simple good faith, and one must proceed accordingly, as well as in accordance with his best judgment. As a matter of fact, the alumnus or former teacher, if he is a conscientious individual, is quite as likely to "lean over backward," as we say, in his attempt to be fair as he is to favor his own school or his friend. In case of doubt he figures that he must offset personal bias and so votes for the other team.

Similarly with the judge who the last time or two voted for one of the schools represented. It is entirely human that he should make perfectly sure that that team is quite decidedly the better one before he will vote for its school again. The moral? Don't have the same judge too often.

And now, at the risk of misunderstanding, I mention
three particular groups as, in general, not being ideal sources for debate judges: preachers, lawyers, public school administrators. College training in debate and experience in judging, however, may offset the defects listed and make these people as valuable judges as can be secured anywhere. To explain the ban: preachers because of set, and often undesirable, speech habits and because of a tendency to respond unduly to emotional appeal; lawyers because by training they attach great importance to black-and-white evidence and so tend to place too heavy a burden of proof on the affirmative, who often simply cannot produce the evidence demanded; school superintendents and principals because in judging high school debates there is danger of interschool politics. The nearby school is apt to be favored at the expense of the more distant one because of reciprocal relations in various activities such as athletics, the theory, to use a crude expression, too often seeming to be "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

III. INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

Several sets of instructions to judges are shown here. The first is in the nature of a question summary of the significant points stressed in this book. College students going out to judge for the first few times can profitably use it, and coaches may find it expedient to send copies in advance to judges who they feel need enlightenment. Naturally, if such a course of procedure is followed, there should be a liberal admixture of tact.

The second form is recommended for the use of the judge with ordinary critic ability. For the competent single judge, printed instructions are unnecessary.

The instructions may appear on the same sheet with the ballot or, probably better, they may be separate. The criticism blank may or may not be furnished the judge. Unless the ability of the judge is beyond question, it is
cf. Formulating the Proposition, Ch. III.

better to err on the side of giving unnecessary instructions than of failing to give those that are needed. Once more it is a question of adaptation, this time by the coach to the judge.

FORM ONE—DETAILED

Instructions

As a judge of this debate, you are expected to lay aside all personal opinions as to the merits of the question under discussion and to award your decision to the team which, on the whole, does the more effective debating.

The following factors should be considered in arriving at your final decision. You are the judge of the importance that should be attached to each. It may, however, be pointed out that, inasmuch as debating is something more than an oratorical contest, items that fall under the heading of content should be given more weight than excellence in presentation. This is especially true of ability in refutation, which many judges regard as the most significant criterion of good debating.

1. Analysis and organization
   a. Are the definition of terms and the analysis and interpretation of the proposition sound and reasonable?
   b. Is the faculty of analysis exercised throughout, in the following through of crucial issues?
   c. Is the organization of the team case and the individual speeches clear without being obtrusively bald?

2. Information and evidence
   a. Does the speaker show convincing knowledge of the question in its various phases?
   b. Does he avoid both unsupported assertions and the continual citation of authorities?
   c. Is there sufficient evidence without being wearisome?
   d. Is evidence used effectively and honestly?

3. Argument—reasoning
   a. Is the reasoning sound? Is it quick and agile?
   b. Are fallacies avoided and detected?
   c. Is there evidence of original thinking?

4. Adaptability
   Is the debater able to extemporize and effectively adapt to opponents' arguments in his main speech?
5. Ability in rebuttal
   a. Is the rebuttal speech clear-cut in its attack on significant points of disagreement between the two teams?
   b. Is it organized about main arguments?
   c. Is there a convincing vigor and spontaneity that comes from familiarity with all phases of the question?
   d. Is significant new evidence presented, or is it merely a repetition of that presented earlier?
   e. Does the speaker use all his time?

6. Effectiveness in public speaking
   a. Does the debater speak with forceful, direct communicativeness, or does he "orate"? Does the use of notes interfere with his audience contact?
   b. Does he adapt, in manner and content, to opponents and to audience situation? Does he extemporize effectively?
   c. Is he persuasive as well as convincing? Does he introduce variety and humor effectively?
   d. Does he give the impression of genuineness and sincerity?
   e. Does he seem at home on the platform in carriage and gesture?
   f. Does he use good diction and pronounce correctly? Are slips due to ignorance and carelessness or to extemporaneous speaking?
   g. Has he a pleasant voice? Does he use it intelligently? Does he speak distinctly?

7. Attitude
   a. Is the speaker courteous to opponents, chairman, audience?
   b. Is he over-controversial? Is he ever willing to yield?
   c. Is he cocky and bombastic?
   d. Is he offensively sarcastic?

8. Teamwork
   a. Do the members of the team cooperate to present a unified constructive case and to assist each other in rebuttal?
   b. Which team, regardless of individual stars, constitutes the better balanced aggregation?

---

**JUDGING THE DEBATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism Blank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points to be Considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis &amp; Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument—Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The judge may use this blank or not, as he desires. He may grade individuals and teams with percentages, or with + for good, — for poor, and O for indifferent, or by any other system that he cares to use. This blank is purely for his own use.

**FORM TWO—ABRIDGED**

*Instructions*

Each judge shall vote solely on the basis of which team in his opinion does the better debating. It is understood that effective debating consists of:

1. Correct analysis of the proposition and a sound, clearly organized case based upon such analysis.
2. Convincing knowledge of the question and telling use of evidence.
3. Quick, straight thinking.
4. Ability to extemporize and to adapt to opponents' arguments throughout the debate.
5. Rebuttal speeches that clearly center about the real issues and that are forceful and convincing in content and delivery.
6. Platform delivery that is distinct, communicative, poised, and persuasive.

7. Courteous, reasonable attitude toward occasion, audience, and opponents.
8. Effective teamwork.

The criticism blank already illustrated may be used equally well in connection with this form.

For purposes of comparison, two other sets of instruction are shown here. The first is used by the Michigan High School Forensic Association. The other is the form employed by the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association. It will be noted that in the latter percentage grades are given competing teams. In both cases these instructions, printed on the back of blank ballots, are sent out to all the member schools in the league.

**Michigan Form**

The judge shall give but one vote, affirmative or negative, basing his decision upon debating standards as set forth below. The judge shall lay aside any prejudice he may have on the question, and shall decide strictly on the merits of the debate as presented, not on what he may think are the merits of the question. He shall not under any circumstances give a "consolation" vote. There shall be no conference of judges after the debate until the decisions have been handed in at the close of the debate. The judge shall write "affirmative" or "negative" on his ballot, sign it and seal it, and hand it to an usher who shall convey it to the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall open the ballots in the presence of the teams and audience, and announce the results. He shall not announce the names of the judges on the ballots. The critic judge may give his decision orally, but in all cases this ballot should be filled out, signed, and handed to the person in charge of the debate.

**Basis of Decision**

The following points should be given primary consideration in arriving at a decision:

1. Case Analysis: Consider the logic and clarity of the cases presented. Is the case as outlined, logically sufficient? Is it clearly organized and easy to follow?
2. Evidence: Evidence consists of facts and authoritative opinions. Consider the pertinence, dependability, and sufficiency of the evidence submitted.

**Wisconsin Form**

Without consultation, vote "Affirmative" or "Negative" as the case may be, basing your vote on the debating ability revealed by the two teams: 1. As revealed in their grasp of the vital issues of the question including research, analysis, and the use of evidence; 2. As revealed in the refutation of the arguments of their opponents; and 3. As revealed in the effectiveness of presentation. No definite percentage grade shall be given each of these phases of the work. They shall simply be vital elements to be considered in forming an estimate of the relative ability of the two teams. Give the winning team one percentage grade of 100 per cent and the other team one percentage grade between 80 and 100 per cent which shall be your estimate of the comparative ability of the two teams.

**IV. Ballots**

Some simple form such as the following is recommended:

Without regard to the merits of the question, in my opinion the better debating was done by the ................. team. (affirmative or negative)

**Signed ..... .......... JUDGE**
An entirely different form, in the nature of a report, is used by Western Reserve University, Cleveland, for numerous off-campus debates in and about the city. These debates are often between two teams from Reserve's own squad, and the single judge is not infrequently an alumnus of the University.

### Judge's Report

On the basis of "effective debating" I have given the decision to the .......... team.

The .......... team was (slightly, much) better in analysis—clearer, sounder, more comprehensive.

The .......... team was (slightly, much) stronger in evidence.

The .......... team was (slightly, much) more discriminating as to value of opposing argument.

The .......... team was (slightly, much) more extemporaneous, more resourceful in answering opponents.

The .......... team was (slightly, much) more vivid and forceful in stating their ideas.

The .......... team was (slightly, much) more effective in platform delivery.

---

I would rank the men, as to individual performance, in the following order:


---

I would rearrange the teams in the following order, judging from their performance in this debate:


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to team case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng. style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eng. style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed ................................

### V. Supplementary Suggestions to Judges

(1) For the sake of exposing mistakes sometimes made, I venture to utter two Don't's at this point, even at the risk of insulting the intelligence of most men and women who have acted as judges. The first is: Don't ever decide which team is the winner on the basis of "points" successfully established and maintained. Obviously, it is not the number of points, but their importance, that counts. One argument may go further toward winning or losing a case than half a dozen less significant ones. Furthermore, since debating is also a contest in public speaking, effectiveness in presentation cannot be ignored.
The other Don't is this: Don't vote for a team simply because on it is the outstanding star of the debate. A debate team should be a reasonably well-balanced group, though of course such an arrangement is not always possible, especially when numerous members of a squad are given a chance in public performance. Conversely, don't vote against a team merely because two of its members are definitely inferior to the third or one is inferior to the other two.

(2) And now for a Do rather than a Don't. Though you are acting as a critic, alone or as one of three, remain one of the audience so far as a common-sense attitude is concerned. When it comes to weighing such matters as interpretation of the proposition, or definition of terms, ask yourself whether they are reasonable and intelligible to the average man on the street, to the general run of people who sit about you. Such questions as these may well arise in your mind: Has the affirmative made the background of this discussion sufficiently clear before starting to argue? From an ordinary common-sense viewpoint, does not the negative have the better of it in challenging the issues outlined by the affirmative? Is this speaker taking too much for granted so far as his hearers are concerned? Why is that speaker so technical and academic?

I have found it illuminating to look about at my fellow listeners from time to time during a debate to see whether they are interested or bored, attracted or antagonized. Debate, like all public speaking, is a two-sided relationship, and your deliberate attention, as judge, to what a speaker is saying may be a far less accurate index of his audience effectiveness than the involuntary attention, or lack of it, on the part of the other listeners.

But is this criterion of popular intelligibility and effectiveness always valid? you ask. And I answer, No. There may be times when specialized, technical information on the part of the audience can be assumed, but such is not the usual situation. Also, a debater or a team may reduce legitimate popular appeal to demagoguery. That also is not common and can be detected by the alert judge.

(3) In fairness to the debaters, and in fairness to yourself in making comments afterwards, you need some system of keeping notes as the debate progresses. The type of outline given on page 227 is very helpful, but it does not show the nature of the arguments made constructively and in rebuttal. To keep record of content I have found the following method useful. Using letter-size sheets of paper, I mark the necessary number of sheets into four sections as shown in the following diagram and then make concise notes in each section as indicated. Some authorities advise a three-column arrangement, the third column being used for notes on answers to refutation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of First Affirmative Speech and Arguments</th>
<th>Refutation by Negative of First Affirmative Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refutation by Affirmative of First Negative Speech</td>
<td>Outline of First Negative Speech and Arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this graphic record of the arguments, I use separate sheets for notations under each of the

---

Footnotes:

* I am indebted to a former colleague, Mr. J. R. Biety, for this device.

If Yes is the answer, then the negative should be declared the winners.

This method may or may not be scientific. One thing is certain,—drowning men grasp at straws, and this device is considerably more substantial.

(5) One final suggestion. You should always be willing to discuss the comparative strengths of the teams and the reasons for your vote, and to offer suggestions for improvement, after the debate,—provided such comment is desired by the debaters and their teachers. It is sometimes necessary to insist that such discussion on their part be in good temper. Although you should be willing to answer questions, the after-session must not be allowed to resolve itself into another debate, this time between the judge and the defeated team. A judge should never take a tongue-lashing from an irate loser or a partisan of his. Refuse to discuss at all unless good sportsmanship and common courtesy obtain.

In conclusion. The judge’s task is an interesting, but not always an easy, one. Training, alertness, common-sense, good intentions—all are needed. He can never be infallible, but he must be tactfully authoritative.

VI. The Single Critic Judge and His Duties

Arguments for and against the single judge were presented in Chapter II. Because, no matter how much human fallibility may or may not interfere with his “expertness,” he is always, in a definite sense, a critic, the latter term will be used in our discussion here.

As indicated in the earlier chapter, the single critic judge usually steps to the platform at the close of the debate and briefly outlines the reasons for his decision. He frequently secures heightened attention by carefully withholding the name of the successful team until the very end of his remarks! These comments before the audience should be brief and not too detailed. From ten
to fifteen minutes is long enough for the average audience. Pointed, intelligible remarks contribute the maximum to educating the audience as to why one team or the other won in this debate and as to what constitutes good contest debating in general. In these public comments the judge should try to strike a happy medium between meaningless commendation and over-censorious criticism.

When he comes to the detailed “post mortem” with the teams and coaches afterwards, however, he should not mince words. Tact, of course, he should use even here, for there is nothing to be gained by brutality, but he can be of the greatest service to both teams by being quite direct and frank in pointing out strengths and weaknesses.

Unless the judge is a most unusual individual, to give detailed criticisms he will have to keep careful and detailed notes as the debate progresses. Suggestions as to note-taking are given on page 233. If he is qualified to act as single judge, he does not need to be furnished with instructions, nor with ballot, for that matter, unless it is a league debate where ballots must be preserved.

Even in schools not yet educated to paying a fee when three judges are used, the single judge receives a fee for his services. Few people would assume the burden otherwise.

VII. SECURING AND PAYING JUDGES

A. Spirit

The method of securing judges should be arranged between the schools concerned, formally by compact or league constitution, informally by conference or correspondence. It is most gratifying to note the decreasing rigidity and suspicion attending the choice of judges in recent years. It is quite common for college teams taking cross-country trips to leave the choice of judges entirely in the hands of the local institutions they meet. Aren’t they taken advantage of? Yes, now and then, but the coach who goes out after scalps by fair means or foul is becoming scarcer or growing civilized, and the loss of an occasional decision for the visiting school is more than equalized by increased cordiality of relations.

It is a truism that we tend to live up to what others expect of us. If you act as though you believe that the opposing coach is guilty until he is proved innocent, he will tend to get judges as favorable to his side as possible. Proceed on the assumption that of course he is honest, and he is less likely, to say the least, to take advantage of you. When it comes to securing judges, mutual good faith is an absolute sine qua non. Even with it, debate relations now and then grow a bit tense; without it what should be friendly rivalry becomes mortal combat.

At the same time, let this be noted. Better be a careful scrutinizer of judges beforehand than a poor loser afterwards. It is better to demand good judges in advance than “sob” when it is too late.

B. Nominating Judges

A common, and recommended, procedure is for the entertaining school to submit a list of nominees for judges to the visiting school. The visiting school strikes out such names as are not acceptable, ranks those that remain in order of preference, and returns the list. The entertaining school then secures three judges, sending out invitations in the order of preference indicated by the other school.

This in outline. Some details will make the matter clearer. The entertaining school should submit names considerably in excess of the number of judges needed. If three are to be used, ten or fifteen names are not too
many. These names should be submitted several weeks before the debate, for there may be delay in correspondence, and there may be refusals from some of the people approached. Nothing is more exasperating—and usually more inexcusable—than to have the day of a debate arrive with a board of judges incomplete.

When names are submitted, especially for a single debate, the entertaining school may well solicit nominations from the visiting school. These nominations can be incorporated with the original list when it is returned, as is shown in the illustration below. Such of these new names as are unacceptable to the entertaining school may be stricken out.

No matter which school submits names, with them should go a brief statement as to qualifications. Similarly, when names are stricken out, a statement of the reason should be sent the school submitting them.

**Samples Nomination Lists**

*Original List as Submitted by Entertaining School*

John Smith—Superintendent of schools, Brownsville; former debater, Albion College

Henry Swift—Coach of debate, Baylor University

R. V. Finch—Professor of history, Carroll College; experienced judge

L. W. Brown—Coach of debate, Cornell College

Miss Mary Hawkins—Coach of women's debate, Drake University

J. D. Small—Pastor First Methodist Church, Grandville; former debater, Hamline University, Minnesota; does much judging

C. M. Hodge—Speech teacher, Hastings High School; Delta Sigma Rho, University of Wisconsin

Miss Lucy Dodd—Speech teacher, Marshall High School; Delta Sigma Rho, University of Michigan

N. J. Strong—President, Rice Institute; former debate coach; accomplished public speaker

A. B. Crandall—Lawyer, Danville; experienced judge

*List as Returned by Visiting School*

In order of our preference. You will note that we have inserted a few new names; ignore those not acceptable.

1. Henry Swift
2. L. W. Brown
3. M. J. Horner—Attorney, Springville; Tau Kappa Alpha, Lawrence College; frequently judges
4. S. M. Fall—Superintendent of schools, Sheridan; much experience; has judged for us only once, but think him excellent.
5. N. J. Strong
6. Mary Hawkins
7. C. M. Hodge
8. Otto Green—Business manager, Mt. Union College; Pi Kappa Delta, Kansas Agricultural College
9. A. B. Crandall
10. J. D. Small
11. George Higley—Pastor Presbyterian Church, Central City; debated at Beloit College

We should rather not use Miss Dodd because we understand she is a bit immature. Professor Finch is too strongly opinionated for such a question as this. Superintendent Smith, before he went to Albion College, studied here two years and so might not be entirely unbiased.

*List as Used by Entertaining School for Sending Invitations and Recording Responses*

Henry Swift—O.K.
L. W. Brown—Prior engagement
M. J. Horner—O.K.
N. J. Strong—Ill
Mary Hawkins—O.K.
C. M. Hodge
Otto Green
A. B. Crandall
J. D. Small

**C. Inviting Judges**

As soon as your list of nominees is complete, lose no time in sending invitations. As soon as you have secured three judges, inform your opponents so that
they need have no anxiety as to last-minute difficulties. Or if some people approached cannot serve and so there is delay, let your opponents know what progress is being made. It sometimes happens that, for one reason or another, a panel of judges is exhausted before three people can be secured. In that case, correspond with the other school, by telephone if time is short, and agree on additional names. One should never go ahead and invite judges that have not been approved by the other school. No more prolific source of bad blood between schools can be found than such procedure.

In general, invitation by mail is better than by telegraph or telephone. Though slower, it is less subject to misunderstanding and has the advantage of putting things in black and white. When the telephone is used, if time permits, all arrangements made by wire should be confirmed by letter.

When inviting by letter, enclose return postage; when by telegraph, direct that the answer be sent collect.

Whether by letter or by wire, if judges are invited and accept even as long as a week in advance, send them a final brief note of reminder of date and place and hour that will reach them not more than a day or two in advance of the debate. Good judges are usually busy men and women with many engagements. This final reminder is cheap insurance against nervous prostration the night of the debate when a judge fails to appear.

In the following sample letter of invitation, attention is called to these matters: date, place, hour, subject, opponents, number of judges, remuneration, reply. If the invitation is sent some time in advance, it may be impossible to state the exact hour and place; hence the alternative form. The subject of the debate is given so that the conscientious judge who feels that he is too biased to judge fairly may decline. If the coach sends the invitation and knows the prospective judge personally, the wording may well be less formal. The various items already referred to should be mentioned, however.

Professor Paul Seagrace
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio

March 30, 1936

My dear Mr. Seagrace:

Friday night, April 19, Massillon High School and Marion High School will debate here on the proposition: “Resolved that the direct primary system of nominating candidates for public office in Ohio should be abolished.” The two schools join in inviting you to act as one of three judges (single critic judge) on that occasion. The debate will be held in the auditorium of the Massillon High School at 8 o’clock. (If you can serve, definite information as to the exact place and hour of the debate will be sent you later.)

In addition to your expenses, the customary fee of $10 will be paid. Will you kindly reply at your earliest convenience?

Very truly yours,

D. Paying Judges

As a matter of common decency, judges have usually been reimbursed for any expenses incurred in going to judge debates. It is only within recent years, however, that the custom has developed of paying a fee in addition to expenses, and it must be admitted that this custom is still far from universal, especially in high schools. Such being the case, it is pertinent to consider the question: Why pay?

There are three or four good reasons at least. They do not require extended treatment. The first is that the time and ability of a competent judge is worth something more than the pleasure he gets from riding a bus over muddy roads, staying all night in a small-town hotel, and getting up at an unearthly hour to catch the local train back for work the next morning, and, I might add, from feeling that he has discharged a civic duty.

The second reason for paying is that by this means busy but well qualified people can be interested in judg-
The debate coached by the college with which I am connected may differ in some respects from the formal kind of discussion. The purpose of discussion, however, is the same: to test the reasoning and ability of the debaters to present arguments effectively and logically.

For purposes of discussion, the schedule of events described here will be followed, but we may occasionally vary the procedure to accommodate different needs.

The debate will begin with each team making its opening statement. Each team will have a total of 5 minutes to present its case. After the opening statements, the debate will proceed with each team taking turns to present their arguments and rebuttals. The debate will continue until the time limit is reached, or until the judges signal the end of the debate.

The debate will conclude with each team making a closing statement. Each team will have a total of 2 minutes to present their closing arguments. After the closing statements, the debate will be judged by a panel of judges.

The judges will be selected from a list of qualified individuals, including members of the faculty and professionals in the field. The judges will evaluate the debate based on a number of criteria, including the clarity and coherence of the arguments, the evidence presented, and the ability of the debaters to respond to each other's arguments.

After the debate, the judges will meet to discuss their evaluation of the debate. The results of the debate will be announced to the teams, the faculty, and the audience.

The debate is an important part of the school's academic program, as it provides students with an opportunity to develop critical thinking and public speaking skills. The debate is also a way for the school to enhance its reputation and attract new students.

The debate is an important part of the school's academic program, as it provides students with an opportunity to develop critical thinking and public speaking skills. The debate is also a way for the school to enhance its reputation and attract new students.
out the post mortem. Also, see that your debaters keep their heads and hold their tongues.

(5) If a judge fails to appear, meet the other school halfway in making some sort of arrangement. Perhaps one of the two who are on hand is qualified to act as single judge. In that case, the other man should, of course, receive his fee anyhow. Perhaps a local person can be secured to act as third judge. Or, again, it may be best to go on with two judges, on the understanding that if they disagree the result will be decided by lot or by conference between them or will remain a tie. Still another possibility is to make the discussion a decisionless one. Some satisfactory way out can be found if both coaches make the best of a bad situation by cooperating in absolute good faith.

(6) You will find it useful to compile a reference list of possible judges, showing their addresses and qualifications. Sometimes a standard uniform list of this sort is prepared for the use of all the members of a league. For quick reference such a list is most convenient.

There are cases on record of schools which zealously kept a card file of all judges they had ever used. These cards showed, not merely the qualifications of the respective judges, but also their records in terms of favorable and unfavorable votes for that school. Such forensic politics is on the same plane as elaborate entertainment of judges so as to secure favorable votes. Such practices, most of us hope, will soon be banished utterly. Certainly nothing of that sort is suggested here.

IX. THE AUDIENCE AS JUDGE

The theory and value of audience decisions were discussed in Chapter II. Though members of the audience are seldom, if ever, qualified to cast critic's votes, they may cast quite valid and significant legislator's votes. Let us first examine two types of ballots and then consider how audience votes may be satisfactorily tabulated.

As was pointed out in Chapter II, ballots for the audience to indicate shifts of opinion on the merits of the question take two general forms. One provides for marking both before and after the debate, the other for voting only at the close of the discussion.

Specimens of both types are reproduced here. The first is that used in an international debate on the principle of prohibition between Cambridge University and Western State Teachers College. The other is the interesting form used by Western Reserve University in most of their debates, even when judges also render a decision. Professor H. S. Woodward of Western Reserve is tabulating results and offers to furnish ballots to other colleges.10

It will be seen that the Western Reserve ballot is the more complicated. At the same time, it is more accurate in determining shifts of opinion and can be used for debates on any subject. The first ballot, attached to the regular debate program and perforated at the top and between its various sections, obviates the necessity of supplying pencils to the audience.

On the back of the ballot there is room for further comment and for brief criticism of individual speakers.

Ballots should be collected by ushers if a round table or open forum follows the debate. If there are sufficient tellers, the ballots can be counted very quickly and the result announced before the audience leaves. Otherwise they should be deposited in boxes in the hands of doorkeepers as the audience files out.

There is just one way of tabulating ballots of the first type. Divide them into four piles: Changed FOR, Changed AGAINST, Unchanged FOR, Unchanged AGAINST. Although the "Unchanged" ballots are interesting in getting a complete tabulation of audience sentiment, only the "Changed" ballots are significant in

all the ballots on the basis of the before-the-debate vote. Place them in three piles: Affirmative, Negative, Undecided, and get the total for each pile. Now go through the ballots in the same manner again, this time tabulating on the basis of the after-the-debate vote. Affirmative votes include both simple “I believe in the affirmative” and “I believe more strongly in the affirmative.” Similarly with the negative. By comparison of the two sets of results the “winning” team is determined. Some illustrative figures may make this explanation clearer.

Before-the-Debate Vote After-the-Debate Vote
Affirmative 19 40
Negative 34 45
Undecided 61 25
Spoiled ballots 4

114 114

Inasmuch as the affirmative gained 21 votes to a gain of 11 votes for the negative, the affirmative team is declared the winner.

Attention is called to the checking of totals to guard against mistakes in counting. To be valid, ballots must be marked both before and after the debate. Ballots should be rejected only when the tellers are unable to determine from them the voter’s purpose.

This method of counting gives only gross results as to opinions before and after the discussion. There is needed a means of determining possible shifts in the opinions of the individual hearers. The second method, outlined below, is designed to show the relative effectiveness of the two teams in securing such shifts. Examine each ballot but once. Reject all those that have not been marked both before and after the debate. Determine what shift, if any, is indicated on each ballot and tabulate its numerical equivalent according to the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My views have been changed</th>
<th>My views have been changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR Prohibition</td>
<td>AGAINST Prohibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My views remain unchanged</th>
<th>My views remain unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR Prohibition</td>
<td>AGAINST Prohibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO THE AUDIENCE
The debaters will appreciate your interest and help if you will, both before and after the debate, indicate on this sheet your personal opinion on the idea proposed for debate.

As soon as the debate is finished, opportunity will be given you to question the debaters on any matters that pertain to the question.

BEFORE THE DEBATE
☐ I believe in the affirmative of the resolution to be debated.
☐ I am undecided.
☐ I believe in the negative of the resolution to be debated.

