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PREFACE

Suppose you were going to chop down a tree. Such a commonplace performance as that would not require extensive preparation nor exhaustive study. But, nevertheless, there would be methodology in every step you took toward completing the task. Naturally you would want a tree to chop down. Then you would get the necessary tools; you wouldn't attempt to chop down the tree with a jackknife. Once you had inquired for the tools and learned what they were, you would acquire some facility in using them. Then you could hack away at your favorite tree as leisure permitted. How simple it would be!

Most all our problems are the same as the simple operation of chopping down a tree. First, there is the problem; next, the best way of solving it; and third, the process that produces the solution. Expressed more concretely, the order of performance is: materials, tools, operation. If the finished product is to be sold, there is still the selling process to add to this threefold activity.

Debating, as it confronts the student, is nothing but one of these problems to be solved. Why are not debate books arranged and ordered, then, to meet the student's needs as he comes to them?
It is a bit strange that no one seems to have thought of debating before as something as concretely businesslike as the production of a commodity and the selling of it.

The aim of this book is to treat debating, not as an illusive, necromantic art which must be caught instead of taught, but as a common-sense student activity, demanding the usual acumen and application of the mind to achieve results.

This book, therefore, is divided into two parts. Part I treats of the production of something to be sold. Part II treats of selling by modern methods the product the student produces according to the rules and principles laid down in Part I. Part I is further divided logically into divisions corresponding to the materials involved and the tools employed; and the operative steps by which these two are used to make the finished product to be sold.

In this order, then, the student learns practical debating. The title of this work has been chosen with care. Very few of the debate texts now on the market present the practical side of debating. The theory of argument (usually treated as if it were logic), the theory of evidence, and gathering proof take up considerable space. Much attention is given to brief- and speech-making. The theory of debate is thus fully treated.

But debating technique, such as the student meets with when he debates with experienced teams, is found jammed into one small chapter at the end of the book. It is this paucity of really valuable and useful debate information, and the great variance between text advice and its applicability to modern debating that has led the author to treat this more important part of the field of debate work at length in Part II. Most textbooks on the subject end where the real problem begins—namely, after speeches have been written out and the cases built. So true is this that real rebuttal and refutation is a rarity in debate circles in spite of the fact that debating is very, very old.

It is with the aim of utility in mind that this book has been written. More practical knowledge and less theory has been the author's purpose. The increased impetus that has been given to debating as an inter-school activity in recent years makes the need of such a work as this timely. In all classes of schools, administrators have been quick to learn that the value of forensics makes its advocacy a matter of business as well as of interest.

WALDO O. WILLHOFT.
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PART I

CONSTRUCTING THE CASE

Real earnest debating requires considerable preparation. Getting up before an audience and giving haphazard catch-as-can arguments pro and con is not debating. Neither is soap-box haranguing in any sense true debating. It takes months of research and study to glean from the chaff of written matter the kernels of significant fact and argument that comprise debate substance.

The debater works like a lawyer. It is not the speech, but the case—a complete plan of offense and defense with respect to a given proposition—that is all-important. As the chief-of-staff for an allied army plans his campaign, so must the debater plan his attack or defense. The bulk of labor that a debater puts forth is never revealed to his audiences. Like the buried foundation of a great skyscraper, it does its bit toward accomplishing its builder’s aims silently, secretly, and without praise.

Part I of this book treats of the vast preparation that the debater must make before he can do creditable debating. The chapters follow in
logical order. First the problem to be handled is treated generally. The chapter having to do with the subject for debate is purposely brief, for today most subjects are assigned by boards of experienced debaters, or by coaches who select and word them with care. This function the debater is now relieved of. Chapter III on Gathering Material is inserted before the chapters on Evidence and Argument for the reason that the tools cannot be used until the material is secured. With this arrangement the student, when studying the chapters on Evidence and Argument, can support and arrange his reading notes in the light of the points brought out in those chapters. However, the student is asked to read through Evidence and Argument before starting his search for material. After the material is secured, the study of those chapters is appropriate.

