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"To open the mind, to correct it, to refine it, to enable it to know, and to digest, master, rule, and use its knowledge, to give it power over its own faculties, application, flexibility, method, critical exactness, sagacity, resource, address, eloquent expression, is an object as intelligible . . . as the cultivation of virtue."

JOHN CARDINAL NEWMAN

PREFACE

From their experience with debating, both in colleges and in high schools, the writers of this book have come to feel that a gap exists between the actual debate and the usual textbook on argumentation. Such a textbook, designed primarily for the classroom, gives a great deal of space to the principles of argument and very little to the specific problems that confront a coach and squad when they start out to prepare for a contest. This book is an attempt to solve some of those problems, giving special attention to the needs of the secondary school.

The discussion of the principles of argumentation has therefore been reduced to a minimum and emphasis placed throughout on the application of principles and on practical suggestions. After the aims of debating have been stated in Chapter I and the coach's duties outlined in Chapter II, the coach and squad are carried, step by step, through the work of preparation, from the first tryout to the final rebuttal speech. The last four chapters and the appendixes are designed to aid the teacher of speech and administrative officer in making incidental arrangements for interscholastic contests and for carrying on debating within the school.

In order to make the book as useful as possible, the
writers have made a special effort to draw their illustrations from actual practice with recent debate questions rather than from classical models of oral argument and written composition. Where additional knowledge of a principle or method is needed for thorough understanding, the reader has been referred in footnotes to fuller discussions in other books. In conformity with the general purpose, the bibliography has been limited to those books and articles which the writers themselves have found especially helpful.

Debating has been treated throughout as an exercise in public speaking and therefore in persuasion. Teachers of speech in ever-increasing numbers are coming to recognize that if training in debate is to benefit the debater in later life, it must emphasize the speaker's relation to his audience. The present writers are convinced that stressing the speaker-audience relation will lead to more effective thinking and speaking, and consequently to more successful debating.

This book was originally a co-operative effort of the Public Speaking staff of the University of Pittsburgh. But as the members of that group have scattered, the scope of the work has broadened to include the contributions of teachers in several universities and a high school: Hoyt H. Hudson, Ph.D., Professor of Public Speaking at Princeton University; Wayland M. Parrish, Ph.D., Professor of Public Speaking at the University of Pittsburgh; Mrs. Ruth Huston-Whipple, A.M., Instructor in Argumentation and Debate at Northwestern High School, Detroit; Wilbur E. Gilman, M.A., Associate Professor of English at the University of Missouri; Ross Scanlan, M.A., Instructor in Public Speaking at Cornell University; Richard Murphy, M.A., Instructor in English at the University of Pittsburgh; and Miss Theresa G. Kahn, A.B., Instructor in English at the University of Pittsburgh. Each of the contributors has had practical experience in training debate teams.

The book owes a great deal more to Mrs. Ruth HustonWhipple than the table of contents can show. Her scheme of apportioning the various stages of debate preparation among twelve weeks forms the skeleton of the whole work, and many of her specific suggestions have been incorporated in various chapters. I am indebted to Mr. Ross Scanlan, formerly a colleague at Washington University, for constant criticism and editorial assistance, and especially to Professor Herbert A. Wichelns of Cornell University, whose detailed comments on the manuscript have been of the highest value. My wife, Louise Riley Howes, has patiently shared the work of reading proof and compiling the Index.

Various individual contributors wish to note obligations to Professor William E. Utterback of Oberlin College, Professor Howard S. Woodward of Western Reserve University, Mr. F. W. Shockley, Director of the Extension Division of the University of Pittsburgh, and to many high school superintendents, principals, and debate coaches whose ideas, offered in letters or conversation, have had an important influence on the material here presented.
The Quarterly Journal of Speech has generously permitted Professor Gilman to reprint part of an article as Chapter XIII and Mrs. Huston-Whipple to use several portions of an article in Chapters III and XII. The writers' debts to the works of Professors W. T. Foster, W. C. Shaw, and J. A. Winans also demand particular mention here, as too great to be adequately acknowledged by the frequent references in the text.

RAYMOND F. HOWES

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
St. Louis, Missouri.
March 1, 1931
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CHAPTER I

THE AIMS OF DEBATING

What True Debating Does for the Student

It is generally agreed that among all the interscholastic activities in which high schools engage debating is one of the most valuable. It is primarily an intellectual activity, often the only intellectual activity in which students may compete with rivals from neighboring schools. Since education is concerned principally with the development of the mind, it is quite right that debating should be regarded with favor. It is an exercise in doing the sort of thing in which the schools are most eager to have their students become proficient. Parents and faculty alike feel honest pride in the boy or girl who excels in debating. The debater has a good mind. He has skill in the use of the language. He has some degree of poise and confidence. He is presumably interested in the great questions of the day, the problems of his people, and is able to discuss them with intelligence. And, if a very good debater, he sometimes has in addition those qualities which Emerson found in the stump orator — "presence of mind, heat,
spunk, continuity, humanity.” Quite naturally, then, debating is in high favor.

But like all good things, it is capable of abuse. Its aim and function are frequently misunderstood. One might reasonably suppose from the nature of contests sometimes heard that debating is a major sport, or a species of mild warfare, or an advertising medium for coaches, or merely a means of accumulating school “victories.” And it frequently happens that an overemphasis on one of these elements defeats the very purpose on which the debater is most intent. We need to reexamine debating in the light of what it is intended to be and do, and determine where and how far it has gone astray.

**Some False Aims in Debating**

Let us consider some of the perversions of the true aims of debating. One of the most frequent of them is the tendency, very common especially among young debaters, to look upon the activity as a form of combat. Such a speaker takes on the platform a belligerent attitude. There is no friendliness about him. He resents everything his opponents say about his case, and feels bound to refute it. He makes no concessions. The opposing debaters are enemies; he watches them with suspicion and mistrust. His mind is filled with the fight image. He is out to flay the enemy, and he will neither accept quarter nor give any. Amid all this bloody slaughter poor Truth runs distracted from the field; friendly courtesy is forgotten; and frequently the debater’s excessive eagerness to win leads to his defeat.

Surely, one of the things we need to learn in society is how to disagree without fighting. Differences of opinion we shall have whenever intelligent people get together. We need to learn that a man whose opinion is different from ours is not necessarily a fool, a liar, or a dangerous enemy. The high school debate is one place where boys and girls should learn and practise friendly discussion. They should not seem to be bent solely upon proving themselves triumphantly right and their opponents disgracefully wrong. The audience and judges have not come to witness a gladiatorial combat, but to hear a fair-minded discussion. They will be stimulated to friendliness toward the speakers if the speakers show some friendliness and tolerance toward their opponents.

A second current delusion is that debating is a kind of elocution exercise or speaking contest, governed by a set of artificial rules gathered from elocution books of thirty years ago. I have watched high school debaters who had evidently been carefully “coached” in where to stand, when to step forward, and when to step sideways, where to lift the hand in what was intended for a gesture, when to become impassioned, and just when and how to do all manner of tricks with the voice. The student’s mind during all this exhibition had presumably been parked in a safe place where it could be found when he left the platform. Surely such performances are a travesty on what debating ought to be. If there is ever a time when one
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should think his own thoughts, speak out of his own mind, it is during a public discussion. His attention should be on what he is saying, not on tricks of elocution. His chief concern should be that his audience get his thought, not that they admire his stance.

A third mistake lies in the notion that debate is merely a listing of arguments, a cataloguing of reasons, an exercise in pure logic. Of course proof is important, vitally important. It is the one element that good debating must never lack. But it is not all of debating. One of the early steps in the preparation of a debate speech is a careful statement of the logical elements involved. But if a speaker stops here and merely recites this bare brief or formal skeleton of proof, he has neglected to complete his preparation. This ugly but useful skeleton should be concealed. The argument should have flesh and blood as well as bones. It must be dressed for public presentation, adapted to the understanding and interest of those who will come to hear it. The speaker must add persuasion to the cold statement of the evidence. This is necessary even before a judge on the bench, as every lawyer knows. It is obvious that the average audience or debate judge cannot be expected to listen more patiently and more critically than a professional judge in the law courts. They are human, and they expect to be interested. If they are not interested, they will never be persuaded.

AIMS

THE GAME ELEMENT

But perhaps the chief evil that attends debating is regarding it as a mere game, a species of contest or sport wherein the only aim is to win a decision, to score a victory. Surely it is a mistake to allow an audience of school children to squirm incomprehendingly during an hour and a half of rhetorical trickery if their sole concern is to hear the home team receive a decision. If the team has failed to interest them in the question discussed, it has failed to accomplish that upon which the decision should be based. And if the teams are intent only on winning a decision, they will very probably lose many of the finest benefits in debating. That high school boys and girls should be interested in discussion for the sake of discussion is surely desirable. And it is just as surely possible. Hear them in an argument of their own making on the street or in the club, and their earnestness and conviction permit no doubt of their genuine interest. Many recent experiments with decisionless debates have not caused any appreciable slackening in interest, either in debaters or auditors.

The stimulus of victory, when it supersedes all other motives, is sometimes positively harmful. It may lead to the neglect of the most valuable features in debating, and it may lead to practices which are definitely unethical. The kind of training that makes a winning team is not necessarily the kind of training that has the highest educational value for the debaters, just as training a football team to win games does not necessarily give them the
kind of exercise most valuable for their physical development. A desire to win at any cost may lead to practices which destroy the educational value of debating, which create hard feeling, and which are sometimes harmful to morals.

There are schools where coaches are hired, not to teach boys and girls, but solely to win debates. There are schools where a money bonus is paid to a team if it wins from a rival school, regardless of the method of winning. There are schools where scouts are sent in advance into the “enemy’s” school to discover if possible his line of attack. There are schools where a judge who votes against the home team is never asked to return; he has committed the unpardonable sin. There are schools where he will need police protection to get out of the hall safely. Under such circumstances, speakers are trained to say only what their coaches think will win the judge’s favor. Little attention is given to urging them to think for themselves. They are taught to score points rather than to shed light on a troublesome question and strive toward its solution.

One teacher, who evidently sees debating as a professional soldier sees war, ventures into print to explain ways of “surprising, astounding, overwhelming, confusing, waylaying, or trapping an opponent.” He recommends for a weak case a strategy which “seeks always to evade the issues,” sometimes by deliberate and far-flung discussion of irrelevant matters, sometimes by setting up a totally different set of alleged issues; and quite frequently by postponing necessary constructive proof under the issues “until there can be no opportunity for reply.” Under such instructions, students will naturally conceal important facts that ought to be made known, invent authorities, manufacture evidence, and, in general, behave like a lot of shyster lawyers engaged in the worst practice of the criminal courts. Add to all this the haggling of the coaches over the selection of judges, the quarreling of timekeepers, and the general attitude of suspicion and hostility between schools, and you have what is indeed a very sorry business.

What is sometimes lost sight of is the fact that victory is worth having only when it is honestly earned. It should come only as a reward for good debating. No decent boy will accept a medal or a cup that he has not earned. No respectable team and no honorable coach will wish to steal a debate victory. And the wholesome corrective for the abuses detailed above lies in the fact that no intelligent audience will favor such practices in debating, and any competent judge will properly penalize them.

**Proper Aims of Debating**

It is time now to state aims that debating as a school activity might properly have. The National Association of Teachers of Speech, in a recently published syllabus of courses for high schools,\(^1\) states the aim of a course of study in argumentation and debating as follows: “to develop

\(^1\) *A Course of Study in Public Speaking and Speech Training*, edited by A. M. Drummond. The Century Company.
the logical faculties, especially in the field of opinion; to train in gathering, testing, and arranging evidence; to give practice in brief drawing and in the writing of arguments; to afford experience and instruction in fair-minded discussion and in oral debate.” The syllabus states further that debating should be conceived as a “process of arriving at compromise, or assent to action, or of attempting to arrive at truth.” These are the aims of a course of study in debating. Will they not serve equally well for extracurricular debating? If debating is conceived as educational in aim, they will. We need to add to them only the aim to give students practical experience in persuading real audiences and judges, and possibly the additional aim of helping audiences to form sound opinions based on a fair hearing of both sides of a public question.

WHAT THIS ATTITUDE INVOLVES

Let us see now what the acceptance of these aims will involve. It will not mean the abandonment of contest debating, but it should mean that “victory” will not be the sole end in these contests. Professor Hicks of Swarthmore College, in an article on “The New Spirit in Debating” in the syllabus mentioned above, says, “The element of sport that should be preserved in debating is sport for sport’s sake, discussion for the sake of expressing one’s convictions upon a subject of immediate concern, not for the glory that comes from being a member of a school team. The sport of debating should find its greatest satisfaction not in the result, but in the playing of the game.” The acceptance of these aims may mean for some a change in the method of training debaters. Instead of two or three good speakers’ being selected and crammed by the coach with speeches which he has written for them, a larger number of students will probably be trained in a class or club for public discussion.

In this normal, natural activity, free from the artificial rules and win-or-die spirit of formal debating, there will ordinarily develop a much sounder and more wholesome conception and practice of discussion. It will mean, too, the selection of questions which are of genuine interest both to the debaters and to their audience. And it may mean a change in the nature of the audience that comes to hear the debate. There may be fewer of the school fans who support anything that has a sporting element in it, and a larger number of the more thoughtful folk who are interested in learning something about the problems of the day.

Another factor which cannot be ignored if contest debating is to continue is the changed conception of debating in the mind of the average judge. The new spirit in debating has quite thoroughly impregnated the colleges, and high school debate judges are often selected either from the members of college faculties or from men who are in close touch with the colleges and subject to their influence. Such judges will expect the kind of discussion here recommended. In general, their criteria of judgment are sounder and more uniform than could be expected
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from the lawyer, the minister, and the school principal who formerly were chosen to make up a jury.

The lawyer serving as judge might look only for dry evidence, and put a premium on quibbling over technicalities. The minister might see only elocution. The school principal might be a baseball fan who would look only for hits. But the modern judge of the best type, with a dominant interest in public affairs, will favor the type of debating which most resembles and best prepares for the real popular discussions of democratic society. Honesty, intelligence, resourcefulness, and skill in this very practical business of public discussion will win, as they will merit, his decision.

A school following these objectives should win victories. But it should have also the higher, if less appreciated, satisfaction of knowing that it is making a sound contribution to the education of its boys and girls, and to the community in which they live.

CHAPTER II

THE FUNCTION OF THE COACH

THE COACH’S DUTIES

The duties of a debate coach have become rather definitely fixed by custom. He is usually expected to work as follows:

1. To make out a definite schedule of work for the debaters
2. To arrange for tryouts and to help select, on the basis of those tryouts, the squad and the team
3. To supervise the gathering of material
4. To give the debaters a working knowledge of tests for evidence and of types of argument
5. To aid the debaters, in a series of conferences, to find the issues and formulate the case
6. To assign individual debaters to specific divisions of the case
7. To criticize speeches for organization, interest, style, and delivery
8. To see that the debaters are equipped for refutation.

He may also be called upon at times to select the subject for discussion. He will often find, too, that he is responsible for securing a chairman and judges and for making other arrangements connected with the actual debate.
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THE SCHEDULE

First in the order of time and certainly not last in importance is the schedule. Many a debate team has been hopelessly swamped because its period of preparation was too short and its method of work poorly outlined. A college team may sometimes make a creditable showing after preparing for six weeks or less, but the average high school team needs three months. The high school debater has to start from the very beginning. Usually he has had little or no experience as a public speaker, lacks a general background of economics, political science, sociology, and history, and needs considerable instruction in argumentation. If possible, therefore, the high school schedule should be as follows:

First week: first tryouts
Second week: second tryouts
Third week: third tryouts
Fourth week: fourth and final tryouts; selection of team or teams
Fifth week: general reading by debaters on the question; conferences between debaters and the coach on issues and organization of the case; division of arguments
Sixth week: more detailed reading by debaters on their specific issues; meetings to allow the coach to check up on this reading and to criticize evidence and arguments
Seventh week: writing by each debater of a complete brief for his part of the case; more conferences
Eighth week: writing of speech by each debater; criticism by the coach; rewriting
Ninth to twelfth weeks: work on delivery, practice debates, and drill on refutation.

FUNCTION OF COACH

Each of these steps produces its peculiar problems, which will be discussed in the chapters following and in the appendixes. One general question must be decided, however, at the very outset: How strictly shall the coach control the preparation of the individual debater?

THE DANGER OF DOMINANCE BY THE COACH

Not long ago the superintendent of schools in a little Pennsylvania town vehemently objected to a judge's decision against his high school debate team. His argument was this: "We have the highest paid and most efficient debate coach in our league. The speeches he wrote for this debate were the best he has ever turned out. Those speeches were thoroughly memorized by the debaters and delivered flawlessly. How could our team lose?" The answer was simple. That team had obviously done no thinking of its own. Even the rebuttal speeches had been memorized before the debate and, though well delivered, failed to hit the important arguments advanced by the opposing team. The coach, by doing all the work, had made mere phonographs of his debaters. And a phonograph, no matter how beautiful in tone, is not an effective instrument in a debate.

The coach must, of course, make out his schedule and see to it that the debaters finish each part of their work on time. But no matter how great the temptation, he should refrain from doing their work for them. That temptation is at times almost overwhelming. A debater may come
to conference after conference lacking the necessary proof for an argument. Probably the coach could find that proof in half an hour. Or the debater may seem absolutely unable to organize his evidence in a clear-cut, logical way. The coach could rewrite the whole speech in an evening. If the coach does either of those tasks for him, however, the student not only loses the personal benefits he should derive from debating but also becomes a less effective speaker on the platform.

Hence one textbook lays down the dictum, "The coach should carefully abstain from looking up material"; and another puts the same idea in these words: "There are times in every debate when nothing but a complete understanding of the underlying principles will suffice. At such times that team will go to pieces which has allowed the coach to do most of the work." The duty of the coach is not to look up material, but to show the debater how to do it. This training will be of inestimable value to the student in later years. After leaving the high school squad he may never be called upon to prove parliamentary government better than government by written constitution, but the methods of gathering and weighing evidence that he learns there may some day help him to discover whether or not he should invest in Bonanza Oil or join the Ku Klux Klan. A more direct result of correct training is that he will debate more effectively. A student whose facts and arguments have been gathered and organized by the coach will not only be helpless to uphold his stand in rebuttal after an opponent’s attack, but will present his ideas with less enthusiasm and force in his direct speech. Arguments must be thoroughly mastered to be given persuasively. A debater ordinarily will not take the trouble to master them if they come to him on a silver platter.

Yet the coach must supervise and criticize the debater’s work. To one learning marksmanship, it is just as bewildering to be handed a gun and told to shoot as best one can as it is to have the instructor load the gun, adjust its sights, aim it, and allow one merely to pull the trigger. The whole problem is rather subtle, and its solution depends often on common sense rather than on rules. This much may be said, however: The coach’s purpose is to make of the student an effective debater; the debater will deliver effectively only what he has thoroughly mastered; the basic problem of the coach, then, is to aid the individual debater to master his material and present it effectively.
CHAPTER III

SELECTING THE TEAM

CONDUCTING SQUAD TRYOUTS

In coaching a team, the first thing to be considered is tryouts. The first year it may be difficult to bring out as many students as you wish, but eventually you will have plenty of material. The debaters may try out through their English classes or debating society, or by signing up with the coach for a series of contests. The latter is usually the better process. Debate tryouts should be advertised three or four weeks before the day for signing up, through the school paper, bulletin-board announcements, and speeches in the grade rooms. All sophomores, juniors, and seniors who are doing passing work in three-fourths of their courses should be eligible. As a rule high school students in their first year are too young and immature to be desirable material. After a sufficient number have signed up, they may choose their own topics for the first tryout. The second tryout should come a week later with speeches of four minutes on the question to be debated. The third week's tryout should consist of five minute speeches and three minutes of rebuttal for each speaker. The fourth and final tryout should take place the fourth week, each student having six minutes for his direct speech and four minutes for rebuttal. If there is practically a tie between two speeches, a fifth tryout with a new set of judges may be held. The number eliminated at each tryout depends, of course, upon the number who enter in the first place. If you have thirty people trying out the first week, eliminate six, leaving twenty-four for the second, eighteen for the third, and twelve for the fourth week. Experience has taught me to have a number of teachers for judges rather than to rely on my own judgment alone. If I had relied solely on my own judgment, we should have lost one of the best high school debaters that Detroit has ever known. Variety of judgment is usually safest; on the other hand, it is wise to choose for judges those teachers who know most about the principles of public speaking. Sometimes five may be used, sometimes seven. Try to keep the same group throughout the series.

Please note the word "series." Too much cannot be said in favor of a series of tryouts instead of only one or two. A month gives the coach a chance to become well acquainted with the squad; it reveals the weaklings who are out for much honor and no work, or those who never stick to anything long enough to progress; it leaves a residue of people who really want to debate. The race is not always to the swift. Many times those who start well end badly, and vice versa. It is the latter who make the best debaters, the plucky ones who will work and fail and fail and work, until finally they achieve. On one occasion our principal and I were fully
convincing that a certain girl would make the team. She went through the first three tryouts with flying colors; her fourth was a distinct failure. In view of her previous record, we gave her a fifth chance, but the result was the same. A few weeks revealed the fact that the girl was exceedingly nervous and could never have stayed on, if she had made a place. If the tryouts had been hasty, this girl would have made the team, would have been compelled to withdraw, and would thus have furnished conspicuous evidence for those who say that debating is too strenuous.

The Basis of Final Selection

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 work? Is his scholarship record high enough to recommend him? Is he dependable? Is he capable of hard work? "Yes" will be the answer to all of these questions for most of the faithful who have withstood the onslaught of four tryouts. If you find one who does not meet these acid tests, both you and the team are better off without him. I remember too well one boy whom we let slide into a debating team on his reputation. He was exceedingly clever and the school pet; consequently every one thought he would make a good debater. He thought so too. He refused to work, had his mind on a dozen other activities, and nearly ruined the morale of his team. The day of the debate his cleverness and supreme self-confidence did not carry him through. He made a mess of everything from his constructive speech to rebuttal, so much so that even he had to admit it. A high school debating team is no place for the overconfident, the indolent, the unreliable, those poor in scholarship, or for the physically weak. As soon as a debating coach has learned this, and practises it even in the face of faculty opposition, he has diminished his problems by half.

The Value of Alternates

Another point to be considered at the time of tryouts is the alternate. A team may go through a whole season without using the alternate in any way. Our teams did this two years, but it is rather unsatisfactory, because, if anything does happen to a member of the team, the alternate is so wholly unprepared that he cannot do justice to himself or his colleagues. Again we have tried having one alternate attend debate practices, participate in rebuttal, and aid the team generally. This is successful if you have an alternate who is willing to work hard, when he is practically sure that he will not participate in a debate. We finally tried having second teams composed of three alternates each. With this system one is sure of having one alternate ready to replace any member of the first team; the second teams get and give real rebuttal training in their practice debates with the first team; a larger number of students are being trained in debate; more people are being prepared for the following year;
and the additional work for the coach is more than offset by aid which the second teams render. Again, however, there is the difficulty of persuading high school boys and girls that second place is desirable. They are even more sensitive about playing second place than are college students. We have partially solved the problem by giving them an interschool debate with another second team as a goal toward which they could work. The question of handling alternates is largely a matter of tact. There is no doubt that every high school debating team needs alternates, sometimes directly and always indirectly.