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date ..................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place ..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This blank is filled by a man ☐ woman ☐, whose age is ............</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFTER THE DEBATE
I have heard the entire discussion, and now
☐ I believe more strongly in the affirmative of the resolution than I did
☐ I believe in the affirmative of the resolution.
☐ I am undecided.
☐ I believe in the negative of the resolution
☐ I believe more strongly in the negative of the resolution than I did.

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

determining the winner. Whichever team has the larger total wins.

There are two ways of tabulating ballots of the second type. The first, and less accurate, method is to arrange
JUDGING THE DEBATE

Actual tabulation of the entire 72 ballots cast gives the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The affirmative wins by a *score*, not a vote in terms of number of ballots, of 31 to 21.

Is it necessary to add that both methods of tabulating may be used, with little additional expenditure of time and labor? A statement by one of the tellers or the chairman summarizing how many favored the proposed policy, how many opposed it, and how many were undecided after the debate as compared with those holding similar views before listening to the discussion is more enlightening to the audience or in the daily press than is a statement of comparative *scores*.

In the example just given, where the affirmative won by a *score* of 31 to 21, the results tabulated by the first method are these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the Debate</th>
<th>After the Debate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To give some idea of the variety that may be introduced into audience ballots, four additional samples are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE DEBATE</th>
<th>AFTER DEBATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ I favor a child labor amendment</td>
<td>☐ I favor a child labor amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I oppose a child labor amendment</td>
<td>☐ I oppose a child labor amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I am undecided</td>
<td>☐ I am undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foregoing ballot was attached by perforations at the bottom of the printed program. Detached and handed in as a whole, it was used first to tabulate individual shifts. Then the two halves were separated for securing gross before-and-after results.

| I am more favorable to Mussolini's principles than I was before the debate. | I am less favorable to Mussolini's principles than I was before the debate. |

This is about as simple a form as can be devised.

**BALLOT**

Each person at the close of the debate will please deposit at the door two ballots, one indicating his own position, the other showing the effect of to-night's discussion.

| I believe in | I am opposed | I am undecided to pacifism |

| I am more favorable to pacifism than I was before the debate. | I am less favorable to pacifism than I was before the debate. |

The proposition for the debate at which this ballot, printed at the end of the program, was used, was: "Resolved, that the only effective attitude toward war is an uncompromising pacifism." Those in charge of the debate thought that it might be significant to get an audience poll on pacifism as such as well as a tabulation of opinion shifts.

This peculiar form was employed in another international debate, on the proposition: "Resolved, that the entry of women into political and professional life is to be deplored." The device of the perforated corners made possible separate tabulation of men's and women's ballots,—with some interesting results!
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I. Management Of Debate

Whether in high school or college, the debate director seldom has the time and energy to look after everything himself. On the other hand, he may add to his troubles by letting a high school principal go ahead and make all arrangements without consulting him. Most important of all, he should share his duties, if only to encourage student assistance. Debating should be kept as much a genuine, spontaneous student activity as possible. The wise director saves himself work and does not "manage" more than necessary, just as he does not "coach" more than is necessary.

The usual situation in college calls for some sort of official student board to preside over the destinies of debate, often in conjunction with oratory and other inter-collegiate speech work. Such plan of organization can often be modified and adopted in high school.

The executive officer of a forensic board is usually an elected or appointed Debate Manager. If the debate program is rather ambitious, there may be separate managers for men's and women's debating. The manager's duties are numerous and varied. To him may be turned over the scheduling of debates, signing of contracts, control of finances, handling of publicity, the making of such detailed arrangements for each debate as meeting the visiting team, paying judges, distributing programs, collecting ballots.

If the debate program is heavy, it is obvious that under such conditions the manager will need an assistant, preferably an underclassman who, if competent, can go on with the work another year.

Indeed, it is well to enlist the services of numerous students in securing publicity and handling various other details. The more students actively at work, the greater the general student support for debating.

Most faculty debate directors will agree, however, that it is not wise to leave everything to the student manager, even though highly capable. There should be conference with the coach before important decisions are made. Otherwise, in saving yourself bother today you run the risk of reaping it several fold tomorrow, when a contract is bungled or the budget overrun.

The debate manager may or may not be a member of the varsity squad. A manager elected by the student body may be much more interested in social affairs than in debating, whereas an appointed squad member is pretty sure to have interest in a successful debate season. The strongest objection to the squad member is that he is apt to be too busy to be either a good debater or a good manager, to say nothing of being even a passing student. All things considered, a competent, interested man or woman outside the squad is apt to make quite as good a manager as a squad member.

If awards or credit are given your debaters, consider whether some sort of tangible recognition should not be given the manager.

A sample constitution for a Forensic Board is given in Appendix VIII.

II. Selling Debate

I should like to discuss this topic under two headings: (1) Publicity to get the audience; (2) Incentives to get the debaters.

In his famous Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University in 1809, John Quincy Adams made this statement: "There is always a certain correspondence and proportion between the estimation in which an art is held and the effect which it produces." If this is true, and most of us will agree that it is, then it behooves the director of debate to have the "art," or activity, which he directs stand in as high popular estimation as possible. If the best students in school go out for debate, debating will improve and will attract better audiences. If debate
An editorial in the school or college paper may now begin:

"The results of consensus, or mutual agreement, are essential components of any editorial. The purpose of an editorial writer is to express an opinion or take a stance on a particular issue. An editorial should not only present facts but also provide analysis and critical thinking.

In the case of the local school, the editorial board's focus should be on the importance of the students' role in the decision-making process. The students should be involved in the planning and implementation of activities and programs that affect them directly.

The editorial should emphasize the need for collaboration among all members of the school community. This includes the administration, faculty, staff, and most importantly, the students. It is crucial that the students are heard and their perspectives are considered.

Furthermore, the editorial should encourage active participation in school activities. It should highlight the importance of students taking an active role in shaping the school's culture and environment.

In conclusion, the editorial should serve as a platform for students to voice their opinions and advocate for their interests. It is a means to foster a sense of community and encourages students to be actively engaged in their school affairs.

V. Publicity

The effect of publicity is crucial for the success of any event. The more publicity, the larger the crowds, and the greater the interest in what is being offered.

For the debate coaching in November, the school's editorial board will focus on increasing awareness and participation. Articles and editorials will be written to promote the event, highlighting its importance and the benefits of debate participation. The goal is to make sure that the students are informed and motivated to attend.

The editorial will also discuss how the debate coaching can enhance the students' public speaking skills and prepare them for future opportunities. It will emphasize the value of teamwork and the importance of critical thinking.

In summary, the editorial will serve as a tool to increase interest and attract more students to the debate coaching event. With thoughtful and strategic planning, the school can expect a successful and engaging experience for all participants."
class to whom the subject of debate is of interest. A
useful device for increasing student attendance is
the ability to operate and classroom instruction in speech has
been stimulated.

The letter or information may be sent to the secretary.
Dress code: C.I.S. in the days not seen feasible, a broad
application of different information, civic and
exercise members of the school paper to write more on
inclusion of the public by means of special information. These
dispositions work well when it casts devastating even more, or
periodically with the methods already outlined, it is
date of the concern.

In the case of the student body.
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and the number is growing.

interesting, desirable, and they are interested in it. They are just
in choosing questions, greater attention should be

appropriate and relevant.

because their courses in the elementary schools are both
bases and high schools, and in proper degree, are both
used. Those courses here are commonly used in the

The national association of teachers of speech in

The above will depend upon the quality and col-

A. Academic Credit

people can do, and then a definite loss to their class work.
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This granting of credit may be justified on several grounds. To be sure, debate may be considered an extra-curricular activity, but rightly handled, squad work is conducted systematically along the lines of regular class work. So conducted, every member on the squad must do conscientious work and spend much time in reading and in meetings. Many a likely prospective debater cannot give so much time in addition to a regular line-up of studies. If, however, he is allowed credit for debating, he can drop an elective and substitute debate for it. And finally, the value of the study itself is argument enough to warrant the granting of academic credit. Ask the debater in what course he has gained the most information, the most thorough, critical knowledge of a subject. The chances are more than even that he will say Debate. Naturally, the question must be a substantial one to yield such return.\(^6\)

If you ask how much credit and how often and under what heading, I do not attempt a dogmatic answer. As shown by the surveys of the National Association of Teachers of Speech and the Mid-West Debate Conference, colleges vary from nothing to three semester hours. Probably a majority of the colleges and high schools that grant credit, allow it more than once if an individual is on the squad more than one year; this in part because questions differ from year to year.

My own feeling is that, whether in college or high school, participation in debate should receive credit equivalent to that yielded by the standard academic course in the institution. In other words, if most of the courses in the college are three-hour courses, debate should yield three semester hours, though frequently it actually yields two. On the other hand, if a man debates more than two years, the work is considerably easier for him because of his earlier practice. For this reason he may well receive less credit for work after his second year.

\(^6\) Cf. Choosing the Question, Ch. III.

In the high school, where four so-called units constitute a year's work, debate, which usually extends over a semester, commonly receives one-half unit credit and may be repeated. The credit may be given for Debate as such or for Speech or for English. Often students are allowed to drop an English class while working on the squad.

Each high school must work out its own problem, which includes that of college entrance credit. Increasingly colleges and universities are giving entrance credit for speech as such, so that debate may be a permissible elective. The important thing for the coach to do is to see that some sort of credit is allowed, provided he believes in it, and then see that his people work hard enough to earn it.

If credit is allowed at all, it is now pretty generally agreed that it should apply to all on the squad, not merely to those who shine in public performance. All the squad members do the work, and sometimes it is the inexperienced boy or girl who does not quite reach the place where he can represent the school, who does the most—for himself and for the development of the teams' cases. To indicate the relative worth of the work done, as in any class, one may well use grades or a sliding scale of credit in terms of units or hours.

4. Awards

Whereas credit should be allowed for work done on the squad and so to all members, provided they earn it, awards should be given as recognition for representing the school in interscholastic competition and so only to those who have actually debated. Not intrinsic value, but their significance, is what makes awards mean anything. Debaters should have them in their own right and especially so when it is considered that outside of athletics and, lately, music, debating and other speaking contests are practically the only forms of interscholastic and inter-
5. Honors Society

All the teachers and the student council should discuss the need to involve the students and the parents in the school's activities. The school should also consider the development of an honors society to recognize and award students who excel in their studies and extra-curricular activities. This will encourage students to perform well and also ensure that they are recognized for their achievements. The society should have clear criteria for membership and should be active in planning and organizing events and activities. The students should be involved in the decision-making process and should be given a say in the running of the society. This will help to ensure that the society is student-driven and that it meets the needs of the students.

5. Miscellaneous Suggestions

The locals chapters of the local clubs and organizations are a valuable and important tool in developing the school's culture and traditions. The clubs and organizations should be flexible and inclusive, allowing students from all backgrounds to participate. The clubs and organizations should also have clear goals and objectives, and should regularly evaluate their effectiveness. The students should be encouraged to take an active role in the planning and running of the clubs and organizations, and should be given a say in the decision-making process. This will help to ensure that the clubs and organizations are student-driven and that they meet the needs of the students.

6. Debate Coaching

In the debate coach, the students will learn critical thinking, public speaking, and research skills. The debate coach should have a clear understanding of the debate format and should be able to provide constructive feedback to the students. The debate coach should also have a clear understanding of the rules and regulations of the debate format, and should be able to provide guidance on how to prepare for the debates. The students should be encouraged to participate in the debate coach and should be given a say in the decision-making process. This will help to ensure that the debate coach is student-driven and that it meets the needs of the students.
may set standards in addition to those established by the national organizations and so make membership an even more powerful incentive for outstanding performance.

In 1925, under the auspices of Ripon College of Wisconsin, was organized the National Forensic League, a high school honor society for those participating in interscholastic public speaking. It is non-secret, and expenses have been kept very low. Although there are doubtless valid objections to such a national organization in the high school field, with its district and national tournaments and its emphasis on winning, its growth has been rapid and striking. It now numbers over 500 chapters in 39 states. In Appendix XII is given its Brief of Organization, as furnished by the national secretary, Professor Bruno E. Jacob of the University of Denver.

The insignia of honorary societies may be presented as school awards, or they may be purchased at the individual's own expense. To illustrate an award system that provides for the incentive of graduated awards and eliminates duplication of school awards and fraternity insignia, there is presented here the detailed system used by a certain mid-west college. Awards for men and women are identical except that women may have a pin attachment for fraternity keys. To be eligible to election in the fraternity one must be of at least sophomore standing and must have participated in at least three intercollegiate speech contests, with the exception of seniors, who may be considered on the basis of two such contests.

First Year

(1) If Freshman or otherwise ineligible to Tau Kappa Alpha—a specially designed wall banner in school colors and seal bearing year and the words “Varsity Debate.”

(2) If upperclassman who has been in the necessary number of contests—the Tau Kappa Alpha key, purchased from college funds.

Second Year

(1) If still ineligible to Tau Kappa Alpha—a specially designed silver pin.

(2) If eligible to Tau Kappa Alpha—key.

(3) If already a member of Tau Kappa Alpha—banner or silver pin.

Third Year

(1) If eligible to Tau Kappa Alpha—key.

(2) If already a member of Tau Kappa Alpha—a specially designed gold pin.

Fourth Year

Pearl-set gold pin.

The Forensic Board is empowered to take special action in exceptional cases.

III. Financing Debate *

Seldom is debate self-supporting. Such a condition is not to be wondered at nor particularly to be deplored. Debate is not spectacular like football or basketball. There are numerous counter-attractives in school and out. Many schools no longer charge admission, for they have found that they increase attendance by throwing the discussion open to the public. A debate on a live public question is a public service, and any means of attracting more hearers should be encouraged. On the other hand, it is frequently pointed out that people appreciate a thing more if they pay for it. The problem of determining just what the traffic will successfully bear is a difficult one.

The various methods of financing debate are four. They may be used alone or in combination.

A. Paid Admissions

If this method discourages attendance, it defeats its own purpose. Otherwise it is eminently logical and busi-

* Cf. Appendix VI.
Promote a series of debates between various clubs in the school. All these activities contribute to the development of public speaking and critical thinking skills. Therefore, the school should consider incorporating these programs into its curriculum.

D. Raising of Money by Special Means

Interest and support can be raised through various means such as special events, fundraising, and grants. For instance, the school can organize a charity event, where students can perform their talents and raise funds for a specific cause.

C. Student Fees

Students are required to pay fees for various activities and programs. These fees can be used to fund the expenses of the programs and ensure their sustainability.

B. Support from School Funds

School funds can be used to support the extracurricular activities. The school can allocate funds from its budget to support these activities. This ensures that the activities are well-funded and can be sustained.

A. An Intramural Program

Although major emphasis in this book has been placed on interscholastic debating, there are other activities that can be included in an intramural program. These activities can be organized by the students themselves, and they can be a great way to develop public speaking skills.

VII. Miscellaneous Suggestions

Take part. There will be more test in the intramural com-
petition if the possession of a trophy is the goal. Such a trophy, usually in the form of a cup, should be inscribed with the winning group's name and remain on display to be competed for the following year. A local newspaper or business men's club or public spirited individual can often be interested in donating the trophy. Or some student organization in the school may offer it, or funds be secured in one of the ways discussed for financing the interscholastic program.

A more permanent, though less inclusive, means of promoting student interest is the literary or debating society. Because of a multiplicity of other activities, these organizations are not so common as they once were, but they will always have a place to fill, and in many schools, they are filling it vigorously and enthusiastically today. Where debating societies are flourishing, you will find it is, first, because they have varied programs of debates, discussions, parliamentary procedure, mock trials, extem-pore speeches; second, because they accept as members only those who are really interested in their activities; and third, because they have wise but not domineering faculty direction.

The debating society can be of direct service to interscholastic debating in a variety of ways. From its number often come several members of the squad. Officially and unofficially its members can help get students try out for the schools teams. Upon it should be placed part, if not all, of the responsibility for advertising school debates, holding informal receptions for visiting and home teams before or after debates, staging "pep" meetings, organizing rooting delegations to accompany the team away from home. Such motivated activity is an excellent means of vitalizing the club's existence.

As coach, you will usually be advisor to the literary society. Your position is a strategic one, for good or ill. The students need direction but not domination. Lead, do not drive.

---

For a sample constitution of such a society see Appendix IX.  

V. EDUCATING EXECUTIVES

Of all the groups to whom debate must be sold, school administrators are perhaps the most difficult. Too often a superintendent or principal says, "Oh, yes, I am in favor of our school's debating, provided: . . ." And then you find out that it must not cost anything to speak of, that students must be very sure not to neglect their other studies, that you may do it in your spare time. It is your job to show that superintendent or principal that if debating is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well; that it is quite unfair to ask you to handle debating in addition to a full teaching load; that, so far as the schedule will permit, there should be time allowed for team meetings and individual conferences; that provision must be made for adequate financial support.

And, finally, educate him on winning and losing. He should not be allowed to forget for a moment that debate is an educational enterprise and that you do not propose to sacrifice unduly educational ends to the gaining of judges' decisions. Such a position on your part need not give him the impression that you lack confidence in yourself or are afraid to give your best efforts to win debates.

VI. ELIGIBILITY

One of the surest ways to secure the support and cooperation of your fellow teachers is to be, not only willing, but anxious to abide by scholastic eligibility standards. In high school leagues, as in athletic leagues, certain standards are usually set up, but even without such standards it is well to make sure that your debaters are maintaining a satisfactory average in their other courses. So far as native ability is concerned, those who make the debate squad are seldom really poor students, but it is easy to let studies slide in the excitement and pressure of debate preparation. It is the director's job to see that such lapses do not occur for very long periods and that

10 Cf. Appendices X and XI.
students get a sane perspective of debate in relation to their whole school program as well as to health, outside work, and other extra-curricular activities. He should not be guilty himself of expecting the impossible and then trying to exact it.

Although freshmen often make the squad, it is seldom that they show sufficient maturity to take part in an interscholastic debate. Of those who do, more than one has had his future value at least temporarily impaired by getting too exalted an estimation of his own abilities. To put freshman on the squad, however, has several arguments in its favor. You thereby secure their interest in debating early, before other activities take their time and attention. In the second place, you train them for actual debaters later. The boy or girl who waits until the senior year to come out is just getting the rough edges knocked off when he graduates.

Although such an arrangement may not be feasible in high school, some colleges have separate freshman squads with their own intercollegiate schedules with freshman teams from other institutions and with junior college teams.

VII. TRAVELING

Certain questions concerned with the traveling of debate teams are often asked.

A. Which Team Travels

Theoretically, the negative should travel. The affirmative should stay at home, so that the alleged advantage of speaking on its own platform may offset the disadvantage of the burden of proof. This was the old idea in the making of schedules, but today it is honored in the breach quite as often as in the observance. Other considerations enter. The schedule of home debates needs to be balanced so that the home audience can hear both sides of a question defended by its representatives. In a league it is often definitely provided that from round to round the side upheld by the home team shall shift.

B. Who Should Go On A Trip?

If physically and financially possible, take more than just the three team members. It is unsafe to go without an alternate to step in, in case one of the regular speakers cannot take part. Furthermore, should not the privilege and enjoyment of a trip be passed around to as many members of the squad as is consistent with the state of the exchequer?

You will find it a wise expenditure of effort and money, especially early in the season, to arrange for the whole squad to accompany the team, provided the debate is not too distant. You will be surprised to find how little it costs to take a large group by automobiles, the use of which can often be secured gratis. The presence of a good group of rooters makes your team debate better, and there is great value in your squad members' hearing numerous debates.

For team traveling, it should be arranged, in line with what has already been said as to the negative's not always traveling, for both affirmative and negative groups to take the trips. If the debater manager does not get a trip as an active debater, he can be given some compensation for his services by including him for a trip.

Although in college teams sometimes travel without a faculty member accompanying them, in high school either the coach or another teacher should always go with the team. If the coach is a man, and a girl is on the team, it may be best to have a woman teacher go as well as the coach.

C. Who Pays Traveling Expenses?

The usual arrangement is for each team to pay its own expenses and for the entertaining school to pay local expenses. Deviation from this general rule frequently occurs, however. In high school leagues all expenses are sometimes prorated. The obvious argument for having
a school pay its own team's traveling expenses is that the team will tend to be more economical than if spending an opponent's money.

Among colleges, where long cross-country trips extending over several days or weeks are frequently taken, it has been the usual custom for entertaining schools to pay a certain cash honorarium. This is naturally the case with the visits of foreign teams. Of late there has developed considerable opposition to the payment of cash guarantees to visiting teams, and it has become the usual arrangement for only local entertainment to be furnished. The entertaining college may, in turn, take a trip in a year or two and in the course of it may meet their present visitors. Each school may as well pay its own expenses as receive fifty dollars this year and pay fifty dollars next. Neither are American colleges so liberal in their payments to foreign teams of late, as there seems to be considerable evidence that they, or their agents, have been asking larger sums than are necessary to defray reasonable expenses.

VIII. A Reception For Guests

Many schools hold an informal reception of some sort before or after the debate, at which members of the visiting and home teams meet in a social way. Judges, coaches, interested teachers, and students are also welcome. Such an informal get-together, along with a good cup of cocoa and a sandwich, makes for friendship and good feeling and is to be encouraged. As mentioned elsewhere, arranging for the reception is an excellent project for the debating society or honorary forensic group.

If judges are used, the reception may be a bit more enjoyable if held before the contest, though such an arrangement is not often feasible. If your team is defeated, of course you won't let the members stand about and be kill-joys at the reception. "A merry heart [even though simulated] doeth good like a medicine."

Even when a reception is not held, there is always the possibility of going down to the corner drug store and having some "eats" together. Thus may the sting be removed from defeat and the discovery made that opponents aren't such a bad sort after all.

IX. Two Practical Questions

A. How Many Debates Should Be Held on One Question?

Some colleges use only one or two questions and debate them only two or three times. Others carry through a long schedule on the same small range of questions. Still others use numerous questions for the season.

The use of only one or two questions makes possible their very intensive study and in some ways is easier for the squad. Even if several questions are used, the squad can be so split that no member works on all of them. Too great specialization may, of course, deaden interest. For the director, who needs to know something about a question to be an intelligent critic of what his students do, the small number of questions is undoubtedly easier.

Audiences, as well as debaters, must be considered, however. A home audience can hardly be expected to get wildly enthusiastic after hearing the same question discussed several times. Although this difficulty may be met, at least in part, by taking debates to audiences outside the school, it must be admitted that variety in question, as well as in debating forms, adds to the interest.

High schools that are members of leagues can always go outside the league for other questions and other opponents. How much variety of question should be used is a matter that must be decided in view of available time, of the character of the squad, and of the nature of its schedule.
CORRESPONDENCE is most effective when
mediated. At least send a preliminary answer. Delay in
making a final decision cannot be made up.

If each school has clear, continuous letters, this kind of
correspondence is going to be missed. If you
haven't been paying attention to what is written, you
will have a problem in making the decision. If you
fail at all, the results will be disastrous.

XI. HANDLING CORRESPONDENCE

Notice how correspondence can be handled.
Scrupulous honesty when answering is required.
If you're paying attention to what is written, you
will have a problem in making the decision. If you
fail at all, the results will be disastrous.

Once again, we come back to the matter of
good faith.

II. SCOUTING

Should a School Win Its Degrees?

A. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF HIS DEGREES

On a question, so little can be too few.
There is more to the question than meets the eye.

Though necessary, ambiguity is often
appearing on both sides of a question in the same
section. Wherever possible, provide any measure
from Appendix X that fits the question. to the end of
the interpretation. Remember that no one can
understand ambiguity of governmental
methods.

Despite the fact that numerous schools, both colleges

and high schools, boast records of

miscellaneous suggestions.
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Systematic filing of all letters received, together with carbon copies of answers, is simply business-like procedure. Even of apparently unimportant letters carbon copies should be made. A complete file of both sides of all correspondence is constantly needed for reference.

XII. THE FILING HABIT

Not merely letters, but various kinds of material in connection with your work, may profitably be filed.

You will find it a good practice to require all squad members to file one or two copies, preferably typewritten, of their speeches. If necessary, credit can be withheld until they are in your hands. Thus there grows from year to year a manuscript library of the debates on various interesting public questions. Such speeches often are very convenient to refer to later, and their filing attaches an importance to them that dignifies the student's work on the debate squad.

Pamphlets and printed material, other than books deposited in the library, should be filed away in some orderly fashion. If possible, have the library take care of all of it.

You will also find it interesting and useful to file press clippings, pictures of the squad, copies of the printed programs used, of banquet programs, and other miscellaneous material which at the time seems quite insignificant. Next year when you are ready to have programs printed or wish to verify a date, you will be able to find what you need.

XIII. KEEPING CALM

And this is my last preachment, although I have not meant to "preach," merely to suggest. For the student, green or experienced, debating is a nervous strain. The wise teacher will not make it harder for him by letting himself get unduly excited when a case is in poor shape, when a speaker goes to pieces in the last practice debate, or when an important decision is at stake. He will keep his head, and his poise will communicate itself to his debaters.

And now, as you finish this chapter, it is suggested that you reread what was said as to the characteristics of the ideal coach under "How Much Should the Coach Do" in Chapter III.
CHAPTER IX

INTERCOLLEGIATE AND INTERSCHO-
LASTIC FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS

I. The Conference
II. The League
III. The Triangular Debate
IV. The Dual Debate
V. The Single Debate
VI. The Tournament

Of types of inter-school debate organizations there are several. Their structure and management may be loose or rigid. Especially in colleges the tendency seems to be away from hard and fast provisions in the form of written contracts in favor of making arrangements as to judging and similar matters by ordinary correspondence. This is in line with the growth away from the idea that an opposing coach will do you dirt if he can and so his possible course of action must be controlled by rigid black and white provisions in a signed contract.

At the same time, from the standpoint of definiteness and conservation of time, there are undoubted advantages in a more or less definite written understanding. Especially is this true for relationships in which more than two schools are concerned, and even when there are only two it is a piece-meal method to arrange everything by letter-writing.

The common types of organizations or relationships are conferences, leagues, triangular debates, dual debates, and single debates. In the following pages these
types are briefly discussed and illustrative sections from written agreements are quoted.¹

I. THE CONFERENCE

The conference may be in the nature of a clearing house for ideas, or it may be a league under another name.

The Mid-West Debate Conference illustrates the first form. It is a very loose organization with a fluctuating membership of about thirty colleges in half a dozen middle western states. On the last Saturday of September the coaches from these colleges meet in Chicago and, by the method outlined under “Choosing the Question” in Chapter III, choose official debate questions for men and for women for the ensuing year. They also discuss general debate problems and policies and elect officers. The member colleges are not obligated to use the questions chosen nor is a schedule of debates drawn up, except privately between individual colleges.

II. THE LEAGUE ²

The state league is common among both colleges and high schools, although details of organization and procedure differ widely. Many college leagues have abandoned so-called championship debating; high schools will probably always have greater need of such an incentive.

The administration of high school leagues is in various hands in different states—the state university department of speech, the university extension division, private colleges, high school principals.

A study of the specimen constitutions given in Appendix XI will disclose interesting differences along

¹In addition, it may be noted that the National Forensic League (Cf. Appendix XII) and all of the national forensic fraternities promote contests among their members. Pi Kappa Delta and Phi Rho Pi (cf. p. 265) are particularly active, with district and national tournaments.