Many books present, under the subjects of Evidence and Argument, substance that cannot be used in a debate. The author has purposely excluded such substance from these chapters. Instead of giving a complete analysis of Evidence and Argument, only such classifications of these two subjects as are useful to the debater are presented. This is not a treatise on logic nor a lawyer’s course in evidence, but a book on practical debating.

Likewise brief making is condensed to a few pages, along with the chapter on speech making.

In a course in debating, it is neither possible nor is it advisable to clutter the big aim of good debating with the theory and practice of briefing and speech training. The latter especially requires continuous effort over a long period. Only the bare essentials and foundation rules are included in these chapters.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

1. What Debate Is.

Debate is formalized oral arguing. It is removing contention from the muck of alley conversation and placing it on a higher level, where personalities hug the background and vernacular and discourse bear some semblance of sedateness and propriety.

Although the definition given above specifies "oral" arguing, such a confinement to the limits of that word are here made arbitrarily, to suit the circumstances of debate in schools. Debates can be written, but that is not the kind of debating here discussed.

Authors have variously described debating as a science, an art, and a practice. These terms are used loosely. One also hears of the science of football, the art of advertising, and the practice of swindling.

Debating in school circles might more appropriately be described as a game. It is conducted more as a mental contest, according to certain prescribed rules, for entertainment, amusement,
and instruction. A judgment is usually rendered, which is the score of the game; and, whether expert judges are employed or a vote is taken on the merits of the debating, those who determine the winners are umpires, for they must take into consideration not only the quality of the debating but the observance of the rules, formalities, and technicalities of the contest, and make their decisions accordingly.

An effort is being made in some sections of the country to throw out of debating entirely this gaming aspect by having no-decision debates. The contention is made that, when a decision is to be rendered, debaters, in their feverish desire to win, pay more regard to trickery than to open-hearted, honest discussion of vital questions. Such a contention, however, can be made against any contest, physical or mental. It is after all a question of purpose. Mankind loves a contest, and certain classes of people find more wholesome entertainment in a mental contest than in a physical one. At the same time it must be conceded that a contest of any nature yields vastly more fruits than those represented by a score or a decision; and, as long as this is true, debating as a game justifies its being.

2. The Aims of Debate.

There are both subjective and objective aims in debating. Of the objective aims, the most vital one is that of influencing or fashioning the thought of others. The ulterior desire is not admiration and praise for the debaters, but action, whether through thought or conduct; neither is the object to influence thought or conduct in a one-sided manner. Each debater in turn tries to win converts toward his way of thinking and reasoning. This he is expected to do by fair tactics instead of clever sophistry. To make people think about matters of public concern; that, after all, sums up the objective aims of debating. Moulding public opinion in line with sound thought is an eminent goal. Not things themselves, but opinions about them, trouble mankind.

Subjectively, debate aims to train participants in the twofold process of conviction and persuasion. Conviction is influencing another's belief by appeal to his reasoning powers, while persuasion is accomplishing a like object by appeal to his emotions. The debater is confronted with a life situation every time he debates—that of making another see his point of view and making him believe in it. The subjective aims are idealistically as high as the objective aims. Winning a decision or the favor of an audience is not the aim of debate.

The success of a debater in later life is little influenced by a debate decision. To glorify the outcome of a decision debate is to place the taint of selfishness upon the game and to cast out from
it the wholesome influence of sportsmanship. It is not a question of winning or losing, but playing the game.

Benjamin Franklin in his “Autobiography” describes the activities of the Junto Club as including debates on popular subjects. The aim of these debates, says Franklin, was to arrive eventually at or near the truth respecting some proposition. It is indeed the hope of debaters and their auditors to be able to decide a question one way or the other, once so much thought is given to it. Disappointment is often felt when this cannot be done. Is one of the aims of debating to arrive at the truth? Were debaters omniscient and omnipotent, they might decide the truth for us. But truth concerning a proposition can hardly be determined by inexperienced youth when it cannot be determined by experienced manhood. Truth can never be grasped and held up as a symbol as long as the complexities of living and social excitations cannot be reduced to barren logical precision. All one can do is to decide for himself, and let truth remain, as always, a matter of opinion.