CHAPTER IV

GATHERING MATERIAL

THE CHIEF SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

During the time of tryouts and for at least four weeks after the team is chosen, the debaters will be gathering material. They have, in general, four sources: knowledge imparted to them in conversation by specialists in the subject to be debated; books and magazines; pamphlets, speeches, clippings, and written opinions obtained through the library or from organizations or individuals particularly interested in the question; and first-hand examinations of conditions in their own community. The coach should be prepared to answer inquiries concerning any of these sources.

First, then, the coach should try to discover which members of the school faculty can help his students. In every school there are teachers of history, economics, and political science who have information valuable to debaters, and who can, if willing, give them facts, points of view, opinions, and advice. The coach himself is not expected to be an authority in the social sciences; he should take every opportunity to send his debaters to those who are.

Second, the coach should be in constant touch with the
school library and, if possible, with a good public or university library near by. The librarian will often set aside a shelf in the reading room for books pertaining to the debate subject, and will usually help to fill the shelf herself. She will know what to do, too, when students come to her with a blank look and the statement, “I’m trying out for a debate on government ownership of hydroelectric power.”

Students often need to be told how to use the index system in the library and where to find and how to use the *Readers’ Guide to Periodical Literature* or some other convenient index to magazine articles. The coach should therefore find out for himself from the librarian what he needs to know to fit himself to give such advice.¹

### Securing Additional Material

Often, however, the facilities of the library are inadequate. The coach can do much on his own account to supply deficiencies. For instance, package libraries containing collections of magazine articles, reports, bulletins, and pamphlets on specific subjects may be borrowed from the extension divisions of most state universities and from the extension divisions of many state libraries, such as the Pennsylvania State Library at Harrisburg. Some libraries will also lend collections of pertinent newspaper clippings.

¹ See J. A. Winans: *Public Speaking* (The Century Company), Chapter XV, on how to use the library. For a full list of guides to newspapers, periodicals, books, Government reports, etc., see Appendix XIX of Foster’s *Argumentation and Debating*.

Government bulletins not in the local library may be obtained through the Congressman of the district or directly from the Superintendent of Documents in Washington, D. C. The Clerk of the House or the Clerk of the Senate will send, on request, copies of bills and committee reports. Members of Congress who are especially interested in the passage or defeat of legislation on the subject for debate will often send copies of their own speeches and supplementary pamphlets. Senator Borah, for example, has on many occasions given debate teams material on the World Court, prohibition, judicial reform, and Latin-American relations. Similar material in great profusion will be furnished free by a large number of interested or nonpartisan organizations such as the Foreign Policy Association, the American Federation of Labor, the American Peace Society, and the League of Women Voters.²

When the subject to be debated is of immediate national importance, the coach can sometimes secure personal letters from social workers, governors of states, university professors, and members of Congress. Great care must be used if these letters are quoted in the actual debate, however. They should be open to perusal by both teams.

² The *World Almanac*, under the heading, “Organizations in the United States,” gives each year a complete list of such associations with their correct addresses.

¹ A complete list of Government publications is contained in the *Congressional Record’s* index to the proceedings of each entire Congress. Publications should be ordered specifically by title and number.
Otherwise the reading of material not generally accessible gives the impression, rightly or wrongly, of unfairness.

In recent years many state universities have become increasingly interested in high school debating and have begun the practice of distributing, in booklet form, information about the questions used in the leagues they sponsor. In 1930 the University of Kansas issued such a booklet on the chain store, and distributed it in several states. Two series of books on debatable questions, the Reference Shelf and the Debaters' Handbook (both published by the H. W. Wilson Company of New York), contain, like the state university booklets, reprints of selected articles, briefs, and bibliographies, and will be found valuable. Books such as the H. W. Wilson Company's University Debaters' Annual and Noble and Noble's Intercollegiate Debates (also published in New York), which contain speeches from actual intercollegiate debates, bibliographies, and sometimes briefs, will help the coach, but in the early stages of preparation should be kept from the debaters.

No two teams ever discuss a subject with precisely the same background or training. Hence a brief entirely adequate for one debate may be nearly worthless for another; and the use of another person's speech, though highly tempting, is dangerous. If the debater is allowed to lean heavily on the finished work of others, he loses all incentive to gather material for himself and think through the problem in his own way. The same reasons should make the coach look with suspicion on prepared speeches offered by numerous debaters' information bureaus. Not only are such speeches often poorly written, but the use of them crushes any spark of originality which the debater may have.

Gathering Information from the Community

Fortunately, the coach who desires to use intercollegiate debates as models need not send his team to books alone. He may take his squad to the nearest college or university. If the local newspapers fail to carry complete schedules of these debates, the director of forensics will be glad to furnish information concerning dates, places, and questions to be discussed. Many colleges will even bring teams to the high school for a debate on any subject suggested. Such a debate imparts facts, outlines the contentions, and illustrates methods of reasoning and of communicating ideas to a real audience without allowing the high school student to copy another speaker's sentences and paragraphs word for word.

If the student has heard several good intercollegiate debates, he may notice that quotations from the speeches

---

1 This booklet, prepared by Professor E. C. Buehler and published by the Journalism Press of the University of Kansas for the Extension Division of the University, was adopted by high school leagues in eighteen states. In the same year the University of Texas and the University of Kentucky published handbooks for the high school leagues in their states. Other material was prepared for distribution by the Speech faculty of Albion College, Michigan, by a professor at the University of Cincinnati, and by several other official and semi-official college organizations.
of local citizens and the reports of local organizations hold the attention of the audience better than most other kinds of evidence. He will begin to realize that people who come to hear debates on unemployment care less about the bills before Congress or statements by Senator Glass than about the accomplishments of their own Community Fund and their own mayor’s plan to use city money for relief of the poor. This realization should open his eyes to the value of clippings from the town newspaper and interviews with public men of his community.

Going a step or two further, he can find many other sources of information near home. If he is debating the desirability of chain stores, he can compare the prices of standard articles in neighborhood chain and independent groceries, and perhaps discover whether or not the chain managers employ fewer clerks than the independent owners. If he plans to speak on the usefulness of installment buying, he can collect advertisements of stores that employ the “dollar down and dollar a week — we trust everybody” system of selling goods, and he can sometimes procure from furniture dealers and automobile salesmen specimen contracts showing how much the buyer is charged for the privilege of making deferred payments. The debater who really desires knowledge will find similar sources of information about modern advertising, censorship, the jury system, and many other subjects of current importance.

The more the coach can do to help his team tap all these sources in the early stages of preparation, the better it will be for everybody. The last three tryouts, as has been explained previously, should be on the subject for debate. The studying which the members of the squad do during these three weeks before the team is finally chosen will give them an indispensable foundation for the work of the fifth week, which includes finding the issues and organizing the case.

**The First Meeting with the Team**

At the first meeting of the two or three debaters who have been selected for the team, a meeting scheduled for the beginning of the fifth week, the coach will find a great deal to do. He must outline the sources of material and make sure that each debater knows how to use the library and the *Readers’ Guide*. He must impress upon each member of the team the importance of making an exact record of every magazine article, book, pamphlet, or speech he reads. Part of the assigned work for the second meeting, held in the middle of the same week, should be to make as complete a record as possible of the books in the library on the particular subject, the articles listed in the *Readers’ Guide*, and any other material available. This bibliography, which can be checked and corrected by reference to published ones in a *Debaters’ Handbook* or some other debate manual, will prove extremely valuable. The coach can use it as a basis for dividing the reading among the members of the team in later stages of preparation. If it is kept in an accessible place, the debaters can use it as a report on their reading, marking off worthless articles,
underlining or checking important ones, and indicating for the latter which side of the question the author takes and briefly what his thesis is. The coach will find that in later meetings, when each debater has been assigned a special portion of the case, conversations like this will spontaneously occur:

Bill: "I've been trying for two days to discover some statistics on increased prosperity under prohibition. I can't seem to find what I want anywhere."

John: "I saw some information on that point yesterday in Fisher's new book. It's on our reference shelf."

Coach: "You'd better make a note of that, John. And, Bill, mark the book on the reading list."

By pooling references, a great deal of unnecessary effort can be avoided.

Besides outlining the sources of material and making a start toward the compilation of a bibliography, the coach will usually find it necessary at this first meeting to explain the use of evidence cards. If these cards are not supplied by the school, the coach must specify the size to be used and also the precise form in which the notes are to be made. These precautions will insure an easy exchange of

1 The usual size is four by six inches. The cards can be obtained from any bookstore. Both Foster and Winans give the following rules for taking notes:

1. Use cards of uniform size.
2. Place on one card matter relating to one subtopic only.
3. Quote from the original source, if possible.
4. Always make an exact reference to the source at the time you make the note.

 cards among the debaters later, when each student has his special portion of the case assigned.

WHAT AND HOW TO READ

With these mechanical details out of the way, the coach can concentrate upon the more difficult problem of showing the debaters what and how to read. The individual debater probably attacked the subject for debate a day or two before his second tryout with little more than one or two dimly remembered newspaper headlines to guide him. For instance, he may have had a vague idea that the Philippine Islands should be given their independence. Perhaps he had even read a speech to that effect or heard a discussion of the subject in an almost forgotten course in American history. For the series of tryouts he probably procured several highly prejudiced magazine articles and developed one minor argument, or perhaps threw together a number of miscellaneous scraps of evidence. What he needs now, as the coach should point out to him, is a general background of fact and principle on the whole question. For the Philippine question he needs to know the history of the relations between the Philippine Islands and the United States and precisely what independence

5. Quote exactly, and use quotation marks.
6. Indicate omissions by means of dots.
7. When you supply your own words inside a quotation, enclose them in brackets.
8. Indicate at the top of each card the main subject or issue to which the evidence relates, and the subtopic.
implies. He may have to read several chapters in histories
and some pages of a book on international law, besides a
number of general books and magazine articles, to acquire
that information; but he should be given no research in a
more restricted phase of the subject until that reading is
done.

As he delves into the history of the question, the student
discovers the basis of disagreement. He reads that the
United States promised independence to the Filipinos
when their territory was conquered, and that that promise
has been reiterated since. Why, then, has independence
not been granted? Because, say those in authority, the
Filipinos are not yet ready for it. Is that true?

Now he has reached the stage where specific evidence
is necessary. He must find and note on his cards facts
about the islands, as given in encyclopedias and other
reference books; statements of authorities as to facts, such as
quotations from published speeches and articles by
Governors General Harrison and Wood and by others who
have investigated conditions there; and opinions of
authorities whom an audience or a group of judges will
accept as expert, unprejudiced, and honest; and he should
note lines of argument which he thinks worth investigating
further. When he comes to his second conference with
other members of the team and the coach, he should have
not only a general background, but a list of suggestions as
to possible issues, and some specific evidence on his side
of the question.

The Necessity for Definite Evidence

The value of specific evidence cannot be impressed too
strongly upon a high school debater. His opinion, in it-
self, is worth nothing. The moment he begins a sentence
with the words "I think," or "I believe," he is opening
himself to the charge of unsupported assertion. What he
thinks or believes will have no weight with an audience or
driver, no matter how often he may insist that he is right.
Every disputable statement he makes must be supported.
Therefore the coach can do him no greater service than to
question him at every opportunity about his sources of
information. If a debater comes to a conference saying,
"The Filipinos should be given their independence because
they all want it," the coach's obvious reply is, "How do
you know?" If the debater can produce four or five cards
showing definitely that the political party controlling the
government of the Philippines represents a great majority
of the people and that the leaders of that party have always
begged for freedom, well and good. If he cannot, he
should be sent in search of such evidence. If the evidence
cannot be found, he will usually admit without further
argument that he would have given his opponents an
excellent point of attack by making the statement. The
coach can do a great deal, simply by asking questions and
demanding proof at every opportunity, to develop in his
debaters the habit of relying upon specific evidence.
Simply as a means of self-defense, the debater will come to
conferences with the attitude, "I'd like to see the coach
try to argue with me on this point. I can give him three tables of statistics from the Wood-Forbes Report and statements by Taft, Roosevelt, and Wilson.” Needless to say, that same attitude, carried into the actual debate, will go far toward making the student an effective speaker.

LOOKING AHEAD WHILE READING

In these conferences during the fifth week, the coach should never lose sight of the fact that his ultimate purpose, at the end of the week, is to organize the case. The debater will be able to help far more intelligently in this extremely important phase of preparation if he has been taught to read not with the idea of collecting a great many fragments of evidence¹ but with the purpose of answering a series of questions about the subject. He should be brought to look upon his notes not as isolated units but as parts of larger divisions of the argument. Suppose, for example, that he is doing general reading in preparation for a debate on recognition of Soviet Russia. One of the problems that he has to solve is what “recognition” means to the United States government. He will need a series of notes on the historical development of the term. From various sources he may obtain a series like this:

¹ For a clear and adequate discussion of types of evidence, see Chapter IV of Argumentation and Debate by J. W. Reeves. D. C. Heath and Company.

GATHERING MATERIAL

Note 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“De facto recognition means what it says: recognition of the existence of the fact of peaceful political control over territory by a government. Approval is neither expressed nor implied in granting such recognition.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a pamphlet, Regarding the Recognition of Russia, published by the Foreign Policy Association, June, 1922.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Henry Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In cases where an old and established nation has thought proper to change the form of its government, the United States ... have not stopped to inquire whether the new government has been rightfully adopted or not.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the report of the Committee of Foreign Relations on the recognition of Texas, June 18, 1836.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note 3:

Recognition  Definition  James Buchanan

“In its intercourse with foreign nations, the United States has, from its origin, always recognized de facto governments. We recognize the right of all nations to create and reform their political institutions according to their own will and pleasure.”

Note to the American ambassador on the recognition of the revolutionary government in France, March 31, 1848.

Note 4:

Recognition  Definition  John Hay

“Its (the government of the Dominican Republic’s) existence . . . is a matter of common notoriety, while its unopposed exercise of power warrants the transaction of necessary affairs by local agents of the United States with the de facto authorities.”

Note to the Secretary of the Navy regarding the revolutionary government of the Dominican Republic, October 2, 1899.

Note 5:

Recognition  Definition  Charles E. Hughes

“If fundamental changes are contemplated involving due regard for the protection of persons and property and the establishment of conditions essential to the maintenance of commerce, this Government will be glad to have convincing evidence of the consummation of such change and until this evidence is supplied this Government is unable to perceive that there is any proper basis for considering trade relations.”

Note transmitted to American consul at Reval, March 25, 1921.

Such a group of cards (which manifestly could be amplified) will give the debater not only historical perspective, but also, if he is keen, the beginning of an argument, for it seems clear that the policy of Hughes differs from that of preceding statesmen.

Uses of a Series of Cards

A series of cards may be used, as above, to define a term; it may give a chronology of events; it may list allegations of causes for conditions; it may give testimony of witnesses as to events or causes; it may be simply a compilation of opinions on a specific topic; in fact, it may serve almost any purpose necessary in building up an argument. For example, a student debating the Monroe
Doctrine would need a series of cards giving the interpretations of Monroe, Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt, etc. He would need another series outlining the historic applications of the doctrine: against the Holy Alliance; against French interference in Mexico during the Civil War; in the Venezuela boundary dispute; in the Spanish-American War; in Santo Domingo, in Haiti, in Nicaragua, etc. A third series might give the causes for present dissatisfaction in Latin-America, including pertinent historic facts; declarations of South Americans in newspapers, magazines, and books; and American statements that have aroused Latin-American ire. Still another series, to be used later in support of a subordinate point, might give statistics as to the power of American capital in individual South American countries.

In other words, the debater, instead of coming to his reading simply with the idea that he will write down all the miscellaneous information he can find, should come to it with certain definite questions in mind, questions that can be answered only by evidence. Before starting to read, he should be encouraged to say to himself, “What do I want to find?” and to answer that question with a list of others:

“What is the history of this question for debate?”
“What is the present condition?”
“Why is there dissatisfaction with the present condition?”
“What remedies have been proposed for it?”
“Have the remedies been tried anywhere else?”

“What are the particular advantages (or disadvantages) of the remedy suggested in the proposition?”
“What do authorities on the subject say on all these points?”

Then his reading will mean something, and his notes will have a definite value in working out the case.
CHAPTER V
ORGANIZING THE CASE

THE DANGER IN ARTIFICIAL PLANS

Organization of the case, preliminary suggestions for which have been given the debaters during the first conferences of the fifth week, should be completed at the last meeting that week. This process necessarily varies widely in detail according to the specific proposition for debate, but the coach should have in the back of his mind, as he considers the issues suggested by the debaters, that nearly every case must meet certain general proof requirements. Suppose for the moment that the team is upholding a definite plan for remedying an existing condition. Several systems of dividing a proposition of this sort into main issues have gained wide acceptance. For example, the skeleton of many cases is apt to be something like this:

This plan should be adopted, for
I. It is economically sound.
II. It will be socially advantageous.
III. It is morally right.

Or this:

This economic policy should be adopted, for
I. It will benefit the employers.
II. It will benefit the employees.
III. It will benefit the general public.

THE CASE

Such skeleton briefs have been constructed artificially and poorly. The arguments have been divided with little regard to the logical coherence of the case as a whole. Each point, instead of having, as it should have, a definite relation to the point that precedes it and the point that follows, is an isolated unit, its only logical connection being that with the proposition.

In contrast, the effective debate case follows a definite development from beginning to end. The second main point, besides having a logical connection with the proposition, grows directly from the first. Likewise, the third main point grows out of the second, and the fourth out of the third.

THE USE OF PROOF REQUIREMENTS

When a debate team takes the platform to persuade an audience or a set of judges that a change of some kind is desirable—that, for example, the Philippines should be given their independence—it assumes a definite burden of proof. In such a debate, involving a departure from present policy (and the great majority of debates are on questions of this type), the Affirmative must establish at least two points:

I. That the nature of the present situation makes a change necessary or desirable.
II. That the proposed change will remedy the situation.

It is usually necessary to prove also:

III. That the proposed change will not introduce new and worse evils.
IV. That no substitute policy would be more satisfactory.¹

As has been said, the first two points are essential. The value of points III and IV depends upon the contentions brought forth by the Negative. Although the Affirmative must always be prepared to prove all four, point III will be necessary only if the Negative argues or seems likely to argue that new and greater evils will arise from the change. Likewise, it would be a waste of time to show the faults of all possible alternative plans unless the Negative proposes one.

Thus, the skeleton brief for a proposition involving the abolition of trial by jury might be drawn as follows:

The jury system should be abolished, for
I. Trial by jury has proved an inadequate method of dispensing justice.
II. The substitution of a single judge or a bench of judges would remedy the evils of the present plan.

Then, if the Negative brings up the contention that the plan will bring greater evils, the Affirmative may argue:

III. This plan will not put autocratic power in the hands of the judge, etc.

If the Negative suggests that increasing the intellectual

¹ See W. C. Shaw: The Art of Debate, p. 151. For the sake of vividness, these four points are sometimes given thus:

I. Is the man sick?
II. Will our medicine cure him?
III. Will it harm him?
IV. Will any other medicine be more effective?
II. The repeal of the Amendment would remedy this condition, for
A. It would render this elaborate, expensive, inefficient, corrupt enforcement service unnecessary.
B. It would immediately remove the necessity for manufacturing and selling poisonous bootleg liquor.
C. It would tend to bring back respect for law.
D. Etc., etc.,

III. The repeal of the Amendment would not bring worse evils in its train, for
A. Conditions before the Amendment were in most respects better than those at present.

IV. Modification of the Volstead Act to allow the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer would not remedy existing conditions, for
A. Such partial prohibition has always failed where tried.1

An example of the way in which these proof requirements have been used in actual practice is the following statement from a debate at Carleton College in 1915: “We shall show [I] that there are certain inherent abuses in the system of private ownership which [IV] regulation cannot eradicate; and that [II] government ownership will remedy these abuses, without in turn [III] promoting any serious evils of its own.” In this debate on government ownership and operation of railroads the Affirmative team used all the proof requirements outlined in the preceding paragraphs, as indicated by the figures in brackets.

DIVIDING THE CASE

The next step is to assign speakers to main divisions of the argument. No definite rules for this phase of the work can be laid down. It is always essential, however, to show first that a change is desirable. Often this will take the whole first speech. Sometimes the second speaker may need to go on with this point; at other times, when it is fairly evident that the Negative must admit present conditions to be bad, a small part of the first speech will be sufficient.

It is next necessary to prove that the proposed plan will remedy the situation. This will ordinarily come in the second speech, though sometimes it may be combined with point I in the opening speech, or, on rare occasions, left to the last. The first speaker can ordinarily have a set speech. The second and third speakers, however, should be more adaptable. The third, especially, must be prepared on all the points not used by his colleagues. He must be able to prove that additional and greater evils will not ensue, and that the alternative plan proposed by the Negative (provided, of course, that one is proposed) is inferior to his. Sometimes, if it is evident from the nature of the question that the Negative must propose an alternative plan, he

1 It will be noted that there has been no attempt here to brief any case completely. For an adequate discussion of brief drawing see Foster’s Argumentation and Debating, Chapters II and III, R. C. Ringwalt: Brief Drawing, and C. L. Maxcy: The Brief. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916. For a discussion particularly adapted to high school students see J. C. Tressler: English in Action, Course Four, Chapter VII. D. C. Heath and Company, 1930.
may be forced to anticipate the arguments of the third Negative speaker. The relative importance of each point, consequently, depends to a large extent upon what the Negative has said or is likely to say. It is obvious that the third speaker must be the clearest thinker, the most effective extemporizer, and the most persuasive debater of the Affirmative team.

The ordinary objection to all this is that the average high school debater is not mature enough to be adaptable, and that he usually is unable to speak extemporaneously with ease and effectiveness. All this is true. The important point, however, is that extemporaneous speaking and adaptability add tremendously to the debating power of a team, and should be the aims toward which the student and coach are striving. If one question is to be used in several debates during a given year, all the direct speeches may have to be memorized the first time, and even the second or third; but sooner or later, as the debaters master their material and gain ease, the memorized speeches should be discarded. Practice, practice, and more practice is the remedy. The coach should, if possible, develop teams on both sides of the question; have frequent debates between the teams, showing each time what points on both sides went unanswered; and stress the importance of proving the proposition rather than that of making a polished speech. Sooner or later some of the squad will develop the ability to think on their feet. These should be used as final speakers in future contests.