²Organization agreements of leagues among high schools, colleges, and universities are given in Appendices X, XI, and XIII.

various lines. The state college debate league usually provides for a meeting of debate coaches or managers or both to decide on a question and formulate a schedule. This meeting may come in the fall or late the preceding spring.

III. THE TRIANGULAR DEBATE

As its name indicates, the triangular debate is an arrangement whereby three debates are held at, or near, the same time. Each of three participating schools uses both an affirmative and a negative team, one at home, the other away from home. Suppose the schools are Hastings, Meadville, and Groton. A possible triangular schedule, then, might be:

At Hastings—Hastings affirmative: Meadville negative
At Meadville—Meadville affirmative: Groton negative
At Groton—Groton affirmative: Hastings negative

If a winner must be determined, it can be done on the basis of decisions, judges' votes, or percentages assigned the various teams by the judges.

The advantage of the triangle is that through it each member school has relations with two other schools and that two teams can be used. Although all three debates, theoretically, are held the same night, such need not be the case. However, not more than a few days should separate them.

A SPECIMEN COMPACT FOR A TRIANGULAR DEBATE

Portage High School, Jamestown High School, and Lakeville High School enter into the following debate agreement:

1. Schedule

a. Three contests shall be held on the same date, one at each institution, these contests to occur on April 12, 1929.

b. The same question shall be used in all three debates, the visiting teams upholding the negative.
c. The schedule of debates shall be as follows:
   Jamestown negative vs. Lakeville affirmative at Lakeville.
   Lakeville negative vs. Portage affirmative at Portage.
   Portage negative vs. Jamestown affirmative at Jamestown.

2. Question
   The question for debate shall be: "Resolved, that capital punishment for first-degree murder should be adopted in Wisconsin."

3. Selection of Judges
   a. The entertaining school in each contest shall send the visiting school, not later than thirty days preceding the debate, a list of ten or more candidates for judges. Each college shall have the right to challenge any or all of the candidates submitted by its opponents and to request other names to complete the list. Notice of such challenge shall be given within four days following receipt of the nominations. The visiting school may suggest names when it returns the entertaining school's list.

   b. On the completion of a satisfactory list of judges the visiting school shall return such list to the entertaining school. From this list the latter shall secure three judges, sending out invitations in the order of preference indicated by its opponent. If it is impossible to get three judges from the original list, the entertaining school shall submit other names under the same conditions.

   c. Judges shall be more or less publicly known, professionally qualified to judge debate, not known to be prejudiced upon the subject at issue, not connected with either of the institutions concerned, and not in any other known way disqualified from rendering a fair and unbiased decision.

   d. The school submitting the names shall indicate the forensic and official qualifications of the persons suggested.

   e. Convenience and economy for the attending judges shall be a factor in the nomination and choice insofar as it may be consistent with the securing of able judges.

4. Conduct of Debate
   a. Each school shall be represented at each contest in which it participates by three regularly enrolled students, boys or girls, with passing grades in at least three-fourths of their subjects.

   b. Each speaker shall be allowed two speeches, one for main argument and one for rebuttal. Each team shall be allowed three ten-minute speeches for constructive argument, and each speaker shall be allowed five minutes for rebuttal. First constructive speech shall be made by the Affirmative and first rebuttal speech by the Negative.

   c. Each judge shall decide for himself what constitutes effective debating except that he shall consider analysis, evidence, refutation, team-work, and delivery. Without consultation he shall vote affirmatively or negatively on the merits of the debate and NOT ON THE MERITS OF THE QUESTION. The ballots shall be collected and delivered to the presiding officer, who shall open them and announce the decision.

   d. The presiding officer shall read Article 4, Section c of this agreement (omitting the last sentence) in the presence of the audience just before the debate, and each judge shall be provided with a typewritten copy of the section.

5. Miscellaneous
   a. Each school shall pay all expenses of its own debaters and all local expenses connected with the home debate, including the expenses of the judges.

   b. It is agreed that reasonable fees may be paid judges for their services.

Signed:

Principal (or Coach) Portage High School

Principal (or Coach) Jamestown High School

Principal (or Coach) Lakeville High School
IV. The Dual Debate

Here only two schools participate, each having both an affirmative and a negative team. The dual is perhaps the most common form of debate relationship, although both triangles and singles are widely used.

With slight modifications the triangular compact just illustrated can be used to govern a dual debate.

V. The Single Debate

In this form A goes to B or B goes to A; there is not a mutual exchange. It is in the case of the single debate that the visiting team sometimes receives a cash payment from the entertaining school to equalize traveling expenses, although, as pointed out in the preceding chapter, an alternative arrangement of providing for a return debate at a later date is being increasingly adopted.

As an illustration of a compact that is brief yet sufficiently inclusive, an agreement for various single debates on a long trip taken by a men's team from Western State Teachers College is shown here. Under some of the headings, alternative methods are offered. The entertaining college in each case crossed off those alternatives not acceptable or checked those favored.

DEBATE AGREEMENT

Western State Teachers College and ....................... two men
hereby agree to hold a debate between a team of three women two men representing W.S.T.C. and a team of three women representing ..............................

Place .........................
Date and Hour .................
Proposition: Resolved:
Sides: Affirmative .......... Negative ................
Length of speeches: Constructive ........ minutes each
Rebuttal ...................... minutes each

FUTURE OF DEBATING

Type of debate: (Check the one selected)
1. Formal debate, with decision by (check the one selected)
   a. Critic judge (acceptable to both schools)
   b. Board of three judges (acceptable to both schools)
2. Debate followed by open forum discussion
   a. With audience shift-of-opinion ballots
   b. Without decision
3. Oregon plan, providing for cross-questioning of and by both teams, followed by
   a. Audience shift-of-opinion ballots
   b. No decision
4. Other plan:

Financial: Entertaining school to pay visiting team $............
Entertaining school to provide entertainment (lodging and meals) for a period not exceeding 24 hours.

Dress: Formal (tuxedo suits for men)
      Informal

SIGNED
For Western State Teachers College For ......................
......................................................... ................................
Director of Men's Debate

Other arrangements besides those discussed here are possible, of course, such as quadrangular and pentangular debates. The larger number of members tends to unwieldiness, however, and as such organizations are not common, discussion of them seems unnecessary.

VI. The Tournament

For a discussion of this new development the reader is referred to Chapter II Types of Debate.
the graded speaking that debaters give. He teaches the art of giving and the art of listening, and he teaches the art of being a good listener. He teaches the art of the defense of the speaker and the art of the attack of the speaker, and he teaches the art of the question and the art of the answer. He teaches the art of the motion and the art of the opposition. He teaches the art of the cases and the art of the arguments. He teaches the art of the debate and the art of the discussion. He teaches the art of the examination and the art of the cross-examination. He teaches the art of the debate and the art of the discussion. He teaches the art of the debate and the art of the discussion. He teaches the art of the debate and the art of the discussion. He teaches the art of the debate and the art of the discussion.

The Future of American Debating

Chapter X
some of these changes have brought definite improvement. We have discovered, however, that it is the attitude, the spirit, that really makes the difference between a declamatory battle of words that ends where it began and an animated, communicative discussion that trains speakers and advances the understanding of listeners. Guided by this vision of vital speaking and constructive controversy, conserving the undoubted values of traditional American debating while rejecting its ineffective and unworthy non-essentials, we who teach and we who practice debate can go forward confidently. As we practice the open-mindedness which we profess our activity develops, and as we bring debate into dynamic relation with life, we serve the highest educational and civic ends.

It is not intended, of course, to give the impression that debate is the only speech activity that furthers these ends. By no means. Dramatics, oratory, extempore speaking, declamation, all these extra-curricular speech activities have their place. But the spirit and the goal here, likewise, are all-important. Is dramatics conducted as an activity to release the personalities of the participants, or is it merely a "show" for the gratification of patrons and the glorification of the director? Who writes the oration, the student or his teacher? Does he speak on a subject that means anything to him? Does he declaim or does he converse? Does the extemporaneous speech grow out of conscientious study of current affairs together with diligent practice in speaking, or is a half-baked assembling of unassimilated facts frosted over with gifted glibness? Is the declamation a sharing with the audience or an exhibition for the audience? Is it a selection entering even remotely into the experience of the boy or girl giving it?

But I stray from the future of American debating. Suffice it to say that in all of these activities the influence of the teacher, the director, the coach—call him what you will—is decisive. Let him stand for common sense, for genuineness, for training of the many as well as the few, and the future, not merely of American debating, but of American speech contests, is assured.

And not merely of contests. Contests, rightly conducted, generate a demand for more instruction, for classroom instruction in speech. Thus shall the side shows lead to the big tent, the big tent of speech education, under competent and adequate direction, for all American youth. Then shall men and women know themselves better, and, knowing themselves, shall better understand one another. Then shall the final petition in the prayer of the ancient Greek teacher be answered:

O great Apollo, send down the reviving rain upon our fields; 
preserve our flocks; ward off our enemies; and—build up our speech.
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DEBATE COACHING

Hedde, Wilhelmina and Brigance, W. N. Speech. $1.80. J. B. Lippincott. '35.
Sandford, William P. and Yeager Willard H. Successful Speaking. $1.40. Thomas Nelson and Sons. '27.
Woolbert, Charles H. and Weaver, Andrew T. Better Speech. rev. & enl. $1.52. Harcourt, Brace and Co. '29.

ADVANCED TEXTS IN DEBATE

Fritz, Charles A. The Method of Argument. $2.50. Prentice-Hall. '32.
Nichols, Egbert Ray and Baccus, Joseph H. Modern Debating. $2.25. W. W. Norton. '36.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

O'Neill, James M., Laycock, Craven, and Scales, Robert L. Argumentation and Debate. $2.10. Macmillan. '17.

ADVANCED TEXTS IN SPEECH

SPRCH IN GENERAL

Davis, Estelle H. and Mammen, Edward W. The Spoken Word in Life and Art. $3. Prentice-Hall. '32.
Gray, Giles Wilkeson and Wise, Claude Merton. The Bases of Speech. $2.50. Harper. '34.
O'Neill, James M. and Weaver, Andrew T. The Elements of Speech. rev. ed. $2.50. Longmans, Green. '33.
Watkins, Dwight Everett. An Introduction to the Art of Speech. $2.75. W. W. Norton. '34.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

Hayworth, Donald. Public Speaking. $2.50. Ronald Press. '35.
Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. $2. Scott, Foresman. '35.
Sandford, William P. and Yeager, Willard H. Principles of Effective Speaking. rev. & enl. $2.50. Thomas Nelson and Sons. '34.
West, Robert W. Purposive Speaking. $1.25. Macmillan. '24.
Williamson, Arleigh B. Speaking in Public. $2.50. Prentice-Hall Inc. '29.

Speech Composition
Brigance, William N. The Spoken Word. $2.25. F. S. Crofts and Co. N.Y. '27.
Law, Frederick H. How to Write and How to Deliver an Oration. $1.50. Putnam. '26.
(Useful for high school.)

Specimen Debates

Collections of Speeches

REFERENCES FOR THE TEACHER
Prepared under the direction of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. Contains outlines of various high school courses and a large number of special articles on all phases of speech work by various leaders in the profession.
An authoritative book on group discussion, with special reference to the leader. A standard guide to the theory and procedure of group discussion.
An Experience Curriculum in English. $1.75 (paper). Appleton-Century. '35.
Recommendations, courses of study, and class suggestions for spoken and written English in elementary grades and high school, following three-year intensive study by the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English.
A concise little book designed to fill the “gap that exists between the actual debate and the usual textbook on argumentation.”
Mulgrave, Dorothy. Speech for the Classroom Teacher. $2.50. Prentice-Hall. '36.
A substantial book of theory and practice for the teacher in service as well as in training.
Selected articles on debate theory and practice of interest to students and coaches; also bibliographies on numerous public questions.
Theory and practical suggestions by the director of speech improvement in the New York City schools.
Quarterly Journal of Speech. $2.50 a year.
Official publication of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. G. E. Denison, Business Manager, University of Michigan.
Speech Bulletin. $2 for 4 issues.
Vital Speeches of the day. $3 a year.
Starting in January, 1935, and published in New York City, this monthly publication prints the complete text of several outstanding speeches delivered throughout the world during the previous few weeks. Two editions: fortnightly and monthly; the latter containing a public speaking department in which a number of the speeches are analyzed by prominent speech teachers.
APPENDIX II

TOPICS FOR DEBATE

There are two reasons for offering suggested debate subjects in the form of topics rather than propositions. Specifically worded propositions often soon become obsolete because of changed conditions and so are no longer usable. In the second place, a topic may be used for the formulation of various sorts of propositions: policy, fact, theoretical soundness, philosophical, factual.

SCHOOL AND LOCAL QUESTIONS

The small college versus the large university
The honor system
Interscholastic athletics
Secret societies in high school
Student self-government
The value of a college education
Speech as a required subject
Abolition of final examinations
The consolidated school
Extra-curricular activities
Teaching of evolution
Reading of the Bible in school
Decisions in debates
Twelve-month school sessions
The junior high school
Abolition of "marks" and "grades"
Commission form of government for
City-manager form of government for
Street cars versus busses
Sunday movies
Abolition of national party labels in local elections

TOPICS FOR DEBATE

LARGER ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS

Censorship
Freedom of speech
Relative contribution of science and the arts
Civilization (For example: "This house pities its grandchildren")
The radio
Modern advertising
Birth control
Pacifism
Military training
Military preparedness
Democracy (For example: "Democracy has failed")
Socialism
Communism
Fascism
The totalitarian state
Government "interference" with business
Stock speculation
Government ownership of public utilities
Control of hydroelectric power
The coal industry
Unemployment
Unemployment insurance
Child labor
Old-age pensions
Health insurance
Socialized medicine
A five-day labor week
Injunctions in labor disputes
Labor unions
Immigration
Liquor control
Crime control
Installment buying
Chain stores
The metric system
Currency reform
Taxation
Capital punishment
Abolition of the jury system
Civil service reform (the merit system)
Proportional representation
A new liberal-conservative political alignment
Compulsory voting
Party loyalty versus independent voting
The "short ballot"
Abolition of the direct primary
The unicameral legislature
Popular election of judges
Declaration of war by popular vote
Direct popular nomination of President and Vice President
Abolition of the electoral college
A single Presidential term of six years
Cabinet-parliamentary government for the United States
Revision of the Federal Constitution
Restriction of the power of the Supreme Court
A federal department of education
A lakes-to-ocean deep waterway
Interstate commerce
Farm relief
The tariff
Reciprocity with Canada (with South America)
Annexation of Canada by the United States
The Monroe Doctrine
Disarmament
War debts and reparations
Philippine independence
The "white man's burden"
China
Japan and the United States
The League of Nations
The World Court

APPENDIX III

ORGANIZATIONS ISSUING MATERIAL USEFUL FOR DEBATE

Adult Education, American Association for. 60 East 42nd Street, New York
Alcohol Problem, Intercollegiate Association for Study of. 635 F Street N.W. Washington
Alcoholism, World League against. Westerville, Ohio
Allied Youth [against beverage alcohol]. National Education Association Building, Washington
American Commonwealth Federation. Hotel Frederic, St. Paul
American Legion, National Headquarters. Indianapolis
Anti-Saloon League of America. 131 B Street S.E. Washington
Bankers Association, American. 22 East 40th Street, New York
Brookings Institution, The. 722 Jackson Place N.W. Washington
Building and Loan Associations, U.S. League of. 22 East 12th Street, Cincinnati
Capital Punishment, League to Abolish. 124 Lexington Avenue, New York
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 700 Jackson Place N.W. Washington
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 522 Fifth Avenue, New York
Catholic Welfare Conference, National. 1312 Massachusetts Avenue N.W. Washington

1 Many other organizations are listed in the World Almanac. Those given here are most serviceable for debate purposes. Addresses are correct for 1936.
Chamber of Commerce of U.S.A. 1615 H Street N.W. Washington
Child Labor Committee, National. 419 Fourth Avenue, New York
Child Welfare League of America. 130 East 22d Street, New York
Churches of Christ in America, Federal Council of the. 105 East 22d Street, New York
City Managers Association, International. 923 East 60th Street, Chicago
Civic Federation, National. 570 Lexington Avenue, New York
Civil Liberties Union, American. 31 Union Square W. New York
Civil Service Reform League, National. 521 Fifth Avenue, New York
College Entrance Examination Board. 431 West 117th Street, New York
Colleges, Association of American. 19 West 44th Street, New York
Colored People, National Association for the Advancement of. 69 Fifth Avenue, New York
Consumers’ League, National. 156 Fifth Avenue, New York
Cooperative League of the U.S.A. 167 West 12th Street, New York
Cooperative Fellowship in North America, Christian. 285 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Country Life Association, American. 105 East 22d Street, New York
Daughters of the American Revolution, National Society. Memorial Continental Hall, Washington
Economic Research, National Bureau of. 1819 Broadway, New York
Editorial Research Reports. 1013 13th Street N.W. Washington
Education Association, National. 1201 16th Street N.W. Washington
Electric Light Association, National. 420 Lexington Avenue, New York
Farm Bureau Federation, American. 48 East Washington Street, Chicago
Farmer Labor Political Federation. Hotel Frederic, St. Paul
Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America. 214 Arcade Building, Kankakee, Ill.

Foreign Policy Association. 8 West 40th Street, New York
Grange, National; Publicity Bureau of. Springfield, Mass.
Industrial Conference Board, National. 247 Park Avenue, New York
Industrial Democracy, League for. 11 East 19th Street, New York
Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc. 165 Broadway, New York
Institute of Politics, Williamstown, Mass.
International Education, Institute of. 2 West 45th Street, New York
International Law, American Society of. 700 Jackson Place N.W. Washington.
Jewish Committee, American. 171 Madison Avenue, New York
Jews and Christians, National Conference of. 289 Fourth Avenue, New York
Labor Legislation, American Association for. 131 East 23d Street, New York
Labor Research Association. 799 Broadway, New York
Latin America, Committee on Cultural Relations with. 287 Fourth Avenue, New York
League of Nations Association. 8 West 40th Street, New York
Lord’s Day Alliance of the United States. 156 Fifth Avenue, New York
Manufacturers of the United States, National Association of. 11 West 42d Street, New York
Medical Association, American. 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago
Metric Association. 156 Fifth Avenue, New York
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. 1 Madison Avenue, New York
Militarism in Education, Committee on. 2929 Broadway, New York
Motion Picture Council in America, Federal. 134 B Street N.E. Washington
Motion Pictures, National Board of Review of. 70 Fifth Avenue, New York
Municipal League, National. 309 East 34th Street, New York
Narcotics Research and Information, Foundation for. 150 Fifth Avenue, New York
Navy League of the United States. Mills Building, Washington
Pan American Union. Washington
Parents and Teachers, National Congress of. 1201 16th Street
N.W. Washington
Peace Conference, National. 8 West 40th Street, New York
Peace Foundation, World. 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, and
8 West 40th Street, New York
Peace Society, American. 734 Jackson Place, Washington
People's Lobby. 113 First Street N.E. Washington
Petroleum Institute, American. 250 Park Avenue, New York
Political Action, League for Independent. Hotel Frederic,
St. Paul
Prison Association, American. 135 East 15th Street, New York
Prisons and Prison Labor, National Committee on. 250 West
57th Street, New York
Probation Association, National. 59 West 50th Street, New
York
Progressive Education Association. 310 West 90th Street,
New York
Proportional Representation League, American. 1417 Locust
Street, Philadelphia
Public Affairs Information Service. 11 West 40th Street, New
York
Public Ownership League of America. 127 North Dearborn
Street, Chicago
Railroads, Association of American. Transportation Building,
Washington
Reconciliation, Fellowship of. 3929 Broadway, New York
Reform Federation, International. 134 B Street N.E. Wash-
ington
Religious Education, International Council of. 203 North
Wabash Avenue, Chicago
Research Bureau, National. 415 North LaSalle Street, Chicago
Research Foundation, American Business Men's [on alcohol
and liquor traffic]. 111 West Jackson Blvd. Chicago
Rural Fellowship, Christian. 156 Fifth Avenue, New York
Russell Sage Foundation. 130 East 22d Street, New York
Scientific Temperance Federation. 400 Boylston Street, Boston
Social Action, Council for. [Congregational and Christian
Churches] 287 Fourth Avenue, New York

Social Security, American Association for. 22 East 17th Street,
New York
Social Work, National Conference of. 82 North High Street,
Columbus, Ohio
Socialist Party of the U.S.A. 549 Randolph Street, Chicago
Stable Money Association. 104 Fifth Avenue, New York
Steamship Owners Association, American. 11 Broadway, New
York
Student Christian Associations, National Council of. 347 Madis-
on Avenue, New York
Student Federation of America, National. 8 West 40th Street,
New York
Tariff League, Fair. 2 Rector Street, New York
Teachers, American Federation of. 506 South Wabash Avenue,
Chicago
Temperance, Methodist Episcopal Church Board of. 100 Mary-
land Avenue N.E. Washington
Unemployment League, National. 420 Madison Avenue, New
York
University Women, American Association of. 1634 1 Street
N.W. Washington
Utility Associations, Joint Committee of National. 420 Lexing-
ton Avenue, New York
Veterans Council, American. 71 West 23d Street, New York
War, National Council for Prevention of. 532 17th Street N.W.
Washington
War Resisters League. 171 West 12th Street, New York
Women's Christian Temperance Union. 1730 Chicago Avenue,
Evanston, Ill.
Woman's Party, National. 144 B Street N.E. Washington
Women Voters, National League of. 726 Jackson Place, Wash-
ington
Women's Clubs, General Federation of. 1734 N Street N.W.
Washington
Women's Trade Union League, New York. 247 Lexington
Avenue, New York
Young Men's Christian Association of North America. 347
Madison Avenue, New York
Young Women's Christian Associations of the U.S.A. 600 Lex-
ington Avenue, New York
APPENDIX IV

SPECIMEN FORMS

A. A First Affirmative Speech

This speech was delivered in 1927 on the preposition, "Resolved, that the essential features of the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill should be enacted into law."

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In discussing such a problem as we have before us tonight we have found that it is very hard to prevent the discussion from becoming so technical and complicated that it would be entirely uninteresting to the ordinary person. We hope, however, that tonight, with the help of our friends of the negative, we can keep the question in its simplest terms and so avoid as many undesirable and unnecessary technicalities as possible. We wish to make it very clear at the outset that we are not necessarily debating the McNary-Haugen bill which President Coolidge saw fit to veto. We are discussing only the essential features of that bill, which might be embodied in any form of legislation, just so those essential features are included.

As I mentioned a moment ago, President Coolidge has vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill. It may seem rather queer to some of you that we should be debating the essential features of a proposition that has already received the disapproval of our president. However, ladies and gentlemen, we do not feel that the bill is permanently dead. The condition of agriculture demands some sort of relief, and despite the president's veto and the opposition of the industrial East, the fight for help is bound to be continued by the farmers of this country until they receive the aid which they are demanding and to which they are certainly entitled.

In brief, the essential features of the McNary-Haugen bill call for a representative Federal farm board, which, through loans and contracts with co-operative organizations of farmers, will control the surplus of basic agricultural commodities in order to prevent that surplus from depressing the home market.

Now in discussing these essential features of the McNary-Haugen bill as a means of relieving the farmer, we wish to propose three very common-sense questions around which we feel the discussion will naturally fall. In the first place, is the condition of the farmer such that it warrants national legislation? Secondly, will these features, if incorporated into law, accomplish their aim? And, last, would a law including these essential features be sound from the standpoint of national welfare?

Sitting here on the debate platform or out there in the audience, we are, to all outward appearances, about as far removed from the ordinary dirt farmer as anyone or anything could possibly be. And yet, ladies and gentlemen, thinking people are beginning to realize that we are not as far removed from the farm nor as independent of it as some of us would like to believe. Agricultural production is so closely interwoven with the general business structure of the nation, and plays so large a part in our national economic life, that there is no individual, no matter what his occupation or place, who would not ultimately be affected by continued agricultural depression. Agriculture affects you and me just as vitally as it affects the farmer because it can plainly be seen that trouble among the farmers is bound to be felt by the entire nation, and depression for the farmer means depression for the whole country.

Realizing, then, that the farmer cannot be ignored because he is the most important factor in industry today, let us investigate the present situation of the farmer so that we may see just why we are on this platform tonight.

It is universally conceded that for several years past agriculture has been unprofitable. We all realize that the farmer works harder, lives more economically, and has fewer of the ordinary pleasures of life than any other class of our citizenry. For several years past, the farmer, while practicing the greatest of economy, has scarcely been able to make both ends meet. "Last year," says Virgil Jordan, chief economist of the National Industrial Conference Board of New York, "the returns on the farms of America yielded scarcely 2 per cent on the assessed valuation." Think of it, ladies and gentlemen, here in the United States, the richest country on the globe, our farmers receive less than 2 per cent on the money they invest in their farms. The story of the American farmer for the past six or seven years has been simply the story of one bank failure after another throughout the country. Just to cite one example, let me
of his surplus because he cannot limit his production even if it were a desirable thing for him to do.

Since the farmer must have a surplus, the next best thing for him to try to do is to control the foreign price. This, however, is just as obviously impossible. Foreign countries with their cheap labor and low standards of living can easily produce farm products much more cheaply than they can be produced by the American farmer.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if the farmer cannot control his surplus and if he cannot control the price he is to get for that surplus, then there is but one thing left for him to do. He must sell his surplus in such a way that it will not affect the price he is to get for the rest of the crop. It is clear that the individual farmer cannot do this. However, if the producers of any farm product were completely organized, like the citrus fruit growers of California for example, if all of the farmers raising a given crop could overcome space and competition and could completely organize, then they would be able to meet this problem of the surplus. And that is what the farmer is trying to do today. That is the very thing the McNary-Haugen bill proposes to help the farmer do. And that is why we are advocating the essential features of that bill here tonight. The fundamental principle of the McNary-Haugen bill is to meet the problem of the surplus by preventing the price the farmer gets for his surplus in the foreign market from determining the price of the product he sells at home.

Time prevents me from going into further detail as to the workings of this plan. However, we have discovered thus far, that the problem with which the farmer is faced is a national one and a serious one and demands governmental aid. For that reason we advocate the adoption of the essential features of the McNary-Haugen bill, because it is a national help to a national industry.

B. AN OUTLINE FOR A THIRD NEGATIVE SPEECH

The following outline is for a third negative speech delivered in 1936 on the proposition, "Resolved, that Congress should be empowered to over-ride, by a two-thirds vote, decisions of the Supreme Court declaring acts of Congress unconstitutional." ²

² Speech by Mr. Robert Richman.
I. Introduction: Summary of contentions advanced by preceding colleagues.
A. First colleague.
1. There is insufficient need for such a change as the Affirmative propose.
   a. Supreme Court is democratic, for it enforces the long-range will of the people of the United States.
   b. Supreme Court is vital to our system of checks and balances.
   c. Instead of “legislating,” as is charged, the Court acts merely in the capacity of a judicial review body.
2. Second colleague.
   a. Supreme Court is the rightful body to exercise final judicial review.
      1. Both function and training make the Court qualified.
      2. It does not block social legislation, as charged, but favors all legal social legislation.
   b. If government action is desired that the Court has declared unconstitutional, it can be secured by the legal, democratic method of Constitutional amendment.