3. The Values of Debate.

One need but read biographies of famous men to learn what debate has meant to those who have studied and practiced it. In American history, Benjamin Franklin, Henry Clay, Patrick Henry, Daniel Webster, Theodore Roosevelt, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, and a score of others slightly less notable have attributed much of their broad foundation for public careers to training received in debate. Some of these, it is true, notably Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, spoke only in support of that side of a proposition with which they were in agreement. For many years, educators have noted that the majority of world leaders are attracted to debate in their school days. Whether their success in later life is due to the debate training or to their natural aptitude and desire to engage in such training cannot be determined; but certainly, if those men found debate worth their time, they must have found something in it that paid them well for the effort necessary to become skilled debaters.

Alexander Meiklejohn, former president of Amherst College, in speaking of the value of various student activities, said:

We dare not fail to take account of the constantly repeated statement by graduates that they count certain “activities” as having been of far greater educational value than the studies given and taken in the classroom. I am sure that this statement contains more of falsity than truth. But there is truth in it. As I look back on my own experience of teaching and disciplining, I seem to see that clearly when I try to single out what these graduates mean. I see it more when I try to select from the long line of students,
some one group which shall stand forth as intellectually the best—best in college work and best in promise of future intellectual achievement. Much as I would like to do so, I cannot draw the line around my favorite students in philosophy, nor the leaders in mathematics, nor those successful in biology; nor could I fairly award the palm to the Phi Beta Kappa men who have excelled in all their subjects.

It seems to me that stronger than any group, tougher in intellectual fiber, keener in intellectual interest, better equipped to battle with coming problems, are the college debaters—the boys who, apart from their regular studies, band themselves together for intellectual controversy with each other and with their friends from other colleges.

The values of debate are many. Below are listed the most important of these values with brief comments concerning each:

(a) Independent thinking.—The hardest business in the world is thinking. A student can go through an entire academic course without doing any original thinking. Learning what is in a book and what a teacher says is true, is not thinking. Thinking consists in hewing out for oneself new lines of thought—new to the thinker, not necessarily new to the entire world. Debating requires thought, thought, and still more thought. The debater learns that thinking is not just a realignment of prejudices nor a justification of congenital bias.

(b) Judgment.—The debater’s sense of judgment secures constant exercise in debate preparation and practice. He must judge among various courses of attack and defense, among different matters of evidence, of lines of conduct on the platform. He gets out of the habit of hasty judgment and rashness. He is continually called upon to exercise judgment in weighing evidence and argument, and in deciding upon main issues and subordinate issues.

(c) Decision.—Along with judgment comes the necessity for decision. The debater is pressed for time on the platform, and pressed for time in preparation. He cannot procrastinate; he works under pressure. Unless he makes decisions quickly he loses out in thorough planning for the next debate. Hoc age, do instantly, is the motto of the debater.

(d) Respect.—Respect for the audience, respect for the opinions of other debaters, respect for another’s opinions and beliefs challenges the debater to weigh in the balance his own fallibilities, and to reckon with human nature as he finds it.

(e) Mental alertness.—Aside from the training in thought there is the keyed-up stress in debate that calls for mental alertness. “To think on one’s feet” is an attribute developed out of debate situations or their equivalent. In this age, when a man’s height is measured from the ears up, the ability to collect one’s thoughts and reach an answer as quickly as if it hung in the
air before him tests a man’s intellectual dexterity and skill. The debater meets in every contest a situation wherein he is called upon to make immediate answer to a question or perplexity submitted by the opponent next preceding. This he must do in such a way that his answer is more than clever, useless repartee.