THE CASE

THE NEGATIVE CASE

According to some theories of argument, the Negative case should meet the Affirmative, point by point, and the skeleton brief showing the proof requirements of the Negative should be:

The proposal should not be adopted, for
I. Conditions are not so bad as to necessitate it.
II. The proposed plan will not adequately meet the situation.
III. The proposed plan will bring with it evils greater than the benefits that can reasonably be expected.
IV. Another plan would be better.

But it immediately becomes evident that a Negative case making a strong stand on all these points would be inconsistent. The team would find itself in a position similar to that of the woman who, when accused of breaking a pot borrowed from her neighbor, swore: first, that the pot was not broken when she returned it; second, that the pot was broken when she borrowed it; and third, that she had not borrowed the pot.

ONE LINE OF ATTACK

Suppose the Negative contends that there are no evils. Then it would obviously be foolish to argue at the same time that the plan of the Affirmative would not remedy existing evils. It would be equally foolish to bring forth an alternative plan, since it has already been argued that no need for any change exists. If a Negative team is
opposing the proposition that the Philippines should be
given immediate independence, for example, it may find
the evidence to indicate that the present type of govern-
ment is entirely satisfactory. The emphasis on succeeding
points will then be shifted from II (that the Affirmative’s
plan will not remedy the evils) to III (that the Affirmative’s
plan will bring greater evils); and IV (an alternative plan)
will, strictly speaking, be unnecessary. Yet, practically,
the Negative is upholding an alternative plan, the plan at
present in operation, the status quo. It is contending that
the present policy is better than the new one proposed by
the Affirmative. A Negative speaker may point out to the
audience or judges that his team, in upholding the status
quo, is practically defending an alternative plan. Such a
statement clears the air of the feeling, always so un-
pleasant to an audience, that the Negative’s argument is
tirely destructive. It also puts the debaters into the
right state of mind. Comparison of the merits of different
proposals is the essence of debate. The idea of comparison
should permeate the thinking of the student, the organi-
ization of his speech, and even the construction of many of
his sentences.

A SECOND LINE OF ATTACK

If the evidence warrants it, the Negative may go to
the other extreme, agree that conditions are bad. It is
possible, then, to center the attack entirely on points II
and III, showing that the plan of the Affirmative will not
work, and will bring with it greater evils. This is usu-
ally not so effective, however, as to combine with points II
and III the advocacy of an alternative plan. In a debate
on the abolition of the jury system, the Negative might
admit all the evils in the present situation, but point
out that the Affirmative’s plan would not make for greater
efficiency and would bring with it the possibility of tyranny
by judges.

This, strictly speaking, would be sufficient. But the
Negative can make a stronger case if it also proposes a plan
that it deems better, such as forcing the highly educated
men of the community to assume jury duty, from which
most of them are now excused by law.

A THIRD LINE OF ATTACK

A third possibility is this: The Negative declares that
conditions, while not ideal, are not so bad as the Affirm-
ative has painted them. The Negative may then uphold
the status quo or suggest a slight change, such as stricter
enforcement of present laws or a slight modification or
new application of existing machinery. For instance, in
debating the proposition that the government should own
and operate the coal mines, the Negative may say that the
coil industry, in general, is fulfilling its function; that
government ownership and operation would not cure the
essential evils that do exist; and either that the present
condition is fairly satisfactory, or that further campaigning
to persuade people to buy coal all the year round would
take care of the situation in time. The peculiar problem
of the Negative, then, is to determine beforehand, from
the nature of the evidence, which general line of attack
best brings out the truth on their side. This line of attack
should be followed rigidly to avoid inconsistency.

INSURING CONSISTENCY

One important reservation needs to be made in con-
nection with the use of proof requirements by either side:
Often not all the material that seems to support a main
division of the case can be used. Frequently a team will
find it necessary to take a definite stand on a general ques-
tion involved in the discussion, and to put aside some
arguments not consistent with this stand.

For example, an Affirmative team debating the subject,
“Resolved, that there should be a Federal Department of
Education with a secretary in the President’s Cabinet,”
will have to make a choice at the very start between a
strong department with the power to raise standards in
backward states or a weak department with the power only
to investigate conditions, make suggestions, and offer
aid. Each type has been exhaustively discussed in Con-
gress. Each has its advantages and disadvantages. If the
debater reads all the discussions printed in books and
magazines between 1915 and 1930 and puts together all
the Affirmative arguments encountered, his case may
appear powerful but will actually be extremely vulnerable.
For the Negative can easily show the impossibility of
having a department which will at the same time be strong
enough to reorganize the high schools of Mississippi and
too weak to interfere with Mississippi’s control of its own
schools. The debater must either denounce or uphold
states’ rights in education.

Likewise, a Negative team defending the Latin-American
policy of the United States must decide whether it will
favor or denounce imperialism. It is possible to admit the
Affirmative’s contention that the United States is im-
perialistic, and to argue that the benefits of this policy
outweigh the evils. It is also possible to argue that the
United States is not imperialistic, since our policy is based
not upon selfish motives but upon a desire to fulfill the
obligations made compulsory by the Monroe Doctrine, our
ownership of the Panama Canal, our treaties with Central
American countries, and our right to take appropriate
measures for self-defense. Obviously the team must select
either one attitude or the other, according to the beliefs of
the debaters. It cannot consistently argue that our policy
of intervention to protect property is founded on sound
precedents since England, France, Germany, and Japan do
the same thing, and also that we have shown that we are
not imperialistic by withdrawing from Central American
countries whenever conditions have been settled satis-
factorily. If our policy is not based on that of imperialistic
nations, it cannot be justified by an appeal to the policy of
such empires as Britain, France, and Japan.

Again, a team arguing a question involving the practices
of democracy will find material indicating that Congress
does not express the will of the people; it will also find
material tending to show that members of Congress vote according to the wishes of their individual constituencies instead of using their own judgment. Obviously, both arguments cannot be used at once, since they cancel one another. Here, again, the members of the team must decide which argument has the larger element of truth.

PROPOSITIONS OF FACT AND INTERPRETATION

All the foregoing discussion about organizing the case applies, as has been indicated, to propositions which embody a change of policy. Such propositions constitute a large proportion of debatable questions. There is another type of proposition, however, which often appears. Such propositions as “Resolved, that democracy is a failure,” “Resolved, that the practices of the modern business world are unethical,” and “Resolved, that the policy of the United States government toward Latin America should be condemned,” are debatable, but they do not involve, except by implication, a change of policy. To them the proof requirements set forth above do not strictly apply.

In a debate on such a proposition of fact and interpretation, the definition of terms often assumes great importance and becomes a focus for extended argument. A team attempting to prove that modern advertising is more harmful than beneficial to society may have to use nearly a whole speech showing that modern advertising attempts to sell goods by illogical appeals to the emotions instead of by truthful descriptions of the products. The establishment of this definition is essential to the case. If the Negative sees this, it may spend a large portion of its time attempting to show that the mass of modern advertising is, on the contrary, truthful and descriptive. Such discussion is certainly not beside the point, because an audience cannot determine whether modern advertising is harmful or beneficial until the speakers have clearly demonstrated what it is.

In much the same way, a debate on the question, “Resolved, that the Hoover Administration deserves a vote of censure” must first of all answer the question: What is the Hoover Administration? The Affirmative may argue that the term includes everything done by the Government during President Hoover’s tenure of office; the Negative may argue that it includes only the acts and policies which President Hoover and his supporters have definitely approved. The next question that arises (and it is also a matter of definition) may be: What have been President Hoover’s policies? A debate which clarifies these two problems alone will, by implication, answer the major question whether a vote of censure is deserved.

FINDING THE ISSUES

Sometimes a complete set of issues may be found in the definition of a term. John Stuart Blackie’s analysis of democracy \(^1\) furnishes an outline for a complete debate on

\(^1\) His speech, with a reply by Ernest Jones, is reprinted in full in Persistent Questions in Public Discussion, edited by A. M. Drummond and E. L. Hunt. The Century Company.
the proposition, "Resolved, that democracy is a failure." In theory, he says, democracy assumes (1) that all men are naturally free, (2) that all men are naturally equal, (3) that self-government is the best type of government, (4) that representative government is good, and (5) that the vote of the majority is the best method of deciding public questions. Using these principles as a basis, a team may decide on a skeleton brief like this:

Democracy has failed in the United States, for
I. Equality and freedom are stringently curbed, for
   A. Various states discriminate between white and black voters.
   B. Various states discriminate between classes of voters by intelligence tests.
   C. Freedom of speech and the press are frequently denied.
   D. Freedom of assembly is often denied.
   E. Etc., etc.
II. Representative government is poor in theory and in practice, for
   A. A representative who is simply a rubber stamp of opinion in his district cannot have the national-mindedness necessary for good nation-wide legislation, for
      1. This has proved true in Congress, where the Farm Bloc, for example, has worked for its own interests regardless of the welfare of the rest of the country, for
         a. The result is a system of bargaining between special groups which often results in the passage of several poor bills at a time, or the failure of several good bills.

III. The will of the majority is often wrong, for
   A. The history of the world shows that minorities have often been right.
   B. Our Constitution recognizes this by giving the President and the Supreme Court the power to overthrow legislation approved by a majority.
   C. If the will of the majority were allowed to prevail, the liberties of the individual or of the minority would have no protection.
   D. Etc.

Obviously, the Negative may object to this set of issues, and attempt to put up a set of its own, including these contentions:
I. Democracy today is not essentially a theory but a practical form of government.
II. It has been more successful than any other type of government.

Hence in a debate on a proposition of fact and interpretation two of the proof requirements may be these:
I. Our definition of the vital term in the proposition is correct.
II. Our issues are the important ones in a discussion of this subject.

In general, then, it is apparent that no definite set of proof requirements can be given for either side of a debate on a question of this type. The principal points of contention can be discovered only by listing and weighing the chief arguments advanced by a large number of authorities. And even after that has been done, the set of issues discovered may have to be defended by argument.
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ISSUES MAY BE FEW

Furthermore it is quite possible that the issues may be few, though the main contentions of each side may be numerous. It is difficult, for example, to find many direct clashes of opinion on the proposition, “Resolved, that the chain store is detrimental to the American people.” Suppose the contentions are these:

AFFIRMATIVE
I. The chain store tends toward monopoly.
II. Chain-store managers take little interest in the individual community.
III. Chain stores employ fewer clerks than independent stores.
IV. Chain stores drive out wholesale merchants.
V. Chain stores cut the legitimate profits of manufacturers.

NEGATIVE
I. The chain store does not tend toward monopoly.
II. Chain-store managers take a lively interest in the individual community.
III. Chain stores give more efficient service than independent stores.
IV. Chain stores sell goods at cheaper prices than independent stores.

All these contentions are relevant to the proposition, yet only two issues develop, on points I and II. In other words, the debate may be largely a discussion of the undeniable advantages of the chain store and its undeniable disadvantages. The predominance of evidence on issues, in the ordinary sense, will not be sufficient to induce belief. The chief question to be decided may be: Is it more benefi-

cial to the community to have consumers receive goods at lower prices or to have wholesalers and manufacturers do a large amount of business at a legitimate profit? The answer depends not upon the validity of the opposing contentions but upon their relative importance.

The debater who has been taught that every allegation of the opposition must be contested will find this sort of question difficult to handle at first; he may even be tempted to manufacture evidence where none exists, if the coach pushes him too far. But if he is made to understand that facts, from whatever source, must be admitted and that such admissions need not harm his own case, he will gain practice in dealing with problems which often arise in real life but which, until recently, have been sadly neglected in formal debating.

He will find, too, that this type of discussion puts a premium on his ability to adapt his arguments to those of the preceding speaker. Negative speakers, especially, must be ready to extemporize, for they can never tell beforehand precisely what the Affirmative’s plan of attack will be. If the Negative cannot adapt its case to the Affirmative argument, the two sides may slip past one another on parallel tracks without any perceptible clash at all.

THE CASE
CHAPTER VI

THE INDIVIDUAL SPEECH: MINOR ARGUMENTS

THE SIXTH WEEK

With the organization of the case completed and each speaker assigned his special portion of the main argument, the coach begins in the sixth week his work with individual debaters on their individual speeches. Each debater should be reading as much as possible in his narrower field. He should be looking now not so much for general background and broad principles as for proof of subordinate arguments necessary to establish his own major ones. He needs additional specific facts and quotations; he should be looking, too, for analogies and illustrations that will add interest to his speech.

During this week he should be called into conferences with the other members of the team at least three times. These meetings are essential, first, because the debaters need the opportunity to exchange references and evidence cards. Each member of the team, in his general reading, has come upon material which is worthless to him but may be valuable to one of the other speakers. Trading material not only helps each individual, but also facilitates the whole team’s understanding of all three speeches. The coach can check up, at the same time, on the amount of work each debater is doing, and offer additional suggestions as to necessary reading. He has a chance, also, to criticize the evidence gathered, and to point out weaknesses in argument.

CRITICIZING EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENT

In order to accomplish the last purpose adequately, the coach must have a working knowledge of the tests for direct evidence and for the various types of argument. His problem is not solved by assigning a chapter from a textbook and making his students memorize the tests; he must make sure that his debaters use the tests. And the best method of doing this is to employ those tests himself on the material brought to conferences by the team.

If, for instance, Bill brings a statement by Samuel Insull on the value of private ownership of electric power plants, the coach must point out to Bill that because Mr. Insull has made a fortune from the power industry, he is not an authority whom an audience will accept as fair and unprejudiced. If John produces a statement by Henry Ford on the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations, the coach must explain gently but firmly that although Mr. Ford knows how to make cheap automobiles, he is not an expert on international diplomacy.

Fred may need to be persuaded that although Clarence Darrow’s opinion of capital punishment is intelligent, it will not help to convince an audience of conservative
citizens who have an unholy fear of the word radical. Then Bill must be steered to the reports of Dr. Elwood Mead, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, John to the writings of Elihu Root, and Fred to speeches and magazine articles by Warden Lawes, the coach pointing out why the first is unprejudiced, the second an expert, and the third a man whose ideas are generally thought to be based on long experience with prisoners rather than on a heretical philosophy of life. In the same way the coach can show his debaters how to apply all the other tests of evidence from authority.¹

Types of Argument

The coach may find it necessary to give more direct instruction concerning the types of argument. He will be wise to distinguish between deductive argument, which derives a conclusion as to a specific instance from a general principle, and inductive argument, which establishes a generalization by piling up specific instances.² The arguments from causal relation, cause to effect, effect to cause, and effect to effect, can be separated and explained most

¹ See Reeves, Chapter IV, and Foster, Chapter IV.
² The following simple diagram may be found useful in making clear the relations among the various chief types of argument:

![Diagram of types of argument]

easily if the coach pounds home the point that in each type the speaker is arguing from the known to the unknown. For example, the effect of government operation of Muscle Shoals is, strictly speaking, unknown. Senator Norris predicts, however, that it will decrease the cost of electricity to consumers in the South. This is a typical argument from cause to effect. Again, we know that the ratio of convictions to crimes in this country is very low. Many people, arguing from effect to cause, declare that the jury system is inadequate and defective. When a candidate for office says that because he is cheered by immense crowds in the streets he will receive a large vote, he is arguing from effect to effect. One effect of his popularity is known; the other, he contends, will follow.

Each type of causal argument can be criticized by definite tests. If an argument from cause to effect is presented, the coach must ask: Is the cause suggested powerful enough to produce the effect? How do we know, for instance, that government operation of Muscle Shoals will give lower rates on electricity to consumers? Isn’t government operation usually inefficient and costly? Won’t politicians use the project for graft? A half dozen questions like these will show the debater what sort of proof he needs to establish his argument.

For the effect-to-cause argument, the key question is this: Can the effect be accounted for by the suggested cause? For instance, is the jury system the only or even the predominant cause of few convictions for crimes? May there not be other reasons, such as lax prosecution,
legal red tape, and public sympathy for criminals, which largely explain the evil? If all these other causes were removed, might not the ratio of convictions to crimes be satisfactory? Questions such as these should lead the debater either to abandon the argument as essentially weak or to strengthen it by obtaining more proof on relevant minor points. The test for the argument from effect to effect is simple: Do the two effects normally appear together? Do cheering crowds and votes usually flock to the same candidate?

USES OF THE ANALOGY

With this, as with the other types of causal argument, the literal analogy may be used as a useful supplement. Crowds fought to hear Woodrow Wilson in the West when he made his last campaign for the presidency, and the West gave him many of his electoral votes. This fact suggests that another candidate may have the same experience. Likewise, if the speaker can show that the public-owned Ontario Hydro-power Company has lowered rates in Canada, he has support for his cause-to-effect argument that government operation of Muscle Shoals would make electricity cheaper in the United States. And, again, if in Maryland the abolition of the jury system in most trials, without any other legal reforms, has decreased crime, that example will increase the probability that the low ratio of convictions to crimes in Missouri is caused by the inadequacy of juries.

Coleridge, in his *Biographia Literaria*, gives as the chief reason for his success in reasoning about current political problems his reliance on the literal analogy. "On every great occurrence," he says, "I endeavored to discover in past history the event that most nearly resembled it. I procured, where it was possible, the contemporary historians, memorialists, and pamphleteers. Then fairly subtracting the points of difference from those of likeness, as the balance favored the former or the latter, I conjectured that the result would be the same or different."

In that passage he gives the test of the literal analogy: Do the points of similarity outweigh the points of difference?

The figurative analogy, which compares two instances from totally different spheres of knowledge, is rarely worth much as proof but helps to make a point vivid. Malcolm MacDonald, in a debate speech at Pittsburgh, stated clearly and effectively the essential difference between equality under the law and equality of opportunity when he said that a man on a desert island may be free to eat apples, but such freedom is of little use if there are no apples; similarly an independent workman may legally be free to work, but such freedom means nothing if unions and employers refuse to give him a job.

The unsoundness of the figurative analogy as argument can easily be shown, however, by the proverbial disagreement between two literary critics: First critic: "When I review a book, I no more need to read it entirely than I need to drink a whole keg of wine to discover its flavor." Second critic: "One cannot form a true idea of the beauty of a
building by examining a single brick.” Both analogies are good, but the ideas are directly antithetical. The moral, then, is this: Use analogies with some other form of argument.¹

**INDUCTIVE ARGUMENT**

The coach will probably have little trouble with argument by example. The debater wants to establish a general rule; therefore he gathers a number of examples all of which show the operation of the same principle. Perhaps he wants to prove that national elections are won by the party having the most money. By scrutinizing the records he finds that McKinley spent more money than Bryan, Roosevelt more than Parker, Wilson more than either Roosevelt or Taft, Harding more than Cox, and Coolidge more than Davis or LaFollette. He presents these instances as proof. The coach has only to ask: Are these examples typical? Are there many exceptions to the rule? Can the existing exceptions, such as Wilson’s victory over Hughes, be explained satisfactorily? Is there other evidence that makes such a rule seem probable?

Closely allied to induction is the use of exposition as argument. Exposition is particularly useful in the first speech of the Affirmative. An absolutely impartial history of prohibition in the United States, for example, followed by an impartial analysis of present conditions, giving benefits as well as evils, leads inevitably, without further argument, to the conclusion that something should be done to remedy the situation. Such a speech, because it is fair and unprejudiced, is more effective than a strongly pugnacious speech which sets forth all the bad and none of the good done by the Eighteenth Amendment. Furthermore, it shifts the basis of disagreement immediately to a comparison of remedies, where the real issue lies.

The coach will usually find it difficult to persuade a student that impartiality is more effective than partisanship, and he will have to watch the debater’s progress closely to see that the right attitude is maintained. The student can usually be brought to see, however, that a partisan speech masquerading as nonpartisan offers an excellent target for an opponent, and that in any event hypocrisy is out of place in honorable public discussion. Besides fairness, exposition should be tested for adequacy of detail and clearness of structure.

**THE SEVENTH WEEK: BRIEFING**

The seventh week should see a complete individual brief, based on a portion of the skeleton worked out for the whole case, written by each member of the team. The coach should prescribe a definite form and insist that the debaters follow it. The system of numerals and letters should be the same throughout, so that the three briefs when put together make a uniform whole. Every debater must be compelled to put every iota of evidence into his

¹ See any of the textbooks listed in Appendix E of this book for a fuller discussion of types of argument. That of Reeves in Chapter V is brief but adequate.
brief. Then the coach, with a complete record before him, can check inconsistencies, throw out weak examples, and help the individual student put his material into logical form.

This done, the coach must help the debaters to decide which portions of the brief should be used in the direct speeches of the particular debate for which they are preparing. Ordinarily it is impossible, because of rigid time limits and the necessity of adapting the material to an audience, to present all the evidence or even all the arguments indicated in the comprehensive brief. Hence minor arguments, or even main contentions, may have to be discarded entirely or slighted in presentation. Yet as the debate proceeds some of these discarded points may become vitally important and demand elaboration in rebuttal. Hence the comprehensive brief, though it may never be completely presented in any one debate, loses none of its value. Only by this careful analysis of all the possible arguments and available sources of evidence can a debater prepare himself to present his case most effectively against opposition. He must be prepared at all points; otherwise he will be at the mercy of an opponent who has studied the subject more thoroughly than he.

CHAPTER VII

INTERESTING THE AUDIENCE

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTEREST

The art of debating is something more than a method by which students are made acquainted with great issues or with methods of argument and logical thinking. It is — or should be — training in public speaking, in the art of inducing other people to give their undivided attention to one's ideas. Presumably the debater has spent seven weeks in preparation, reading, taking notes, and briefing the case. The debate is now four or five weeks away, and he is faced with the task of developing from his material a speech covering his section of the case.

At this point he may need the reminder that his success will depend not alone on the excellence of his arguments, but in a great measure upon his ability to make people listen to these arguments. Whether the debate is to be decided by a single expert judge or by a vote of the whole audience, the situation is the same; the debater must make some one listen. A general audience will give no attention that requires effort, and even the expert judge will be inclined to see most merit in that speech which he can follow most easily.
THE NECESSITY FOR STRESSING INTEREST

It should be unnecessary for the coach to stress the notion that the debater must endeavor in every way to interest the audience, but the practice of many debaters warrants such emphasis. Failure to appreciate the importance of striving for interest is easily explained. Many times a debater overestimates the interest in the subject which the audience brings to the debate. A current topic has been chosen; it is a large national problem. Why shouldn't the audience follow the speaker's every word? Perhaps because the individual listeners don't know enough about the subject, perhaps because the subject doesn't touch—or doesn't seem to touch—their daily lives. At all events, it is far better for the speaker to underestimate the previous interest of his audience than to overestimate it.

A second and even more frequent explanation is that the debater has derived from his long and careful analysis of the subject a particular interest which those who have not made such a study cannot be expected to possess. A lecture on chemistry to a group engaged in the study of that science differs obviously from one designed to popularize that subject with an audience that knows little or nothing about it.