II. Since the real issue is Congress versus Court as the interpreter of the Constitution, let us consider this question: Is Congress qualified as final judge of its own acts?
A. Congress is not equipped by training to assume a judicial role.
   1. Members are not Constitutional lawyers.
   2. Party organization a hindrance.
   3. Members often represent local and sectional interests.
   4. It would tend to decide in its own favor.
   James Bryce: “If such a body as Congress were permitted to decide whether the acts it had passed were constitutional, it would of course decide in its own favor; and to allow it to decide would be to put the Constitution at its mercy.”

B. Subject to outside pressure politics.
   1. This would be exerted both in original legislation and on the reconsideration.

C. Congress apt to be carried away by the excitement of the hour.
   1. Impeachment and trial of President Johnson.
      a. Vote almost completely on party lines.
      b. Prof. Andrew McLaughlin: “The trial stands today as the most regrettable and shameful exhibition of passionate spite and ruthless partisanship in American history.”

D. Procedure ill suited for judicial function.
   1. Hurried legislation at close of session.
      a. In February, 1925, Senate passed 134 bills in 5 hours.
   2. W. B. Munro (Atlantic Monthly, 1935): “A government system which complacently tolerates a long chain of abuses including pork-barrel appropriations, patronage appointments, filibustering, gag rule, riders, printing of undelivered speeches, rubber-stamp legislation, and innumerable other abominations of law-making. . . .”

E. Such evils inherent in a large legislative body make affirmative proposal inadvisable and unsound.

III. Not only is Congress, as compared with the Court, unqualified for the judicial task, but there are positive evils and dangers in the scheme advanced by the Affirmative.
A. Personal liberties would be at the mercy of Congress.
   1. No final appeal beyond Congress.
   2. In a number of cases Congress has infringed and the Supreme Court has protected individual rights.
      a. Ex parte Garland.
       Congress passed law to effect that all Southern lawyers before they could practice in Federal courts must take oath to effect that they had not aided the South during the Civil War, despite fact that all offenses against Union had been pardoned.
       Held unconstitutional as bill of attainder.
Under Congressional law, police court in District of Columbia sentenced man to 30 days in jail without trial by jury.
Held unconstitutional as denial of trial by jury.
c. Wong Wing v. United States.
Act of Congress allowed customs commissioner to sentence a foreigner to as much as year's imprisonment if unlawfully in United States.
Unconstitutional because even a Chinese alien entitled to indictment and trial by jury.
d. Boyd v. United States.
Customs act tried to compel man to testify against himself.
Unconstitutional because contrary to Sixth Amendment.
3. Charles Warren ("Congress, the Constitution, and the Supreme Court") : "Moreover, it is a solemn fact that even in times of comparative freedom from emergency or excitement Congress, or one of its branches, has violated the provisions of the Bill of Rights at least ten times since 1867; and at least ten times has the Supreme Court saved the individual against Congressional usurpation of power." (p. 150)
4. Senator Borah: "Taken as a whole, there is no finer record in protecting human rights than recorded in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States." (Reader's Digest, March, 1936)
B. State rights likewise at the mercy of Congress.
1. Congress has infringed in the past and has been checked only by the action of the Supreme Court.
   a. Child labor laws.
   b. N.R.A.
   c. A.A.A.
2. Walter Lippman (syndicated article, January 25, 1936): "Obviously Congress cannot be the judge of its own powers as against the states. For in that event the states would be at the mercy of Congressional majorities."
3. Felix Frankfurter, professor of public law at Harvard, and an Affirmative authority: "If any federalism is to endure, it must provide some check-rein on the constituent units, and the history of the American colonies and states made inevitable that the check-rein should be a court and not Congress. . . . The tribunal is the ultimate organ short of popular action for adjusting the relationships of the individual to the several states, of the forty-eight states one to another, of the states to the Union, and of the three departments of government one to another."
C. There are practical difficulties of operation in the affirmative plan.
   1. What would be the status of a law declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court before it is voted on again by Congress?
D. In effect the Affirmative propose to upset our American system of checks and balances.
   1. With Congress supreme we should have virtual parliamentary government.
   2. Congress could remove from the Supreme Court the power of judicial review entirely.
   3. Congress by a twice-passed law could change the fundamental law and so circumvent the people's right of Constitutional amendment.
4. James Madison: "The jurisdiction claimed for the Federal judiciary is truly the only defensive armor of the Federal Government, or rather for the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Strip it of that armor, and the door is wide open for convulsion, anarchy, and nullification."
IV. Conclusion.
   A. Brief summary of own points just made.
   B. Persuasive summary, brief, of entire negative presentation.
C. A Balanced Summary

A balanced summary, its fullness dependent on the urgency of answering outstanding opposing arguments, (and a summary that contains argument is often more telling than the consideration of separate points) is often used by the last affirmative. The following excerpt is taken from the concluding speech of a Purdue University speaker. He has organized his summary about speeches; he might have done it about issues.

Since the negative have closed their case, we will now consider their case as a whole. The first speaker of the negative has attempted to show that the present agricultural situation does not warrant the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill. First, because there was a similar situation at the close of the Civil War, and this situation was remedied without the enactment of legislation. On studying the analogy we find that the conditions existing at the close of the Civil War are not comparable to those of today. For this reason we see that this analogy does not hold and may not be used as evidence that there is not need; but on the other hand, the affirmative has shown by numerous statistics that there is a need for agricultural relief. The gentlemen of the negative say that the situation has resulted from the enormous increase in production during the War, and therefore more farmers must go out of business. During the War, the government encouraged farmers to produce their maximum, and the farmers in response to the national needs increased their production. Now the gentlemen of the negative wish to reward this patriotic service by ruining the farmers. They have said that the other causes, besides the surplus, have contributed to the present depression, and therefore a solution must remedy all the causes. They are assuming that a law to be effective must remedy all the causes. This assumption is unjustified and unsupported by evidence; for example, crime laws are generally considered effective in reducing crime, but do not affect the fundamental causes of crime. Furthermore, the McNary-Haugen bill in controlling the surplus will increase the price to the farmers as the preceding speakers of the affirmative have shown and thus improve the agriculture situation.

The second speaker of the negative has attempted to show that the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill are inadequate to the present situation. In my previous speech I have shown that this argument is unsound because it is not substantiated by evidence and is contrary to the statistics from the Agricultural Year Book of 1925. On the other hand, the affirmative have shown that the bill is practical and by controlling the surplus will increase the farmers’ price.

The third speaker of the negative has said that the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill are unsound economically because increased prices will cause over-production. The gentleman has assumed that increased prices of agricultural products cause increased production. In the period 1929 to 1925, the price of corn increased in eight different years, yet in five of the cases the following year there was a decrease in production. This means that in the case of corn 62.5 per cent of the times when there has been an increase in price, there was a decrease in production. In the case of wheat, in 44.4 per cent of the times when there was an increase in the price, there was a decrease in production. Other examples of this can be cited. From this we see that the preceding argument is false and not substantiated by reliable evidence.

Let us summarize the affirmative case. We have seen that at the present time agriculture is in a dire situation, and the negative agrees to this. We have shown that orderly marketing and control of the surplus is the only practical means of controlling the farmers’ income. The affirmative has shown that control of production is impossible and undesirable, and since the negative have taken no exception to this we must assume that they must agree with us on this point. We have seen further that present marketing agencies are not effective, and thus there is a need for the McNary-Haugen bill. In the second place the affirmative has shown that the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill will make possible control of surplus and orderly marketing. In the third place the affirmative has shown that the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill are based upon sound business practice. The McNary-Haugen bill enables the farmers to have an effective marketing program. For these reasons we of the affirmative advocate that the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill be enacted in federal legislation.

D. An Affirmative Brief

The brief printed here was prepared by the affirmative for a special debate, on the proposition: "Resolved, that Congress
should be empowered to over-ride, by a two-thirds vote, decisions of the Supreme Court declaring acts of Congress unconstitutional. Its presentation here is possible through the courtesy of The H. W. Wilson Company. The brief, together with a stenographically reported debate, appears in the University Debaters' Annual for 1935-36.

AFFIRMATIVE

Introduction:
A. A sensible approach to the question of judicial supremacy is much needed at the present time.
   1. Discussions of the problem as reported in the newspapers are too often mere partisan mud-slinging contests.
   2. Academic quibbles over the antecedents and precedents for the doctrine of judicial review give no real understanding of the problem.
B. Although this question takes on interest and timeliness because of recent decisions of the Supreme Court invalidating certain "New Deal" laws passed since 1933, the issues involved go far deeper and are much more permanent than the New Deal and party politics in the year of a Presidential election.
C. Numerous proposals have been made by political scientists and by members of Congress to curb the power of the Supreme Court.
   1. Though they differ in method, they have the same goal: to reduce the power of the Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional.
   2. The affirmative proposal is one of these methods suggested for reducing the power of the Court.
D. To clarify the discussion, the following explanations are offered:
   1. The plan provides that when a Federal statute is declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, Congress shall have the right to reconsider the law if it desires, and, if two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives and two-thirds of the Senators vote for it, it remains valid despite the Supreme Court.
   2. This arrangement would be put into effect by legislation or by constitutional amendment, as required by orderly and legal procedure.
   3. The proposed procedure does not do certain things:
      a. It does not apply to state laws—only to laws passed by Congress, a branch of the Federal Government coordinate with the Supreme Court.
      b. It does not abolish judicial review; the Supreme Court will continue to pass on all Congressional enactments that reach it in the ordinary process of appeal from the lower courts.
E. Although there is considerable doubt that the Supreme Court was ever given the power of judicial review of the acts of Congress, the important question is not what the framers of the Constitution intended but whether final judicial review by the Supreme Court is justified by its effects.
F. The issues of the question for debate may be stated as follows:
   1. Are the effects of the Supreme Court's exercise of the judicial veto such as to demand a change in the system?
   2. Can this need best be met by making Congress the final authority as to the interpretation of the Constitution?
   3. Is the imposition of the proposed check on the Court consonant with the true spirit of the Constitution?
G. To establish its case the Affirmative offers the following contentions:
   1. The Supreme Court's exercise of the judicial veto is not justified by its effects.
      a. It constitutes an undemocratic element in American government.
      b. It has resulted in the holding up of social legislation under the Constitution.
c. It will continue to block social progress as long as it is maintained.

d. It has thwarted the will of the people as expressed in amendments to the Constitution.

2. This need can best be met by making Congress the final authority as to the interpretation of the Constitution.
   a. Congress is the logical body to exercise such authority.
   b. The need cannot be met, as is often supposed, by occasional amendments to the Constitution.

3. The Affirmative proposal defends the Constitution and the true spirit of democracy against attack.

I. The Supreme Court's exercise of the final judicial veto is not justified by its effects.
   A. The unchecked power of the Supreme Court to declare the policy of the government to be unconstitutional is an undemocratic element in our political set-up.
      1. It gives the Court the power to do absurd things from which there is no appeal.
         a. In the AAA decision the Court decreed that the government should pay the meat packers $200,000,000 which, while the packers had technically paid the tax, had in reality been collected from the consumer.
      2. Some of our greatest statesmen have objected to this authority of the Court as undemocratic.
         a. Abraham Lincoln said that "If the policy of the government is to be fixed by the Supreme Court, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers."
         b. Theodore Roosevelt believed that "When a judge decides what the people as a whole can or cannot do, the people should have the right to recall that decision."
         c. George W. Norris recently said: "The members of the Supreme Court are not elected by anybody... Yet they hold dominion over everybody."

3. It is a violation of the principle that Congress should exercise the legislative function.
   a. Oliver Wendell Holmes said that under the present system "the judges do and must legislate."
   b. The "interpretation" of the Constitution involves legislation.
      1) It determines the policy of the government.
      2) The general phrases of the Constitution do not admit of positive legal interpretation, being rather matters of personal opinion.
         a) The judges often do not agree among themselves, rendering split decisions.
         b) The Court has several times reversed itself.

B. The power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional has resulted in the holding up of desirable social legislation under the Constitution, because of the personal bias of the justices.
   1. The Supreme Court invalidated the income tax laws because of prejudice.
      a. The Court had previously upheld income taxes by the Federal government in a unanimous decision.
      b. Several members of the Court, as revealed in the majority opinion, thought the income tax would lead to communism.
   2. The child labor laws, passed overwhelmingly by Congress, were nullified by the political opinions of a bare majority of the Court.
      a. The Court had upheld the government when it used the same grants of authority under the Constitution to outlaw white slavery, lottery tickets, and impure drugs.
   3. In the AAA decision the Supreme Court prevented the carrying out of a policy to help the farmers.
DEBATE COACHING

a. The Court "defended" a state right which could never have been exercised.

4. The Supreme Court has prevented the operation of several other laws designed for the general good.
   a. It nullified a law making it a felony to carry in interstate commerce coal oil inflammable at less than 110 degrees.
   b. It prevented the operation of a law to keep a person from obtaining money under false pretenses.
   c. It denied Congress the right to prohibit the sale of liquor to Indians.

C. If there is no check placed upon the autocratic power of the Court, it will continue to hinder our social development under the Constitution.
   1. In the last fifteen years the Supreme Court has invalidated more laws than in the first hundred years of its existence.
   2. The need for united government action under the spirit of the Constitution is becoming greater.
      a. Our problems are becoming more and more social and economic.

D. In the same way in which the Supreme Court in a number of cases has made a tortured interpretation of the Constitution, it has also prevented the people's will from being effectively expressed in the form of amendments to the Constitution.
   1. The Fourteenth Amendment was designed to protect the newly freed Negro, but it has been interpreted as useless to him but as a tower of safety to the vested interests.
   2. The Fifteenth Amendment was intended to guarantee the franchise to the ex-slaves, but in *James v. Bowman* and *United States v. Reese* and other cases, that right was clearly denied.
   3. The Sixteenth Amendment authorized the collection of an income tax upon incomes "from whatever source derived," but the interpretations in *Evans v. Gore* and *Eisner v. Macomber* seem de-

nials of that right, Justice Brandeis declaring that the Court in the latter decision "defied the will of the people in passing the Sixteenth Amendment."

II. The need for a change, established in the preceding contention, can best be met by making Congress the final authority as to the interpretation of the Constitution.
A. Congress represents as well as anything can the will of the people.
   1. The members of Congress are elected by the people.
   2. They are responsible to the people for their actions.
   3. Their proceedings are open to the public.

B. If Congress were given this power, the people would be able to express their will as to the meaning of the Constitution; they would be able to obtain all the social legislation which they feel is constitutional; and the amendments which they make to their Constitution could no longer be misinterpreted by the Court.

C. This need can not be met, as is often supposed, by occasional amendments to the Constitution.
   1. An amendment to correct a specific Court decision could still be ineffective if the Court chose to misinterpret it. (See I, D.)
   2. The purpose of constitutional amendments is not to substitute one interpretation of the Constitution for another interpretation, but actually to change the Constitution itself.
      a. An amendment to define in a particular way "freedom of contract" or "due process of law" would be absurd.
   3. To correct specific Court decisions by actually putting the laws themselves into the Constitution would ruin the Constitution.
      a. Piecemeal amendment to include statute law in constitutions has almost ruined many state constitutions.

III. The Affirmative is defending by its proposal the true spirit of democracy and wishes only to strengthen the Constitution against attack.
A. If the foregoing evils in the present system are not remedied, there is danger of trouble.
1. We cannot allow the Constitution and its amendments to be misinterpreted by the Court, thus keeping the people from enacting the social legislation which they desire.
2. If the system does continue and the Court's power is not checked, there is danger of social revolution or complete abolition of the Court, defiance of the Court, or underhand methods of getting around it.

B. The change which we propose will prevent this discontent by allowing the people's will to be expressed.

E. QUESTIONS FOR CROSS-EXAMINATION

These affirmative questions were prepared at Albion College in 1932 under the direction of the late N. J. Weiss, for years the talented director of forensics there. The proposition for debate was: "Resolved, that a substitute for the capitalist system should be adopted in the United States."

You agree, of course, that our economic order is imperfect? Great numbers of our people are in need of bare necessities? A few people have far more than they can possibly spend? The market is glutted with consumption goods? Is the overproduction apparent or real? The masses haven't the price to buy the goods which they need, have they? Is there enough money in the country? It is badly distributed, isn't it? Somebody has been taking more than his share, hasn't he? How do you account for this?

Is our shutdown helping matters? Is it making it worse? Has a profit-centric owner an incentive to produce if he cannot sell? Who are his customers? Will a cessation of production increase the selling potentialities? To wait for buying power to increase while the buyers are cut off from their incomes is rather futile, isn't it? Society is failing to enjoy the fruits of our productive potentialities, is it not? A profit-centric owner will not produce for charity, will he? How, then, can we gear the industrial machine to the social needs? By transferring ownership to some one interested in social needs? Who is that person or group of persons? Collective society is interested in its own welfare, is it not? Then, collective ownership would be the ultimate step to take?

How are most large industries managed under the present system? (By professional managers) The owners do not also manage? Are the managers put on a salary basis? Is it reasonable to believe that a manager would be as competent working for collective society as for an absentee owner? Industrial efficiency would not be impaired seriously by government ownership, would it? In our present highly organized corporate industry, the owner does not contribute anything to its effectiveness, does he? Ownership does not increase material productivity, then? On the productive side industry would remain unchanged, do you agree?

What is our national income? (75 billions) How much of this is reward for ownership? (35 billions) If society owned the productive capital who would receive this latter portion? How would it be distributed? Higher wages? Lower prices? Lower taxes? Are the excessively high individual incomes due to ownership? Excessive individual incomes would be impossible under collective ownership, wouldn't they? Distribution would then be more equitable? If the production is not affected and the purchasing power is more widely distributed, production and consumption would be kept in comparative equilibrium? This lack of equilibrium is the chief difficulty now, is it not? Then collective ownership will provide a release for the present dead-lock? And prevent future tie-ups?

Will you admit that collective ownership is a substitute for our capitalistic system?

Do you believe in the right of Eminent Domain? Is it fair for the state to appropriate private property for school purposes? Is it fair, then, for the state to appropriate private property to other necessary public uses? If all our productive machinery is deemed necessary for public use, would it be right to appropriate it with just compensation? A revolution would not be necessary, then, to establish collective ownership? Do you think high inheritance taxes are justifiable? In the long run could the government not retire the bonds necessary in assuming ownership?

Do you think the individual should be given free rein in his own enterprise? If not, how far should he be controlled?
Should control be arbitrary? Is government back-seat driving preferable to government driving? The driving at present is unsteady, is it not? There are two ways to keep too much from gravitating to the owners in our society: arbitrary government control which would cramp productivity, and collective ownership which will make for more diverse distribution with no diminution of production. Which do you prefer? Is our material productivity due to capitalism or to technology? When was the steam engine invented? When did the industrial revolution begin? Invention is one of the dominant factors in our material advance? Would invention be retarded under collective ownership? Would the engineer have less incentive to do his best under collective ownership? Is it not true that in the machine age the engineer has replaced the entrepreneur in importance? Does Russia make use of the engineer? Is Russia advancing under an extreme form of collectivism? How many are unemployed in Russia? Doesn’t the world depression affect Russia? How do you account for it? Does she have more credit than we? Does she have greater resources? Does she have higher engineering skill? Are her government leaders better schooled? Or more benevolent? Is it her collectivistic society which is responsible?

We have everything and more than Russia and yet ten millions go hungry. Why? Is it because the capitalistic owner sees no chance for profit? Is it because he is not sensitive to social needs? This fact remains: Starvation in the midst of too much can be laid on our profit-centric economic system, which can be changed only by a substitute of collective ownership for private ownership. You wish to control the stubborn and dangerous man who steers; we wish to buy the car and take the wheel.

APPENDIX V

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING

The following report is taken from a longer article that appeared in School and Society for November 24, 1928, written by Professor H. A. White of the University of Nebraska, who conducted the survey. Questionnaires were sent to every state in the union, and replies were received from twenty-four: Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin. The trend toward the reduction of the number of judges has continued, even to the extent, in a few instances, of doing away with judges entirely in preliminary contests.

(1) “What organization fosters high-school debating in your state?” Extension divisions in thirteen states organize the high schools into various groups or districts, in five cases with the assistance of some state organization of teachers; in five states independent societies or institutions manage the debates; in four states the English or speech departments; in two states no general organization exists. Most have a high-school debate league or association, with headquarters at the state university, and with officers chosen in part from the high schools participating.

(2) “What types of questions have proved most suitable for debates?” Seven mention political topics; four, those “of national interest”; five, economic; three, social; and only two, topics of local or distinctly state interest. Four complain that subjects are often chosen that are too technical or difficult for high-school students.

(3) “Are the propositions for debate chosen by a single person, a committee, or by vote of the participating schools?” Seven report that the committee of officers chooses the propositions for debate; four, a committee of high-school teachers;

1 Reprinted by permission of the author and of the publishers of School and Society.
eight report a referendum by the participating schools; two report action by an individual. In four cases the schools submit the subjects, and the committee chooses from the entire group so collected; in eight instances the committee submits the subjects, and the schools, by majority vote, pick from that list sent them.

(4) "How is the championship of the state determined?" In eighteen states there is some type of elimination contest by districts, counties or conferences, and then the winners proceed to some central point, usually to the state university, for a final championship tournament. One state has a tournament open to all high schools; one arranges for district championships only; one has both district and "conference" contests; one allows any team that wins both sides to appear in the final tournament at some central point.

(5) "What special methods have been used to increase the interest in debating among high-school students themselves?" In eight different states rewards in the nature of prizes, wall plaques or debate certificates are offered; in six, unusual newspaper publicity tends to attract debaters, and one reply mentions that debating attracts interest similar to that in athletic contests; two states send intercollegiate debaters out to talk before high-school audiences; five emphasize radio talks by the secretary of the state league; and four mention enlisting the sympathy and cooperation of school officials. Four recall the difficulties in gaining the financial support of school boards.

(6) "What was the approximate size of the audiences at the championship contests last year?" Of the specific replies to this query, the numbers mentioned are given in order: 200, 4,000 (in Michigan for 1928, increased by 500 over the 1927 audience), 300-500, 300, 1,000, 600, 200, 400, 300, 100, 400. These figures tend to show that debating still draws fair-sized crowds. Inasmuch as most of the championship teams appeared before audiences away from home, it seems that a considerable number of the persons who heard debates were attracted not by friendship for the speakers, but by interest in the debates as contests or in the subjects discussed. Four replies mention that public interest in debate is small, but seven note a gradual increase from year to year.

(7) "Was admission charged for the championship contests?" Negative replies, thirteen; affirmative, five; occasionally, three; not specified, three.

(8) "From what class, group or occupation do you select judges most often?" Professional men in general are mentioned the greatest number of times, eight; more definitely, teachers are named five times; debate coaches, three; college professors, five; lawyers, six; student intercollegiate debaters, three; and clergymen, two. Two replies specify that judges are usually chosen from among those who have had collegiate experience in debating.

(9) "Do you use the single, critic judge in any debates?" Yes, fourteen, including four that use no other type; no, three; will change to single-judge plan, three; use single-judge seldom, one; indefinite replies, four. Despite the apparent trend toward the use of one judge who is known to be well qualified by experience, the greater majority of states still use most often the three-judge plan of decision.

(10) "Comment on any notable successes or failures in the judging systems that you have been using." Five mention that their plans are working well, but seven express general or specific dissatisfaction with some form or all forms of judging; four use only expert judges in state contests; North Dakota has, for two years, used successfully seven judges in the championship debate.

One may not be wholly justified in generalizing from the replies to these questions. They seem to show the trend, however, in several directions. Subjects seem to be chosen from among broad, national topics of the times rather than from local or sectional ones. More than half the states of the Union have definitely organized debating in the high schools, and in nearly every instance there is provision for a state tournament or some similar means of determining the best school debate in a given season. Judging still is a sore point in more than one state, with the tendency in favor of having one or a few expert judges. Finally, so far as public interest goes, most of the states seem to be holding their own. Whether the high-school debaters are making much of an impression on their home communities can hardly be determined. Yet, out of the hundreds of debates on the McNary-Haugen bill or on the Curtis-Reed bill or some other national education measure, undoubtedly there has been no little sublimation of popular opinion.
APPENDIX VI

SURVEYS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATING

A. IN THE MIDDLE WEST 1927

This survey was conducted in the spring of 1927 by the Mid-West Debate Conference, a loose organization of about twenty colleges whose representatives meet annually to choose a question for debate. Questionnaires were sent to one hundred and three colleges and universities in the Middle West; fifty-six institutions responded. The report as given here is abridged from the official report by the Conference secretary, Mildred Freburg Berry of Rockford College, as it appeared in the Quarterly Journal of Speech for February, 1928.

I. THE FINANCING OF DEBATE

The returns from the questionnaire indicate that most of the colleges have established a definite financial plan which guarantees them a specified sum of money each year for intercollegiate debate.

1. Computing the average, we find that each college spent $697.54 to carry on debate during 1926-1927.
2. Forty-two schools or 78 per cent rely on student assessment. Three of these schools receive in addition some aid from the general college budget. Thirty-nine or 72.7 per cent of the colleges rely entirely on student assessment.
3. Thirteen schools receive their entire support for forensics from the general college budget.
4. Eleven schools are aided by revenue from debate. Thirty-five schools note that they cannot look for any revenue from debate. The largest amount of revenue from debate noted is $200.
5. The average assessment on the student for debate is $1.00 plus. The range of assessment is from $17 to $200. Only two schools, however, have an assessment of less than $50 and in these two cases the student enrollment is over 1500.

II. TYPES OF DEBATE

1. The preference of the colleges is for one of two types of debate: the "open-forum-no-decision" or the "expert decision" (one judge) debate. Forty-six schools note that they use the first plan; forty-four schools note the second. It must be remembered that each college had the opportunity to record every form it had used. Unfortunately the writer neglected to request that the number of each type used be recorded. Two-thirds of the colleges noted, however, that they used the no-decision-open-forum type most frequently... Only twenty-two schools made use of an audience decision on the merits of the question before and after the debate. Twenty-five schools have had decision debates followed by an open forum; thirty-four have employed the traditional three judges to decide the issue.

2. That colleges show little inclination to reduce the number of speakers on a team is evident from the reports. Fifty-six or all of the colleges maintain that the "three-man team" is the best. Twenty-two schools note, to be sure, that they have participated in "two-man" debates but these seem to have been only single experiences. The notation, "But once," in answer to this question seems to indicate that it does not have ardent support. Only three colleges reported having engaged in a "split-team" debate.