(f) Industry.—Francis Bacon in his essay “Of Studies” writes: “If a man write little, he had need of a great memory; if he confer little, he had need of a present wit; if he read little, he need have much cunning to seem to know what he doth not know.” The debater who expects to “make the team” with little reading and study need, as Bacon says, have much cunning. Most people are not gifted with the memory, wit, and cunning that will enable them to appear learned when they are ignorant. Debating suffers criticism, inasmuch as most of the hard work of preparation cannot be appreciated except by those who have undergone the process. The habits of reading, selection, and compilation, and the industry of thought, decision, and judgment stay with one long after debate has ceased to call them forth.

(g) Speaking ability.—Nothing brings out what is in a man so quickly and effectively as trying to convince an audience of what he says. The foes of self-consciousness, timidity, and fear, the debater learns, disappear when he ascends the platform in full possession of enough material to make his speeches. William Ewart Gladstone once remarked, “Ninety-nine men in every hundred never rise above mediocrity because the training of the voice has been entirely neglected.” The debater must speak—that is the value in taking debating as a step toward a speaking career. There is no substitute for it in debate, as the debater learns. Moreover, he soon finds that if one has something to say, believes in it with all his might, and has enough of it to last the allotted speaking time, telling it to others is comparatively easy. Many prominent men today owe their early recovery from stage fright to debate, in which they first learned that the man with a message never knows fear.

(h) Leadership.—One who has ideas of his own and can make others believe in them is destined to lead instead of follow. As independent thinkers, as persons with ideas, debaters become known as pioneers in any new field of endeavor. Their training teaches them courage, fearlessness, and confidence. They never deceive themselves into thinking they know what they do not know. The sincerity with which they learn and administer teaches them the elements of leadership.

4. The Limitations of Debate.

Debate is but one of the multifarious activities in which a student engages. It must necessarily
be limited, along with other important school functions. Only a few subjects can be studied and debated during the year. Most states now have debate leagues which assign a single topic for debate purposes each season. This enables intensive research, "going to the bottom" of a question. National debating fraternities decide on one or two questions for each season's debating.

Besides the limitation of subject, debate is limited considerably in point of time. To allow two teams of three debaters each to make main speeches and rebuttal speeches requires that the time allotted to each debater be only a few minutes. As a result, the debaters must unduly condense and compress their remarks. Moreover, in the progress of a debate, they cannot take "time out," as is done in athletic contests. It is taken for granted that preparation and consultation among team members is thorough to perfection. No recesses are granted, as is done in courts when lawyers are contending back and forth.

Another limitation of debate is that of participants. Three debaters on a side, and hence six in a contest, is all that can comfortably be handled. To use more reduces the speaking time of each to so few minutes that little constructive argument can be presented.

It is these limitations of debate that make it somewhat artificial as compared with its utility when put to work in life situations. But, being only an apprentice game, it can hardly be called upon to serve without the restrictions accorded other school activities.

5. The Problem.

From the foregoing remarks in this chapter the student will ascertain for himself what the problem confronting him is. Given a proposition, he has to apply his time toward accumulating a vast store of knowledge. Once obtained, he must next learn how to mould and shape that material into oral controversy according to certain prescribed regulations and precedents. After that, he is confronted with the task of putting the product into the strait-jacket of formal debate, with its limited scope of action, knowing that the value of debate is never immediate, but remote. He must play the game as much as his athletic friends, and he has to suffer the regrets as well as cherish the joys of participation.
CHAPTER II

THE SUBJECT

A chapter on "The Subject" usually takes up considerable space in books of debate. Because of the increasingly popular custom of assigning the proposition for debate by debate leagues and fraternities, the author considers it well that only the fundamentals of selecting a subject be discussed in this book.

1. What to Debate?

In the summer time along Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D. C., are numerous itinerant soap-box purveyors of demagogic oratory, who, from the street corners, harass and harangue passers-by with their superficial comments on men and public affairs. One will shout out, "Hey there, I'll debate Henry Ford wid ya." Another will answer, "I'll debate Wall Street wid ya." The passer-by wonders precisely what would be debated under such a general splurge of subject matter.