A third explanation of this failure to strive for interest is the short time allowed the speaker on the platform. The debater has much to say and only a few minutes in which to say it. Consequently he has no time, he thinks, to draw analogies, or to tell stories—even relevant stories. He must deal in abstractions, generalities, and statistics, because these are the shortest methods of presenting his material. To such a notion there is only one answer: that it is far better to make one point clear and interesting to an audience or to a judge than to present twenty-five arguments that are neither clear not interesting. If all twenty-five arguments are required by the proposition, then the subject is too complicated for presentation in one evening. In summary, then, the coach must guard against overestimating the previous interest of the audience in the subject; and he must guard the debater against the notion that it is more persuasive to present many arguments in any fashion than to develop a few interestingly and clearly.

INTEREST AND UNDERSTANDING

In order to secure the attention of the audience to the subject the following principles of interest should be observed:

I. Interest in an idea depends upon ability to grasp that idea, to understand it when presented. Even a tale of mystery is interesting only when one understands the problem proposed. Understanding in turn depends upon one's ability to relate the new thing, the thing to be understood, with something already understood. When we begin the study of a foreign language we have no previous knowledge of it upon which to build. Therefore we identify the elements of it with similar elements in English. We
place the German word *Buch*, for example, beside its English equivalent *book*, and so by relating the new subject with the old we come to understand the new. In the same way, the members of an audience will understand a speaker's argument only by their ability to relate it to some previous knowledge of the subject or to their knowledge of something similar. To interest them, however, the speaker must carry on most of this process of relating new and old ideas for them. For the audience to do it requires a voluntary attention, an effort which the audience is rarely willing to make.

A corollary to the first principle is that audiences are not interested in that which is too new, in that which cannot be easily and quickly identified with previous knowledge or experience. And a second corollary is that they are not interested in that which is too familiar, which is already understood. A story is interesting the first time we hear it; possibly we may find some new interest in it a second time; but the chances are against the continuance of such interest indefinitely. Each time we must be shown some new charm in it.

**The Necessity for Studying the Audience**

To avoid presenting material which is too novel or too familiar, the coach and the debater need in the preparation of the speech to study the probable audience in connection with the subject. What is common knowledge about this subject? What is this particular audience likely to know about this subject? What other knowledge has this audi-
Presenting Essential Information

The task of presenting the essential information, the information that is to interest the audience in the subject, falls chiefly upon the Affirmative. The Affirmative raised the question and must prove it to be a vital one. Speakers on the Negative, however, must watch the Affirmative's presentation of the facts to see that nothing essential has been omitted. And if the Negative wishes to add to this presentation, it must be prepared to justify such additions.

This presentation of the facts is probably the most difficult part of the speech. Here, more than anywhere else, the debater must strive for interest. Few audiences will listen attentively to exposition unless it is made interesting. Successful playwrights realize this trait of the audience and resort to innumerable devices to add interest to the statement of facts. If the facts either in a play or in a debate are interestingly set forth, it is probable that the audience will follow the remainder of the work attentively.

In summary, then, the interest of the audience in any argument will depend in a large measure upon their understanding of this argument. And the amount of exposition necessary will depend upon how much the audience already knows about it. And, finally, the exposition will do its work, will lend interest to the whole subject, only when a special effort is made to make the exposition itself interesting and clear. This leads us to our second essential of interest.

Interest by Association

II. To secure interest, associate the subject with something already interesting. Just as understanding moves through that which is known to that which is unknown, so interest moves through that which is already interesting to that which is uninteresting. "What difference does it make one way or the other?" asks some member of the audience. With that person, at least, the debater has failed. The hearer will form no opinion—at least, no valuable or sincere opinion—unless he has been aroused by the subject.

If many audiences were permitted to think aloud, they would ask throughout the speaker's talk, "What has this to do with us? Why should we care? We have our own concerns." But let the speaker once touch upon these concerns, let him connect his subject logically and clearly with them, and such questions are answered.

What things interest the debater's audience? What interest do they bring to the debate? First, they bring group interests. The audience is usually drawn from one community. Is this community affected in any way by the issue? The audience may have a common occupational interest—say, education. Does the question involve this activity? Whatever special interest all or the majority of the audience may have in common constitutes a group interest and is of special importance to the debater.

Second, the hearers have fundamental or common human interests. These are not confined to any one group; all
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men share them to a considerable extent. Professor Winans lists as fundamental interests life and health, property, power and reputation, honor, social welfare, patriotism, righteousness, the sentiments and affections, sources of pleasure, and the human interest, “man’s interest in man.” The people who come to hear the debater are interested in these things, and in anything that is connected with them. Has the subject anything to do with the listeners’ lives, health, pocketbooks, reputations, or more altruistic interests? If not, the speaker can be reasonably certain that they will form no very deep conviction upon it. Every interesting speech, then, contains an adequate answer to these questions: What are people interested in? How is this subject related to those interests?

To summarize: In preparing his arguments for presentation the debater must give adequate information on the subject and present this information in such a manner that it is readily grasped by the audience, and he must strive in every way to connect his subject with things already interesting to the audience. These are the two essential principles of interest.

CHAPTER VIII

THE INDIVIDUAL SPEECH: ARRANGEMENT

THE NECESSITY FOR A DEFINITE PLAN

A debater may have plenty of material, a thorough knowledge of the case, and skill in the use of various types of argument, yet fail to make an effective speech. One frequent cause for such a failure, as has been indicated in the last chapter, is that the debater fails to make an effort to interest his audience. The presentation of sufficient explanatory matter to make the subject understandable, and the effort to associate phases of the question with topics already interesting to the audience are, however, only two of a number of ways to gain and hold attention. A third is to arrange the details so carefully that the listener will not be compelled to waste energy in following the line of argument, and, further, will realize the significance of each illustration in its relation to the whole case. Many a speech has been a failure simply because the debater treated a series of brief minor arguments as individual units instead of working them into a larger plan.

For example, suppose, in arguing against the recognition of Soviet Russia, a speaker wants to prove that the
so-called Red propaganda in the United States is not powerful and that it should not be laid at the door of the Soviet Government.

He may find a series of points like this:

A. Most of the Communist propaganda in this country comes from the Third Internationale, which is not an official organ of the Soviet Government.

B. Even the strongest opponents of recognition blame Russia for only twenty-four strikes in this country since 1918.

C. Many of these strikes were caused by organizations not affiliated with the Soviet Government in any way.

D. Communists in the United States poll a small vote.

All these facts are relevant to the issue, but if given in this way and in this order they lack effectiveness. What the speaker needs is a plan of organization into which he can fit these subordinate arguments in order to bring out the real importance of each.

**THE “FUNNEL” PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT**

His problem, evidently, is to minimize the importance of Russian propaganda. If he adds a few other facts to his store, and uses what, for want of a better name, may be called the “funnel” plan of arrangement, he can make a decidedly more effective speech. He may then have something like this:

A. Of the 22,000,000 voters in the United States, only 260,000, or less than one per thousand, are affiliated with a party having any connection with Communism.

B. Of the 22,000 strikes in the United States between 1918 and 1928, only 24, or one in 900, have been attributed to Russian influence even by Russia’s worst enemies.

C. Of this 24, several were caused by organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, etc., which are not affiliated with any organization in Russia.

D. The other organizations that admittedly caused some of these strikes are affiliated not with the Soviet Government, but with the Third Internationale.

E. The Third Internationale is not an organ of the Soviet Government, but a separate, international body whose headquarters happen to be in Russia.

In this outline the same facts are used, but they have been put into a larger plan which gives each point added significance and also makes the entire speech a unit instead of a group of isolated subordinate arguments. The argument follows a coherent development that can easily be grasped by the audience.

This “funnel” plan has been used extensively by Negative speakers on the Child Labor question. The speaker starts out with the total number of children under eighteen working in the United States; he cuts off a large number of these by showing that many states already have laws as good as the proposed Federal law; he cuts off still more by showing that in many other states children under fourteen are not allowed to work; he further diminishes the number by showing that in other states children are not allowed to work in dangerous occupations; then he proves that most of the children remaining are employed on farms doing work not harmful to them.
By this method a speaker can bring the number affected by the proposed Amendment down to a few thousand, and argue that if school laws were enforced even these would probably not be working.

REPERTITION OF A PATTERN

It would be impossible to list and explain all the types of speech plans. But a large number of them are based on one principle — the repetition of a pattern. This does not mean the repetition of a particular sentence, or even, necessarily, of a particular phrase; it means the recurrence of a small plan of arrangement within the larger plan for the whole speech. Suppose, for instance, that the debater is to make a speech proving that the policy of armed intervention to protect private capital in foreign countries inevitably leads to evils. He will probably find that the best specific examples to use are our interventions in Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua. The following examples of specimen briefs for this speech indicate the results with and without repetition of pattern:

(I) Without

A. The policy of armed intervention to protect private capital invested in foreign countries inevitably leads to evils, for
   1. This happened in Haiti, for
      a. Our marines killed many natives.

(II) With

A. The policy of armed intervention to protect private capital invested in foreign countries inevitably leads to evils, for
   1. This happened in Haiti, for
      a. Our marines destroyed property.

b. They destroyed property.

c. They took financial and political control of the country into their own hands.

2. This happened in Santo Domingo, for
   a. The marines took control of the government.
   b. They killed many natives.
   c. They destroyed property.

3. This happened in Nicaragua, for
   a. The marines destroyed property.
   b. They killed many natives.
   c. They are virtually in political control of the country.
   d. They have killed many natives.

In the second brief, the points a, b, and c under each example are given in the same order. Thus the small pattern, "destruction of property, killing of natives, assumption of political control," is repeated three times within the larger plan of "general statement, example, example, example," which serves for the whole speech. In other words, the large pattern, used in both briefs, is this:

A. General statement: This policy leads to evils.
   1. Example: This was true in Haiti.
   2. Example: This was true in Santo Domingo.
   3. Example: This was true in Nicaragua.
In the second brief the parallelism is simply carried a step further, so that each example is developed thus:

1. Example: This was true in ___.
   a. First minor point: Property was destroyed.
   b. Second minor point: Many natives were killed.
   c. Third minor point: The United States assumed political control.

This method will make a stronger impression on the audience, since it helps to keep the line of argument clear, avoiding the impression so often given by inexperienced speakers that they are lost in a bog of specific details.

Again, a speech is often composed of a number of statements of general principles and examples of the working out of those principles. The repetition of a smaller pattern will aid here in making the speech more effective. For example:

Three other principles besides the question of stability have been followed in the recognition policy of the United States, for

A. We have always, when necessary, taken plenty of time to investigate before according recognition, for
   1. Henry Clay laid down this principle in 1836.
   2. This principle was followed in the Texas case.

B. We have often considered whether the government to be recognized was representative of the will of the people, for
   1. Secretary Seward enunciated this principle in 1868.
   2. This principle was followed in the Peru case in 1883.

C. We have always tried to discover whether the government to be recognized will fulfill its international obligations, for

**Contrast in a Speech**

Part of the effectiveness of contrast in a speech arises from this same principle of repeating a pattern. When a speaker is contrasting two proposals, he has two possible methods, each of which is good. For example:

**I**

Plan X is superior to Plan Y, for

1. Plan Y has certain definite disadvantages, for
   a. It will raise freight rates.
   b. It will lengthen the average haul.
   c. It will not improve terminal facilities.

**II**

Plan X is superior to Plan Y, for

1. It will lower freight rates, while Y will raise them.
2. It will shorten the average haul, while Y will lengthen it.
3. It will improve terminal facilities, while Y will not.
Each outline shows repetition of a smaller pattern. The second is usually superior, however, because the contrast on each point is more direct.

**The Inductive Method**

Another type of speech plan employs the inductive method of approach. It is the reverse of the ordinary deductive plan which starts out with a general statement of what is to be proved and then offers evidence to support each subordinate point. The debater who uses the deductive method usually falls into the time-honored formula, "Ladies and gentlemen, I shall prove to you that our intervention policy has been unprofitable. I shall show, first, that it has failed in Haiti, second, that it has failed in Santo Domingo, and third, that it has failed in Nicaragua." Then he goes on to offer his specific evidence. When the speaker uses the inductive plan, he starts with some such sentence as this: "Ladies and gentlemen, the interventions in Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua are probably the most typical examples of our policy. Suppose we trace the course of those interventions and try to discover just what has happened."

Then he offers his evidence. He shows that to protect a $27,000,000 investment in Haiti we spent $20,000,000; killed 3500 inhabitants, destroyed property, and incurred the ill-will of the whole populace; he shows that in Santo Domingo we spent $15,000,000, killed 1000 inhabitants, and incurred more ill-will to protect an investment of $20,000,000; he shows that to protect an investment of $20,000,000 in Nicaragua we have spent an ever-increasing number of millions of dollars, have killed more than 4000 inhabitants, have destroyed property, and have incurred the ill-will of most of Latin America. Having given his evidence, he sums up by stating his main contention, that our policy of intervention to protect property does not pay. This plan is good because it differs from the cut-and-dried deductive plan and in addition is often more persuasive, especially if the audience is inclined to disagree with the speaker’s main contention.

**The Order of Increasing Force**

Another general plan, used when the speech is made up of a number of specific examples, is to present these examples in the order of increasing force or vividness. Thus a speaker attempting to show the evils of majority rule in America might give these illustrations:

1. The majority in the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, denies the minority the harmless pleasure of seeing a moving-picture show on Sunday.
2. The majority in the state of Oregon has tried to deny students the privilege of attending parochial schools.
3. The majority in the state of Illinois has elected corrupt men to office.
4. The majority in the state of Tennessee has tried to deny its citizens the right to think, by prohibiting the teaching of evolution in the schools.

Each illustration is more important in its bearing on the main proposition than the one before it.
This plan, the order of increasing force, clashes with chronological order in nearly all speeches dealing with historical material. When such a clash occurs, the chronological order, unless there is a special reason for its use, should be discarded. A historical survey of our recognition policy, done in chronological order, would probably be a hopeless jumble from the point of view of logical or rhetorical effectiveness. The thing to do is to work out a plan and then insert the individual examples from history at the particular points where they most clearly aid the argument.

Many other plans might be suggested, but the list could not be made exhaustive, and the main purpose of this discussion has been to emphasize the necessity of using some plan. If the speaker and coach give careful thought to this stage of preparation, it will not be found excessively difficult to discover a plan which adds considerably to the effectiveness of any argument. The plan for any individual speech must be finally determined by the nature of the specific material to be presented.

CHAPTER IX

THE INDIVIDUAL SPEECH: CONCRETENESS

What Is Concreteness?

When the speech plan has been made and approved by the coach, the debater's next problem is to amplify each division of the plan with concrete details. Concreteness implies a direct or indirect appeal to the senses. Charts, diagrams, and pictures are concrete because they give the audience a direct visual sensation; descriptions of incidents and scenes are concrete because they give the audience imagined sensations of sight, sound, odor, taste, or touch. Such details help the debater to induce belief and to hold interest.

Concreteness and Belief

Suppose the speaker wants to convince an audience that the state police of Pennsylvania should be abolished. During his reading he may find the case of Mrs. Clarissa Englert, who testified before a Senate Committee that a policeman hit her with a blackjack, sat on her stomach, and twisted handcuffs on her wrists until blood spurted out, or the case of Rudolph Diapiazza, who offered five eye-
witnesses in a Bentleyville court to prove that four policemen had beaten him with a mace until it broke in two. With these details in mind, the debater may tell his audience that the state police are brutal. But no matter how strongly he may state the general conclusion, his hearers will probably not believe him, because they lack the concrete information which he possesses. His problem is to show his audience not only what his conclusion is, but also how he arrived at it. If he can describe several actual incidents so vividly that the members of the audience will see women struck down, hear maces cracking on men's skulls, and feel the impact of hard knuckles on their own jaws, the general charge of brutality may not need to be made at all.

Suppose, again, that the speaker wants to convince his audience that the United States government should protect the property of American citizens in foreign countries, even, if necessary, by military intervention. One of the most effective methods is to try to make each listener imagine himself a property owner in China. Make the listener imagine that he has sold his home in St. Louis and moved to China, investing his savings in a small farm. He builds a barn, hires coolies to plow and sow his land, and is about to harvest his crop when a gang of bandits swoops down upon him, burns his barn, tramples his crop, and drives him from his home. The Chinese government is powerless to aid him. Should his own government refuse to protect his rights? Such an argument has far more weight with an audience than a whole page of statistics.

Macaulay has admirably illustrated the power of concrete images over the human mind in the following passage:

Logicians may reason about abstractions; but the great mass of men must have images. The strong tendency of the multitude in all ages and nations to idolatry can be explained on no other principle. The first inhabitants of Greece worshipped one invisible Deity. But the necessity of having something more definite to adore produced, in a few centuries, the innumerable crowd of gods and goddesses. In like manner the ancient Persians thought it impious to exhibit the Creator under a human form. Yet even these transferred to the sun the worship which, in speculation, they considered due only to the Supreme Mind. The history of the Jews is the record of a continued struggle between pure Theism, supported by the most terrible sanctions, and the strangely fascinating desire of having some visible and tangible object of adoration. Perhaps none of the secondary causes which Gibbon has assigned for the rapidity with which Christianity spread over the world, while Judaism scarcely ever acquired a proselyte, operated more powerfully than this feeling. God, the uncreated, the incomprehensible, the invisible, attracted few worshippers. A philosopher might admire so noble a conception; but the crowd turned away in disgust from words which presented no image to their minds. It was before Deity, embodied in a human form, walking among men, partaking of their infirmities, leaning on their bosoms, weeping over their graves, slumbering in the manger, bleeding on the cross, that the prejudices of the Synagogue, and the doubts of the Academy, and the pride of the Portico, and the fasces of the Lictor, and the swords of thirty legions, were humbled in the dust.
It is worth noting that Macaulay himself, attesting the power of images, uses vivid, concrete details to enforce his argument.

**Concrete and Interest**

Concrete should not, however, be confined to the most argumentative parts of the speech. Colorful illustrations add interest even to impartial exposition. "Almost always prefer the concrete word to the abstract" is the first rule for good prose laid down by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. The tendency to think and to express thought concretely has abundant illustrations. The abstract idea of Justice is embodied in a blindfolded goddess holding scales and sword. The United States is figured in Uncle Sam and the American eagle, Great Britain in John Bull and the British lion and the British bulldog. Time is an old man with a long white beard. Death is a gruesome skeleton with an hour glass and a scythe. And so one might list War, Peace, Wealth, Prohibition, and hundreds of other abstractions that are constantly personified. But personification is only one instance of the ordinary person's preference for concrete thought. Statisticians, not content with specific numbers, are constantly laying things end to end until they reach several times around the earth or perhaps from here to the moon. The fable, the allegory, and the parable are still popular and effective methods of presenting an idea; description and narration still present far more meaning to most minds than abstract exposition or argument.

**Concreteness**

Compare the effectiveness of the following passages:

**Abstract**

People become incensed at efforts to interfere with their personal affairs.

**Concrete**

Suppose some one tried to take your cup of coffee out of your hands in the morning. Suppose some one said that you had no right to eat a piece of cherry pie. Or suppose some one attempted to tell you when to rise in the morning, how to act during the day, and when to retire at night. You would become incensed.

You can buy almost anything on the installment plan.

Education has made us skeptical.

In order to tell the truth in history, one need not blacken the characters of all the great
men we have been taught to revere.

Benjamin Franklin, the fact that Patrick Henry shined glasses behind a bar before he was admitted to practise before one, or the fact that John Hancock had a sloop, the *Liberty*, on which he brought in Madeira wine without paying customs. In one textbook called *Community Civics* there are pictures of toothbrush drills in the steel mills, and community Christmas trees, and healthy workers thriving on twelve hour shifts. But there are no pictures of blast furnaces or sweating men.

**THINKING AND SPEAKING**

Granting that concreteness is important to the speaker and his audience, how shall the debater speak concretely? He must revert to Cardinal Newman’s principle that “thought and speech are inseparable from each other.” To speak concretely, think concretely. The debater should, as part of his preparation, write or present orally some points in his case by description or narration. If, for example, the debate is on the abolition of capital punishment, let him describe a specific execution; if it is on child labor, let him describe a scene in the beet fields where child labor is employed. This will heighten his own impression and understanding of the facts of his case.

**CONCRETENESS**

In such work, however, it will probably be necessary to caution him against working for an effect, against overdoing the picture. He should be told that the value of the picture is measured in terms of its accuracy to the fact. Even if his efforts at these pictures do not produce literary masterpieces, they will still be his best method of preparing his speech, provided, as stated above, that accuracy and truth, rather than effect or literary adornment, are his aims.

**Concrete Illustrations**

By the term illustration is meant the description of some scene or incident which explains and substantiates a general contention. The following principles should be observed in the use of illustrations:

1. *The illustration as a whole must be relevant to the general contention.* The audience must be able to see clearly and without question the logical connection between example and generalization. Frequently speakers succumb to the temptation to use a story because it is interesting although irrelevant, and the audience is left to puzzle out the relation between the story and the speaker’s subject.

2. *Each detail of the illustration must be relevant.* It is possible for a speaker to select an example which proves or makes clear his point, and then to mar the effect by adding to this example many interesting bits that contribute nothing to clarity or proof, but rather obscure those points which are relevant.

3. *The illustration should be no longer than is absolutely
necesary. This echoes the second principle. Tell only those facts which prove or explain the general statement. Come to the point as quickly as possible.

4. The illustration must be typical and plausible. The illustration may be interesting; it may be obviously relevant to the general statement; and yet it may leave the audience unimpressed. The speaker must avoid the criticism that his example is a special case. If he selects his example from actual fact, he must select one that is common enough to warrant his general statement; if he makes up an illustration, he must conform as nearly as possible to actual facts. Otherwise, the audience will say in the first case, “Well, that’s the only time that ever happened,” or in the second, “That could never happen.”

5. The details of the illustration must be arranged in ascending order. As far as possible each item must be more interesting and more significant than the one that preceded it, in order to avoid anticlimax.

The Analogy

When an example is drawn from some other subject than that to which the general statement belongs, it is called a figurative analogy. In this sentence, “A man may vote regularly and still fail essentially of his political duty, as the Pharisee who gave tithes of all that he possessed and fasted three times in the week, yet lacked the very heart of religion,” George William Curtis explains a general truth in politics by likening it to a more specific situation in religion. A famous instance of a more detailed use of analogy is the following from Lincoln’s speech at Springfield when he charged that Douglas, Buchanan, Pierce, and Taney had conspired to legalize the spread of slavery:

We cannot absolutely know that all these adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen — Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance — and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places and not a piece too many or too few, — not omitting even scaffolding, — or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in — in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

Here a situation in politics is explained by likening it to a similar one in building.