3. In regard to the most popular number of rebuttal speeches, there can be little doubt. It is true that twenty-one institutions have engaged in one-rebuttal debates but the highest number of this type in any one college was five. Contrast with this the fact that fifty-two schools heard six rebuttal speeches in nine out of every ten debates. Fourteen colleges have varied their debates by having two rebuttals but here again it seems to have been the variation rather than the rule.

4. The "off-campus" debate has taken great strides forward. In forty-three colleges this form of debate is in favor. The number of such debates ranges from two to twenty-four.

III. ADMINISTRATION OF DEBATE

1. Forty-five of the fifty-six institutions responding award academic credit for debate. The average number of credits is two hours a semester. The method of awarding this credit varies with colleges. One college allows three hours per semester, the total number of hours to be accumulated in this manner not to exceed twelve. Another college awards two hours to members

---

1 Reprinted by permission of the author and of the publishers of the Quarterly Journal of Speech.
of the first year squad, three hours to members of the sophomore, junior and senior squads. Credit at another institution is given to the members of the squad who are enrolled in the course, "Debate Seminar."

The question of awarding credit to the entire squad shows a divided opinion. Twenty-five of the forty-five schools who award credit believe that it should be given to the entire squad; the remaining twenty award it to intercollegiate debaters only.

(2) Seventy per cent of the colleges allow first year students to debate.

(3) One of the three plans for selecting debaters is mentioned by all colleges.

a. Fourteen schools favor what might be termed the "invitation squad," i.e., no formal tryouts are held; any student may join the squad. An intensive study of the question is made by all members. The students are not chosen for the specific teams until shortly before the debate, the period varying from one day to two weeks.

b. The second plan in favor will call the "competitive squad." The group is selected by public tryout, with judges either from the department of speech or from other departments of the college. The director of debate then selects his teams from the squad.

c. The third plan, mentioned by nine colleges is the "class" method, of which the following is a representative explanation: "I have all prospects enroll in a class in theory. I pick the best men from this class. The question is studied from one to three months. We divide the class into teams and have actual debates. Those members who are not selected for platform work are utilized in research, publicity, etc."

d. Some colleges believe that the best plan is to have a series of actual debates, employing the same judges for all the contests. Other colleges mention a progressive series of class debates, inter-class debates, and college debates to determine the inter-collegiate debate team.

(4) From the returns of the questionnaire, it is evident that women have invaded the forensic field to stay. Nine colleges out of every ten have women participating in intercollegiate debate. Forty-four institutions have separate women's teams,—eleven institutions a separate director for women's debate.

(5) Medals and election to an honorary society seem to be the favorite way of awarding distinction to debaters. Twenty-five schools give medals; thirty-four schools have honorary forensic societies,—Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, Tau Kappa Alpha. A few colleges give gavels to intercollegiate debaters; others award college pins, money, numerals, or sweaters.

(6) On the average, the colleges use seventeen students in intercollegiate debate each year. The numbers run from seven in the case of J—College to fifty-one at U—College. The squad is a somewhat larger group, averaging twenty-five members. The largest squad recorded was seventy-five.

(7) The figures on attendance are so frequently qualified that it is difficult to find a true average. For instance, V—College writes: "The average is 230. At the college it was about 30. The mean is swelled by the debates before high schools and community groups." Again, J—College answers to this question: "Usually about 125; international debate, 1500; one debate on farm relief before special audience, 1100."

(8) The titles of the departments which direct debate were a source of interest. Debate was under the direction of the "Department of Public Speaking" in nineteen colleges, "Department of Speech" in thirteen colleges, "Department of Oratory" in one college, "Department of Expression" in one college, "Department of Reading and Speech" in one college, "Department of English," in eighteen colleges, "Department of Political Science" in one college, "Department of Chemistry" in one college, "Department of Economics" in one college.

(9) The teaching load of the director of debate varies somewhat from college to college, the extremes being nine and seventeen hours. The average schedule is fourteen hours.

V. GENERAL INFORMATION

(1) Only one college declares that there is so much student interest in debate that it is unnecessary for them to give the matter thought. The majority confess it to be a most baffling problem.

Suggestions as to the remedy for this situation center around four principal ideas: (1) election to honorary society; (2) debates away from home (all debaters like some award; give them a few attractive trips); (3) interesting, non-academic
questions; (4) advertisement through college and local papers, assembly or chapel speeches, farce debates, letters to high school debaters, etc. These suggestions are mentioned by two-thirds of the colleges. Other suggestions which may be of help are: (1) Popularization of the material for presentation by employment of humor, elimination of desk-hammering, aggressive oratory, etc. (2) medals and prizes; (3) a system of intramural debate; (4) "decision" debates (develop a winning team!); (5) "no-decision-open-forum" debates; (6) a Mid-West Debate Tournament.

(2) It was difficult to gain an opinion of the type of question that debate directors preferred because of the use of ambiguous terminology. A number of colleges declare that they like no certain type; they use both philosophical and statistical questions. Other colleges claim that the philosophical question is excellent for upperclassmen and more interesting to the audience, but that it demands a maturity and background of debaters that is difficult to find. Twenty-five colleges hold that the statistical question is the better; seventeen colleges vote for the philosophical question.

(3) In regard to the problem of judging, it is evident that we are swinging from the traditional three-judge system to the single expert critic judge. Twenty-five colleges maintain that it is the best solution to the problem of decisions. The three-judge plan still has support, however; fourteen colleges favor it. Three colleges note that they prefer three expert critic judges—a slightly different proposition. If there must be a decision, say seven colleges, let it be an audience decision on the merits of the question before and after the debate. The remainder of the colleges believe in no-decision debating.

(4) The matter of a cash guarantee to visiting teams is answered in the majority of instances with qualifications. Twenty-six colleges state that they are willing to make a cash guarantee if it is sufficiently small, if the team is so noted that it will aid the cause of debating on the local campus, or if the arrangement is reciprocal in subsequent years. Twenty-four colleges maintain a policy of "no guarantees," stating in support of their policy that they prefer to spend their money on their own debaters and establish permanent dual relationships with nearby institutions.

(5) This chart showing the preference in number and length of speeches is self-explanatory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive</th>
<th>Rebuttal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 colleges favor 10 minute speeches</td>
<td>16 colleges favor 5 minute speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 colleges favor 12 minute speeches</td>
<td>11 colleges favor 5-5-7 minute speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 colleges favor 12-10-10 minute speeches</td>
<td>3 colleges favor 7 minute speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 colleges favor 15 minute speeches</td>
<td>2 colleges favor 6 minute speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 colleges favor 7-7-5 minute speeches</td>
<td>1 college favors 4-4-6 minute speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 colleges favor 3 speeches</td>
<td>28 colleges favor 3 rebuttals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 colleges favor 2 speeches</td>
<td>5 colleges favor 2 rebuttals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most directors agree that a two-man debate is more interesting to the audience but that a team of three is the more valuable educationally because it utilizes a greater number of students.

(6) The writer finds it impossible to organize the comments suggested under reforms. The problem of judging is mentioned by a number of colleges. They ask for "more honesty in judging," "uniform standards of judging," "more pay for judges." Six colleges suggest the adoption of the "Oregon plan of debate." A number of colleges hope for less formality, more real wit, less attention to technicalities, more genuine discussion of the question in the debating of the future. The following passages are quoted directly from the questionnaires:

"Too much responsibility now rests on coaches. Debates are apt to be too much the work of coaches. Students seem to practice too long on one subject. They ought to be tested on ability to investigate, to collect material, and organize debates, and on skill in presenting material to an audience in such a manner as successfully to persuade and convince."

"Abolish the special rebuttal speech. This forces the speaker to introduce rebuttal into his main speech. A few years of debating under this plan does much to develop flexibility. It is used exclusively by the Eastern Intercollegiate Debate League."

"Eliminate championships everywhere. Have speakers present their discussions before real audiences, audiences whose opinions they definitely set out to influence."

"Let us have more variety in types of debates; more willingness to try new sorts and arrangements."
DEBATE COACHING

B. WHITHER THE TRENDS IN DEBATING? 1931

This survey was made by Professor H. A. White of the University of Nebraska during 1929 and 1930. Almost six hundred collegiate institutions listed in the World Almanac were sent copies of the questionnaire. The report is taken, with minor changes, from the Quarterly Journal of Speech for February, 1931.

Altogether 159 colleges and universities are represented in the final results. Of these 53 came from institutions having chapters of Delta Sigma Rho; 41 from chapters of Tau Kappa Alpha; 37 from chapters of Pi Kappa Delta; and the remainder, 38, from those educational centers where no chapter of a forensic fraternity has been located. Though a larger harvest of replies, notably from some of the smaller colleges, might have changed the classifications in some degree, the trend is doubtless well indicated; for the answers came from every type of college and university, large and small, state and private, in all parts of the country.

Comment is offered only when the question proved a bit obscure or when the reply seemed to need further elucidation. Otherwise, it seemed advisable to present in serial order the questions, with a brief tabulation of the results. If the numbers reported after a given question do not add up to a total of 159, it is understood that some of the persons replying failed to answer. All tabulations are mutually exclusive, except when the statement is made that two or more items from the same questionnaires were included in the totals.

1. How many intercollegiate debates did your institution hold last year?
   In the 159 reporting colleges a total of 2847 debates were held, making an average of almost 11.68 for each. Within certain number groupings, the figures follow: 13 held fewer than five; 48 held from five to ten each; 68, from eleven to fifteen; 49, from sixteen to twenty-five; 46, from twenty-six to thirty-five; 12, from thirty-six to forty-five; and 3 others fifty, fifty-seven, and sixty-four respectively. No doubt this record far exceeds in number the debates of older days when most held but two or three dual or triangular intercollegiate contests in a season.

2. What was the average size of the audience?
   An attendance below fifty is mentioned by 42 different colleges and universities; from fifty to one hundred by 73; from one hundred to two hundred fifty by 29; and upwards of two hundred fifty by 17. The highest figures are six hundred for a Harvard debate, but none of those just given account for a few spectacular or unusual performances, like those of international contests. Attendance at debates with certain English teams have reached at least twenty-eight hundred once, and more than two thousand several times. When one complains of the loss of audience in recent years, should he not compare the figures for debates with those for club, luncheon, or other groups as we organize them today?

3. Are audiences decreasing or increasing in size?
   Reports from 65 indicate a fairly stable attendance; from 53, an increase; and from 40, a decrease.

4. Mention any plans used to secure greater audiences.
   More than a score of definite means were cited, some of them a number of times. Publicity in popular news style is mentioned 30 times; advertising posters, 18; other advertising, 6; special announcements in hall, chapel, or fraternity, 6; taking the discussions to clubs, 24, and to high school audiences, 12; newer types of debating, 13; requiring speech students to attend, 10; audience voting, 8; open forum debates, 7; use of current or local questions, 6. All others that were noted five or fewer times: special invitations, having music or a short play before the debate, free or reduced admissions, shortened time of the debate itself, having fewer contests, and closing the night against other engagements. No special attempts are made to increase the audience in 35 institutions; of this number, 17 report attendance as stationary, 9 as decreasing, and 7 as gaining.

5. What rewards are given the debaters besides semester-hour credit?
   Medals are mentioned 18 times; keys in 16; money prizes in 15; pins of some variety in 10; college letters in 10; cups in 8; and scholarships in 2. No special recognition is provided in 31 colleges and universities. Forensic society membership is the sole award in 25 colleges, six of which pay for the debater’s emblems or keys; trips alone are mentioned 5 times;
a special honor at commencement 1; and fobs 1. Several give a pin to underclassmen and a letter, election to a forensic fraternity, or some added recognition to seniors.

6. How many hours of credit yearly may a student earn for debating?

Nearly all replies were in terms of the semester-hour, but no academic credit at all is granted in 47 instances. One hour is possible in 10 places; two hours in 48; three in 26; four in 8; six in 5; and nine in 1. Part of the replies mention also the total hours that may be earned during the entire course. These are—two hours in 2 cases; three hours in 3; four in 3; five in 2; six in 5; nine in 2; and ten in 2.

7. To what degree do you have intramural debating?

Except for the questionnaires that return indefinite or no replies, 49 report no intramural forensics at all; 24 mention debating with no further information; 18 mention interclass contests; 34 have society or fraternity debating; 7, freshman; and 2, sophomore. While at least a score have rather generous programs of literary society and intramural debate and oratory, a pronounced tendency is evident in favor of the forum, interclass, or intramural contest as a substitute for the once famous society or fraternity debating. Only three or four mention directly that debates still interest the regular social fraternities. One correspondent remarks that the only intramural forensics in his university are found in the familiar “bull session.” Yet some large universities, as well as many small colleges, still maintain a healthy tradition of intramural tournaments. The most elaborate of these are reported from Washington State College, with 34 teams engaged in annual clashes; from Ohio State University, with 40; and from Purdue University, with 46.

8. Do you still have active local literary or debating societies?

Affirmative replies, 83; negative, 72. Of the affirmative total, however, 8 local groups are described as somewhat inactive, but twice that number are said to be flourishing; 3 others are recently dead; and 1 is “worse than dead.” Three teachers of debating complain that newer campus organizations have crowded out the old forensic societies; 5 speak of newly-promoted forensic clubs. No doubt some of the old debating societies have been enlarged into all-student forums. What surprises me most is that the literary or debate society holds on so tenaciously in many colleges and large universities. Several replies show that, while the literary groups have ceased to carry on, the debating club in the same environment has contrived to stem the tide of apathy.

9. To what debate leagues or organizations do you belong?

Of the 159 reporting, 131 institutions are members of some national honorary forensic society; fully half the remaining 28 belong to some state or district conference; and about half of the total belong to a national society and also to some local league.

10. Do you hold debates before off-campus clubs or societies?

Affirmative replies, 105; negative, 36; yes, but rarely, 7; will try this plan, 9. Success is mentioned in 80 cases, failure in only 2.

11. Do you encourage audiences to take part in these?

Affirmative, 84; negative, 25; will try, 2.

12. Add any further comment on open-forum or audience features. About 50 offered interesting comments, which might be divided roughly into three classes in nearly equal numbers. Some find the audiences able and willing to participate, and a lesser number confine the forum feature solely to asking questions of the debaters; some have found the people unresponsive, or the time monopolized by a few voluble talkers, or the occasion one in which members of the audience air their political and social views, without regard to relevancy to the topic being debated; and a third class, choosing a chairman well, directing the forum carefully, and shutting off the tedious ones, report the audience features a help to the debaters.

11. To what extent have you allowed audiences to vote on the merits of the question for debate?

Never, 65; frequently, 29; sometimes, 24; a few times only, 24; once, 7; gave up this plan, 2.

12. To what extent have you allowed audiences to vote on the comparative merits of the teams engaged in the debates?

Never, 52; frequently, 31; sometimes, 27; a few times only, 27; once, 9.

13. Does your institution favor audience decisions? Do you?
Affirmative, in both instances, 52; negative, 68; neutral, 12.
Institution opposed, coach favorable, 16; institution favorable,
coach opposed, 7; institution opposed, coach neutral, 1.
14. What proportion of your debates are judged by three
judges?
Replies, mutually exclusive, are: none, 42; fewer than half,
28; a few only, 26; half or more, 13; most, 23; all, 14.
15. What proportion is judged by more than three judges?
None, 122; some, 11; all, 1.
By the single “expert” judge?
None, 36; one, 9; a few, 6; some, 55; half, 9; most, 17;
all, 13. Gave up this plan, 2. Will try another year: yes, 12,
possibly, 3; no, 29.
16. How many debates have you held without decisions of
any kind?
None, 37; one, 10; a few, 19; some, 28; half, 8; most, 6;
all, 5.
17. Underline the name of the form you personally think
is most likely to be fairest on the average or in a series of
debates—three judges, single judge, audience decision, no
decision.
Single judge, 56; three judges, 39; no decision, 23; audience
decision, 11. Two inquired how no decision could be “fairest.”
It certainly could not be, if we insist on some decision; but
might not the absence of a decision be the most satisfactory,
all things considered, or fairest to the debaters, in the long
run?
18. How can we get audiences more interested in the subjects
of discussion rather than in the outcome, decision, or
“who won the debate?”
Though 76 correspondents, in various statements and intimations,
mentioned that subjects for debate should be chosen that will interest the common run of persons, the answers ranged all the way from the laconic “Make better debates” to the more laconic “God knows.” Only 17 offered no comment at all. Other answers were as follows: better debating, no decision, having audience forum, and “don’t know” with 13 each; discourage boasting about victories, 8; publicity, 7; hold international debates, 4; there is no way, 4; get the debaters more interested, 7; use newer methods, 3, less technique, 2, and “we don’t worry about it,” 2.

19. Name types of questions that appeal to audiences.
All the types named have been included in the tabulations.
Many correspondents mentioned two or more separate ones,
and so there are more mentions than the total number of questionnaires.
Political, 32; social, 24; local, 23; human interest, 23; eco-

nomie, 19; timely, 19; religious, national, sensational, and audi-

cence appeal, 5 each; vital, moral, and non-technical, 4 each;
semi-humorous, crime, philosophical, 3 each. No answer at all,
33 questionnaires.
20. Will judges follow rules that are given them?
Yes, 35; no, 33; some will or all will sometimes, 46. No
rules at all are given judges by 31 colleges.
21. How elaborate rules do you advocate for judging?
Simple or very simple, 73; none, 57; ballot only, 10.

C. THE STATUS QUO IN DEBATE 1934
This most recent national survey, by Professor Joseph F.
O’Brien of Pennsylvania State College, was based on a ques-
tionnaire prepared by the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate
of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. The find-
ings throw light, not merely on practices, but also on opinions
concerning the practices. The report printed here is an abridg-
ment of that presented in the Quarterly Journal of Speech for
June, 1934.

The present survey of national conditions in intercollegiate
debate was conducted with a three-fold aim: first, the deter-
mination of present practices with regard to conditions of con-
tests, styles of debate, and decisions; secondly, the uncovering
of new trends; thirdly, the gathering of significant opinion as
of the value of the different objectives and practices. A ques-
tionnaire covering these items was prepared and mailed in
January, 1933, to 250 colleges and universities in all parts of
the United States. Replies were received from 109 institutions
distributed over thirty-six states and the District of Columbia.
Two colleges reported “no debate.” The 107 institutions spon-
soring the activity were classified, for tabulation, on the basis
of geographical location, the number falling in each section

*Reprinted by permission of the author and of the publishers of
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being as follows: East, 25; Southeast and South-Central, 12; Mid-West, 36; Northwest, 17; Southwest, 11; Pacific, 6. . . . No replies were received from Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, or Vermont. . . .

**Statistical Data on Present Practices**

**Conditions of Contests.** In summarizing the results regarding contest conditions, we find that annually in these 107 institutions, 2,512 men and women take part in intramural debate and 2,028 in intercollegiate debate, and that 2,996 contests are held before a total audience of 233,397, not including radio listeners. Hence, while the right of debate to exist may be questioned, or the precise form it at present takes, the fact that debate audiences in these 107 colleges and universities annually total almost a quarter of a million seems to leave little ground for doubting the ability of the activity to maintain itself.

An interesting speculation may be made as to the probable effect on public opinion were the utterances of all debaters controlled by some central authority.

Though one institution reported 200 taking part in intramural debate as compared with 22 in intercollegiate debate, and another 160 as compared with 30, on the average only three more men and two more women participated in such contests than debated other institutions. Such a condition may either indicate a question as to the value of intramural debate or simply point to the failure of teachers to make use of an opportunity.

The extremes reported for participation in intercollegiate debate by men (56-6) and the number of contests held (115-3), further provoke thought as to the objectives and methods followed in extracurricular speech. . . .

The question as to whether or not audiences prefer analysis to entertainment in extension debates, submitted in an effort to determine how seriously off-campus audiences regard discussions by undergraduates, resulted in a two to one vote for analysis.

Though 7 per cent of all debates were reported as held over the radio, only 26 institutions out of 64 reporting such contests indicated receiving written replies. This condition seems to show a rather lackadaisical attitude toward whether or not radio debates are delivered to an audience. It is also interesting to note that the author was unable to secure any information as to the probable number of listeners per written response to a broadcast debate.

**Styles of Debate.** The holding of an open forum is a popular practice, almost one-third of all debates being held under this system, and the vote in its favor being nearly five to one. Split-team debating, on the other hand, seems to be held in but slight favor, only 2 per cent of all debates being held under this scheme, and the vote falling heavily against it. . . .

As to the three major speech set-ups, though in percentage of use the Orthodox, with 82, leads by wide margins, both the Oregon, with 12, and the single long speech variant, with 6, it is significant that in the vote as to preference this margin was less marked, especially with regard to the Oregon. A number of institutions reported inability to use the Oregon plan because of scheduling difficulties. Many institutions have never tried any method except the Orthodox.

Three per cent of the debates of the Northwest were reported as held under other systems, 2 per cent under the Congressional and 1 per cent under the Direct Clash.

**Decisions.** Perhaps the most interesting fact revealed regarding decisions is that the judge decision (critic or three) and no-decision practically divide the field evenly between them in percentage of use, with no-decision having a three point advantage. The popularity of no-decision debates is not, however, in all cases a matter of choice, as is indicated by the popularity vote, wherein the judge decisions gained heavily at its expense. A number of schools reported that they preferred judge decisions but were unable to afford them.

The critic judge, though used slightly less than three judges, outranks the latter decision by a wide margin in actual popularity, according to the vote.

A sharp difference as to preference for the critic judge or three judges is apparent between the East and Mid-West, the respective percentages assigned each being 9-40 in the former and 30-6 in the latter.

As to the basic criterion for decision [or no-decision] preference, "selects superior team most accurately" ranked first
colleges and universities are scarcely justified in requiring such a sacrifice of time which might well be devoted to advanced study or research.

**Recommendations**

In the light of the preceding data and comment, if any fact stands out it is that of **diversity** of objective and method. And while such diversity may at times be the result of differing local requirements, the author is inclined to believe that it more often represents mere aimlessness. Many of us go about our extra-curricular speech work simply as a result of habit, and with little questioning as to objectives, forms, and methods. From this point of view, a valuable recommendation seems to be that those interested in extra-curricular speech in the college and university should give at least a certain amount of their attention to two major problems:

1. Determination of the place of intramural speech in the college and university, with an evaluation of objectives and forms.
2. Determination of the place of intercollegiate speech in the college and university, with an evaluation of objectives and forms.

---

**APPENDIX VII**

**A PRINTED DEBATE PROGRAM**

**LEAGUE DEBATE**

Between

**DIXON HIGH SCHOOL and AMBOY HIGH SCHOOL**

---

**Held at Dixon**

Friday, March 6, 1936

---

**QUESTION**

Resolved: That the United States should cease to protect, by armed force, capital invested in foreign lands except after formal declaration of war.

*Amboy—Affirmative*  *Dixon—Negative*

Hazel Roth  Charles Lomax
Wallace Jones  Ralph Kehl
John Holmes  Richard Weaver

*Chairman:* Dr. James H. Whitcomb

Tomorrow night Dixon's affirmative team, consisting of Thomas Eggleston, Ruth Hardesty, and Ray Hawkins, will meet Amboy's negative team at Amboy.

---

**COMING DEGATES:**

March 13: Ashton vs. Dixon
March 20: Princeton vs. Dixon
APPENDIX VIII

A SPECIMEN FORENSIC BOARD CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE ONE

SECTION 1. The Forensic Board shall be composed of:
   a. The men's debate manager
   b. The women's debate manager
   c. One representative from each of the debating societies.
   d. The debate coaches

SECTION 2. The debate managers shall be appointed by the president of the Student Association, following conference with the debate coaches, at the opening of each school year and shall serve throughout the year.

SECTION 3. Either debate manager may be designated by the president of the Student Association to represent debating activities on the Student Council.

ARTICLE TWO

SECTION 1. The duties of the Forensic Board shall be:
   a. To supervise intra-mural debating.
   b. To advise the debate managers in regard to intercollegiate debating.
   c. To approve awards for intercollegiate debaters.

SECTION 2. Each member shall have equal voting rights at all meetings of the board.

ARTICLE THREE

SECTION 1. The debate managers shall cooperate with the respective coaches in scheduling debates, handling local arrangements, and securing publicity.

SECTION 2. One manager designated by the president of the Student Association shall:
   a. Act as the agent of the Council in handling debate finan-
   ces, presenting budgets for the approval of the Council and submitting reports following individual debates.
   b. Be a regular voting member of the Council.
   c. Preside at the meetings of the Forensic Board.

SECTION 3. In the absence of the one, the other debate manager shall act, both in presiding at the meetings of the Forensic Board and in representing debate activities on the Council.

ARTICLE FOUR

All meetings of the Forensic Board shall be called by the debate manager at his discretion or on request of any two members of the board.

ARTICLE FIVE

Proposed amendments to this constitution shall be read at a meeting of the board at least one week before final action is taken, and shall require a two-thirds vote for adoption.
HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING SOCIETY

ARTICLE VI: Amendments

This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at any regular meeting, provided notice of amendment is given at the preceding meeting.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I: Selection of Members

Section 1. New members shall be chosen in the following manner:
a. Old members may present names, or would-be members may file application on their own initiative with the chairman of the membership committee.
b. The membership committee shall investigate the records and relative merits of all prospective members and report findings to the society, following oral try-outs, at which the membership committee, together with the President and Advisor, shall act as judges.
c. The society shall vote by ballot upon each applicant separately.
d. A two-thirds majority of those present shall be required to elect new members to this organization.
e. If rejected, an applicant may be reconsidered in the elections of another semester.

Section 2. Election of new members shall occur not later than the third regular meeting of each semester.

Section 3. To insure a workable, homogeneous organization, membership shall be limited to forty members.

Section 4. Honorary members may be nominated and elected at any time. Election shall require a two-thirds vote.

ARTICLE II: Tenure and Duties of Officers

Section 1. Officers shall hold office for four months and shall be eligible to re-election.

Section 2. The President shall preside at all meetings, appoint committees, call special meetings at his own discretion or upon request of three or more members, act as chairman of the cabinet, and discharge such other duties as commonly fall to his office.

Section 3. The Vice President shall act in the President's absence and shall serve as chairman of the program committee.
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SECTION 4. The Secretary shall keep the minutes of all society and cabinet meetings, call roll, read notices, and discharge such other duties as usually fall to that office.*

SECTION 5. The Journalist shall act as historian, conduct correspondence, and act as chairman of the publicity committee.

SECTION 6. The Treasurer shall collect all dues and assessments, pay all bills as authorized by the society or cabinet, and act as chairman of the finance committee.

SECTION 7. The Advisor shall offer suggestions for the good of the organization and shall act as critic of speaking programs presented. (There may also be additional critics.)

ARTICLE III: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. Officers shall be elected by ballot at the meeting preceding the last regular meeting in December, and in April.

SECTION 2. At the meeting preceding that at which the election occurs the President shall appoint a nominating committee of three members; who, at the election meeting, shall present the names of one or more candidates for each office. Nominations may also be made from the floor.

SECTION 3. A majority vote of those present shall be required to elect.

ARTICLE IV: STANDING COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. There shall be a membership committee consisting of three members whose duty, in addition to those stated elsewhere in these by-laws, shall be to interest worthy students in joining this organization.