Before one can debate, the subject must be definite, and "Henry Ford" and "Wall Street" are too indefinite for our use. Under the first,

one might debate a hundred phases of Ford policy; there would be a debate without a head-on clash of arguments. Under the latter topic, one might debate Wall Street ethics, Wall Street policies, Wall Street benefits, Wall Street development. The term "Wall Street" itself might mean the New York financial world, the Morgan interests, the prominent brokers, or the environment of the street.

In a debate there is no time to adjust the two teams to the same close bounds of a general question—that must be done before the debate training begins, for the debaters have no time to study all deviations and divisions of a general subject.

So it is necessary to determine at the outset just what to debate. Suppose the debate is to be about "America's policy toward foreign war loans." Shall we debate the question of loan cancellation? Shall it be the question of using coercive measures? We might debate the question of policy with respect not to present loans but future loans. Some plan of settlement might be debated. There is in fact no limit to the number of debate proposals that could grow out of the general subject of "America's policy toward foreign war loans."

Definiteness is the all-important essential of any topic for debate. But there are other tests to bear in mind in deciding upon the subject for debate.
2. Tests of a Fair Proposition.

The subject for debate is better termed the “proposition”, to be proved or disproved by contending debaters. The proposition is best stated in the form of a resolution, made up of one declarative sentence. There are eight important tests to be applied to a proposition before it is acceptable:

(a) The proposition should be controversial. To be controversial the proposition as stated must not be one-sided. It must be neither true nor false, but subject to a determination after proof, pro and con, is heard upon it. If a man is guilty of a crime and admits his criminality, the state holds no trial to determine guilt. Neither is it sensible to debate a proposition when the object of holding the debate is apparently fulfilled before the debate begins.

(b) The proposition should be capable of some degree of proof.—As previously stated, it is not the aim of debate to settle for all time the truth of a certain question in dispute. Nevertheless, this does not preclude coming nearer a solution by means of a preponderance of proof on one side or another. Such a proposition as, “Resolved, that Jefferson was a greater man than Hamilton,” is not capable of any approximate proof. No fair comparison can be made.

The medieval idea of a suitable question was, “How many angels can dance on the point of a needle?” Great debates were held on this proposition, yet not a bit of evidence could be brought to the aid of either side of the dispute. The student has undoubtedly been asked, “What happens when an irresistible force meets an immovable body?” Here again there is no clash of fact, but a clash of unsupported opinion, as in deciding what are the world’s ten finest novels, who are the ten greatest men, or what are the seven wonders of the modern world. A debate proposition, to admit of proof, then, must allow fair comparisons, must be within the powers of the debaters to determine approximately, and must not devolve into a matching of diverse opinions.

(c) The proposition should be timely.—If the proposition is not timely, it will be difficult to obtain sufficient and suitable information concerning it. Further, if it is not timely, it is not likely to be an important proposition for debate, and, unless it is important, there will be little interest engendered in the minds of the listening public. In a world so fast moving as ours, timeliness is essential in order to get suitable publicity from the press. There is also the element of utility to consider. Current questions debated before the public influence public opinion. It is an encouragement to both the debaters and their followers to be debating a timely subject; it seems a more worthwhile pursuit. We might say that a question is timely when something can still
be done about it.

(d) The proposition should be interesting.—There is a difference between interest and timeliness. The interest of the debater is paramount. Such a proposition as, “Resolved, that the Interstate Commerce Commission should permit the merger of the Erie and Chesapeake & Ohio railroads” may be timely, but it has little interest for the debater. To be interesting, the proposition should be to some degree within the knowledge of the debaters. If it is foreign to their thoughts, and concerns them not at all, it will not be interesting. The same objections hold true of propositions concerning affairs in foreign countries. The proposition should involve some controversy affecting the lives of citizens living in the vicinity. Unless the proposition bears these points of interest, it will be difficult to secure an audience for a debate, and consequently, squad enthusiasm will wane.

A proposition is interesting when the debaters and the general public are concerned in its determination, and such concern usually springs from the effect that a determination one way or the other will bring about in the community. Therefore a subject demanding technical knowledge is not likely to have any interest.