An analogy, it is apparent, derives its effectiveness from similarities. The speaker must therefore be certain that the facts he sets forth of the known member of his analogy are really true. If house building were not as Lincoln described it or if the Pharisee were other than Curtis painted him, these analogies would obviously detract from the effectiveness of the speeches instead of adding interest and persuasive force.
To these methods of attaining concreteness may be added personification, which has already been mentioned, simile, metaphor, and the use of concrete words, discussed in the next chapter. Again it must be observed, however, that these are not adornments of speech and that attempts to handle them as such can only result in artificiality; rather they are methods of thought, of conceiving one's ideas.

CHAPTER X

SPEECH STYLE

THE CARDINAL VIRTUES

With the consideration of methods of interesting his hearers, the debater passes to the problem of embodying his thought in speech. He will doubtless need to be told first that the style of speech differs in some ways from the style of writing. The writer addresses a reader who can proceed as slowly as he likes, can peruse a profound sentence several times to get all its meaning, and can, if bored, drop the page altogether, to return at another time when his interest is greater. In contrast, the speaker communicates ideas to a listener who must follow as fast as he leads, must get all the meaning from each sentence as it is spoken, and will, if bored, miss whole divisions of the speech completely and forever. Furthermore, the author writes for a large and often ill-defined audience, whereas the audience of the speaker is relatively small and usually drawn from a particular community.

Each of these facts affects the speaker's style. His ideas must be developed slowly enough so that his audience can easily follow; each sentence must be clear enough to be grasped at once; the speech must be sufficiently interesting to hold attention at all times; and specific allusions may
be local, that is, examples may be used which the particular audience in Memphis will understand but which a reader in Jacksonville would not. It is evident that the speaker, even more than the writer, must observe the cardinal stylistic virtues of simplicity, clarity, vividness, and propriety.

AIDS TO SIMPLICITY

1. Of two synonyms, choose the shorter.

Say fire for “conflagration,” shady for “umbrageous,” behead for “decapitate.”

2. In general, prefer the short sentence to the long, but in using short sentences be careful to avoid monotonous rhythm.

3. Prefer always to be understood rather than to be impressive.

“An ordering of parts made lucid by marked indications of consecutiveness” may be impressive, but “a clear and coherent plan” is more intelligible.

AIDS TO CLARITY

1. Of two synonyms, choose the one more familiar to the audience.

Say secret for “cryptic,” flabby for “flaccid,” bit for “modicum,” beggar for “mendicant.”

2. Always prefer the accurate word to the high-sounding one.

Say leg for “nether limb,” foot for “pedal extremity,” barber shop for “tonsorial emporium.”

SPEECH STYLE

As far as possible, let thought dictate speech; the debater should break this rule only when the thought itself requires translation in order to be understood and appreciated by the audience.

3. Give careful attention to transitions from one idea to another. Leave no gaps in the chain of thought.

Make constant use of such transitional words and phrases as “because,” “therefore,” “consequently,” “yet,” “but,” “likewise,” “in contrast,” “in other words,” “in summary,” etc. Use words as echoes. For example, if one sentence is “Congress has again passed the Muscle Shoals bill,” the next might be, “But the bill may be vetoed by the President.” In the second sentence, “bill” is an echo word.

AIDS TO VIVIDNESS

1. Almost always prefer the concrete word to the abstract.

Say Babbitt instead of “a typical American businessman,” Middletown instead of “a small settlement in the Middle West,” George Washington instead of “the father of his country,” Bill Jones instead of “the corrupt politician,” ten thousand dollars instead of “a large sum of money,” they rioted instead of “they broke the peace,” they threw rotten eggs instead of “they staged a demonstration,” they wash dirty dishes instead of “they do menial labor,” he has to dig scraps of bread from garbage cans instead of “he lacks the necessities of life.”

2. Whenever possible, use the active rather than the passive voice.

Caesar said, “I came, I saw, I conquered”; not “The new territory was entered, was surveyed, and was taken by me.”
Lincoln said, "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation"; not, "Fourscore and seven years ago a new nation was brought forth upon this continent by our fathers." He said, "We take increased devotion"; not, "Increased devotion should be taken." Compare the effectiveness of the following sentences:

**Passive**

While the streets are filled with five million unemployed Americans, and starvation is faced by thousands of farmers, the principle of the dole is debated week after week in Congress.

**Active**

While five million unemployed Americans walk the streets and thousands of farmers starve, Congress debates, week after week, the principle of the dole.

3. Make use of the rhetorical question. Be absolutely certain, however, that the correct answer is so clearly implied as to leave no room for misunderstanding. Often a series of rhetorical questions, one coming, for example, at the end of each of a series of illustrations, adds effectiveness to the speech.

A debater at the University of Pittsburgh made a speech several years ago in which he argued that the Government should suppress subversive propaganda. He quoted a sentence or two: "The police hate us. We must shoot them down." Then he asked, "Should we allow this to be published?"

He quoted again: "A brave man shot McKinley. Why not shoot Coolidge?" And again he asked, "Should this be published?" After the third or fourth illustration, several excited members of the audience regularly shouted, "No!"

4. Use parallel structure to bring out important ideas. For example:

If we board a street car, signs implore us to buy facial soap; if we ride along a country road, larger signs suggest that we dye our hair; and if we turn on the radio in the evening, a local politician urges us to support his particular party.

Parallel structure is particularly effective when employed with contrast.

5. Use contrast or antithesis whenever possible. Contrasting one proposal with another, one idea with another, or one line of argument with another, is the essence of debate.

For example:

Private ownership means direction by competent executives; government ownership means control by corrupt politicians. Private ownership means economy; government ownership means waste. Private ownership means competition; government ownership means monopoly.

6. Repeat important ideas or "key" words or phrases, in order that the audience will remember them.

Booker T. Washington, in his speech at the Atlanta Exposition, told the story of a ship lost at sea. The crew, dying of thirst, signalled a passing boat for water. The answer came back, "Cast down your bucket where you are." They did, and found fresh water from the mouth of the Amazon. Time after time, during the rest of the speech, as he sketched the relations between the Negroes and whites, Mr. Washington repeated the phrase, "Cast down your bucket where you are." Cast it down in agriculture, he urged; cast it down in me-
chanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. The repetition of this vivid "key phrase" helped to make the speech memorable.

7. Give a humorous twist to an idea when feasible. Be sure always, however, that the humor is relevant, not dragged in simply for the sake of getting a laugh. Irrelevant humor either falls flat or distracts attention from the central idea of the speech.

"Three more payments and the baby's ours" enlivens a debate on installment buying, but might be out of place in a discussion of farm relief.

THE PRINCIPLES OF PROPRIETY

1. The speech must be appropriate to the speaker himself. Few things are more ludicrous than the spectacle of a youthful debater pouring forth ponderous, pedantic, or highly technical phrases. First of all, it is almost always apparent that he is unaccustomed to such language, and secondly, it is probably bad speech coming from any one. The debater must talk his own language. To be sure, he has special need to be careful of his speech, but, above all, it must be his speech.

2. The speech must be appropriate to the audience. This governs the first principle of clarity. If the members of the audience are not specially trained in the subject, if, say, they have made no special study of economics or politics, all special or technical terms should be translated into popular speech. Conversely, a farmer boy can use phrases

before an audience in his own high school auditorium which would be out of place at a city gathering. Thus a debate team may have to rephrase considerable portions of their speeches as they move from one place to another on a trip.

3. The speech must be appropriate to the occasion. Primarily the occasion is one for the communication of thought; therefore style is governed primarily by this demand. Secondly, and only secondarily, the occasion is likely to be slightly more formal than ordinary polite conversation. Simplicity and ease, however, are far more appropriate than empty and meaningless formalities.

4. The speech must be appropriate to the thought to be expressed. This is the fundamental principle of style. Since the thought is—or should be—the speaker's, since the audience is primarily interested in the thought, and since the occasion is the communication of thought, all the principles of style are implied in propriety to content. As far as possible, let the thought to be expressed govern its own expression.
CHAPTER XI

DELIVERY

SHALL THE SPEECH BE MEMORIZED?

When all the material has been gathered, organized, and shaped into a speech, the debater's final problem, taken up during the last four weeks, is his delivery, the physical act of speaking. Unless this problem is correctly handled, much, if not all, of the effort spent in the preparation of the debate will have been wasted. At this stage the question naturally arises whether to memorize the speech or to deliver it extempore.

Each method has its advantages and defects. In the memorized speech, the debater knows exactly where he is going, how much time he will spend on each argument, and precisely what he will say. In delivering the speech extempore, that is, from an outline, he runs the danger of spending too much time on one argument, of having no time to complete his case. In the memorized speech, however, he has no means of adapting his speech to those of his opponents, nor to the reactions of his audience; he has committed himself to a definite plan of attack and must follow through no matter what happens. Furthermore, reliance upon memorized manuscripts for the direct speech often produces marked discrepancies between these direct speeches and the rebuttal. In such instances, the speaker handles his direct speech readily and easily, but stumbles and falters through his rebuttal.

But the greatest objection to the memorized speech is that it is the most difficult form to deliver well. The speaker must constantly combat a tendency to speak monotonously, to give his attention to words when he should direct it to meaning. Having committed himself to specific words, he must remember those words. The added burden is often too great, and the speaker deserts his ideas and devotes all his energy on the platform to remembering words. Only when the thoughts to be expressed are striking and vivid in the speaker's mind and when the language is entirely familiar to him can he deliver his memorized speech with the necessary spontaneity and life. And when the thought is vivid and the language is his own, the extempore speaker will not be far behind the speaker from manuscript in fluency and readiness; he will probably be far ahead of him in spontaneity of expression. The coach, realizing these advantages and defects of each type of speaking, must decide which type the individual debater shall use.

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES OF DELIVERY

In either case, the following principles should be observed:

1. When speaking, focus attention upon the thought to be expressed. This is the first element in an effective delivery.
The more vividly a thought comes to the speaker, the more vividly will he express it by the action of his voice. The appropriate changes of pitch, volume, and rate of speaking come naturally as a result of thought and feeling, and not from deliberate control. Do not attempt to manipulate the voice for emphasis or impressiveness or for any reason whatever. Even the most ignorant audience is rarely fooled by tricks of voice, and is quick to resent any evidences of insincerity in the speaker.

2. Coupled with this understanding of the thought must be consciousness of the audience. More than that, to have a really effective delivery the speaker must have a desire to reach his hearers. A mere order from the debate coach to look at the audience is futile. Directness and communicativeness are gained only when the speaker feels the desire to talk to his audience.

3. The advice "Be at ease" is meaningless. If the speaker can lose himself in his subject and in his effort to communicate ideas, he will be sufficiently, if not entirely, at ease. In this way only can he gain freedom from "stage-fright" or nervousness.

4. The commonest fault in delivery is artificiality, which comes from the attempt to control voice and gesture deliberately. These two elements should always be spontaneous and instinctive. The aim of speech delivery is to focus the hearers' attention upon the thought of the speech and not upon the delivery itself.

5. In the matter of posture, speakers striving for correctness sometimes "lean over backward" literally as well as figuratively. Nothing is gained by a military stiffness. The speaker should be trained instinctively to stand comfortably erect.

6. Where necessary, corrections in pronunciation should be practised in advance until they have become habitual, that is, until they are used without distracting the speaker's own attention from the thought. Any dictionary is a helpful guide to pronunciation.

In summary, it may be repeated that delivery is almost entirely instinctive or involuntary. Pauses, changes in pitch or volume of the voice, correct pronunciation, gestures, even posture should not require the speaker's attention during the delivery of his speech. Any corrections which must be made should be thoroughly mastered before the delivery of the speech. During the speech the speaker must devote his attention to the content of his speech and to the reactions of his audience.

**The First Step in Preparation: Understanding the Material**

Obviously the first step toward effective delivery is a thorough mastery of the thought to be expressed. All the available material and argument must be understood by the speaker himself, and he must see clearly all the logical relations of point to point. Various methods may be devised by the coach to test this thorough understanding. If two teams are developing the subject at the same time, it is both interesting and profitable, not only to have the two
teams debate, but to let each team cross-examine the other on the question. Such cross-questioning should be supervised by the coach, who must see that the questions asked can be answered quickly and without too many qualifications. The coach, too, may question the debaters. If desirable, the cross-examination of each team by the other may be conducted as a contest presided over by the coach and conducted before the school audience. However, it is primarily a step in the preparation of the debate, an acid test of the debater's knowledge and understanding of his subject.

The Second Step: Visualization

The second step is the visualization of the material. The debater should reinforce every generalization with an illustration. He may not employ all these illustrations in his speech, but the consciousness of them will vivify his own thought. The coach may assign each debater the task of working out orally or in writing an illustration either real or imaginary for each argument. Statistics may be handled in the same way. "Unless an abstraction is easily translatable into concrete terms it is very elusive indeed... The clear thinker will be able to put his ideas into both abstract and concrete form, and one form will be a corrective of the other," writes Professor Winans.¹ One cannot place too much emphasis upon this visualization of material in the preparation of the speech.

¹ _Public Speaking_, pp. 62 and 64.

The Third Step: Writing

The next step is to write out the speech. "Thinking with pen in hand," says Goethe, "if it does no other good, keeps the mind from staggering about." The debater, of course, should not begin to write out his whole speech until he has completed all previous steps in gathering and assimilating his material. When he has written it, let him study what he has written, correcting the expression of his ideas for accuracy, clarity, simplicity, vividness, and propriety. In the first draft of the speech it is better to ignore the element of time; let him "write himself empty" on the subject.

After he has completed his examination of the first draft of his speech, and has gone over it with the coach, he is ready for a second draft designed to overcome the faults of the first and to conform to the time-limit allowed him. The number of such drafts must be determined by the amount of time he has for preparation, but time spent "thinking with pen in hand" will be spent profitably.

The Fourth Step: Practice

When the method of handling the direct speech has been determined and carried through, the debater should be afforded as much opportunity as possible for practice. During this practice, the coach should check any tendency toward recitation or platform affectations. He should follow the speech closely to try to detect those places where the speaker's attention is not concentrated upon his thought. The communicativeness of delivery both in
practice and in the debate depends, as Professor Winans observes, upon a full realization of the content of words as they are uttered and a lively sense of communication with one's listeners.

Matters of word-choice, grammar, pronunciation, posture, and gesture may be corrected during such practices, but here the coach needs to use particular care. Too much criticism of such details in the preparation of the debate will tend to increase the debater's self-consciousness and to send him to the platform thinking of the form when he should be attending to the content of his speech.

**Conclusion: Delivery Is Communication**

In conclusion it may be said again that delivery is primarily the communication of thought. Therefore attention to content at the moment of delivery is the first requisite for good speaking. The second requisite is a consciousness of the reaction of the audience. Thought — and the speaker's own feeling which attends thought — must be the principal guides for speech, for word, tone, and gesture. Where speech is inadequate for the thought, where grammar and pronunciation are faulty and the vocabulary is meager or inadequate for the occasion, correction is obviously necessary; but this correction is of value only when the debater becomes entirely familiar with the improvements made. And, finally, if delivery is controlled by real thought and feeling, it will tend to be appropriate to this thought and feeling as well as to the speaker himself, to his audience, and to the occasion.

**CHAPTER XII**

**REFUTATION**

**The Place of Refutation**

Refutation, the attempt to overthrow an opponent's argument, should not, as is sometimes assumed, appear only in rebuttal. In fact one distinguishing mark of a skillful debater is that he can adapt his argument at any point directly to what has been said by preceding speakers. No vitally important argument should be allowed to pass without comment. Aristotle's advice is sound: "You must first, by means of refutation... attempt some answer to your opponent's speech, especially if his arguments have been well received. For just as our minds refuse a favorable reception to a person against whom they are prejudiced, so they refuse it to a speech when they have been favorably impressed by the speech on the other side. You should, therefore, make room in the minds of the audience for your coming speech; and this will be done by getting your opponent's speech out of the way. So attack that first — either the whole of it, or the most important, successful, or vulnerable points in it, and thus inspire confidence in what you have to say yourself."
The debater can easily see the force of Aristotle's suggestion if he will put himself for a moment in the place of a member of the audience. He must imagine himself sitting in an uncomfortable chair while two teams try to gain his support. One team wants him to accept a new plan; the other team wants him to adhere to the old plan. Suppose, now, that the first speaker says, "You should support my plan because it will save you money"; the second speaker says, "You should adhere to my plan because it is morally sound"; the third speaker says, "You should support us because our plan is in accord with American principles"; and the fourth speaker says, "You should adhere to our plan because it will cost less money than a change."

If the first Affirmative argument has any force, it will linger in the listener's mind through two speeches, distracting his attention from the rest of the case; if the argument is not strong enough to hold attention during the two middle speeches, the last Negative speaker will have to revive it before his answer has any weight. Either way the result is confusion. English debaters have an excellent phrase for the better type of debate, in which each speaker partially answers his predecessor before giving his own constructive argument. They say, "We lay down our proposal; they pick it up; we lay it down again; they pick it up again."

This phrase emphasizes the fact that a new audience situation is created at the end of each speech. Let us assume that an audience is quite impartial at the opening of a debate on modern advertising. When the first Affirmative speaker has finished, the audience is partisan, believing that modern advertising sells products by illogical appeals to emotion. The first Negative speaker must at least throw doubt on that idea before the audience will listen to him with an open mind. Having won a hearing, he can then argue that modern advertising has brought labor-saving devices into American homes.

When the audience faces the second Affirmative speaker, what does it believe? The idea that modern advertising achieves its purpose by questionable methods has been partly removed, and the new idea that advertising helps to make home life easier has been added. Hence the new speaker, to make a direct contact with his audience at the start, must revive faith in his colleague's argument and destroy some of the audience's faith in that of his opponent. If he fails to accomplish these things, the audience, instead of listening willingly to his new argument, will struggle against him.

In other words, the beliefs of the audience should swing back and forth slowly from speech to speech, like a pendulum. If a debater tries to drive them instantly from one end of the arc to the other without crossing the intervening space, he encounters mental obstacles almost as great as the physical. The net results are confusion and irritation rather than conviction and persuasion.

**ATTACKING CONTENTIONS**

In order to prove an opponent's contentions unsound, the debater has two main courses. He may show that
there is a fallacy in the reasoning process or that the direct evidence is not valid. For the detection of fallacies, he needs a thorough understanding of the types of argument. He cannot adequately overthrow a generalization unless he knows the requirements of a good generalization. He cannot overthrow an argument from causal relation unless he knows the tests for a causal argument. He cannot overthrow a deductive argument, based on a syllogism, unless he knows the rules of the syllogism and can recognize one even when a premise is suppressed. Many times the fallacy in a syllogistic argument lies not in the part stated in the speech, but in a second premise that is implied.¹

Exposing the inaccuracy of alleged facts stated by an opponent calls for a thorough knowledge of the actual facts. The impeachment of the testimony of persons cited as authorities requires a knowledge of the tests for authority: Is the so-called authority an expert? Is he prejudiced? Does he know the facts of this particular problem? Is he aware of the significance of his testimony? Is he acceptable to the audience? Is the quotation an accurate indication of his point of view, or has the opponent taken a sentence out of its context and made it mean something different? The debater must know enough about

¹ For fuller discussions of fallacies see Shaw: The Art of Debate, Chapter III; Baker and Huntington: Principles of Argumentation, Chapter III; O'Neil, Laycock, and Scales: Argumentation and Debating, Part II, Section B; and Foster: Argumentation and Debating, Chapter VIII.
RELATION TO THE AUDIENCE

In all refutation, as has been said, the audience must be kept clearly in mind. The only points that really count are those which the audience remembers. Hence, if a dozen contentions are offered by one team, the first problem facing the other team is to decide which two or three are most important in the minds of the audience. To hammer home a few main arguments is more effective than to touch briefly on a large number. The latter method, known as “scrappy rebuttal,” results only in confusion.

It is evident, therefore, that the unit of thought in rebuttal, as in the direct speech, should be not the single evidence card but the series of cards. A speaker can no more draw a general conclusion from one example in refutation than he can in constructive argument. If a Negative speaker decides that the strongest Affirmative argument against modern advertising is that it increases the cost of the product, he cannot answer it in rebuttal with a single letter from a cereal company. He must show that the Kellogg Company, the Babbitt Soap Company, the Champion Spark Plug Company, and two or three others attribute decreases in the price of their products to advertising, and that Professors F. E. Clark of Northwestern University and Daniel Starch of Harvard University consider these results typical. Then, by using a series of seven cards, he has built a strong argument. Re buttal time is short, but for that very reason it should not be wasted on trifles or on the presentation of arguments which, from lack of sufficient evidence, fail to induce belief.

But it cannot be enforced too strongly that the team, when presenting its rebuttal to the three or four strong contentions of the opposition, must indicate clearly why those particular contentions have been selected. The other arguments must be reviewed briefly and shown to be irrelevant, admitted, or trivial before the attack is centered on more important ones.

Considered as a whole, rebuttal, like direct speaking, is concerned with contrast and comparison. Each speaker must keep this constantly in mind. The rebuttal should show on what points of contrast between the proposed plan of the Affirmative and the status quo or alternative plan of the Negative the solution of the problem hinges. Summaries on each side should be prepared with that end in view. The whole argument, instead of spreading out into a bog of trivialities, should narrow down, step by step, to the vital issues. By the effectiveness of their treatment of these issues the debaters will be judged.

DEBATERS NEED PRACTICE

The only really successful method of training debaters for rebuttal is to give them plenty of practice. Mrs. Huston-Whipple thus describes her procedure at Northwestern High School in Detroit: “We have at least three, if not more, complete debates each week with the teams sitting at their respective tables, the alternates acting as
timekeepers, the gavel sounding at the appointed times, and no interruptions. Sometimes on other days we abandon main speeches altogether, and have rebuttal on a single point until that is exhausted, and then treat other points in the same manner. On still other days we discuss the points which our opponents may raise, and plan lines of attack. Sometimes, but rarely, of course, the coach takes the platform and represents the opposition. The debaters enjoy this variety.

"Much of the success of any rebuttal work is dependent upon the card-index system which high school boys and girls thoroughly enjoy. One year we had one box for the three debaters, but it seems more practical for each debater to have his own box and cards. They also are aided by a division of labor; each debater is responsible for certain points in rebuttal. For example, when the question of the Ruhr came up in connection with the proposition of cancellation of war debts, Norma knew that she was to answer that point, because she had worked out a better refutation than her two colleagues.

"It is helpful to have each debater particularly responsible for the points of one speech of his opponents. For example, let the first Affirmative be responsible for every point mentioned by the first Negative speaker. This method fixes responsibility, and permits those who have not yet spoken to concentrate on their own speeches. However, this is by no means to be interpreted as an absolute division of labor; every debater must listen carefully to every speech. On the other hand, the debaters

have often stated that they liked the plan as a general rule of procedure.