SECTION 2. There shall be a social committee of three members, to devise and execute plans for social periods at regular meetings when desirable and for special social meetings.

SECTION 3. There shall be a program committee of three members, whose duty it shall be to plan the regular programs and to assign tasks therein to all members of the society.

SECTION 4. There shall be a finance committee, the size of its membership to be determined by the President, its task to consist of formulating plans for the raising of money for the activities of the organization.

*The Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Journalist should be supplied, respectively, with permanent record books for minutes, financial record, and history (including clippings). The secretary should also have the constitution for new members to sign.
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SECTION 5. There shall be a publicity committee of from one to three members, whose duty it shall be to secure publicity for the activities of the organization, both among its members and outside, and to assist in advertising school debates and other speaking contests.

SECTION 6. The President, ex officio, shall be a member of all standing committees.

ARTICLE V: CABINET

SECTION 1. There shall be a cabinet consisting of all officers, including the Advisor, and all chairmen of standing committees.

SECTION 2. The cabinet shall be empowered to settle all business arising between meetings and to act as judge of excuses for absence.

ARTICLE VI: DUES AND ASSESSMENTS

SECTION 1. Each new member shall be required to pay an initiation fee of twenty-five cents.

SECTION 2. Each member shall be required to pay twenty-five cents each half-year as regular dues.

SECTION 3. Special assessments shall be levied only if absolutely necessary, and, when authorized by majority vote, shall be binding on all members.

ARTICLE VII: ABSENCES

SECTION 1. Two unexcused absences from regular meetings in one half-year shall automatically drop a student from membership in this organization.

SECTION 2. Excuses shall be presented in writing to any member of the membership committee, who shall present them at the first cabinet meeting for final decision.

SECTION 3. A student may be reinstated in membership upon written petition by himself, followed by a two-thirds vote at a regular meeting.

ARTICLE VIII: QUORUM

One half the membership of this organization shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE IX: PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

When the constitution and by-laws do not provide otherwise, this society shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.
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CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF A HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE LEAGUE

SAGINAW VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

ARTICLE I NAME
This association shall be known as the Saginaw Valley High School Association.

ARTICLE II PURPOSE
The purpose of this association is to foster and regulate interscholastic relationships.

ARTICLE III MEMBERS
The member schools shall be:
Bay City Central
Flint Central
Flint Northern
Owosso
Saginaw Arthur Hill
Saginaw Eastern
and such other schools as may be admitted by unanimous vote of the association. All voting powers shall be vested in the principals.

ARTICLE IV OFFICERS, TERM AND DUTIES
A. The executive officer of this association shall be a president.
B. He shall hold office for one year beginning September first.

SECURED THROUGH THE COURTESY OF MESSRS. JAMES McMONAGLE AND CARNEY SMITH.

HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE LEAGUE

C. The presidency shall rotate among the principals of the member schools according to the order in which they are listed in Article III.
D. The president shall preside at all meetings and shall be responsible for the proper recording and distribution of the minutes of all meetings.

ARTICLE V MEETINGS
A. Meetings shall be held at the call of the president or upon request of a majority of the voting members. The time and the place of meeting shall be designated by the president.
B. A majority vote of the principals of the member schools shall be necessary to transact business.

ARTICLE VI AMENDMENTS
A. This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the principals of the member schools.

ARTICLE VII BY-LAWS
This association shall adopt by-laws incorporating policies, standards, and regulations which shall further govern various types of interscholastic relationships.

BY-LAWS
Concerning Athletic Relations
(Omitted because not relevant here.)

BY-LAWS
Concerning Forensic Relations

ARTICLE I FORM OF COMPETITION
This Association shall foster interscholastic contests in Debate, Declamation, Oratory, Extempore Speaking, and any other form of forensic competition which the Association may later include.

ARTICLE II DUES
Section 1. Annual dues of a minimum of two dollars ($2.00) shall be paid by each competing school to the president for
each type of activity entered. This money shall be paid at the first meeting of each year and will be in addition to any dues charged by state associations under which this organization may operate.

Section 2. This money shall be used for postage, preparation and sending of bulletins by the secretary, and suitable awards as hereinafter provided.

Article III Schedules

Section 1. Debate.
A. Debates shall be scheduled at the first meeting of the year of the association.
B. Each school shall meet each of the other schools twice during each debating season on opposite sides of the question.
C. The time, place, judges, and other details shall be arranged between individual schools.

Section 2. Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking.
A. Separate annual contests in Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking shall be held during the spring semester.
B. These annual contests shall be under the management of the member schools in alphabetical order as listed in article III of the constitution.

Section 3. General.
All Valley schedules shall be arranged subject to the approval of the principals.

Article IV Eligibility

Section 1. The eligibility of contestants in this association shall be governed by the regulations of the Michigan High School Forensic Association.

Section 2. Further restrictions on the eligibility of contestants may be made upon the agreement of three-fourths of the Association, or by agreement between the competing schools.

Article V Conduct of Contests

Section 1. Debate.
A. In debate the length of speeches shall be eight (8) minutes for constructive and four (4) minutes for rebuttal.

Three speakers shall constitute a team and each speaker shall be permitted twelve (12) minutes of speaking time during each debate.

B. Any changes in the conduct of a debate may be made upon the agreement of the coaches of the competing schools.

Section 2. Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking.
A. Contests in Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking shall be governed by the rules of the Michigan High School Forensic Association.
B. Departure from the rules of the above named association may be made by a three-fourths vote of the members of this Association.

Article VI Judges

Section 1. Debate.
A. Judges shall be chosen from neutral cities, and shall be subject to the approval of the coaches of the contesting teams.
B. Judging shall be done by a single judge, secured by the entertaining school from an approved list agreed upon by the coaches of the competing schools.
C. Upon mutual agreement of the two schools a board of three or more judges may be used.
D. Judges shall be instructed that decision must be made upon the relative merits of the competing teams, and under no circumstances shall a consolation or a tie vote be rendered.

Section 2. Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking.
A. A board of three judges shall be secured by the managing school from lists submitted and approved by the coaches of the member schools for contests in Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking.
B. By unanimous vote of the schools, decisions in these contests may be made by other means than a board of three judges.

Article VII Expenses

Section 1. Debate.
A. The entertaining school shall pay those expenses arising out of the actual debate, such as judges' fees, advertising, luncheons, etc.
B. The Association recommends that the fees paid judges shall not exceed the following:
   Single judges: $10 plus 10c per mile one way;
   Board of three or more judges: $5 plus 10c per mile one way for drivers.
C. The visiting school shall pay its own traveling expenses and any other expenses incident to the trip.

Section 2. Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking.
A. In the case of Extempore Speaking, Declamation, and Oratorical contests each school shall pay its own traveling expenses and other expenses incident to the trip.
B. The expenses of the conduct of the contest, judges fees, telephone calls, postage, etc., shall be paid by equal assessments to the contesting schools.
C. The Association recommends that the fees paid judges shall not exceed the following:
   Board of three or more judges: $5 plus 10c per mile one way for drivers;
   Single judge: $15 plus 10c per mile one way;
   Coach judges: no expense.

Article VIII Determination of Championships

Section 1. Debate.
A. The percentage system based on winning and losing a number of debates, shall be the basis for determining the championship.
B. The school having the highest percentage of victories shall be adjudged champion and shall be awarded the annual trophy at the first meeting of the Association following the close of the season.
C. In case of a tie between two or more schools in percentages an elimination series shall be run off, until one school is left. Where there is an uneven number one school shall draw a bye for the first round.

Section 2. Other contests.
A. In Declamation, Oratory, and Extempore Speaking the championship shall be awarded to the school whose contestant is ranked first by the judges in the annual contest.

B. The school receiving first ranking shall be awarded the annual trophy at the first meeting of the Association following the annual contest in each activity.

Article IX Transaction of Business
Motions may be made, seconded, and discussed by any representative of any member school, but in accordance with Article III of the Constitution only principals are permitted to vote.

Article X Amendments
These by-laws may be revised or amended at any meeting of the Association by a two-thirds vote of the principals of the member schools.
APPENDIX XI

SPECIMEN CONSTITUTIONS OF STATE HIGH SCHOOL FORENSIC LEAGUES

The constitutions of the Iowa and Indiana leagues are given in full, the first because it shows in detail the arrangements that are found with slight modification in many states, that of Indiana because it provides for individual discussion rather than team debating. Excerpts from the Michigan league illustrate differences from the Iowa plan—in centralization of management, district organization, single as compared with triangular debates, size of teams, limitation of speakers to one side, scoring of individual debaters, etc.

A. CONSTITUTION OF THE IOWA HIGH SCHOOL FORENSIC LEAGUE
(As revised, 1935)

ARTICLE I—OBJECT

The object of this League is to promote training in debate, extemporaneous speaking, original oratory, and other forms of public speaking in the high schools of Iowa by friendly rivalry.

ARTICLE II—MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Any approved high school or academy of good standing in Iowa may become a member of this League by paying the annual dues.

SECTION 2. All schools seeking admission for any particular year must join not later than December 1 of that year.

ARTICLE III—DEBATING DISTRICTS

There shall be four debating districts as follows: Northwestern, Southwestern, Northeastern, Southeastern.

1 The names of the various counties comprising the respective districts have been omitted here.

ARTICLE IV—CONTESTS

Contests in debating, extempore speaking, original oratory, and other forms of public speaking decided upon by the schools will be conducted as hereinafter provided for under "Regulations."

ARTICLE V—DISTRICT DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. The superintendent of the winning school in each district in his class in debate, or some member of the faculty whom he shall appoint, shall be the district director for the ensuing year, in charge of all the speaking activities of the League in his district.

SECTION 2. When for any reason the district has no director, the Executive Committee shall appoint such officer.

SECTION 3. It shall be the duty of the district director to fix the dates for the debates, give prompt notice of the same to the high schools of his district, supervise the pairing of schools, furnish all necessary information regarding the working of the League, report interesting matter to the papers, and in other ways stimulate and sustain interest in the public speaking contests in the schools of his district.

ARTICLE VI—EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of five members. One shall be the Head of the Department of Speech of the University of Iowa, one the Superintendent of Public Schools in Iowa City, one the Director of the Extension Division of the University, one a member of the Department of Speech appointed by the Head of the Speech Department and by the Director of the Extension Division, which appointee shall be chairman of the committee, and a fifth member to be elected by the remaining members of the Committee.

SECTION 1. The duties of the Executive Committee shall be:

a. To appoint a local business manager to take general charge of the final contests.

b. To have charge of the annual dues and be responsible for the same.

c. To select the question for debate.

d. To have full charge of the final contests.
DEBATE COACHING

Section 2. The Executive Committee may punish dishonorable conduct by expulsion from the League or by any such penalty as it may deem fit.

Article VII—Annual Meeting

Section 1. The annual meeting shall be held at the time of the final contests.

Section 2. The members of the Executive Committee, the district directors, and one representative from each high school constituting the membership of the League shall be allowed membership in the annual meeting.

Section 3. The privilege of a vote in the annual meeting shall not be abridged except in case such privilege shall give more than one vote to any high school represented in said meeting.

Section 4. The members of the League present at any annual meeting shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5. No proxies shall be allowed.

Section 6. At the call of the Executive Committee, special meetings of the League may be held.

Article VIII—Eligibility

The representatives in any of the speaking contests of the League shall be bona fide high school students doing passing work in three of their subjects of the regular curriculum, undergraduates of their school at the time of the contest, and under twenty-one years of age.

Article IX—Expenses

Section 1. The annual dues shall be two dollars, paid to the chairman by December 1.

Section 2. In the district contests each team shall defray its own expenses of travel and all home expenses.

Article X—Disputes

All disputes among members of the League, except in regard to the selection of judges, shall be settled by the Executive Committee, from whose decision appeals may be taken to the Senate Board on Intercollegiate Debate and Oratory of the
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State University of Iowa. If two teams have a dispute concerning the selection of judges, each team shall appoint one person, these two shall appoint a third and these three shall settle the dispute. If either team shall refuse to accept the decision of the above committee, it shall lose by default.

Article XI—Participation

In the final state contests at Iowa City no one student shall participate in more than two final speech events.

Article XII—Amendments

The constitution and by-laws may be amended at any annual meeting by a majority vote.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING DEBATE

Article I—Contests

Section 1. For the contests in debating the members of the League shall be divided into two classes: A class will constitute schools of more than three hundred enrollment; and B class, those of less than three hundred enrollment.

Section 2. Each district shall determine its own method of selecting the district winners in its class, the winners to be determined by not later than the last Friday in February. In no case shall any methods of elimination supersede the Constitution and by-laws of the League. This method of selecting the winners may be by means of a tournament, round-robin home and home debates, or by having home and home triangle debates.

For 1935-1936 the A class schools shall follow the procedure of selecting the highest 25 per cent of the schools in each district. The schools in B class will follow the procedure of selecting the highest 25 per cent of the affirmative teams and the highest 25 per cent of the negative teams, regardless of schools.

Section 3. If home and home triangle debates are held, the size of the schools and their location shall be the basis of grouping. If a school drops out and the district director is unable to secure a substitute school, the two schools remaining shall debate each other, each sending a team to the other school.
SECTION 4. In the first of the home and home debates, the home team will uphold the affirmative and thereafter alternate. SECTION 5. Any school winning its contests in its district will be entitled to send its teams to the State University of Iowa for the final contests. SECTION 6. In the case of home and home debates held, the contests shall be held on the same day. SECTION 7. When the dates for contests shall have been set, they will not be changed except by the consent of the teams immediately concerned and this consent shall be secured by the school requesting the change. SECTION 8. Any high school team failing to appear in debate at the appointed date, having been unable to secure a change of date provided in Section 7 of this article, shall forfeit the debate. SECTION 9. If any district champion fails to take part in the contests another school may be designated by the chairman of the Executive Committee to continue the contests. SECTION 10. Any failure to comply with the conditions set forth in this Article shall work a forfeiture of the debate upon the part of the team or teams failing to comply. SECTION 11. The final debates shall be held not later than the second week in April at the State University, and under the direction of the Executive Committee, except as hereinafter provided for.

**ARTICLE II—GOVERNMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL DEBATE**

SECTION 1. The debaters shall be separated from the audience and shall receive no help during the progress of the debate. SECTION 2. Each school shall be represented by two teams, affirmative and negative, throughout the series of debates, each team to have two speakers. The personnel of any team may be changed by the school. Under no circumstances may a student debate on both teams in the same series of debates. SECTION 3. The time and order of the speakers shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Rebuttal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative, 10 minutes</td>
<td>Negative, 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative, 10 minutes</td>
<td>Affirmative, 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative, 10 minutes</td>
<td>Negative, 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative, 10 minutes</td>
<td>Affirmative, 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 4. Time lost in unavoidable interruption shall be made good to the speaker interrupted. SECTION 5. Cheering a debater while he is speaking is forbidden. Time so consumed by the speaker’s friends shall not be made up to him. Time so consumed by his opponents shall be made up to him. SECTION 6. New matter, except it is strictly rebuttal, shall not be introduced in the last rebuttal speech of the affirmative. SECTION 7. Speakers shall not be interrupted by their opponents except when the negative is attempting to protect its rights in accordance with the preceding section (Section 6, Article II). SECTION 8. Debaters shall be entitled to warning signals as they may direct. SECTION 9. Debaters shall cease speaking when the signal is given. SECTION 10. The doors shall be kept closed while each debater is speaking. SECTION 11. Personal letters shall not be admissible. SECTION 12. When convenient both teams shall be seated on the platform. SECTION 13. Each school shall appoint a time keeper, and time keepers and presiding officer shall be instructed to interpret the time rule of the constitution strictly. SECTION 14. A chart shall be prohibited in a rebuttal speech, unless it shall have been explained in a constructive speech. SECTION 15. It shall be considered dishonorable for one school to send representatives to hear the debates of another school which it is likely to meet later in the series. It shall also be considered dishonorable for any team to seek or to give information concerning the argument used by the team which has not yet finished its debate season. It shall be considered that the making public by one school of charges of unfairness by another school in the League before such charges have been submitted to and acted upon by the Executive Committee shall constitute dishonorable conduct. Any school violating this Article shall forfeit its right to debate in the series in question.

**ARTICLE III—JUDGES**

SECTION 1. Representatives of the teams shall mutually agree upon judges except for the final contests, which judges shall
be selected by the Executive Committee, and all judges shall be selected for their capability, impartiality, and availability.

Section 2. Each contest shall be decided by three judges unless both teams debating agree upon a single critic judge. The judge or judges may or may not be remunerated.

Section 3. Before the contests, judges should be entertained at the hotel.

Section 4. It shall be considered dishonorable for any person to attempt in any manner to influence the judges.

Section 5. Unless the teams mutually agree as to distance, all judges for the district debates shall be selected from a distance not to exceed fifty miles by least railway mileage from the location of the debate.

Section 6. In any contest of the district series the visiting team shall submit to its opponent a list of twelve names and the entertaining team a list of six names. On the third day thereafter, these lists, if entirely acceptable, shall be returned to the senders arranged in the order of choice.

Section 7. These lists in each case must be sent in the first instance on the fifteenth day prior to the date previously arranged for the contest.

Section 8. The entertaining school shall invite the first and second judges from the list of twelve and the first judge from the list of six. In case any judge cannot serve, the next judge from the list on which his name appears shall be invited.

Section 9. The following form of invitation is suggested:

The high schools of .......... and .......... will hold a public contest in debate at .......... on the evening of .......... They join in a cordial request to you to act as a judge upon that occasion. The other judge invited are .......... The question to be debated is, Resolved: that .......... Your expenses will of course be paid.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN JONES

...................... High School

JOHN JONES

...................... High School
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Section 10. Two stamped envelopes shall be sent to each of the judges, one addressed to the principal of the visiting school and the other to the principal of the entertaining school.

Section 11. Any school violating any section of this article shall forfeit to its opponent the right to select judges of its own choice.

Section 12. It will be the duty of the judge to determine which team has done the more effective debating, and to select the individual debaters in order of excellence. Each judge on the evening of the debate shall be provided with written instructions in the following form:

Instructions to Judges

You are requested to determine which team shall be awarded the decision, and to select the individual debaters in order of excellence.

In rendering your decision, both in regard to the teams and in regard to the individual speakers, you are to consider the merits of the debate AND NOT THE MERITS OF THE QUESTION. You are to remember that both thought and delivery are to be considered and that matter is of more importance than form. You are to discount speeches that are obviously and merely memorized productions, and you are to distinguish genuine argument from mere oratorical embellishment. "While a debate is not an oratorical contest, it should not be a dry, uninteresting statement of quotations, facts and figures." A good debate is a strong, effective presentation of clear and logical thought. The judges should carefully weigh both excellence in thinking and excellence in speaking. They should award the decision to the team which shows the more effective combination of the two in a vital give-and-take discussion."

Grading of Individual Debaters

The judge shall assign to each individual debater a ranking on an 8-point scale, giving the best speaker 1 and the poorest speaker, 8. Each of the other debaters shall receive a rating that properly shows, on a 1-8 basis, his degree of excellence. Grade no two the same.

Method of Determining the Winning Team

The judge shall base his decision on the summation of the ranking of the teams, the team receiving the smaller summation being declared the winning team. The individual ratings shall be for the purpose of deciding the winning team in case of a
tie and not for the purpose of selecting the best speakers. At
the close of each debate each judge without consultation with
any other judge shall register his decision upon this ballot,
seal it in an envelope, and hand it to the teller appointed to
receive it. The chairman of the debate together with the
faculty representatives of the schools involved shall constitute
a canvassing committee to see that the judges’ decisions are
rendered in accordance with the instructions provided. The
chairman shall then announce the winning team. Immediately
after the debate, the school authorities shall mail to the Chair-
man of the Iowa High School Forensic League, State University
of Iowa, these decisions as they were rendered by the judges.
Also each winning school shall report within twenty-four hours
the result of its debates to the district director in order to
facilitate immediate arrangement of the next series.

JUDGE’S VOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(first speaker)</td>
<td>(first speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(second speaker)</td>
<td>(second speaker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total       Total
I vote for

(affirmative or negative)

Which is the team with the LOWEST total rank

Signed

(judge)

Date

Street address

City

ARTICLE IV—COACH OR DIRECTOR OF DEBATE

The paying of a coach in debate who is not otherwise regu-
larly on the teaching staff is prohibited.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING EXTEMPORNE SPEAKING

ARTICLE I—GENERAL REGULATIONS

SECTION 1. Eligibility. Any high school student in good
standing, who is doing passing work in all his subjects, is
eligible to compete provided he has not attended high school
more than eight semesters.

SECTION 2. Topics. For the intra-school contest and for
the district contests, the topics shall be taken from the De-
cember, January, February, and March issues of The Literary
Digest and Current History. For the final contests the topics
shall be taken from the December, January, February and March
issues of the same periodicals. No topic will be taken from
an article less than one page in length. Twenty topics are to
be sent sealed to the principal of the high school and are to
be opened by him in the presence of the contestants at the
time and place set for the drawing.

SECTION 3. Drawing for Topics. Each contestant shall be
given eight minutes to discuss one of the twenty subjects in
the official list. He shall pick his subject in this manner: the
topics shall be placed haphazard in a hat or receptacle. From
this the contestant shall draw one topic. If a contestant is
dissatisfied with the topic drawn, he may immediately draw an-
other. He shall then replace which ever topic he wishes to
discard, and the drawing shall continue in the same manner.
This drawing shall be absolutely by lot, and the contestants
shall not reveal to each other what they have drawn until all
have finished drawing. Drawing shall be done one hour before
the contest. The order of appearance on the program shall
also be determined by lot.

SECTION 4. Speech. Between the drawing and the contest
the contestants should be provided with writing materials and
secluded in a room, away from helpers, presided over by a
proctor. They may take with them any reference material
which they may have collected. Any written material which
the speaker may wish to take with him should be inspected
by those in charge of the contest, to be sure that no prepared
speeches are taken into the room.

Each speaker shall write out his notes on the paper fur-
nished by the high school principal in charge of the contest.
These notes shall be submitted to the committee in charge ten minutes before the speaking is to begin. If the committee shall find that any speaker has written out more than a bare outline of his speech or that any speaker has attempted to substitute notes written out beforehand, he shall be deprived of the use of these or any other notes.

The speaker may take either side of a controversial topic—or he may divide his time and discuss both sides. He will be allowed eight minutes for his speech.

Section 5. Judges. There shall be three judges, or one expert judge, for this contest. If three judges are used the decision shall be determined as provided in the system herein-after described. The following is the form of the official ballot. This should be copied, or copies may be secured by writing to the League at Iowa City.

Instructions to Judges

Grade the contestants on the basis of effectiveness as extemporane speakers. The use of notes is not to be regarded as a weakness on the part of any contestant, but the notes should furnish only reminders as to the main divisions of the speech and should not contain the material to be read to the audience verbatim. The use of notes which prevent the spontaneity and directness that should accompany effective extemporaneous speaking, should be discounted. Failure to use the time allotted to him should also be counted against the speaker. Give the best contestant 95 per cent, no more and no less, and if the poorest 50 per cent, no more and no less, regardless of the degree of difference between them. Grade the others accordingly, so that when your report is finished, it will show how much better or worse each contestant is than every other one. In brief: Grade the best 95 per cent; grade the poorest 50 per cent; and grade each of the others a percentage that will properly show, on the 95-50 basis, his particular degree of excellence. Grade no two the same. Consider that this is an extemporaneous speech, therefore thought is more important than delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contestant</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State High School Forensic Leagues

Instructions to the Committee in Charge

After the contest collect these blanks from the judges and prepare the final decision in the following manner: Add each contestant’s marks; the one having the highest total percentage is the winner; the one having the next highest is the second best, etc. However, if a speaker has been ranked first by two judges, he shall be declared the winner regardless of his total percentage. In case of a tie in the total percentages given to any two contestants examine the grades given by each judge to the two concerned, and award the better rank to the contestant preferred by the majority of judges.

Section 6. Report. Immediately after the contest the report should be sent to the Director of the Iowa High School Forensic League at Iowa City.

Article II—Intra-School Contests

Section 1. In each high school the selection of contestants for the final local contest may be made in any fair manner that seems suited to local conditions. It is suggested that as many preliminary contests as possible be given. The final contest shall include not more than ten speakers, and exactly that number is recommended.

Section 2. The final home contest shall be held by the last of February.

Article III—District Contests

Section 1. A contest will be held in each of the four districts of the state provided for the forensic contests.

Section 2. The district contests must be held not later than the end of the second week in March. The time and place of these contests is to be decided by the district director after consultation with the participating schools.

Article IV—Final Contests

Section 1. The two successful contestants in each of the district contests will meet at Iowa City at the time of the Iowa High School Forensic League contests, to compete for the championship.

Section 2. The rules shall be the same as those governing the preceding contests.
The two winners in each division will participate in the final Four-Year High School Forensic League.

Article II—Final Contests

Place determined in the same manner as the first place.

Section 1. Any high school student in Grades 11, 12, and 13 may be judged by three of fewer judges.

Article III—Judging

same the responsibility for the district director of contests.

Section 2. The district director of the competition shall be held at the same time and place where the district contests shall be held at the same time and place.

Article II—District Contests

Section 2. The district director of the competition shall be held at the same time and place where the district contests shall be held at the same time and place.

Section 3. The district director of the competition shall be held at the same time and place where the district contests shall be held at the same time and place.

Section 4. Judges shall select a maximum of 1000 words. The contest shall include any reason applicable.

Article I—Organization
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Section 3. Contests other than debate shall terminate with the district.

Section 4. In debate, pairings shall be announced by the State Manager, recognizing schedules of affiliated local leagues, with contests terminating in a state championship debate.

Section 5. Pairings shall be based on size of schools as well as geographical location.

Article IV—District Organization

Section 1. The State shall be divided into eight districts identical with the districts of the Michigan Education Association for purposes of administering this Association.

Section 2. In scheduling contests other than debate, the district arrangement of the Michigan Education Association shall be recognized in a general way, but the distribution of the member schools shall determine the specific district arrangement in any given year.

Section 3. Within the districts there may be such subdistricts and sections as are necessary to secure programs of satisfactory length in oratory, declamation, and extemporaneous speaking.

Section 4. Groupings next following local contests shall be based on size of schools as well as geographical location.

Article V—Administration

Section 1. This Association shall be administered by the Extension Division of the University of Michigan, in cooperation with an advisory council which shall be known as the State Forensic Council, representing the Michigan Conference of City Superintendents, the Michigan High School Principals Association, and the Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech.

Section 2. The State Forensic Council.

(a) The State Forensic Council shall consist of two members of the Michigan Conference of City Superintendents, two members of the Michigan Principals Association, two members of the Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech, and the State Forensic Manager, who shall be the ex-officio Chairman of the Council.

(b) The superintendents, principals, and speech teachers shall be elected at the annual meetings, respectively, of the Conference of City Superintendents, the High School Principals Association, and the Michigan Association of Teachers of Speech. They shall serve for two years and shall be eligible to reelection. In 1933–34 each organization shall elect one representative for one year and the other for two years, and thereafter elections shall be for two-year terms.