(e) The proposition should be narrow.—Such a proposition as “Resolved, that the United States is justified in annexing Canada” is too broad for debate purposes. Likewise “Resolved, that democracy is a failure” is too broad. Both the word “democracy” and the word “failure” are subject to very broad and conflicting definitions. Even such a question as “Resolved, that protection should be extended to our citizens abroad” is using a term, “protection,” that admits of wide interpretation. Different teams might construe the word in such a way that a clash of argument would not result, yet no team would be to blame. Broad propositions lead to misunderstandings as to what is the real subject for debate.

Such expressions as “foreign lands,” “several states,” “elsewhere,” “arbitration,” “means to secure peace,” “the government,” “schools,” taken from debate propositions, indicate that often those who assign topics for debate in debating leagues do not narrow the proposition sufficiently. When such broad language is used, the persons responsible for the phrasing should be asked for an official interpretation of the words used. In this way, common ground will be taken at the outset by all debate teams affected.

(f) The proposition should embrace a single idea.—Propositions having more than one idea require more than one debate to arrive at a settlement. If one part of the proposition can be decided affirmatively and another part negatively, there is more than one idea included in the
proposition. Such propositions usually contain the conjunction "and" between two coordinate expressions, as "Resolved, that the United States should cancel all allied war debts, and adopt this policy permanently."

Confusion results when the proposition contains several debatable points. There is a shifting of ground from one to another, an attempt to unify when no unity is possible, and a muddled array of conflicting arguments. Such a debate cannot result in a decision fair to either party.

That a proposition contains but one single idea may be tested by the question: Can all proof presented be enlisted under one idea expressed in the proposition? If so, the proposition meets the test.

(g) The proposition should be worded in the affirmative.—To avoid phrasing the proposition in the negative, such words as "not," "no," "never," that are distinctly negative in meaning should be omitted. Likewise, other words that connote the negative, as "cease," "refuse," "prevent," make the proposition negative. "Resolved, that the nations of the world should cease to use poison gas as an instrument of warfare" has precisely the same meaning as "Resolved, that the nations of the world should not use poison gas as an instrument of warfare," and hence is a negative proposition.

It is customary that the burden of proof lie with the affirmative. To the mind of an audience, a negatively worded proposition places the burden of proof on the negative, and hence the first affirmative speech fails to invoke controversy. In legal circles such is not the case. But a debater cannot follow all the usages of the lawyer; he must adapt legal usages to the debate situation. The question of burden of proof will be taken up later.

(h) The proposition should be stated in clear, concise, and unequivocal terms.—This requirement needs little clarification. The English language is rich in choice words to phrase any idea in simple manner. Anglo-Saxon derivatives are to be preferred to Latin derivatives. Any word admitting of two interpretations should not be used in phrasing a proposition. General terms such as "democracy," "the Church," "society," "the modern world," "a new law," "principles," are not suitable for a debate proposition. All unnecessary words should be eliminated. The proposition ought to be easy to understand and easy to remember. Question-begging words, or words that amount to a prejudgment of the question, will cause untold difficulty in a debate. A proposition like "Resolved, that the alarmingly low wages of railroad employees should be increased" admits of an affirmative contention in the words "alarmingly low." Therefore these words, presenting a prejudiced question, should not be put into the proposition.
3. Proposition of Fact or Policy.

Perhaps the student by this time has noticed that the propositions used herein as examples are all propositions that have as their basis a change in policy. Such propositions are preferred to propositions of fact, such as “Resolved, that Bolshevism is a menace,” since nearly every proposition of policy contains within itself questions of evidence or fact. Propositions of policy center around a new course of action, and hence are decisive of something paramount and useful to the public. They embrace the future instead of the present. Their determination may result in very practical results. They can be taken much more seriously than propositions of fact, which have more artistic than utilitarian value in their settlement. For these reasons, propositions of policy are more suitable for debate.