"Rebuttal means hunting for fallacies, searching for inconsistencies, and answering evidence with evidence that is still more convincing. The best results are obtained when you have either two first teams, or a second team with which to hold actual debates. Not theory, but practice, practice, practice makes successful rebuttal. If it is impossible to have two teams, the alternate and the coach must furnish the opposition, for opposition there must be! Any debating team which has had three weeks of consistent rebuttal practice will revel in the intellectual exhilaration of mental combat, instead of weakly wondering, 'What shall we say in rebuttal?'

Strategy in Debate

One of the major problems to be solved by any debate coach is the ethics of strategy. Is it ethical to ask questions of the opposition? Is it ethical to hold out strong evidence until the final rebuttal speech? Is it ethical to employ the dilemma? Is it ethical to attempt to center discussion on minor issues? Some of these queries answer themselves. Questions are ethical when used to clarify the issues; the dilemma is ethical when fairly conceived and fairly stated. Holding out strong evidence until the final rebuttal speech is unethical, and so is a deliberate attempt to direct the discussion into unimportant bypaths.

In general, the intent of the strategy determines its fair-
ness. Fortunately, the intent of the coaches who argue most strongly for the less savory forms of strategy is evident in their own discussions. They admit quite openly that their primary object is not to enlighten or convince an audience but to win a victory. Most of them think of debating only in terms of war.

Hence it is not surprising to discover that several types of strategy are designed to take advantage not of the opponents' lack of knowledge or reasoning power, but of the inevitable lack of time. To propound several dozen, or even several hundred, questions would not be unfair if the opposing team were given unlimited time to study those questions, separate the important from the unimportant, and answer them one by one. But the confessed object of asking so many questions is to present a list so long that all of them could never be answered completely if the debate lasted forever. Again, it would not be unfair to argue on side issues if there were unlimited time to treat each subordinate argument, as well as each main argument, thoroughly. Nor would it be unfair to save the strongest evidence to the last if the success of the plan did not depend on the fact that the opponents have no opportunity for refutation.

One reassuring sign is that a few of the most confirmed victory-hunters among debate coaches now admit the unfairness of these tactics. They continue to use the methods, however, not because they want to gain Napoleonic victories themselves — nothing, they assure us, could be farther from their thoughts — but because their opponents may still resort to questionable practices. Obviously the only sensible procedure is for each coach to train his own debaters to be fair; then the number of unscrupulous opponents will immediately be cut fifty per cent.

**Borderline Cases**

Some strategic devices, as has been said, may be used fairly or unfairly. The dilemma is such a device. In a recent intercollegiate debate on repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, the Negative propounded this question: "Do you favor less liquor or the return of the saloon?" The dilemma presented was obviously a trick. The team had offered no proof that continuance of the Eighteenth Amendment would decrease the consumption of liquor, and the Affirmative had already stated quite clearly its opposition to the return of the saloon. Yet to answer that question the Affirmative had either to give the audience the impression that it was deliberately evading the issue, or to spend at least half a main speech in explanation. In either case the Negative had deliberately taken an unfair advantage of the opposition.

In contrast, an Affirmative team in another recent intercollegiate debate presented this dilemma: "Either ninetenths of the money spent on modern advertising is designed to mislead and confuse the public mind or the advertising industry is ninety per cent inefficient." In this instance the team had used a whole speech to prove that modern advertising is designed to mislead the public;
and it had cited statistics offered by Stuart Chase and Professor Roland Vaile to show that all the actual information contained in advertisements could be compiled and distributed by one-tenth of the men now employed in the business at one-tenth the cost. Hence the dilemma, when presented, summed up the two chief contentions of the Affirmative case and clarified the vital issue of the debate. All the refutation which the Negative offered was directed toward the central clash of opinion. In that instance, the use of the dilemma was clearly fair.

Likewise a direct question, when it strikes at a vital contention, is not only fair but highly effective. A team arguing for free trade may be troubled by the question: “Do you favor removing all restrictions on immigration?” But the question is pertinent and important, for the success of free trade, according to experts in economics, depends on the unrestricted flow of labor. But the question: “How would free trade affect the shoe industry in St. Louis?” may be unfair, because although any Affirmative team should be able to answer a general question as to the effect of free trade on American industry, no team can be expected to know in detail how free trade would affect every specific manufacturer in the United States. If this question were supplemented by a dozen more of the same kind, the unfairness of the strategy would be obvious to all but the most obtuse. Again one must return to the general rule that the intent of the strategy determines whether or not it is justifiable.

**THE EFFECT OF STRATEGY ON THE AUDIENCE**

Fortunately most debate audiences can sense unfair strategy. Hence the use of it often prejudices the audience, and in these days judges as well, against the user. If one team demands answers to forty questions, the audience understands immediately that the team is trying to win by unsavory means. If a team insists upon talking on minor issues, it gives the opposition a chance to show the audience what is happening and to allege inability to meet the real issues. If a team holds out its strongest evidence until the final rebuttal speech, the members of the audience or the judges inevitably get the feeling that somehow that evidence must be faulty or weak. An audience, except under special circumstances, as when a silver cup is at stake, always likes fair play. A hint of unfair tactics will often undo all the other work a team has done during the evening.

Several English debaters who have appeared in this country recently have shown that they recognize this fact. In one debate, the last speaker advanced some strong evidence on a point that had been previously mentioned only briefly. Immediately he realized the unfavorable response of the audience, and, to save the situation, turned to his opponents with the words: “In order that I may not seem to take advantage of my position as last speaker, I invite the gentlemen on the other side of the house to speak again if they can answer my arguments.” As it happened, his opponents were unprepared to take advantage of the opportunity, but even had they answered him, the English-
man would still have risen in the estimation of the audience because of his courtesy and fairness.

Again, skillful debaters make a point of conceding gracefully the soundness of arguments that they know to be good. This procedure has several merits: It shows fairmindedness, which an audience likes; it is more effective logically than a weak rebuttal; and it shifts attention to other issues on which the weight of evidence may be more favorable to them. A team should be fair in its argument, then, because unfairness is unethical, and also because a fair-minded attitude is highly effective as persuasion. If a debater is fair to his opponents, the audience or judges will be fair to him.

CHAPTER XIII

ADVERTISING THE DEBATE

THE PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED

The teacher who begins to coach debates with the notion that his work ends with selecting and training the team is, under ordinary conditions, quickly disillusioned. Larger problems involving the relation of debating to the school and to the community arise for solution. The chief of these are (1) how to get the best students to represent the school in debate, (2) how to obtain large and interested audiences, and (3) how to make debating known and respected by the school community and by the general public. All three may be solved, at least partially, by a discreet use of the right kinds of publicity.

Before we are in a position to apply the technique of publicity to debating, however, we must make sure that the quality of our debates is such as to justify urging people to attend. We must present something of genuine benefit to the community. Our effort should be to win for debating the support it really deserves — no more and no less. There are many outside the teaching profession who assure us that it deserves far more support than it receives, and speak sorrowfully about the decline of debating in the last thirty or forty years. All we wish is to hold our own
against the more widely advertised attractions in our modern life. We may think that it is hopeless to compete for our share of attention, but we cannot be certain until we make a thorough and sincere effort not only to regain the position which too many are content to believe is lost, but also to attain an even more important place in school and community life.

THE DIRECTION OF PUBLICITY

What organization and what means we should employ to advertise debating will depend to a great extent upon the local situation. If a capable and dependable student can be found, he should be entrusted with the work. Since the direction of publicity is a large task in itself, it seems unwise to ask the student debate manager to handle it along with his other duties. Furthermore, the debate manager may not have a special aptitude for such a task. Perhaps it would be best to have a senior for publicity director, with a junior for associate publicity director in order that there may be some one each year with sufficient experience to take charge of the work. Underclassmen who wish to compete for these upperclass positions will make useful assistants for the director.

The most important qualifications, aside from experience, are some knowledge of advertising and news writing, fairly wide acquaintance in the school, interest in debate, tact, persistence, and spare time. Some connection with the school paper is helpful, but not essential. If no student can be found capable of filling the position, the coach or the principal should undertake the work. In any event, a single teacher or administrative officer should exercise strict supervision over every phase of publicity, for mature and intelligent direction is essential to its success. Careless, inaccurate, or poorly written publicity will do more harm than good.

For numerous reasons it is best to have one man in charge. First of all, one man will be able to work out and to follow a definite and consistent plan of publicity. Secondly, a man will have more interest, a keener sense of responsibility, and consequently greater success if he realizes that debating is relying upon him for all publicity and that he will get all of the praise or all of the blame. With practice, such a director will become more efficient and will develop a style which will make debate publicity interesting. He will discover different points of view for news stories; he will collect information about all of the members of the squads; he will follow the progress made by a team preparing for a debate; he will secure facts about visiting teams, biographies of the speakers, and news of their tours. In other words, he will learn to develop a climactic interest before each debate.

A third and very important reason is that, as time goes on, the editors of the school and local papers come to depend upon a particular man for news of debate, and will print more of the material submitted. After a certain number of stories have been printed, the city editor begins to realize the importance of the stories and will ask for them, whereas at first the publicity director will find it
necessary to ask to have them run and may need to resort to persuasion. One important task of the publicity director is to gain the confidence of editors in order that they may be induced to print what he turns in. Furthermore, one man soon comes to know just what is needed and just how to work with the various people in authority.

But most important of all, perhaps, one man, if he is persistent, can accomplish a great deal in securing metropolitan publicity. If all of the stories come from one man, the editor will feel that they are more authoritative, and he will know to whom to write for further information if he needs it. If a half dozen students send in articles, the editor has less confidence in them and will be less likely to print them. Finally, from the point of view of those in charge of debating, placing one man in authority is desirable because it centers the responsibility and makes easier the development of the work.

**THE NEWS STORY**

Of the various types of publicity that may be used, news stories are probably most effective in the long run. Since the public must be constantly reminded that debates are coming, many short stories presumably gain more than a few long ones. If the director will begin with the tryouts in the fall and work up interest at once in order to bring out as many students as possible, he will find the school much more receptive during the year. Summaries of the preceding season and of the proposed schedule for the new season make good opening news stories. To interest stu-

dents directly in the tryouts, stories on the history of debating at the institution, on prominent graduates who were debaters, on what eminent men have said of debating, and on the importance of debating to the student, to the school, and to the public will serve fairly well.

Of course, the time, the place, and the nature of the tryout, and the time and the procedure for registration should be announced two or three weeks in advance. After the squad is selected, a list of the men chosen, with some account of their achievements in activities and in scholarship, if any, should appear. Even though the season does not get under way immediately, the director will still have plenty of material for stories. Changes in debating, the various types used, local debate organizations, traditional rivalries in debate, the differences between debating and athletics, debating in foreign countries, and similar subjects will suggest feature articles.

As the time of the first debate approaches, the director should submit stories on the progress of the team, on the importance of the question, on the visiting debaters, on former debates with the visiting schools, on the reason why a large audience is expected, and on the arrangements for the debate, such as time, place, chairman, plan of debate, length of speeches, and type of decision. Anything that promises to make the debate especially interesting, novel, or significant should be stressed. By submitting stories several weeks before a debate, the director can develop interest which he could not arouse by last-minute accounts. He must beware, however, of unnecessary rep-
etition, since no editor will print the same news story twice.

Since most people will look at photographs in newspapers, it is wise to run pictures of both teams about two days before the debates. If there is no photo-engraving department on the paper, the debate organization will do well to buy cuts both of the squads and of the individual debaters. The value of pictures in attracting attention is far greater than that of a story. City papers will accept pictures more readily than they will stories in most instances, especially if debaters come from that city or from some near-by town where the paper has circulation.

After a debate, the director should make sure that an interesting account of the debate itself is immediately submitted for publication, because the editors are usually willing to give such accounts considerable space and prominence, and because such accounts will arouse interest in the next debate. If such material is published in the metropolitan press, the prestige of debating will be increased since it will then have more than school significance. School papers of other institutions are usually glad to have concise, interesting accounts of the major events at rival schools. It seems wise to take advantage of every opportunity to secure dignified publicity outside of the local school community.

**Other Types of Advertising**

A second important way to secure publicity is to post in prominent places before each debate at least one set of placards. There should be enough to receive complete circulation both in the school and in the local stores and public places. The success of these placards depends entirely upon how well they apply the psychology of winning attention. They can be very attractive or very drab and uninteresting. The word "debate" should not be emphasized. It is better to play up some particular part of the debate or some special feature connected with it. We must remember that people have to be induced to change their minds about debating, which they think of as dry and dull. Anything which will make placards more appealing, such as bright colors or amusing cuts, will have some influence in getting people to attend debates.

Another good way of bringing debates to the attention of the community is to have students make speeches before various clubs and organizations. Many students will be interested if the matter is presented to them in the right way. Incidentally, this method costs nothing and gives students excellent practice in persuasive speaking. They should learn to stress the value of the particular debate to the particular audience; they should not be content with a mere announcement. Where possible, visiting each school club or home room for a brief speech of this sort will have noticeable effects. If a debater can get an opportunity to speak at a student assembly, he may do a great deal to attract a crowd.

An energetic and resourceful publicity director will think of many other means of creating interest in debate, and will make an investigation to discover what appeals
are most successful with the student body and with the community. He will make every effort to win the cooperation of the students and of the town folk. Of course the faculty members in charge of debating must serve as a restraining influence at times in order to keep the publicity on a dignified plane, but any student entitled to hold such a responsible position would be likely to have good judgment.

Some may inquire what will induce a student to devote the necessary time and energy to a task of this kind. The right type of student will enjoy the work and will appreciate the experience. He will be glad to make the large number of necessary contacts in the school, in town, and in near-by cities. Furthermore, he will receive a certain amount of money for the news and pictures he places in city papers. If those in charge of debating will recognize his efforts in every way possible, his position should easily become one of importance in the eyes of the students.

**Attainable Results**

Let us see now how well this scheme will solve the three problems with which debating is confronted. In the first place, if debating is well known and appreciated in the school, we should have no difficulty in securing the capable students for the squads. Publicity in metropolitan as well as local papers will raise debating in the esteem of the students and will make positions on debate squads posts of honor and importance toward which to strive. The second problem of obtaining large and interested audiences will be directly taken care of by advertising, providing debates are sufficiently well prepared and sufficiently interesting to make people want to go a second time. If the debaters themselves are students of importance in the school, many students will go just to hear them speak. If the first two problems are solved, respect for debating both by the school and by the general public will rapidly increase.

It is often said that nothing succeeds like success. If debating is properly advertised, it will bring out crowds and will arouse students’ interest. A better type of student will then become interested in debating, and debates will improve. Better debates will draw larger crowds and increased interest until debating will command the attention and respect of the whole community. Even though people do not always attend the debates, they will maintain an interest in the progress of the debaters. But in the last analysis, the size of audiences will be the measure of success of the whole plan.

If such a plan for bringing debating to the attention of the public is worked out slowly and carefully and is not permitted to become blatant, we should have no reason to fear the criticism made of bad commercial advertising. With a well-developed organization for restrained debate publicity, we should not have to apologize for debating as a highly respected and thriving student activity, as an excellent means of giving students experience in public address before real audiences, or as a reliable way of increasing public interest in both sides of controversial questions.
CHAPTER XIV
JUDGING THE DEBATE

VARIOUS METHODS OF JUDGING

In Chapter I the aims and objectives of interscholastic debating have been discussed in detail. In any contest that team will be superior which more nearly realizes these aims. Since both debaters and audiences like a formal declaration of this superiority, various methods of deciding the contest have come into use. There seems to be no "best method." If the audience can be depended upon to vote impartially, the audience decision is satisfactory. If, however, the audience is likely to be influenced by partisan sympathies, it is better to employ neutral judges. Sometimes as many as five judges decide a contest, more often three, and, not infrequently, the single "expert" judge.

THE THREE BASES OF JUDGMENT

Three possible bases for decision are open to judges. First, the judge may attempt the practically impossible task of serving as a juror. Previous knowledge of the question must not influence his decision. He must have an "unbiased mind." "Y" school presents its evidence; "Z" school presents its evidence. At the end the juror is supposed to render his decision entirely on the basis of this evidence. Two objections to this method are (1) that few judges possess the necessary ignorance of the subject or the ability to assume it for the occasion, and (2) that, lacking strict rules of evidence and the time and means of applying them, offered a juryman in the courtroom, the judge's decision will probably revert to his previous opinions or sympathies.

In the second place, the judge may vote as a legislator. At the end of the debate the judge simply votes for or against the proposition. If, having heard both sides, the judge is convinced that the Philippines should be given independence, he gives his decision to the Affirmative. Any previous conviction about the subject is legitimately thrown into the balance on one side or the other. Such judgments give no indication of comparative skill in debating.

In the third place, a judge may act as a critic. He need not be ignorant of the question discussed, nor does he feel obligated to vote for the team that upholds the side of the question he prefers. He uses his knowledge of the subject and of debate methods to evaluate the arguments and their presentation. The critic judge can give a judicious decision on a question which is obviously one-sided. It is seldom that a question can be so equitably stated that each side has an equal burden of contention. A thoroughly debatable question often gives either the Affirmative or the Negative a decided advantage in material.
In several county leagues the question used recently was cancellation of war debts. Although each school entered teams upholding each side of the question, a surprising majority of three-judge decisions went to the Negative. It is relatively easy to prove that a just debt should be paid, no questions asked. The judges who gave these decisions declared that the Affirmative did not give as much proof as the Negative. Now the critic judge would examine the question, realize the advantages or disadvantages of either side, and award his decision to the team which had made the most of its opportunities, not necessarily the one that submitted more evidence. The critic judge is therefore most satisfactory for the average interscholastic debate.

SELECTING THE JUDGES

Judges should be chosen from those who, in addition to some knowledge of the subject, have some conception of debate aims and rules and of the theory of persuasion. If the debate is held near a college, varsity debaters usually can be got without much difficulty. They know what to look for in debate, and are quite willing to serve, often for expenses only. Teachers in social science subjects often qualify. For the single expert-judge, a teacher of debating is most satisfactory. Judges should not be chosen on the basis of prominence. That an individual is a successful merchant is no indication that he can judge a debate. Too often judges are selected because they are successful, look distinguished and wise, and speak authoritatively. If the judges are chosen on their ability to give a decision on the merits of the debate, there will be less dissatisfaction with this system.

THE SINGLE EXPERT-JUDGE

A single expert-judge often is used. By paying one man the combined fees of three judges, it is possible to get one competent judge of considerable experience. Especially in a debate league, where there are a number of contests to decide, it is often convenient for the schools to use expert-judges. Usually the expert-judge gives with his decision a short criticism of the debate. This helps the debaters, for they need the definite appraisal of a neutral person to show them the strong and the weak parts of their methods. It should also help to educate the audience concerning the qualities and tests of good debating.

THREE JUDGES

When schools are unwilling to trust all the responsibility to one man, three judges may be used. If the debate is between schools where the contests are very intense, a three-judge decision may seem to give a greater degree of finality. In schools of this kind, agreement on three judges to be selected is sometimes easier than upon one judge.

THE FIVE-JUDGE DECISION

If there is abundant judging material available, if there is no need to economize on expense, or if the judges can be secured without fees, five judges may be practicable. If the contest is one to be treated with especial care, perhaps the added inconvenience of arranging for five judges may be worth while. The result seems more convincing than a decision by one or by three judges.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGES

Regardless of number, judges should sit in the audience. There should be no conferring before the sealed ballots are turned in to the chairman; otherwise the decision will reflect the opinion only of the most persuasive and forceful judge. Many schools send a blank of instructions to judges several days before the contest, so that they may be thoroughly familiar with the method of judging. Others give the instruction blank to the judges just before the debate. It is not necessary for the judges to know the schools representing either side of the resolution. The decision is given either "Affirmative" or "Negative." Some schools supply the judges with rather general instructions (see Appendix B). Other schools and leagues give minute instructions. Often the judge writes on his ballot only the side for which he votes. Sometimes he qualifies and explains his decision. Regardless of the method used in recording the decision, the instruction blanks should be so definite that no judge will attempt to give other than a critic's vote.

THE AUDIENCE DECISION

Audience decisions are becoming more and more popular. This method often stimulates a more general interest in debating and induces the audience to follow the arguments more closely. In a single vote at the conclusion the audience may be asked to express its opinion about the question or about the debating. If the audience is asked to decide the question, its opinion does not directly indicate relative skill in debating. Like the legislative vote of the judge, this opinion may involve previous beliefs, sympathies, or prejudices.

If the audience is asked to decide the relative skill in debating, the decision will reflect the opinion of persons not versed in debating technique and without a unified point of view. Furthermore, this opinion may reflect partisan feeling for one of the teams. To overcome these difficulties, votes on the subject are often taken both before and after the debate, and the shift of opinion decides the debate (see Appendix C). Prejudices on the question and partisan feeling, if recorded in the first ballot, are thereby discounted. Since this decision indicates the persuasive effect of the debate, it most nearly approximates the critic vote of the judge.

Since in later life the debater will employ his training more often to persuade audiences than "expert" judges, this method of conducting the contest, in spite of some
disadvantages, is of real benefit to him. Facing an audience and not a judge, the debater feels a real problem in persuasion. He is no longer confined to nor content with arbitrary and sometimes artificial rules of argumentation. The debate is no longer a school recitation or exercise in applied logic. He must adapt his reasoning to the particular group; the evidence that he offers must not only be adequate but must also be selected with an eye to its effect on a group whose general sympathies can be predicted. Furthermore, while the judge demands simply that the case be proved, the audience demands in addition that it be presented in such a way as to arouse and sustain interest.

**COMBINATIONS OF METHODS**

Numerous combinations of methods of judging are used. Sometimes the audience serves as one judge along with two expert-judges. The individuals comprising the audience, in this case, give judgments either for the Affirmative or for the Negative. The total audience vote is cast as one ballot. Each of the two judges casts one ballot. An eastern league varies this plan to use three judges and the audience vote. If the audience and one judge cast their ballots to tie with the other two judges, the audience-judge decision carries.

I have seen great interest aroused in an intramural scholastic debate when the chairman announced that at the conclusion of the debate several rows of students would be selected to decide the contest. Of course such a method is decidedly inaccurate. Its main function is to arouse interest. Sometimes both expert-judge and audience decisions are made at the same debate, and the results announced separately. In these last mentioned plans, members of the audience vote as critics. The disadvantages of this have been discussed above.

In general, the audience decision works most satisfactorily when the group is impartial, or relatively so, when the judgment is cast in the form of opinions changed, and when the audience is fairly mature. To use the plan under other conditions usually is unsatisfactory.

The types of judging mentioned in this chapter will meet almost any debate situation. In some debates, the expert-judge may be most advisable. In others, three- or five-judge decisions may be most practicable. When the audience can give a fair decision, there are many advantages to this plan. The important thing is to choose a type of judging to meet the local situation. If this is done, and if the aims and purposes of debating are kept in mind during the judging, decision debates need not degenerate into word-battles for points.
CHAPTER XV

TYPES OF DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

A CHANCE FOR EXPERIMENTATION

The moment we consider debating as an educational activity, we see that the formal debate, aimed at winning the decision of three judges or of a single judge, with a narrowly defined question and carefully timed speeches, is not necessarily the only type of debating to be encouraged. While most interscholastic contests probably will follow the formal pattern for some time to come, it is well to know and to experiment with other types, giving students experience in different forms of speaking. The classroom and the debating society offer occasions for such experimentation.