(c) Members of the State Forensic Council shall assume office at the first annual meeting following their election.

(d) The State Forensic Council shall hold an annual meeting in Ann Arbor at the time of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club, or at such other time as may be agreed upon.

(e) At all meetings of the State Forensic Council a quorum shall consist of four members.

(f) Any vacancy in the State Forensic Council shall be filled by appointment by the president of the organization concerned until the next annual meeting of that organization, when the vacancy shall be filled by election for the remainder of the term. Leaving the profession or moving from the State shall constitute a vacancy.

Section 3. State Forensic Manager.

(a) The executive direction of all contests shall be lodged in a State Forensic Manager, who, upon recommendation of the Director of the Extension Division, shall be appointed by the Regents of the University, his salary to be paid by the University. It is contemplated that the manager shall be selected from the Faculty of the Department of Speech and General Linguistics, as has been the practice in the case of the Manager of the High School Debating League.

(b) The Manager shall be ex-officio Chairman of the Council as heretofore provided, and as such it shall be his duty to transmit to the Director of the Extension Division all recommendations as to plans and policies.

Section 4. District Chairmen.

(a) In each district, under supervision of the State Manager, the executive direction of all contests, with the exception of debate, shall be lodged in a district chairman.

(b) District chairmen shall be appointed by the State Manager, subject to approval by the State Forensic Council.
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They shall assume office the 1st of February following appointment, and shall serve for one year, with the privilege of reappointment.

(c) The State Manager shall solicit three nominations for the chairmanship of each district from the fall speech sectional meeting of the corresponding Michigan Education Association district.

Section 5. Subdistrict and Sectional Chairman.

(a) Subdistrict and sectional chairmen shall be appointed for a term of one year by the several district chairmen, with the approval of the State Manager.

ARTICLE VI—FINANCIAL PLAN

Section 1. The expenses of this Association shall be paid from two sources: (1) a fund known as the Michigan High School Forensic Association Fund, and (2) such other funds as may be provided by the Extension Division of the University of Michigan.


(a) This fund shall consist of the annual dues of the member schools and shall be held by the Controller of the University of Michigan as a trust fund for the use of the Association.

(b) Requisitions upon this fund for legitimate expenses of the Association shall be drawn upon the regular voucher forms of the University and signed by the Director of the Extension Division.

(c) The Director of the Extension Division, or his authorized agent, shall, at the annual meeting of the Council, make a report of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year.

ARTICLE VII—RULES GOVERNING CONTESTS

Section 1. The rules governing contests shall cover the eligibility of contestants, length of speeches, selection of judges, dates of contests, awards, and all other necessary legislation not otherwise provided for in this Agreement.

Section 2. The rules governing contests shall be those now governing the contests of the Michigan High School Oratorical Association and the Michigan High School Debating League (by fusion of which the Michigan High School Forensic Asso-
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ication was formed) except where they are superseded by the provisions of this Agreement.

Section 3. Changes in the rules may be made upon the recommendation of the State Forensic Council and the approval of the Extension Division of the University of Michigan.

Section 4. The State Forensic Manager shall, each year, solicit the opinions of the member schools through a questionnaire ballot and present the results of this ballot at the annual meeting of the State Forensic Council.

Note.—In pursuance of Article VII, the rules governing contests are compiled and published annually.

EXCERPTS FROM DEBATE REGULATIONS (1935-36)

Membership. Participation in debate is limited to four-year high schools and three-year senior high schools. Any such high school in the State may become eligible for participation in debate by payment of the annual fee of three dollars for participation in all contests sponsored by the Michigan High School Forensic Association, or by payment of two dollars for participation in debate alone. Application for membership in debate must be made and dues paid not later than November 1, 1935.

Contests in Debate. All member schools of the Association debate upon the same question throughout the year.

The debates of the Association are held in two series. The first is a point-winning series in which each school debates four times, win or lose. Each judge's decision counts one point and the victory counts one point. At the end of this series the schools having the largest number of points go through an elimination series, the losing schools in each debate dropping out of the schedule. The two undefeated teams meet at Ann Arbor for the State Championship Debate, which will be held on May 1, 1936.

Form of Debate. The standard form of all Association debates shall be six eight-minute constructive arguments and six four-minute rebuttals, with the affirmative opening the constructive argument and the negative opening the rebuttal. Each debater shall have one constructive and one rebuttal speech.
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The debating team shall consist of three debaters, with both boys and girls eligible to places on teams.

The form of all Association debates shall be as herein provided, except that in the preliminary series any two competing schools, upon mutual agreement, may vary the length and arrangement of speeches. In no case, however, shall fewer than three debaters represent a school in any given debate. This option in the preliminary series is provided to enable schools to modify the form of debate in such a way as to meet the needs of special occasions such as assembly debates and other special-audience debates.

CONDUCT OF DEBATE. During the contest the debaters shall be separated from the audience and shall receive no help of any kind from any source. No debater shall be prompted, even by members of his own team. This section is not to be construed, however, as prohibiting the use of notes by the speaker. It merely means that each speaker shall be on his or her own resources.

Two timekeepers, one appointed by each side, shall keep time together. A warning signal shall be given at the end of six minutes in each constructive speech and at the end of three minutes in each rebuttal speech. When the time is up the signal shall be given at once and the speaker shall stop speaking.

The loss in unavoidable interruptions shall be made good to the speaker, but no cheering shall be allowed during the progress of a speech.

If charts or other like material are used by either team they shall be left before the audience and shall be available for refutation by either team.

JUDGES. The debates of the Association are judged by three judges, except where any two member schools, by mutual agreement, leave the decision to one judge. Thus, where three judges are used and the decision is unanimous, four points are awarded to the winning school and no points to the losing school; in the case of a split decision three points are awarded to the winning school and one point to the losing school. Where a critic judge is used a split decision is never recognized, four points being awarded to the winning school and no points to the losing school.
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Each judge shall be provided with an official ballot and instruction card to be supplied by the State Association. The judge shall give but one vote, affirmative or negative, basing his decision upon debating standards as set forth on the official instruction card. He shall not under any circumstances give a "consolation vote." There shall be no conference of judges after the debate until the decisions have been handed in. At the close of the debate, the judge shall write "Affirmative" or "Negative" on his ballot, sign and seal it, and hand it to an usher, who shall hand it to the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall open the ballots in the presence of the teams and audience and announce the results. He shall not announce the names of the judges on the ballots.

CLASS DIVISIONS. The schools of the State will be divided into "A" and "B" classes, and, so far as possible, the schools will debate within their respective classes. In general, schools of 250 pupils or more will be classified as "A," and those of less than 250 as "B." Schools will please indicate their classification when applying for membership.

SUBJECT OF DEBATES. The subject of all Association debates throughout the year is, "Resolved, that the several nations should make government monopolies of the manufacture and sale of all combat instruments of war."

LIBRARY EXTENSION SERVICE. Immediately upon receipt of the application for membership, the University of Michigan Library Extension Service will mail each school a package of library material on the subject for debate.

PLAN OF PRELIMINARY SERIES. The debates of the preliminary series shall be four in number. In these four preliminary debates, each school will have two debates on the affirmative and two debates on the negative. Schools allotted the affirmative in the first debate will retain the affirmative in the second debate and then change to the negative for two debates. Schools allotted the negative in the first debate will retain the negative in the second debate and then change to the affirmative for two debates. The location of the debate will alternate so that each school will support each side once at home, and once away from home. It should be understood that, while the above is the general plan, unforeseen circumstances may necessitate an occasional exception.
Schedule of preliminary debates. The Association Manager pairs all member schools in debate, following as far as possible the requests of the schools for opponents, sides, and debate locations. At least two weeks before each debate, the pairing of all schools is tabulated in a debate schedule and mailed to each member school.

Local leagues. In accordance with the wishes of member schools, the Manager has encouraged the organization of local leagues within the State Association where a demand for such existed. These sectional leagues in each case run off a preliminary series to include at least four debates, and admit schools to the elimination series on a proportional basis. Schools conducting their preliminary debates in local leagues join the State Association in the regular way and conduct their debates according to the regular rules of the Association, except that the preliminary debates are scheduled within the local league.

Expenses of preliminary debates. In the debates of the preliminary series, each school shall pay its own expenses. The visiting school shall be responsible for its own expenses incident to whatever travel and entertainment is necessary for the debate. The entertaining school shall be responsible for whatever additional expenses are necessary for holding the debate. Any surplus funds shall belong to the entertaining school.

Plan of elimination series. As soon as the preliminary series of debates has been held, the schools with the highest number of points will be declared eligible to enter the elimination series. Schools will enter the elimination series from two general groups: (1) those whose preliminary debates are scheduled by the State Manager; and (2) those whose preliminary debates are arranged through sectional leagues. The schools will be entered from each of these two groups in the ratio that the total number of participating schools in each group bears to the total number of schools participating in debate.

Expenses of elimination debates. In all the debates of the elimination series except the State Championship Debate, the entertaining school shall be responsible for all expenses, including necessary expenses of the visiting team and one attendant, up to the limit of admission receipts. Beyond this, expenses shall be shared equally. Any surplus shall belong to the entertaining school.

Schedule of elimination debates. At least two weeks before each debate, the pairing of all schools will be tabulated in a debate schedule and mailed to each member school.

The Association Manager will, at the request of any member school participating in the elimination series, notify that school by telegram, collect, of its side, opponent, and debate location for any debate.

State Championship Debate. The Nineteenth Annual State Championship Debate of the Michigan High School Forensic Association will be held at Ann Arbor, in Hill Auditorium, Friday, May 1, 1936. This date has been selected so that the State Championship Debate may be held during the session of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club, which will meet at Ann Arbor on April 30 and May 1 and 2, 1936.

Expenses of the State Championship Debate. In the State contest, the University shall pay the expenses of the two visiting teams and the coaches (one coach for each team) from the funds of the High School Forensic Association. In case there are one or more girls on the team and the coach is not a woman, the expenses of a chaperon shall also be paid.

Awards. Through the cooperation of the Detroit Free Press, the University of Michigan Wall Plaque Trophy will be presented to each of the high schools that enter the elimination series of debates.

The Detroit Free Press will present a lapel button or pin, which is a replica of the Wall Plaque Trophy, to each debater participating in one or more elimination debates.

The University of Michigan Extension Division will award a large trophy cup to each of the two teams participating in the State Championship Debate, and a smaller trophy cup to each of the two semifinal teams.

The trophy cups will be presented at the State Championship Debate in Ann Arbor on May 1, 1936, and they will remain in the permanent possession of the schools receiving them.

To each of the six debaters participating in the State Championship Debate, the Detroit Free Press will present a gold watch.
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3. Secure three disinterested judges to judge the contest. No person shall act as judge who is a relative of any contestant or who is in any way connected with the school represented by a contestant, or who is likely for any other reason to be prejudiced for or against a particular contestant. (It is suggested that the county chairman submit his list of judges for approval to the teachers in charge of the contests in those schools in his county which are members of the League and that the district committeeman submit his list of judges for approval to his county chairmen and to the teachers in charge of the contests in the schools which are declared winners of the county contests; i.e., those schools which are entitled to send representatives to the district contest.)

4. Secure a chairman to preside at your contest.

5. Immediately after the completion of your contest, report the result of the contest to the Bureau of Public Discussion of the Extension Division on the blank provided for that purpose. County Chairmen, report also to your district committeeman. Enclose with your report to the Extension Division the judges' sheets used at the contest.

Fifteen minutes after the close of the contest, collect the signed decisions of the judges, and determine the rank of the contestants as follows:

On each of the three sheets, verify the averages, and from the averages, determine the ranks as follows: give to the speaker with the highest average the rank 1; to the speaker with the next highest average, the rank 2; and so on. (Thus on each sheet the speaker with the highest average has the lowest figure for rank, and vice versa.) Add the ranks given to each speaker. Declare the speaker who receives the lowest total of ranks the winner of the contest. However, if any contestant is ranked first by two of the three judges, he shall be declared the winner, regardless of the totals. In case of tie, give the decision to that one of the tying contestants who has the highest averages.

DIRECTIONS FOR JUDGING THE CONTESTS. No set rule of percentages has been formulated for judging the discussion contests. Both thought and delivery are to be taken into account by the judge who is expected to base his judgment upon the contestant's performance as a whole, as a piece of forceful, convincing, and effective discussion. In the rebuttal, care should be taken to guard against giving high rank to the refutation that has been committed to memory; the contestant should be judged upon his skill in meeting his opponent's arguments.

In the event that there is no occasion for refutation (i.e., that all contestants take the same position), the contestant should use his three minutes to elaborate points in his own constructive arguments, to propound new arguments to strengthen his position, or even to seize upon his opponent's argument and elaborate it. That is, in the rebuttal in all circumstances, the test should be the contestant's skill in meeting the situation that confronts him.

The printed blanks which will be used by the judges in all contests will bear the following instructions:

You are instructed that this is an informal discussion in which each participant is free to present the general topic from whatever angle he chooses. Base your judgment upon effective discussion, taking into consideration both thought and delivery. It is expected that contestants will present an extemporaneous rebuttal which meets the arguments actually offered by opponents. Base your judgment of the refutation, therefore, primarily upon its spontaneity and aptness, rather than upon its form. No student who presents a memorized rebuttal at the final contest will be eligible to receive any of the medals awarded.

EXPENSES. The participating schools are expected to bear the traveling expenses of their contestants in the county, district, and state contests. To defray the necessary expenses, it is suggested that a small admission fee to the contest be charged, or that a local entertainment, social, or Fair be given to raise the necessary funds.
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INTER-STATE HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING

A. AS SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION 1

Although high school debate leagues have existed in a few states for more than thirty years, state-wide debating is a comparatively recent development, and cooperation between states in sponsoring the activity dates back only until 1927. Under the direction of the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation of the National University Extension Association, the number of states has grown from four in 1928 to thirty-one in 1935-36. This number varies somewhat from year to year, as there is nothing compulsory about the use by any state league of the question adopted for a given year by the interstate committee. Three-fourths of all states in the Union (or nine-tenths of all states having leagues among high schools) have cooperated one or more years since the interstate committee began to function.

It should not be understood that interstate debating as here described means contests and tournaments between the league of one state and that of another. Although such interstate contests were held from 1928 to 1930, they were then given up for various reasons, including that of duplicating the work of the National Forensic League, whose organization and activities are outlined in the following pages.

The work of the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation falls under three heads: (1) the selection of an approved proposition for debate, (2) the appointment of a handbook editor and the distribution through him of approved debate materials, and (3) the presentation of a nation-wide radio demonstration debate on the current question early in the debate season.

Professor Bower Aly, handbook editor for the past three years, thus outlines the procedure by which the question is chosen each year. "The Committee on Debate Materials receives suggestions for the debate proposition from anyone interested all over the United States. Usually the propositions come to the Committee through the director of an Extension Division or a debate coach. After the Committee receives the suggested propositions, they are classified and studied, and a meeting is called for their consideration... After a complete and thorough-going analysis of the problem, three topics for debate are chosen. The chairman of the Committee then appoints a sub-committee on Wording, chosen from the ranks of debate coaches. The Wording Committee suggests a wording for each of the three topics. On receipt of the report of the chairman of this sub-committee, the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation submits the three propositions to a ballot of the interested groups. The proposition chosen becomes the approved proposition for the year.

The editor of the Handbook is chosen on the basis of his general qualifications and of his bid for producing the book. The Handbook is now issued in two volumes, one ready at the opening of school in the fall and the other issued as a supplement in three forms: as a bound volume, as seven pamphlets, or as a series of about thirty articles. Both volumes of the Handbook are available to member institutions at the subscription, or pre-printing contract, price. In addition to publishing the Handbook, the editor does what he can to make other helpful material available to the member schools and sponsoring institutions.

As was pointed out in the opening paragraph, no state league is in any way compelled to use the interstate question, and likewise the purchasing or use of the Handbook is a matter for the individual member to decide.

Through the courtesy and cooperation of the National Broadcasting Company and the National Advisory Council on Education by Radio, an hour debate is annually presented in the fall over a nation-wide radio hook-up. The participants in this demonstration discussion are leaders in the speech field and in the field covered by the proposition under debate. For

1 This account is based on the article "Nation-Wide High School Debating," by William Witt in the Journal of the National Education Association, January, 1933; an article by Arta Maginnis accompanying the text of the demonstration radio debate for 1934; and a personal letter from Professor Bower Aly of the University of Missouri.
example, the four speakers in the debate on November 12, 1935, on the question of "state medicine," were William Trufant Foster, a member of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care and director of the Pollak Foundation for Economic Research, Professor Bower Aly, director of forensics at the University of Missouri, Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, and Dr. R. G. Leland, director of the Bureau of Medical Economics of the American Medical Association.

Thus operates a loose but extremely valuable organization of some 7000 high schools from coast to coast, whose official question is debated annually by 100,000 students in 75,000 or more debates before perhaps as many as 10,000,000 listeners.

The following states during 1935-36 discussed the official proposition: Resolved, that the several states should enact legislation providing for a system of complete medical service available to all citizens at public expense: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York (Long Island), North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

B. THE NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

Brief of Organization

Purpose

The purpose of the National Forensic League is to stimulate interest in debate and oratory by offering definite and suitable recognition for successful participation in those activities.

Its next purpose is to induce more students to enter these worthwhile activities. With a definite, tangible reward to work for it will follow that more students will enter these contests than there would if no recognition were offered. The realization of this purpose has been demonstrated by the number of chapters reporting two and even three times as many students trying out for forensic contests.

² As printed by the League, 1936.

Its further purpose is to keep active the interest of the students who have taken part in debate and oratory and to urge them on to greater attainments. This is accomplished by awarding Degrees with special privileges. By always having new honors to earn the student will not be likely to cease his efforts as soon as membership and the key have been attained, but press on for further accomplishments.

The National Forensic League does not interfere in any way with local forensic contests. Each Chapter is entirely free to arrange its own debates and continue present relations with its neighboring schools and with its state association.

Tournaments

Since 1931 the League has sponsored annually the National Speech Tournament, held successively at Ripon, Wisconsin; Sioux City, Iowa; Wooster, Ohio; Topeka, Kansas; and Kent, Ohio. At Kent 130 schools from coast to coast were represented in the six national contests of the tournament. These contests are Debate, Original Oratory, Extemporaneous Speaking, Humorous, Dramatic, and Oratorical Declamation.

For four years the National Forensic League has placed the national championship debate on the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the winners of the individual contests events on networks of the National Broadcasting Company.

Participation in the national tournament is reserved primarily to winners of state contests. However, N.F.L. chapters have special opportunity to qualify contestants by ranking in the Decalot of Leaders, by earning the Distinguished Service Award, or by acquiring 100 degrees. The winners of the N. F. L. district tournament also qualify for national tournament entry.

Membership

Membership is open to both students and coaches, male or female. Eligibility is determined by a system of Credit Points. In a general way a student must participate in two winning or four losing debates, or place first in two large speaking contests or take a lesser place in several smaller contests. Oratory, Declamation, and Extemporaneous Speaking are recognized. Reading and acting are not included.
Membership is obtained through local chapters. Any high school or academy is eligible to petition for a chapter if it has engaged actively in forensic contests during the past two years.

DEGREES

Four degrees, Merit, Honor, Excellence, and Distinction, are awarded for corresponding attainments. Each degree adds a distinctive seal to the membership certificate, entitles the member to cast an additional vote in all Chapter and National affairs, and to receive an individual copy of the monthly Rostrum.

EMBLEM

The emblem is exceedingly attractive in design, and either key or pin may be procured. For student members the emblem is platinum plated silver, and for instructors 10k. gold. The cost is very nominal, ranging from $1.75 to $4.

To designate advanced degrees held by the members, the emblems may be jeweled. Emerald Designates the Degree of Honor; Blue Sapphire, the Degree of Excellence; and Ruby, the Degree of Distinction. Jeweling adds only 50¢ to the cost of any key or pin. As successive degrees are earned the jewels are exchanged.

CERTIFICATES AND CHARTERS

Attractive Membership Certificates are furnished the members and beautifully engraved Charters are furnished the school upon the organization of the Chapter. Membership cards are also available for those who desire them.

DUES

The chapter pays a fee of $5.00 when it is admitted, which includes three-year subscription to the League monthly publication. Members pay a membership fee of $1.50 for Life Membership. A fee of 50 cents is paid for higher degrees. There are no annual dues.

NON-SECRET

The constitution expressly prohibits any secret practice or any obligation of secrecy upon the members. The constitution has been carefully drawn to comply with the statutes of every state on the subject of high school organizations.

DEMOCRATIC

The organization is democratic. All officers, except the Secretary, are elected biennially by direct vote of the entire membership and all matters of government are in their hands. The Secretary is elected by the Executive Council.

A "NATIONAL ORGANIZATION"

The twenty-four schools effecting this organization were located in 15 states and the 500 chapters at the present time represent 39 states from coast to coast. This is really a "National" organization, in fact, as well as name.
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Subject for Women's Series to be submitted by each member to the Secretary not later than June first of the preceding academic year. Similar procedure to be followed as in the case of the subject for Men's Fall Series.

Subject for Spring Tournament to be submitted by each member to the Secretary not later than December 10. Similar procedure to be followed as in other two cases.

MISCELLANEOUS

(1) A student may not speak on both sides of the question in an Official League debate. This may be waived by agreement between the schools involved in any contest.

(2) The sentiment of the League is opposed to the practice of scouting during the Spring Tournament.

(3) The secretaryship of the League rotates among the members alphabetically, the new Secretary assuming office on April first, or as soon thereafter as it is possible for the report of the tournament and business meeting to be submitted to him by the outgoing Secretary.

(4) In addition to the duties indicated above it shall be the function of the Secretary to receive reports of judges' decisions for the member universities and to transmit them to all members.

(5) It is agreed that constitutionality be waived with respect to all debate propositions used in the League.

(6) Expenses: Each visiting university shall provide for all expenses of its team. Each entertaining university shall provide for the fee and expenses of the judge.

(7) A graduate student is defined as anyone who has received a bachelor's degree of any kind and is taking work in any department of the university for an advanced degree.

(8) Each member is to determine its own eligibility rule and may use freshmen if it desires to do so.

(9) The Secretary is officially authorized to adhere strictly to the rules in carrying out and enforcing the provisions relative to the submitting of and the voting on subjects and propositions. The dates indicated in the agreement shall be construed as meaning that correspondence involved should be postmarked on or before the several dates.

B. CONSTITUTION OF THE MICHIGAN INTERCOLLEGIATE SPEECH LEAGUE

GENERAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE I—NAME AND OBJECT

SECTION 1. This organization shall be known as the Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League.

SECTION 2. The object of this League shall be to promote interest in all forms of speech activity in the colleges of the State of Michigan.

ARTICLE II—ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. This League shall conduct contests in the following divisions: oratory, debate, extempore speaking, interpretative reading, and any other divisions which may be added by a majority vote of the League.

SECTION 2. The membership shall consist of the following colleges: Adrian, Albion, Alma, Battle Creek, Calvin, Central State Teachers, University of Detroit, Hillsdale, Hope, Kalamazoo, Michigan State, Michigan State Normal, Olivet, Wayne University, and Western State Teachers.

SECTION 3. Other colleges may be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the faculty directors present at the annual meeting, each college being entitled to one vote.

ARTICLE III—ELIGIBILITY

Only bona fide students of the several colleges who are carrying satisfactorily at least two-thirds of the required amount of work at the time of the contest, who have not received any academic degree (120 semester hours), and who are under twenty-eight years of age, shall be admitted as competitors.

ARTICLE IV—OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The offices of this League shall be those of president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer. These offices, except that of treasurer, shall be held in rotation, and the faculty directory of the various member colleges shall in their turns be responsible for the execution of the duties of the
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offices. The treasurer shall be a faculty director elected at an annual meeting for a term of 4 years. He shall be eligible for re-election.

Section 2. At an annual meeting of the League there shall be elected four advisers for a term of four years each to direct the work of each of the divisions of the League.

Section 3. The officers, together with the divisional advisers, shall constitute the Executive Council of the League.

Section 4. The new officers of the League shall assume their duties at the annual meeting in October.

ARTICLES V—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. It shall be the duty of the president to call the annual meeting of the League and to notify the colleges at least ten days in advance. He shall also call a special meeting at the written request of no less than five colleges, giving at least ten days' notice of such meeting to each college. He shall preside at all business meetings.

Section 2. The secretary, in addition to the usual duties of that office, and such other duties as the League may require, shall:

(a) Immediately after the annual meeting send to the faculty director of each college a complete list of the names and addresses of the faculty directors and student representatives of the League, and also the schedule of the League debates.

(b) Inform the colleges at least one month in advance of the various dates and places of the contests of the League.

Section 3. The treasurer shall:

(a) Keep the accounts of the League and all of its subsidiary divisions, and pay bills and dispose of funds subject to the order of the Executive Council.

(b) Send out notices of the dues and on approval of the Executive Council have power to levy a special assessment upon each college to meet a temporary deficit. Such special assessment shall be accompanied by a clear statement of the reasons for the assessment.

Section 4. The duties of the Executive Council shall be:

(a) To audit the accounts of the treasurer.
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(b) To assist the advisers in making arrangements for the various contests of the League, and to transact other business not herein provided for.

Section 5. Financial duties of each divisional adviser shall include:

(a) To levy such assessment as he deems necessary as a condition for entrance of each college into the Divisional contests which he has in charge.

(b) To pay from the assessments levied by him the legitimate League expenses of conducting each speech contest—any surplus funds to be deposited with the League treasurer to the credit of the specific division, and any deficit to be provided by additional Divisional assessments to be paid before participation in the contest.

(c) To forward to the League Treasurer, immediately following the contests which he has in charge, a complete financial accounting thereof.

ARTICLE VI—ANNUAL MEETINGS

Section 1. The annual meeting of the League shall be held at a central point specified by the League at the previous October meeting. It shall be held the first Friday evening of October and the subsequent Saturday of each year, and shall begin promptly at six-thirty o'clock eastern time.

Section 2. Each college shall be represented by one faculty director and one student, each representative being entitled to a vote. (Note: This does not mean that other faculty members or students shall be excluded from the meeting; rather, it means that in the deliberations upon a stated item of business the representation shall be as provided in this section.)

ARTICLE VII—PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

Section 1. At the annual meeting each college shall announce its intention regarding participation in the following eight activities of the League: men's oratory, women's oratory, men's debate, women's debate, men's extempore speaking, women's extempore speaking, men's interpretative reading, and women's interpretative reading.

Section 2. No college shall be allowed to participate in a given contest which has not paid its contest fees two weeks in advance.
SECTION 3. Any college in the League failing to take part in any contest without furnishing satisfactory excuse shall be suspended from the League, but participation in five of the activities of the League shall fulfill the requirements of this section. Any college failing for two successive years to comply with the provisions of this section shall automatically be dropped from the League.

SECTION 4. In case any contestant shall withdraw from the contest before the date of such contest, the college may enter an alternate in his place.