THE SYMPOSIUM

A type of discussion which is especially suited for the classroom is the symposium. A symposium partakes of the nature of a debate, except that whereas the debate limits one to a choice between two sides, in a symposium there are many sides.

A symposium might be organized in this way: Let the class suppose that there is to be elected to the Hall of Fame a single American author (or inventor, or statesman) who is not now represented there. (This will require some fairly easy and profitable research.) Now let each member of the class prepare to nominate a candidate for this election. If several choose the same name, this fact should be ascertained beforehand and the presentation of that name can be divided—or, since usually members of the class will be open to suggestion, different names can be assigned. After the nominating speeches have been made, with further open discussion if desirable, an election can be held. In order to make possible a choice, each speaker will necessarily agree not to vote for the person he nominated; in other words, the election will be judged on their second choices.

Two criticisms of the symposium I have suggested should be considered. One is that the argument may resolve itself somewhat into a matter of taste, proverbially barred from disputation. And yet matters of taste of the sort suggested do have to be decided; and I do not agree that all discussion of them is fruitless. The other criticism is that there is a slight touch of artificiality in the situation created. The discussion will lack a little of the reality which is essential and will contain a touch of the “make believe” which has been a harmful element in much instruction in public speaking in the past. This fault could be corrected if a subject of school or local interest could be found; for example, your symposium might be upon the question, “What would be the best name for the school paper?” Or, “What should the new high school be named?” Or, even, “Who was our greatest President?”
Variations of this general idea will suggest themselves. For instance, a picked group of five or six speakers might present the conflicting points of view and the remainder of the class act as audience-judges. A vote is not absolutely essential to the symposium but usually adds zest to it. As one can see, the symposium gives opportunity for all sorts of persuasive and argumentative speaking, including rebuttal; and if it is found to work successfully in the classroom there is no reason why it might not be carried out before a public or semipublic gathering.

**The Open Forum Debate**

Within the last four or five years the open forum debate has come into popularity among American colleges. It has been felt that this type of debate adds to the value of the activity because it places the speakers in a better relation to their audience than does the formal debate. American school debating has emphasized the set speech, with extemporaneous work confined to the rebuttal, with rigid time-limits and rules of evidence; in short, it tends to be a game rather than a form of real discussion, a contest in which the contestants display their skill before expert judges without regard to their persuasive effect upon the hearers before them.

In the formal debate the judges are often asked to vote in total disregard of their beliefs concerning the proposal debated, whereas such beliefs are the chief concern in a real occasion of discussion. Under the open forum system there are no judges specified, but an expression of the opinion of the audience with reference to the question (not with reference to the skill of the debaters) is taken at the end of the discussion. I say discussion rather than debate, for after the speeches by the debaters the question is usually thrown open for discussion from the floor. Such an occasion, therefore, is nothing more or less than an open forum with the discussion led by the prepared debaters.

Debating of the open forum type is not a competitive sport, but is rather a real effort to influence public opinion. However, if some comparison of the effectiveness of teams is desired, the opinion of the audience on the question can be taken before the debate as well as afterwards and the shift of opinion noted.

In stating the question for an open forum debate, a form like the following is suggested: "It is the opinion of this body that the United States government should own and operate the coal mines," or "This house opposes immediate increases of the United States Navy." Suppose that on such a question a vote of the audience is taken before the debate, by ballot, giving each one a chance to register his opinion as favorable, neutral, or opposed. Then let the debate proceed, let there be speeches from the floor (limited to two minutes or four minutes), questions from the floor answered by debaters, and then let another ballot be cast and the final opinion of the audience be taken. Some such method has been tried in scores of college debates with success. The vote before the debate, it may be said, is not an essential feature of open forum debate.
If the competitive element is present at all, there probably will be some partisanship in the audience; that is, some members of the audience are going to allow their opinions to be determined wholly by the speakers from their own school. To get rid of this factor, a "split-team" system can be used: one Affirmative and one Negative speaker can be furnished by each school, so that each team represents both schools.

In open forum debating much depends upon cultivating a spirit of free discussion among both speakers and audience. The chairman of such a debate should have all the qualities of a good presiding officer of the parliamentary type. He should know how to encourage discussion. He should repeat questions from the floor so that they will be clear, and he should know when to end the discussion and take the vote.

DEBATE ON THE "OREGON PLAN"

A type of debate introduced at the University of Oregon combines cross-examination with speaking. In this form there are two speakers on each side. The first Affirmative speaker is allowed twenty minutes in which to present the entire constructive argument for his side. The first Negative speaker also has twenty minutes for the negative argument. Then the first Affirmative speaker is recalled to the platform and required to answer questions put to him by the second Negative speaker. "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." ¹

This period of questioning lasts for ten minutes, after which the first Negative speaker is called to the platform and similarly questioned for ten minutes by the second Affirmative. Then the second Negative speaker is allowed ten minutes for a speech, for the purpose of rebuttal and summary, followed by a speech of like length and purpose by the second Affirmative.

This type of debate is reported to require thorough preparation on the part of the speakers and to be of special interest to audiences. It may be decided by an audience vote, or by a vote of judges, or it may be left decisionless.

THE THREE-SIDED DEBATE

It is well known that not every question before the public resolves into two exactly opposed points of view. Upon a motion before a deliberative body, one may choose to vote affirmatively or negatively—or one may move to amend. In view of these facts, some experiments have been tried with the three-sided debate. In a debate on the World Court, for example, one team might oppose America's adherence, a second team might favor adherence to the court as constituted, while a third team might argue for certain reservations or amendments. Such a debate would give rise to a very interesting argumentative situation, and

might well be concluded by a division of the audience upon the question.

**Other Variations**

Several other variations from the formal debate have been tried recently with success. At Hunter College an extra speaker precedes the regular debaters. His duty is to examine the subject impartially and to give the audience the information necessary for an understanding of the clash of opinion involved. This plan relieves the first Affirmative speaker of a burden which he too often is tempted to slight. In addition, it gives the extra speaker training in exposition, which is nearly if not quite as valuable as training in argument.

A more elaborate scheme, based on the procedure of the Oxford Union, has been tried at Washington University. The plan demands an unusually intelligent chairman (called, on this occasion, president) and a group of students, preferably debaters, trained to follow the Union rules. There may be four or six speakers “on the paper,” that is, speakers with prepared talks on the subject, two or three on each side as in a formal debate. Members of the Union (which may be made up, as suggested, of a particular group of debaters sitting together, or of the whole audience) may interrupt any speaker at any time, by rising and addressing the president, to challenge a statement or to ask a relevant question. The speaker must dispose of the objection or question before going on with his speech. The relevance and importance of challenges and questions are decided by the president, who may, if he deems it wise, call the heckler out of order.

After the four or six main speeches, the discussion is thrown open to members of the Union. Speeches from the floor are limited to four or five minutes. The president should try to have these talks alternate between supporters and opponents of the proposition. After the discussion has continued until the president finds it advisable, because of the lateness of the hour or the weakness of the speeches, to stop it, the first Affirmative speaker “on the paper” has an opportunity, if he wishes, to summarize his side of the argument in a five-minute speech. The members of the Union then vote on the question, expressing their convictions without any reference to the quality of the debating.

The first time this scheme is used in public, the coach will probably find it necessary to have three or four speakers with four-minute speeches “planted” in the Union with definite instructions to take part. As the school debaters become used to the plan, however, the necessity for this preparation will disappear, and the discussion after the main speeches will be, as it should be, entirely spontaneous. The Oxford Union plan has all the advantages of the open forum and audience decision debate, with the additional merit that because of frequent interruptions of speakers interest is kept at a high pitch throughout. It also develops quickness of wit and skill in rebuttal to a greater degree than most other forms of debate.
THE FORMAL DEBATE

Little need be said concerning the organization of a formal or "old-style" debate. Variations in the number of speakers, length of speeches, number and order of rebuttal speeches, and instructions to judges usually depend upon local custom or convenience. Elsewhere in this book will be found advice concerning some of these points. It may be said here that even in the formal debate, where the winning of the judges' votes is the object, the debaters would do well to speak to the whole audience, addressing their persuasion to the minds of all their hearers. And some touches of informality, such as references to colleagues and opponents by name, are encouraged by many debate coaches, as adding reality to an occasion which is too likely to be artificial.

CHAPTER XVI

DEBATING WITHIN THE HIGH SCHOOL

THE VALUE OF DEBATING

Probably no other extracurricular activity can prove of more value to the average student than debating. Yet an examination of the extracurricular programs of many of our high schools shows that other activities are emphasized, while debating has been for the most part ignored. Either it has been given no place in the program, or it has been limited to the few ambitious students composing the school team. Now, certainly, the careful organization and training of not more than six students is no small undertaking, but such overspecialization is neither desirable nor necessary; and under such a system debating cannot properly be called an educational activity of the school. It is rather the hobby of six or seven intelligent students. To interest students in debating and to give instruction and practice to as many as possible is the problem, then, in organizing the activity.

Obviously, the number taking part in interscholastic debating is limited. The solution must be found in supplementing interscholastic debating with intrascholastic debating. What are the means of doing this?
Within the School

Classroom Debating

The first place one would expect such instruction and practice to be given is the English classroom. For achieving the objectives of the English course, debating affords an excellent project. The use of such questions as “Resolved, that literature was as important as statesmanship in bringing about the abolition of slavery,” or “Resolved, that there should be censorship of newspapers” should prove valuable both as media for presenting class work and as excellent exercises in themselves. Use should be made of debating during the entire four years, not merely for a few weeks of a designated school term. Not only in the English class but also in the history, economics, and civics classes, debating can be used. Here debating is important to the instructor as a device for presenting the content of the course. Whether the project is used in the social science or English classes, however, there must be careful supervision by the teacher.

Class Teams

A second means of giving debate practice to pupils other than those representing the school in interscholastic debates is through the organization of class teams. In some schools it is the practice to have tryouts at the beginning of the year for the selection of school and class teams. The best students are designated school debaters. In addition, two or three students are selected from each of the classes to represent their class. Each class meets every other class for the championship of the school. The class team is important, also, in affording the prospective interscholastic debater an opportunity for preliminary practice.

The Debate Club

A third and even more important means for giving instruction and practice is the debate club. The modern high school has recognized the value of club organization as a means for carrying out school activities. For a student to belong to at least one club is now the accepted thing. For several years, one of Pittsburgh’s largest high schools has limited its debating to intraschool debates, carried on by its two clubs, one for boys and one for girls. This plan has not only given experience and instruction in debating to a large number of students, but it has also enabled these students to receive practice in parliamentary procedure; it has aroused a great deal of interest in debating throughout the school; and it has permitted the students interested in debate to know each other socially. Although this particular high school has limited its activities to the club, the club and the school team need not be mutually exclusive.

The debate club can in fact do much to foster and encourage interscholastic debating. From its members, debaters can be trained and selected for interschool debates, and later on these same chosen few can gain much by discussing their particular questions for debate with the
cluster. From the club, too, teams may be chosen to practise against the team that represents the school. The club as a whole will present a critical audience for practice debates, as well as the nucleus for an interested audience at the final contest. The club may also be depended upon to take the responsibility of advertising, providing hospitality for the visiting teams, ushering, etc. Such support as this, given by a well-organized group of debaters, will do much to raise the prestige of debating in the eyes of the students.

In spite of the generally accepted advantages of debating and the use of the club as a medium for giving debate practice to a great many students, many high school debate clubs have failed. In general this failure can be traced to the wrong type of membership, faulty supervision, or the wrong type of programs.

**Membership in the Club**

Some clubs begin too ambitiously. Numbers are all-important; genuine interest and ability in debating are not sufficiently considered. More than the desire to join some club should be required for admission. One high school club lasted for two meetings and then disbanded. It had been organized at the request of nine eager and intelligent students, certainly a happy beginning. The faculty committee decided, however, that there must be more members. The overflow from the dramatics club was drafted — and the club disbanded.

**Within the School**

It is far better to begin with a small group of the right type of members, than to dilute the enthusiasm and the interest of the group with a large number of half-interested or incapable students. Some sort of selection, moreover, makes membership in the club an honor and raises its prestige. Membership can be determined by tryouts or limited to those students on the honor roll, or to those having had experience in classroom debate. For obvious reasons, membership should not be dependent upon the vote of the group.

Although selection is wise, care should be taken lest the club be so exclusive that only a very small percentage of the student body receive debate practice. On the other hand, no club should be composed of more than thirty members. Where more students are eligible, however, additional clubs can be formed, a junior club for freshman and sophomore students, and a senior club for juniors and seniors; or there may be a club for boys, and a club for girls. Division according to classes is recommended rather than division according to sex. The former is a much more normal arrangement, and the fact that meetings are held at school under faculty supervision should be sufficient to keep the social element in its proper place.

**Faculty Supervision**

Another problem involved in the conduct of the debate club is the amount and kind of faculty supervision. Some clubs fail because they are not free from the formal routine...
of the classroom. Too often the emphasis is upon teacher rather than student activity. Other clubs fail because the adviser himself has no interest in or enthusiasm for the activity; the principal has told him that he must take charge of the debate club. Many casualties are also occasioned because the adviser does not have time enough to give to the club. Unless the debate coach is carrying only a part-time teaching schedule, he should not consider coaching the school teams and directing the activities of the club at the same time. In the heat of the interscholastic debate season, he will be tempted either to ignore the club altogether or to make it a mere practice ground for school debaters.

When the office of debate coach and club adviser are held by different teachers, however, there can and should be close cooperation between the two. Interscholastic debating should aid the club, and the club can certainly aid interscholastic debating. In all cases the faculty coach or club adviser should be selected by the principal or the director of extracurricular activities, not by the club members.

Club Programs

Unquestionably, the type of program presented determines largely the success of the club. Meetings should be held weekly or biweekly, depending upon the policy of the school. Weekly meetings are preferable. The first meeting should be devoted to the organization of the club, the election of officers, and the appointment of committees.

Within the School

At all other meetings a definite program relating to debating should be planned by the program committee and the faculty adviser. Chapter XV offers many suggestions as to variations in program. Occasionally an outside speaker or a former school debater who has won recognition may speak before the group. Many universities now follow the policy of having their own debaters present debates before high school groups. Such practice has proved valuable both to the university and to the high school.

Other possible variations are to have the group regard itself as the senate and to have the debaters impersonate certain senators in discussing national issues, or to have the group become the city council in debating local issues. The mock trial presents another possibility. For the most part, however, the debaters should not be encouraged to impersonate. Such practice will prove a diversion and aid the student in acting, but will do little to cultivate sincerity in the speaker or conviction on the part of the audience.

Throughout the year debates may be arranged with other clubs. Questions of historical importance may be debated with representatives from the history club, of economic importance with the economics club or class, etc. Occasionally a humorous subject should be debated.

Debating before the Assembly

In addition to debates within the club, or debates with another school group, the debating club should debate before the school assembly. If the school does not hold
regular assemblies, the club might put the question of holding them before the students. Both sides could be presented by the club for discussion. For the club to identify itself with school movements can do more towards making debating interesting to the students than years of arguing the League of Nations or recognition of Soviet Russia. Does your school have a student council, a home-room system, a point scale for judging activities, an athletic board, a newspaper? Does it give a school letter to school debaters as well as to athletes? If not, why not let the club present the pros and cons of some of these questions before the students and faculty? Here is a practical as well as an educational outlet for the club's activities. It makes debating a part of the life of the school and not something entirely distinct and separate.

DEBATE AS EDUCATION

In the organization either of interscholastic or intra-scholastic debating, we must not forget that debating has a definite educational value that should be enjoyed by as many students as possible, and that interest and enthusiasm can only be aroused from within the school. Interscholastic debating certainly has its place, especially in schools where there is already great interest shown, but it should not constitute the entire program of the school. Classroom debating, class-team debating, and debate-club activity are worth-while educational projects in themselves and will greatly strengthen and stimulate interscholastic debating.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTING THE CHAIRMAN

Often it is necessary to tell the chairman, tactfully but firmly, that the audience has assembled to hear a debate, not to hear him talk. It is not his duty to discuss the question, or even to attempt to be humorous. His function is simply to start the affair as quickly and effectively as possible.

The chairman should welcome the visiting team; trace, if necessary, the history of forensic relations between the two schools; explain any rules of the contest that need explanation; read the question; name the debaters, telling which team has the Affirmative side and which the Negative; name the judges, if there are any, and, if not, state clearly the method of judgment that the audience is to use; and introduce the speakers in turn.

Speakers are introduced in the following order: in direct speaking: first Affirmative, first Negative, second Affirmative, second Negative, third Affirmative, third Negative; in rebuttal: first Negative, first Affirmative, second Negative, second Affirmative, third Negative, third Affirmative. (If only two speakers are used on each side, they appear in the same order.)

The chairman usually announces the decision. He may, however, introduce one of the judges to perform that duty. If an expert-judge is used, he is always introduced and is usually given some time to explain his decision.

If the decision is made by a shift-of-opinion vote of the
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

The whole problem of instructing judges is a much-discussed and never-settled one. Sometimes judges are given no instructions beyond the admonition that they shall sit apart during the debate and shall not confer before their sealed ballots have been handed to the chairman. At other times they are puzzled by several sheets of reading matter which profess to tell them precisely how to weigh various elements in debating; they are asked to distinguish, for example, between "resourcefulness" and "the speaker's ability to think for himself." between "adequate presentation of facts" and "accurate presentation of facts," and, in more general terms, between content and delivery. And not only that, but they must evaluate each item for each speaker according to a specified rating scale and, then, by a supreme exercise of mathematical skill, add, subtract, and reach a number which, in some mysterious way, expresses, supposedly, an exact opinion of the contest.

The purpose of rating scales is laudable enough. The school superintendents who hand them out believe that the judges receiving them will be forced to give a critic vote. But the results do not come up to the expectations. In the first place, the rating scale is based upon a principle that is psychologically unsound. Any listener must judge a debater's speech as a whole; he cannot, at the moment, break it up into a number of separate qualities which are not clearly defined. A competent
judge will usually make his decision independently and then fill in the rating scale afterwards to conform with his general opinion on the relative debating ability of the teams. The incompetent or inexperienced judge will become entangled in a mass of phrases and figures, and in five cases out of ten come out with an erroneous result.

The only definite value in a list of qualities, therefore, is that it will serve as a guide for the judge if he is called upon, after he has given his decision, to explain it. The following sample instruction sheet is recommended solely for that purpose.

INSTRUCTIONS

The judge's decision should depend solely upon which side is the more skillful in handling the available material. This will depend upon

1. What is said
   a. Which side seems to present the facts more accurately and adequately?
   b. Which side is sounder or more logical in the reasoning based upon these facts?
   c. Which side supports more strongly the important issues involved in the question?
   d. Which side in rebuttal answers more effectively the important arguments of the other side? (Very important)

2. How it is said
   a. On which side do the speakers seem more resourceful — more able to think for themselves, especially in rebuttal? (Very important)
   b. On which side do the speakers show more naturalness and ease; that is, freedom from stiffness, artificiality, pose, and rant?

---

INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES

   c. On which side are the speakers more persuasive? Persuasion will depend upon such qualities as fair-mindedness, courtesy, sincerity, enthusiasm, sense of humor, sympathy, intelligence, understanding of the interests of the audience, as well as upon pleasing voice and appearance.

   d. Which side is more skillful in accurate and effective use of English?

The decision of the judge should be rendered without regard to his opinion on the question at issue. If thoroughly acquainted with the subject, he should use his knowledge to determine the relative strength of arguments and the comprehensiveness and adequacy of each case.¹

The above instructions should not be fitted out with a set of numbers and used as the basis for numerical decisions. When so used, they defeat their only legitimate purpose.

When a single expert-judge is used, instructions are usually not given him. He is supposed to know his business. He is usually asked, however, to explain his decision to the audience, and the specific criticism of the particular debate thus given is vastly more valuable than the general criticism given in numbers on a rating scale.

¹ See O'Neill, Laycock, and Scales: Argumentation, Appendix C, pp. 452-453, for further instructions to judges and ballot form.
APPENDIX C

AUDIENCE DECISION BALLOTS

When an audience is asked to vote only once, the problem of balloting is not difficult. All that is necessary is to attach two perforated slips to the bottom of the debate program bearing the words “Affirmative” and “Negative.” The individual listener can then detach whichever slip he wishes and hand it in.

When two votes are taken, however, one before and one after the debate, a special type of ballot is necessary. The one printed on pages 162 and 163 has been developed by Professor H. S. Woodward of Western Reserve University.

The reverse side of this ballot may be ruled off to give space for specific comments on each speaker.

In counting these votes no ballot should be validated unless both halves are clearly marked. The number of ballots marked before the debate, therefore, will always equal the number marked after the debate. The points “before” and “after,” however, will not be equal, because a change of opinion to “more convinced” or “less convinced” is evaluated at two points in the scale. Following is an example of weighing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE THE DEBATE</th>
<th>Evaluated at</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFTER THE DEBATE</th>
<th>Evaluated at</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>More favorable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>More opposed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the increase of the Affirmative, subtract the total Affirmative before the debate (a) from the total Affirmative after the debate (c).

Thus, c—a or 26—16 gives 10 (increase in points for the Affirmative).

To determine the increase in points for the Negative, subtract the total Negative before the debate (b) from the total Negative after the debate (d).

Thus, d—b or 51—31 is 20 (increase in points for the Negative).

The comparison is an increase of 20 for the Negative to an increase of 10 for the Affirmative, a decision for the Negative.

Another poll might show:

Affirmative:

| a | 16  |
|   |     |
| c | 13  |

This gives a decrease of 3 to the Affirmative.

Negative:

| b | 31  |
|   |     |
| d | 69  |

This gives an increase of 38 to the Negative.

Consequently the decision goes to the Negative.

In a very exceptional case, there might be a decided shift to Neutral. Since Neutral votes are evaluated at zero, there
THE SPECIAL WOODWARD BALLOT

TO THE AUDIENCE

The idea to be discussed will be found on the program stated in question form, or the chairman will state it.

Will you express

YOUR PERSONAL OPINION ON THIS QUESTION by marking this ballot both before the discussion and again after the discussion. Your cooperation will be much appreciated.

This form is filled by a

☐ man  ☐ woman, whose age is .................

BEFORE THE DISCUSSION

☐ YES (This expresses my belief on the question.)
☐ — I am undecided.
☐ NO (This expresses my belief on the question.)