ARTICLE VIII—Records

SECTION 1. The secretary shall keep on record the names of the students participating in the contests of the League (except Debate), and the names and rankings of the judges, and any necessary additional data.

SECTION 2. The archives for the permanent preservation of the constitution, by-laws, books, papers, etc., of the League shall be at Albion College and under the supervision of the professor of speech at Albion College.

ARTICLE IX—Expenses

SECTION 1. The League shall pay all necessary expense of the president, secretary, treasurer, the vice-president when acting as president, and the advisers, not including travelling expenses of said officers to the annual meeting and contests of the League.

SECTION 2. Each college in the League shall pay the treasurer at the time of the annual meeting the sum of one dollar. This sum may be increased or diminished by two-thirds vote at the annual meeting. This money shall be subject to the order of the Executive Council in meeting the expenses of the League.

SECTION 3. Any college failing to comply with the provisions of Article IX, Section 2, without sufficient reason being given, shall be denied representation at the annual meeting and in the contests of the League.

SECTION 4. As testimonials of success in the final contests of the League (except Debate) there shall be awarded to the contestants such honors as may be designated by the membership of the League, directly or through the Executive Council or divisional advisers.

SECTION 5. All local arrangements for contests of the League shall be left to the colleges where the contests are held, subject to the approval of the divisional adviser.

ARTICLE X—Amending the Constitution

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended at any meeting of the League by the vote of at least two-thirds of the colleges comprising the membership.

SECTION 2. The parliamentary authority shall be Robert's Rules of Order.

SECTION 3. This revision of the constitution shall go into effect when approved by two-thirds of the colleges of the League.

DIVISION A: ORATORY

(Omitted because not relevant here.)

DIVISION B: DEBATE

ARTICLE I—Organization

SECTION 1. This organization shall be known as the Debate Division of the Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League.

ARTICLE II—Contests

SECTION 1. Division B shall hold separate contests in debating for both men and women.

SECTION 2. Unless otherwise provided, men's debates shall occur the first and third weeks of February, and women's debates shall occur the second and fourth weeks of February.
ARTICLE III—Eligibility

Section 1. The eligibility requirements for Division B shall be the same as those stated in Article III of the General Provisions.

ARTICLE IV—Schedules and Questions

Section 1. Questions for men's and women's debates shall be chosen and the schedules of debates shall be adopted at the annual meeting, each college being entitled to one faculty and one student vote.

Section 2. The schedule shall be presented for approval or amendment by the faculty adviser of this division or some person designated by him.

Section 3. In adopting questions, only such colleges shall vote as officially participate in the activities of Division B for that year.

Section 4. Student members shall caucus on the debate questions at the annual meeting, and shall present a report to the general meeting.

Section 5. Through circularization of the member colleges by the divisional adviser, there shall be consideration of possible debate questions prior to the annual meeting.

ARTICLE V—Teams

Section 1. The standard team for both men and women shall consist of two members, with each speaker having a main speech of ten minutes and a rebuttal speech of five minutes. Deviation from these arrangements may be made by mutual agreement of the colleges concerned.

ARTICLE VI—Judging

Section 1. Unless by mutual agreement to the contrary, the League debates shall not be judged. All tournament debates shall be judged.

Section 2. The number of judges shall be determined by negotiations between the colleges concerned. The entertaining college shall be responsible for submitting a list of nominees to the visiting college at least two weeks before the debate.

Section 3. There shall be no League championship for either men or women.

DIVISION C: EXTEMPORI SPEAKING

DIVISION D: INTERPRETATIVE READING

(Omitted because not relevant here.)
APPENDIX XIV

DEBATE VERSUS DISCUSSION

A. DISCUSSION, LECTURE-FORUM, AND DEBATE
Alfred D. Sheffield, Wellesley College

DISCUSSION

Study-groups mean by discussion a way of thinking together by methodical steps that show characteristically—

(1) An approach to the subject as the members touch it in experienced situations.

(2) The modifying of divisive points of view.

(3) A cooperatively tested conclusion.

These features call for some explaining in what follows...

Discussion starts with certain questions, addressed by the leader to members, which will draw out views of the situation in its critical essentials. What the members see in the situation is determined not simply by what is there to be seen, but also by their own socially engendered attitudes and preferences. These of course differ with the diversities of interests and sentiments that align people into class-groups: cultural, industrial, and political. Hence, what the members say about the situation will in effect begin to define what it is...

The second feature of the thought-process in a group discussion is the modifying of the member points of view. At the outset members see things differently because they feel the values differently, because their present attitudes and interests make them diversely sensitive and attentive to the whole situation. As a result they suggest courses of action which express their partialities of vision—doing so with no lack of good intentions, and even unaware of their espousals of some interests at the cost of others. What discussion does here is to entertain...


these suggestions, with the reasons for them, and then to test them by exploring together their likely consequences for all the felt values at stake. This testing of the possibilities of action involves two kinds of effort which are simple enough to mention but which require time and skill to do; namely, (1) the applying of factual information, and (2) the reconsidering of partisan desires. It proceeds on the assumption that people will modify what they now want either by finding better means for satisfying the desire, or by coming to recognize the essentials from the trappings of it, or by shifting to a more enlightened desire.

This cooperative quest of ways to develop a situation so that it shall give effect to all the values which people have at heart brings the group to the third feature of discussion; its trend towards a socially validated conclusion. Here it gives effect to a special way of looking at conflict: one that clearly differentiates between conflict and strife. Conflict it views as a natural phase of tension among people's interests—a phase inevitable where new interests arise and changed circumstances call for adjustments. Strife is conflict that has been embroiled by coercive handling. "Much that is wasteful in the threshing out of social issues is due to wrong attitudes towards conflict, arising from bad habits of thought about its nature. Hard feeling, suspicion, egoistic triumph and chagrin all come from treating as a battle what is essentially a problem. There are always two sides to a battle. There are two sides to an argument only when people are disposed to coerce rather than to collaborate. A really creative argument has as many sides as there are interests at stake. The interests, doubtless, seem to be in collision, but this is because their spokesmen have not thought their way through the possibilities ahead. The interests do indeed confront one another, and show their differences in a state of upset equilibrium. Disputants' purposes do appear as cross-purposes. But it is precisely the task of discussion to make discriminations about our purposes, and to induce long views of the situation—views that forecast a continuing experience within which our interests can interact for mutual development." So conceived, discussion is not a fight to be won. It is a process of cooperative testing of proposals for their maximum promise to all parties concerned.
In speaking of the "conclusion" here we must recognize that
discussion may have either of two kinds of objective: it may
seek a decision looking towards action, or it may seek simply
the education of its participants. In a conference on disarmament
government representatives hope to make their discussion
reach real accord on mutually satisfactory things to do. In
an educational discussion on the issue the group of course will
not go that far. It will not go home with the armament situation
solved. But it will have learned something of the solvability
of such a problem where the modifying of people's claims
and desires is managed as a process not of whittling them down
to some compromise but of seeking for them new conditions
and expressions on maturer levels of satisfaction. The process,
as we have noted, seems mainly one of mutual help in seeing
better. The special sensitivities and outlook of each member
stir new awarenesses in the others until all experience an en-
richment of social insight in the matter.

Forum

Where discussion deals with a theme by the interchange of
contributions from members who speak on the same footing,
a forum deals with it by a platform address to which the
hearers offer questions and comment for the speaker's reply.
The speaker, unlike a discussion-leader, is really in the role
of a teacher—a visiting "star" teacher—and the aim of the
member participation is mainly to get the maximum value from
his special gift at clarification or enlargement of thought.

The forum, therefore, is a sort of glorified class in which
the learners register their reactions to a lecturer's thought.
The organisation of the thinking is the previous work of the
latter, and not, as in discussion, the creative task of the group.
And the outcome of the process is not something achieved by
the gathering as a group. It is something achieved by and for
the persons present as individuals. It is an advance for each
in his grasp and appreciation of a subject.

Debate

The most important difference between discussion and de-
bate is that one makes group thinking and the other individual
thinking its approach to an issue. Where discussion starts

with the group looking at a situation and entertaining tentative
proposals out of which to develop a solution, debate starts with
one party's solution, already thought out in private, and brought
to the group for acceptance. Instead of a "situation approach"
the group thus makes a "proposal approach" which lines up its
members to speak on the yes-side and the no-side of a conviction formed on the outside...

Where the issue is a large and complicated matter on which
popular thinking has milled around two or three prevailing
contentions, debate does three needed things:

(1) It brings the whole medley of data and contentions
into an orderly logical scheme.

(2) It draws attention to fallacies that beset the course of
thinking.

(3) It precipitates a decision...

A Comparison of Types

The special considerations which invite the use of DIS-
CUSSION may be offered in the following list:

Discussion serves:
1. To maintain a balance of listening and of contributory
   activity for the members in an educational program.
2. To bring information near to the members' day-to-day
   concerns.
3. To increase the alertness of members toward information
to be introduced.
4. To clarify the thinking of the group about material
   which has been presented.
5. To make problems carrying only academic interest
   more alive and personal.
6. To pool member experience around a common problem.
7. To induce the appreciation of differing points of view.
8. To help members face in a self-scrutinizing spirit the
   psychological difficulties involved in reaching agreements
   where emotions and prejudices are part of the problem.
9. To deal directly with opinions and assumptions which
   underlie the arguments used on controversial subjects.
10. To place the initiative toward better understanding be-
    tween members on the members themselves.
The Quarterly Journal of Speech

P. W. Beeman, "The Quarterly Journal of Speech: A Progressive Overview of the Field of Public Speaking in April, 1944"

The influence of the Quarterly Journal of Speech on current research and practice in public speaking.

1. The Journal has been influential in advancing the field of public speaking.
2. It has published numerous articles on various aspects of public speaking.
3. The Journal has been instrumental in promoting research in the field.
4. It has contributed to the development of new theories and techniques.

DEBATE OR CONFERENCE?

1. Debate is a more formal and structured form of argumentation.
2. It involves a specific format and rules for presenting arguments.
3. Debate is often used in formal settings such as competitions and tournaments.
4. Conference, on the other hand, is more informal and emphasizes discussion and collaboration.

THE DESIGN OF THE ESSAY: A TWO-PART DISCUSSION

1. The first part of the essay introduces the topic and outlines the main points to be discussed.
2. The second part delves deeper into the issues and provides evidence and arguments.

The speaker begins the speech with a statement of the issue:

- "The debate is on the topic of..."
- "The problem is..."
- "The question is..."

The speaker then presents evidence to support their position:

- "According to research, ...
- "It is noteworthy that ...
- "The historical context of ...

The speaker concludes by summarizing their argument and reiterating their main points:

- "In conclusion, I believe that ...
- "To conclude, I would like to emphasize that ...
- "Finally, I would like to reiterate that ...

In general, it is important to be clear and concise in presenting arguments.

DEBATE COACHING

1. To prepare effectively for a debate, it is important to:
   - Research the topic thoroughly.
   - Develop clear and concise arguments.
   - Practice delivering your speech.

The coach should:

- Provide feedback on the content and delivery of the speech.
- Help the debater identify areas for improvement.
- Encourage the debater to believe in their arguments.
judicious adults. ... So far as my own observation goes, I should rather try to persuade a man who has been a debater than one who has not; he is more apt to realize that every question has at least two sides, and that wisdom will not die with him. My experience with all kinds of student speakers would indicate that the debaters are much more careful than other speakers not to make statements that cannot be defended and not to depend upon mere assertion and reiteration. Compare the average political speech and the occasional political debate; which depends more upon facts and reasoning, which upon "mere rhetoric?" 

One of the oldest of the arguments against debate is that it teaches insincerity by having students speak against their convictions. ... The truth is, as anybody who knows students will admit, that they have no deep-rooted convictions upon most public questions because they have not thought them out, and no violence is done to their souls by debating. When they do have sincere convictions, they ought not to be required to speak against them; and no intelligent director of debate will ask men to speak against them, if for no other reason than that a man speaks better with than against his convictions.

But what if a man does have to speak against his convictions? ... The whole scheme of Anglo-Saxon law is postulated upon the presumption that men can be found who will speak against their convictions, when necessary; for, if a man is entitled to a trial, he is entitled to a lawyer to defend him. Perhaps a lawyer may believe his client to be guilty and the prosecutor may believe him to be innocent; nevertheless some centuries of experience would seem to indicate that justice is more nearly approximated when both men do their duty.

Professor Overstreet, who has in general a very low opinion of debate, says that it is anti-scientific, for it presumes an alternative which is not true in life and in fact; in debate, he says, "It is either this or that," but in nature there are not two sides, but many.

It is too much to demand that every debate should consider every possible solution to a given problem; two hours will not permit the careful consideration of all the plans that have been offered for farm relief, for instance, but one or two plans can be well covered. A discussion group could not do more, and might easily have the discussion more diffused. Con-

gress may debate for weeks upon some problem and may examine every suggestion, but debaters are compelled to examine only a segment of the problem, perhaps the outstanding suggestion made. It all depends upon the question for debate. A debate is not unscientific when it does not exhaust every possibility in a question; rather, it is scientific when certain parts of a problem or one suggested solution are taken for thorough examination ...

Group discussion is a proper preliminary to debate. In school and college debates this preliminary stage comes when the debaters undertake to determine the issues. They may argue the question in a general way, getting rid of irrelevant arguments, determining which arguments are most important, which are likely to be agreed to, and so forth. In a legislature, the preliminary stage may take place in a committee where a bill is being drawn; irrelevancies and obscurities should be removed so that the debate upon the bill in the house will be clear-cut. It is difficult to imagine a good debate without the preliminary discussion; but the discussion is distinctly preliminary; it shapes the problem so that debate upon the final alternatives may be well focused. So long as discussion is regarded as preparatory to debate there can be no conflict between the two methods; the conflict arises when we are urged to stop the process of argument at the end of the first stage ...

... the argument is that when people holding divergent opinions come together for discussion, a new opinion will emerge, and that this new opinion will be satisfactory to all ...

... Now what is this process of give-and-take but compromise? If no new solution can be found, what can be done but to compromise or to adjourn? ... Men have been discussing and compromising ever since they have had problems, but perhaps the new names, "discussion group," "group for creative experience," and others, do not have the bad connotations that surround the simpler word, compromise. Now a compromise is often the best solution to a problem, and often a compromise is completely successful; particularly in politics there is a good defense for the use of compromise as a substitute for force. But if we are to teach an old technique under a new name or names, it might be well to inquire why compromise has such a bad odor. The old technique, incidentally,
is fairly simple when compared with the principles of persuasion: demand more than you really expect to get so that you will have something to bargain with; and hold out doggedly for your real demands.

My greatest objection to making instruction in discussion and compromise a prime object of our teaching is that it may tend to enfeeble rigorous thinking and real convictions. If we are to teach students that an agreement is more important than anything else, that the only purpose of discussion is to reach some solution, even a compromise, we may teach shallowness and insincerity. John Morley gave this advice to compromisers: "Thoroughness is a mistake, and nailing your flag to the mast a bit of delusive heroics. Think wholly of today, and not at all of tomorrow. Beware of the high and hold fast to the safe. Dismiss convictions and study general consensus. No zeal, no faith, no intellectual trenchancy, but as much low-minded geniality and trivial complaisance as you please." Debating, for all its faults, need not encourage "low-minded geniality and trivial complaisance." A debater, rather, learns to stick to his position—perhaps too long—but to stick until he can be disproved; his purpose is to uphold this position with evidence and logic, not to strive for an agreement no matter what may happen to reason and facts. Surely there are a great many questions upon which an intelligent man ought never to compromise, ought never to give way an inch. When there are many questions upon which there can be no agreement, to teach students that they should agree, no matter what reasons or facts stand in the way, may be a dubious kind of education.

The discussion group method—or any other method—will not change men's fundamental interests. They are going to fight just as hard, just as bitterly, and with all the tricks they can command, any time that they feel that they are about to lose something. Methodology for discussion will not change the thing discussed. The discussion group method, as I see it, has two uses: it may be a necessary preliminary to debate, or in the situations where compromise seems called for, it may refine the technique. At the same time, the method has some serious disadvantages, some great difficulties, and even some dangers.

APPENDIX XV

SPEECH CONTESTS AS EDUCATIONAL TECHNICS

Henry L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin

We have witnessed, during the last few years, a remarkable increase both in the number of speech contests and in the number of participants. More students in high school and college are appearing in these events than ever before in the history of American education. While individual audiences are not so large as they were when winning debaters were borne aloft on the shoulders of cheering comrades, the total audience at speech contests in the United States, in any one year, runs well into the millions. It is significant that the various organizations and foundations interested in state or socialized medicine were glad to contribute this year $20,000 worth of pamphlets for distribution among the high schools debating this question.

At the same time, there has developed among some members of our Association an increasing distrust of the speech contest, a feeling that it consumes time and energy that might more profitably be devoted to other forms of teaching or research, a tendency to doubt its educational values. We have had speeches and articles on the pains of losing, the evils of winning, and the nefarious practices of the other side. We are as usual in the midst of a period of critical analysis.

But this critical analysis is not confined to our field. The entire curriculum, from kindergarten to graduate school, is under investigation. There is a growing revolt against the mental discipline theory of education and an insistent demand for a dynamic curriculum (I am quoting from Harold Rugg) "built around a core of pupils' activities—studies of their home communities, special readings and investigations, and a constantly growing stream of opportunities for participation in open-forum discussions, debate, and exchange of ideas."

It is high time, then, that we bring such knowledge as we have to bear in an attempt to decide whether speech contests are educational liabilities or assets—whether they should be encouraged, checked, or endured.

My discussion, like All Gaul, is divided into three parts:

1. A brief examination of the history of speech contests;
2. An inspection of these contests in the light of current trends in curriculum building.
3. An examination of some of the complaints that have been filed against them.

I.

Neither the speech contests nor the problems arising from them are new. The Greeks had a name for them. Aristotle complained because the subjects chosen for debate in the school exercises of his time were not sufficiently true to life. He was familiar, too, with the problems arising from decisions. . . .

Quintilian spoke very highly of a declamation contest that was used when he was a boy in school. . . .

Debate during the Middle Ages took the form of disputatation. . . .

Since this is not a complete history, I will not take time to tell of the growth and development of literary and debating societies in the British universities. I make the point, merely, that speech contests are old devices, that stimulating a student to his greatest endeavors by a desire to win approval or victory over his fellows is not a product of this mad, modern, materialistic age.

Moreover, we should remember that our profession had its beginnings largely in preparing students for speech contests. The idea of having courses in speech and departments of speech did not spring full grown from the brains of presidents and deans. It came from the students who wanted to do well in literary societies, in the required declamations and orations, and in the oratorical contests, and who were willing to pay extra for special instruction in elocution. Speech courses, like courses in journalism, grew out of student activities. . . .

We should remember, too, that the use of the contest has not been confined to speech. Our colleagues in music have used it much more extensively, and in many ways more successfully, than we. County and state fairs, with ribbons and money prizes for the best entries, have all through their history used the contest technique for improving farm practices. The 4-H Clubs, with their county, state, and national contests in cooking and sewing, stock judging and stock raising, have brought national attention and commendation to the efforts of state and federal departments of agriculture to train young men and women for life on the farm and in the home. Contests have been used to stimulate the production of art and literature; and prizes have been offered for the best school newspaper, the best play, and the best suggestion for bringing about world peace. . . .

II.

I turn now to the second question, "How do speech contests fit into current trends in curriculum building?"

I do not pretend to have read all of the new educational psychology, but I have read a great deal of it, and, if I mistake not, most of its philosophy can be summarized in the following five statements (for the wording of which no one but me should be held responsible).

Statement I. That form of education is best which begins with the student's immediate interests and works toward more remote goals. Most girls and boys are more interested in doing a play than in analyzing a plot; more interested in trying to read poems aloud than in hearing about the poet's social philosophy or in memorizing his rhyme scheme; more interested in debates and discussions of current problems than in studying a book that begins at the historical beginning and ends with a few scattered comments about the twentieth century.

Statement II. That form of education is best which demands marked activity on the part of the student.

The student learns more from doing the thing badly than he does from hearing teacher talk about it. The student who is reading a selection aloud is more active than when he looks at black marks on a white page. The student who is reading or presenting his knowledge in the form of a discussion, a speech, or a debate, is more active than when he is listening to a more thorough explanation from his teacher. The student
who is acting in a play is more active than when he is reading it silently.

Furthermore, the contestants who are listening to opposing debaters, or waiting for their turn in a speaking or reading contest, are more active than when they are sitting in class wondering whether they will be called on to answer a question.

Statement III. The situations and projects devised should resemble desirable life situations as nearly as possible.

Note that I said desirable life situations. Because discussions in real life are often based on little knowledge of the subject, it does not follow that we should plan speech contests in which the speaker substitutes wisecracks for evidence. Because in real life we often act without viewing both sides of the question, it does not follow that we should plan contests that countenance or encourage this practice.

Our speech contests are often criticized on the ground that they have become so stereotyped and formalized that they no longer resemble life situations. Certain it is that we should be constantly on the alert to improve them, just as we are constantly trying to improve our classroom techniques.

But speech contests are good in that they make use of knowledge in the form in which such knowledge is used outside of school. After students leave school they write very few themes and take very few written examinations. Many adults actually confess that they have never written a bluebook since they quit school! But they talk about economics and social problems; they argue about political matters; they listen to plays; they give reports and read poems at club meetings; they speak before juries and boards of directors; they talk much and write little.

Statement IV. The situation and projects devised should challenge the student to his best efforts.

There is ample testimony that speech contests call forth efforts that are not motivated by the work of the classroom. Superior students who can get "A's" without extending themselves are publicly pitted against superior students from other groups. When properly conducted, the contest program provides a series of tests or crises that measure the student's ability to rise to the occasion, to call on his reserves, and to do better than he supposed was his best.

Statement V. The situations and projects should test the student's ability to synthesize materials drawn from various sources.

Our educational system, with its courses and credits, is often criticized as being too compartmentalized. But in the proper presentation of a play, the student makes use of his knowledge of electricity, of carpentry, of costuming, of the literature and history of the period. It is, indeed, the drawing together of all the pertinent knowledge that can be gained from many and seemingly diverse departments and courses.

Precisely the same thing is true of debating. Knowledge that the debater gains from many sources, within and without the classroom, must be fitted together into a unified argument.

On the basis of this theoretical analysis, I think we are justified in concluding that speech contests, when properly conducted, are based on sound educational psychology, and are, indeed, an extension of the work of the classroom.

But how does the theory work out in practice? I here present the results of two studies.

About three years ago the United States Office of Education released the findings of the National Survey of Secondary Education, a study of considerable scope and importance. One section of this investigation dealt with non-athletic extra-curriculum activities in 224 selected high schools.\(^1\) It was found in these schools that 5,424 students practiced for, and 1,326 actually took part in interscholastic contests in oratory, declamation, dramatic reading, and extempore speaking.

I quote the summary paragraph: "The data shows that interscholastic activities of the non-athletic type have gained a prominent place in the extra-curricular programs... The administration of the activities in the training, selection, and maintenance of standards for the participation of contestants appears to be fairly satisfactory."

The same report records the result of a survey of 529 graduates of secondary schools who had been out of high school for an average of nine years. These graduates believed (1) that participation in these activities in high school developed desirable traits and characteristics, (2) that the undesirable influences of activities are slight as compared with the desirable. Approximately 90 per cent advise pupils entering high school to enter such activities.

\(^1\) Non-athletic Extra-curriculum Activities (Bulletins, 1932, No. 17. United States Office of Education).
The second study deals with extra-curriculum activities at the college level. It was conducted by Professor F. S. Chapin of the Department of Sociology at the University of Minnesota. He found that students who participated "... in several campus activities have a slightly higher average of academic achievement than students who are less active or inactive in campus affairs. ..." and that students engaged in intellectual activities (with the exception of those in dramatics and music) have a higher scholastic average than those whose activities were chiefly of a social character.

38 per cent of the alumni he interviewed thought their extra-curriculum ... more valuable than classroom.

25.6 per cent ... of equal value.

36.4 per cent ... of less value.
These percentages are not sorted for different types of activities.

Professor Chapin concludes, "... all the results seem to point to the fact of social and educational values inhering in and accruing from extra-curricular activities. ... It seems likely that they serve a real function in developing that social intelligence which has long been recognized ... as an attribute of vast importance."

There is every reason to believe that speech contests, when properly conducted, have inherent educational value and social worth.

III.

We come now to a consideration of some of the complaints that have been made against them.

Our first observation is that every school exercise, every educational technique, has been the target of such attacks. And every educational device from the first freshman theme to the last examination may be so poorly conducted as to be of little or no value. Let us hasten to admit that some of our present speech contests fall within this category. We have our share of poor teachers and are doing our share of poor teaching. Our contests, conducted by untrained, uninterested,
best without the motivation that comes from public recognition or possible victory.

But more fundamental than these somewhat perennial complaints is the criticism of the debate. There is something in the nature of a revolt against this device and a corresponding movement towards the panel, the symposium, the forum, or the parliamentary assembly. With the idea behind this movement I am in sympathy. The debate is not the best device for all stages in the formation of public opinion. There should be three steps in the formation of an intelligent decision on any problem:

First, What is the problem? What is its history? Is it a serious problem or a minor difficulty?

Second, If you find that a real problem exists, what are the suggested solutions? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each?

Third, Which solution is the group willing to recommend?

For the first and second steps the debate is poorly adapted. It attempts to force one too quickly to a decision, without an adequate background knowledge of the question and of alternatives other than the one considered in the debate. For these stages some form of group discussion that encourages the discovery and presentation of expository and historical material is best. But when the third stage is reached, the debate is the best method yet devised because (I am quoting A. Lawrence Lowell) "it forces the audience to listen to both sides, thereby avoiding the danger of having the verdict result from fixing the attention only on facts bearing on one side."

Too often we have assumed that in order to advocate the use of discussion we need to attack debate. The propagandist for the discussion device tends to compare a poor debate, or a debate wrongly used, with an ideal discussion. But the panel, the group discussion, and the symposium are not without their weaknesses. One is that, unless there is careful advance preparation, they substitute lots of talk and a pleasant time for a thorough study of the question. Then it is easier to "rig" the discussion, to load the dice in favor of one point of view. There is real danger that the panel, the informal discussion, and the forum may become the tools of propaganda groups. The same groups avoid the debate (unless it be a set-up affair with a stooge for an opponent), for the debate gives the other side an equal chance. In some form or other, debate must be preserved as the essential tool of democracy.

IV.

Speech contests, like any other educational device, are, of themselves, neither good nor bad. Their value rests on whether they stimulate the student to efforts he would not otherwise have made, in situations that are measurably like those he may meet outside of school. Speech contests have a long, and, in the main, an enviable history as devices for training superior students who are not stimulated to their best efforts by the work of the classroom. We should apportion our teaching time and decide what part of it may properly be devoted to these superior students. We should be constantly looking for ways of varying the contests so that they may not become stereotyped in form or unresponsive to changing conditions. But let us not discard them unless we are sure that we have invented other techniques of equal motivating power and with fewer possibilities for misuse.
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