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

AFTER THE DISCUSSION

(Mark one place)

I have heard the entire discussion, and now

☐ YES (I believe more strongly than I did before in answering "yes.")
☐ YES (This expresses my present belief on the question.)
☐ — I am undecided.
☐ NO (This expresses my present belief on the question.)
☐ NO (I believe more strongly than I did before in answering "no.")

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:
might well be a decrease in points (not in ballots) cast for either side.

Affirmative:
\[
\begin{align*}
  a & \quad 16 \\
  c & \quad 10 \\
\end{align*}
\]
This gives a decrease of 6 for the Affirmative.

Negative:
\[
\begin{align*}
  b & \quad 31 \\
  d & \quad 29 \\
\end{align*}
\]
This gives a decrease of 2 for the Negative.

The score would read: a decrease of 2 for the Negative; a decrease of 6 for the Affirmative. The decision would go to the Negative.

If the Negative increased equally with the Affirmative, or decreased equally, the result would be a tie. Such a possibility, however, is slight.

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE AND DISCUSSION

A survey based on the opinions of one hundred fifty high school coaches concludes that questions of policy are preferable to questions of fact and interpretation and that local questions are preferable to national ones. The first conclusion merely confirms present practice; probably six out of every ten questions debated by high school teams are questions of policy. The second endorses a commendable movement to make debating a real force in the individual community.

As long as state-wide debate leagues and interstate contests continue, however, national questions will be discussed by debaters. And often the greatest service a high school team can do is to explain a national issue to the people of the community. There is justification, therefore, for listing several types of propositions for debate.

I. CURRENT QUESTIONS

A. Propositions of policy:
   1. That the nations should adopt a policy of free trade.
   2. That Great Britian should immediately grant dominion status to India.
   3. That the present policy of military preparedness should be abandoned.
   4. Upon declaration of war with another nation, our government should use conscripted wealth for all expenditures involved in the war.
5. The several states should enact legislation for compulsory unemployment insurance, to which employers shall contribute.
6. The state should provide a system of state medicine.
7. That the Eighteenth Amendment should be repealed.
8. That the United States should cancel its interallied war debts.
9. That the United States should recognize the Soviet Government of Russia.
10. That utility rather than culture should form the basis of college curricula.
11. That the Canadian system of liquor control should be adopted by the United States.
12. That the nations should adopt a policy of complete disarmament except for such forces as are needed for police purposes.
13. That all automobile owners should be required by law to carry insurance covering personal liability and property damage.
14. That our public highways should be nationalized.
15. That the five-day labor week should be adopted.
16. That there should be a Federal old-age pension law.
17. That junior colleges should take over freshman and sophomore work now offered in colleges and universities.
18. That professional lobbying in Washington should be abolished.
19. That the United States should abandon the protective tariff law.
20. That the principles of the Baumes laws of New York should be adopted by other states.
21. That the United States should join the World Court without delay.
22. That the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign countries except after a formal declaration of war.

B. Propositions of fact and interpretation:
23. That the content of courses in public schools should not be controlled by legislatures and boards of education.
24. That the plea of insanity should not be available as a bar to punishment for crime.
25. That the installment plan of buying should be curtailed.
26. That intercollegiate (or interscholastic) athletics should be abolished.
27. That the emergence of women from the home is a regrettable feature of modern life.
28. That the progress of science is a great and growing menace to civilization.
29. That the increase of socialism in the modern world should be deplored.
30. That the world has more to fear than hope from the further development of machines.
31. That democracy is a failure.
32. That in the interests of society severe punishment is the best method of reducing crimes.
33. That the principle of nationalism is a positive evil in the modern world.
34. That the Young plan cannot be the final settlement of the reparations problem.
35. That the foreign indictment of American culture is justified.
36. That chain stores are more harmful than beneficial to the American people.
37. That the policies of the Federal Farm Board should be condemned.
38. That the policy of protective tariff should be condemned.
39. That present trends in intercollegiate (or interscholastic) athletics should be condemned.
40. That lobbying designed to influence Congressional legislation should be condemned.
41. That the present activity of the Church in politics is harmful.
42. That the Hoover Administration deserves a vote of censure.
43. That the intervention of the Federal Government in the wheat situation has been detrimental to the farmer.
44. That Gandhi has been a benefit to India.
45. That modern advertising is more harmful than beneficial to society.
46. That the formation of a federation of European states would be conducive to world peace and prosperity.
47. That the installment buying of consumption goods should be condemned.
48. That the tendency of governments to interfere with the rights of individuals should be condemned.
49. That modern business practice is unethical.
50. That the Latin-American policy of the United States should be condemned.
51. That the policies of Mussolini should be endorsed.
52. That the current trend in education toward practical training rather than liberal training should be condemned.
53. That the United States is an imperialistic nation.
54. That intelligence tests serve no useful purpose in schools.
55. That the foreign policy of the United States toward Europe since the World War should be condemned.

II. HARDY PERENNIALS

A. **Propositions of policy:**

56. That capital punishment should be abolished.
57. That the United States should adopt the parliamentary system of government.
58. That the United States should immediately grant independence to the Philippines.

59. That the jury system should be abolished.
60. That there should be a Department of Education with a secretary in the President's cabinet.
61. That the Child Labor Amendment should be ratified.
62. That the Government should own and operate the railroads.
63. That the Government should own and operate the coal mines.
64. That the Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned by the United States.
65. That the Government should operate Muscle Shoals.
66. That the United States should join the League of Nations.
67. That the commission form of municipal government should be generally adopted.
68. That the city manager plan should be generally adopted.
69. That the direct primary should be abolished.
70. That the use of the injunction in labor disputes should be prohibited.
71. That the Government should own and operate the telegraph and telephone systems.
72. That a system of compulsory voting should be adopted in the United States.
73. That the power of the press ought to be diminished.
74. That there should be absolute freedom of speech in the United States.
75. That there should be no censorship of books.
76. That there should be no censorship of magazines.
77. That there should be no censorship of plays.
78. That there should be no censorship of movies.
79. That the Republican Party (or, if it is in power, the Democratic Party) should be repudiated at the next national election.
80. That there should be an educational test as a qualification for voting.
DEBATING

81. That Congress should enact uniform marriage and divorce laws.

B. Propositions of fact and interpretation:
82. That the principle of censorship should be condemned.
83. That the principle of prohibition should be condemned.
84. That coeducation is a failure.
85. That the centralization of power in the Federal Government should be condemned.

III. DISTINCTLY LOCAL QUESTIONS
86. That our city should adopt the city manager plan of government.
87. That our city should furnish free textbooks to all students in the public schools.
88. That no prizes should be offered in our school.
89. That secret societies should be prohibited in our school.
90. That the student in our school should be given greater freedom in choosing his studies.
91. That our state should have a state constabulary.
92. That our state should abolish its state constabulary.
93. That the Gary system of school organization should be adopted by our city.
94. That our city should own and operate its lighting and power plant.
95. That our city should own and operate its street railway system.
96. That our city should own and operate its bus lines.
97. That pupils should receive school credit for participation in athletics.
98. That the state should pay the college tuition of all high school graduates.
99. That the honor system in examinations should be adopted in our school.

QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE

100. That a system of student self-government should be established in our school.

Note: A supplementary list of questions for use in class debates in the high school may be found in J. C. Tressler's English in Action, Course Four, p. 148.
APPENDIX E

HELPFUL BOOKS AND ARTICLES ON DEBATING

(The following list of books is not intended to be a complete bibliography. It contains only those volumes which can be definitely recommended after actual use by the authors of this work.)


This was one of the first books in the field, but is still a favorite in many schools. It has twenty-five pages given specifically to debating.


This book is better than most in its method of linking persuasion with argument. It is clear, well planned, and not too advanced.


This syllabus of courses of study for high schools, prepared by a committee of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, contains an authoritative statement of the ends sought in debating, and several helpful papers on method.


A recent investigation by the National Association of Teachers of Speech showed this to be the textbook most widely used in American colleges and universities. It is one of the most adequate books in the field. The Appendix gives specimens of analysis, briefs, material

for briefing, a forensic, a complete specimen debate, and an exhaustive list of sources for material, as well as two hundred seventy-five debatable propositions.


In this textbook Professor Foster has revised the material contained in Argumentation and Debating especially for high school use. The elements of exposition and argument are presented in simple language.


Prepared as a textbook for high school courses, this work combines sound theory with a large variety of practical suggestions.


This is probably the most complete discussion of the problems of coaching to be found in print. It assumes that the coach is thoroughly acquainted with the principles of argumentation, and therefore gives almost exclusive attention to the specific problems of directing the debate squad and preparing the team.

In the Appendix will be found lists of debatable questions and of organizations furnishing material, and surveys of high school and college debating.


There are about forty-five pages upon debating, covering most of the questions that will arise in ordinary practice. The book is addressed to high school students.


Clear and definite instruction on "The Requirements of Successful Debating," "Determining the Issues," "How to Prove the Issues," "The Brief," and other subjects connected with debating, is given. The book is inadequate on the persuasive side, however, with no instruction on how to make the arguments interesting.

Teachers wishing to conduct various types of discussion besides the formal debate will find this book useful. The authors have included a brief but informative Appendix devoted to suggestions for the director of debating.


This is a thorough work, going into the theory of argument deeply and giving also some excellent practical suggestions on debating. It is rather too advanced for ordinary use in high schools, but is recommended for teachers.


This manual is made up largely of reprints from other books and articles. It goes thoroughly into the subjects of the presentation of the debate and the organization of debating societies.


In less than a hundred pages the author has set forth clearly and succinctly the principles of argumentation. The teacher who needs to gain a knowledge of these principles quickly will find the book invaluable.


This author treats debating as a kind of warfare, in which one team is always attempting to conquer the enemy. His chapter on "Surveying the Proof," however, marks a distinct advance over former textbooks in the matter of analysis.


The question of style in debate speeches is treated with unusual completeness. The remainder of the text covers the usual ground in a rather casual way.

---


In Chapter VII the author discusses argumentation and debate in terms completely intelligible to high school students. Course Two of the same series has a chapter on "Thinking, Discussing, and Debating" which introduces the student to the problems of argumentation concisely and interestingly.


Probably the best book on public speaking yet written for high school students, this work contains a complete chapter on debating and a number of highly readable chapters on the preparation of the individual speech.


The authors of this textbook take the broad conception that argumentation includes all methods of influencing the mind. The book is therefore valuable to the teacher for supplementary reading, though too advanced for use in high school classes.


An Appendix to this book is devoted to debating. There is little theory, but a great deal of practical advice on how to conduct debating in secondary schools.

---

**ARTICLES ON DEBATING FROM THE**

**QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH**


Hicks, P. M.: “Two Years of Open Forum Debating at Swarthmore.”
Vol. X, No. 4.
No. 4.
Huston, R. E.: “Debate Coaching in High Schools—Benefits and
——: “The Modern High School Debating Society.” Vol. XI,
No. 2.
XIV, No. 3.
Schirer, W.: “Shifting the Emphasis: An Argument for No-Decision
Debating.” Vol. XV, No. 3.
Symposium on Debate and Discussion by Several Authors. Vol. V,
No. 1.
Weaver, A. T.: “Argumentation and Debate in High Schools.”
Vol. IV, No. 2.
Vol. XIV, No. 1.

(The teacher will find other articles listed in “A High School
Bibliography of the Quarterly Journal,” printed in Vol. XII, No. 2.)

The National Association of Teachers of Speech publishes at
intervals a Speech Bulletin, designed for secondary schools, to
supplement the Quarterly Journal of Speech. Number 1 of Volume II is a
Debate Issue. It contains ten articles, including excellent ones on
“Strategy” by H. L. Ewbank and “Evils of Contest Debating” by
J. R. Bietry. It also has an Appendix containing information about
various debate leagues.

INDEX

Abstract words, 95
Abstractions, 67, 85, 86, 104; examples of, 87, 88
Accuracy, 89, 94
Admissions, 55
Advertising the debate, 121–129;
purposes of, 121, 122; direction
of, 122–124; news stories,
124–126; photographs, 126; other
methods, 126–128; results,
128, 129
Affirmative case, 39–44
Aims, 1–10; somefalse, 2–7;
proper, 7–10
Alternates, 19, 20, 113, 114, 115
Alternative plan, 49, 41, 42, 43,
45, 46, 47, 113
Analogy, 60–62, 90, 91; literal,
60, 61; figurative, 61, 62; test
for, 61; in refutation, 111
Anecdotes, 67, 68
Argument, types of, 58, 59;
deductive, 58, 59, 60; inductive,
58, 62; cause to effect, 58, 59;
effect to cause, 58, 59, 60; effect
to effect, 58, 59, 60; analogy,
60–62, 90, 91; concreteness
in, 83, 84
Argument by example, see Inductive argument

Arguments, debate as a mere listing of, 4
Aristotle, quoted, 107
Arrangement, 73–82; “funnel” plan, 74–76; repetition of
patterns, 76–80; inductive
plan, 80, 81; order of increasing
force, 81, 82
Articles on debating, 174, 175
Artificiality in delivery, 102; in
the symposium, 139
Assembly, debates before, 153,
154
Attention, concreteness and, 83;
style, 93, 94
Audience, importance of, 4; atti-
tude of, 7, 67; adapting brief
to, 64; interesting, 65–72;
knowledge of, 68–70; interests
of, 71, 72; effect of concreteness
on, 83–86; and style, 93,
94, 98; speaker's consciousness of, 102; and refutation,
107–109, 112, 113; effect of
strategy on, 110, 120
Audience decision, 139, 135, 136,
137, 156; in symposium, 140;
in open forum, 141; ballots
for, 160–164; specimen, 162,
163; how to weigh, 160, 161, 164
INDEX

Audiences, how to obtain, 121, 122, 124-129
Authorities, 30; tests for, 57, 58, 110
Belief and concreteness, 83-86
Bibliography, compiling a, 27, 28
Blackie, J. S., cited, 51, 52
Books on debating, 172-175
Brief, writing the complete, 63;
see Case
Briefs, use of published, 25

Caesar, Julius, quoted, 95
Card index, 114
Cards, use of, 28, 31, 32-37, 112
Case, the, 38-55; artificial organization of, 38, 39; effective organization of, 39 ff; use of proof requirements, 39-42; dividing, 43, 44, 64; the negative, 45-48; insuring consistency in, 48-50; for propositions of fact and interpretation, 50-55
Causal arguments, tests for, 59, 60
Chairman, 142; in Oxford Union plan, 144-145; instructions for, 155, 156
Charts, 83
Clarity in style, 93, 94; in language, 98, 99
Classroom discussion, see Symposium

Club, value of, 149, 150; membership in, 150, 151; faculty supervision of, 151, 152; programs for, 152, 153
Coach, function of, 11-15; duties of, 11; making the schedule, 12; danger of dominance by, 13-15; securing material, 21-29; criticizing evidence, 31, 32, 57; criticizing arguments, 58-64; criticizing delivery, 103, 105, 106; in rebuttal, 114, 115; and strategy, 115-117; in Oxford Union plan, 145; and debate club, 152; and the chairman, 156
Coaching, poor, 6, 9, 13
Combat, debate as, 2
Communication in delivery, 105, 106
Community, as source of evidence, 26; relation of debating to, 121, 122, 128, 129
Comparison, 46, 113
Concreteness, 83-92; definition of, 83; and belief, 83-86; and interest, 86; examples of, 87, 88; in thinking, 88, 89; rules for illustrations, 89, 90; analogy, 90, 91; in words, 95; in preparation, 104
Consistency, 48-50; see Inconsistencies
Contentions and definition of terms, 50, 51; and issues, 51,
52, 53; attacking, 109-111; see Proof requirements
Contrast, 79, 97, 113
Critic, judge as, 131, 132, 135
Cross-examination, 104; in Oregon plan, 142, 143
Curtis, G. W., quoted, 90

Debater, qualities of a good, 1, 2, 17, 18, 19
Decision, methods of, 130-137; by one judge, 133; by three judges, 133; by five judges, 134; by the audience, 135, 136; combinations of methods, 136, 137
Decisions, danger in, 5
Definition of terms, 50, 51
Delivery, 100-106; methods of, 100, 101; principles of, 101-103; preparation for, 103-106; artificial, 3
Description and concreteness, 84, 86, 88, 89
Details, concrete and specific, 83-86; examples of, 87, 88
Dilemma, 115, 117, 118
Discussion, types of, 138-146; symposium, 138-140; open forum, 140-142; Oregon plan, 142, 143; three-sided debate, 143, 144; Hunter College plan, 144; Oxford Union plan, 144, 145; formal debate, 146; debate as a form of, 3, 9, 10
Dividing the case, 43, 44, 64; the rebuttal, 114
Douglas, S. A., strategy of, 111

Ease in delivery, 102
Educational value of debating, 1, 7, 8, 10, 14, 154
Elocution exercise, debate as, 3, 4
Emerson, R. W., quoted, 1
Ethics of strategy, 115-118
Evidence, sources of, see Sources; direct, 30; need of specific, 31, 32; in rebuttal, 112, 113, 115
Expert judge, 133, 159
Exposition, 62, 63, 69, 70; concrete, 86; in Hunter College debate, 144
Extemporaneous speaking, 43, 44, 55, 100, 101

Faculty adviser of debate club, 151-153
Fallacies, 110, 111, 115
Familiarity and interest, 67, 68
Force, order of increasing, 81, 82
Formal debate, 140, 146
Function of debating, see Aims
"Funnel" plan of arrangement, 74-76
Game, debate as a, 5, 8, 9, 140, 141
Generalities, 67
Generalization, see Inductive argument
INDEX

Gesture, 106
Goethe, quoted, 105
Gray, J. S., quoted, 142, 143

Hicks, P. M., quoted, 8, 9
Humor, 98
Hunter College debate, 144

Illustrations, 104; and interest, 86; rules for, 89, 90
Imagination, 84–86, 104
Inconsistencies, 111, 115
Inductive argument, 58, 62; tests for, 62
Inductive plan, 80, 81
Informality, 146
Information, presenting essential, 69, 70
Instructions for the chairman, 155, 156; for judges, 134, 135
Interest, importance of, 4, 5, 65–67; failure to secure, 66, 67; and understanding, 67–70; by association, 71, 72; by arrangement, 73–82; and concrete illustrations, 86, 87, 88; and style, 93, 94
Interests of audience, 71, 72
Intraschool debating, 147–154; value of, 147; in classroom, 148; by classes, 148, 149; in debate club, 149–153; before assembly, 153, 154
Issues, 51–55; deviations from, 111, 115, 116
Judges, 130–137; types of, 130–132; selection of, 132, 133; expert-judge, 133, 159; fees of, 133; instructions for, 134, 135, 157–159; professors as, 9, 10, 132; lawyers as, 10; ministers as, 10; school principals as, 10; business men as, 132, 133; college debaters as, 132; attitude of, 65, 67; effect of strategy on, 119, 120
Judging, 130–137; bases of, 130–132; disadvantages of, 6
Juror, judge as, 130, 131
“Key” words, 97
Legislator, judge as, 131
Lincoln, A., quoted, 91, 96
Macaulay, T. B., quoted, 85
Material, gathering, 21–37; chief sources of, 21–27; exchanging, 56, 57
Memorized speech, 100, 101
National Association of Teachers of Speech, syllabus of, quoted, 7, 8
Negative case, 45–48
Newman, John Cardinal, quoted, 88
News story, 124–126
No-decision debates, 5
Novelty and interest, 68
Occasion, relation of speech to, 99
Open forum debate, 140–142, 156
Order, see Arrangement
Oregon plan, 142, 143
Organization, see Case
Originality, 13, 25, 98
Oxford Union plan, 144, 145
Parallel structure, 97
Patterns, repetition of, 76–80
Personification, 86
Photographs for publicity, 126
Plans, speech, see Arrangement
Posters for publicity, 126, 127
Posture, 102, 103, 106
Practice for rebuttal, 113–115; in club, 149, 150
Preparation, part of coach in, 11–15; schedule for, 12; writing as part of, 88, 89, 104–106; for delivery, 103–106
Pronunciation, corrections in, 103, 106
Proof, see Evidence; necessity of, 4
Proof requirements, affirmative, 39–43; negative, 45–48
Propositions of policy, 38–50; of fact and interpretation, 50–55; list of, 165–171
Propriety, principles of, 98, 99
Publicity, see Advertising; director of, 122–124
Qualities of a good debater, 1, 2, 17, 18, 19
Quarterly Journal of Speech, articles from, 175, 176
Question, rhetorical, 96
Questions, ethics of asking, 115, 116, 118
Questions for debate and discussion, 154, 165–171; selection of, 9
Rating scale for judges, 157, 158
Reading, general, 29, 30; specific, 30–37
Rebuttal, 112–115
Refutation, 107–120; place of, 107–109; methods of, 109–111; and audience, 112, 113; practice for, 113–115; strategy in, 115–120
Schedule for preparation, 12
Senses, appeal to, 83
Sentences, length of, 94
Simplicity, aids to, 94
Sources of evidence, 21–27; specialists, 21; libraries, 22; magazines, 22; package libraries, 22; Government bulletins, 23; letters, 23; debate books, 24; university booklets, 24; college teams, 25; information bureaus, 25; local community, 26
Speaking and thinking, 88, 89, 95, 99, 101, 102, 106
Speech, memorized, 100, 101; extemporaneous, 100, 101;
style, see Style
Speeches for publicity, 127
Split team, 142
Stage-fright, 102, 106
Statistics, 67, 84, 86, 104
Status quo, 46, 47, 113
Strategy, 6, 7, 115-120; ethics of, 115-118; effect on audience, 119, 120
Structure, parallel, 97
Style, speech, 93-99; contrasted with written, 93, 94; cardinal virtues of, 94; simplicity, 94; clarity, 94, 95; vividness, 95-98; propriety, 98, 99
Summaries in rebuttal, 113
Syllogism, fallacies in, 110
Symposium, 138-140
Synonyms, 94

Team, selecting the, 16-20; tryouts for, 16, 17; basis of selecting, 18, 19; first meeting with, 27, 28; second meeting with, 28, 30; third meeting with, 38; further meetings with, 56-58, 63, 64; rebuttal practice for, 115; class, 148, 149; relation of club to, 149, 150, 152
Thinking and speaking, 88, 89, 95, 99, 101, 102, 106
Three-sided debate, 143, 144
Transitions, 95
Tryouts, 16, 17; advertising the, 16; eligibility for, 16; judges for, 17
Types of discussion and debate, see Discussion

Value of debating, 1, 147
Victory, stimulus of, 5, 6, 7, 8, 116
Visualization, 104
Vividness, 83-86; aids to, 95-98
Voice, 102; active, 95, 96; passive, 95, 96
Vote, see Decision

War, debate conceived as, 6, 116
Washington, B. T., quoted, 97
Winans, J. A., cited, 72; quoted, 104, 106
Woodward ballot, 156, 160-164
Writing in preparation, 88, 89, 104-106