4. Examples of Fair Propositions.

Most of the examples given here advocate changes of policy with respect to the national government. These propositions are popular, for they can be coördinated with the work in civics and government in schools, and because they meet easily all the tests of fair propositions:

“Resolved, that the United States should adopt the English cabinet system of government.”

“Resolved, that trial by jury in the United States should be abolished.”

“Resolved, that the short sessions of Congress should be abandoned.”

“Resolved, that the United States should grant independence to the Philippines at once.”

“Resolved, that the honor system should be adopted by all high schools in the United States.”

“Resolved, that (name of State) should provide for a unicameral legislature.”

“Resolved, that Congress should be given the power to annul decisions of the Supreme Court by a two-thirds vote.”

“Resolved, that a Federal Department of Education should be established.”

“Resolved, that cabinet members should have a right to participate in debates on the floor of Congress.”
CHAPTER III
GATHERING THE MATERIAL

1. Analysis Follows Reading.

No step is more fatal in preparing for a debate than to follow the selection of the proposition with intensive analysis. He who takes that method of approach will invariably get a narrow view of the whole field of controversy. He will form prejudices, and his later reading will be an attempt to justify those prejudices. It is a common saying that a judge, if he decides the case before he reads or reviews the law, never changes his decision. He decides the case and then finds the law to justify his unsupported decision. It is the same with the debater who has little knowledge of the subject until he starts his study.

The problem should be approached logically: First, what is to be debated; second, what do our readings tell us of the subject; third, from these readings what arguments can we submit and support?

If the debaters are well read upon the particular topic chosen for debate, intensive analysis may precede reading. But such is seldom the case, and hence, the plan of reading and study before analysis is started is to be preferred.

2. Read Affirmative and Negative Sides.

As it is necessary to have a very broad view of the proposition before it can be analyzed successfully, it is useless to divide the study into the affirmative and negative at the start. As long as an article or chapter has a direct bearing on the subject, it should be read to ascertain new viewpoints, new evidence, a restatement, new arguments, pro and con points which the author presents concerning the debate topic. The debater must become broad-minded; and only a preliminary study of both sides of the question will make him so.

3. Methods in Reading.

It is better to make a selection of readings, so that the debater will read articles of a more general nature first, and leave till later the articles dealing specifically with the narrowed debate subject. The titles of the articles will often tell whether they are general or specific; likewise, a knowledge of the author and his acquaintance with his subject will help decide the nature of some particular article.

The reading should be to learn the current trend of thought among noted authorities. The debater must take the word, fact, and argument of others, for his limited experience does not allow
him to express opinions and judgments until they are supported by those of an authority. He may have ideas of his own after doing extensive reading, but he should not be too willing to assert them and use them until they are supported authoritatively. Trick debate cases often fail because they lack sincerity. Facts and arguments can be warped and twisted till they lead to different conclusions, or to the same conclusions by an unknown route. However, the debater has judges and audiences of mature individuals, who look askance upon any original ideas that lack sincerity and earnestness. These qualities come from following the thought and advice of authorities.

The most valuable suggestion with respect to reading is that the debater read all that time will permit. Sometimes the slighting of one article will weaken the debater’s case. With experience he will learn that some articles possess a high degree of potency, while others yield nothing that can be used. Knowledge of this fact should make him both cautious and inquiring, and teach him to read to the limit of his time and material.

The debater should not form the conception that his own mind is to be nothing but a file for the thoughts of others. He must constantly work out comparisons between the different aspects of articles read. He must associate like ideas, weigh evidence as he gleans it, test the importance of usable material, and continually search his own mind to fashion his readings into a unit from which to build his case.

4. Preparation of a Bibliography.

The only systematic method of reading is from a complete list of the available sources. Such a list is called a bibliography. Bibliographies on current questions can be obtained from libraries and associations interested. The Library of Congress at Washington, D. C., prepares bibliographies from time to time, as do various government departments. Such bibliographies can be obtained for a few cents. But such bibliographies often contain references which the debater does not have access to, and likewise omit local references. It is better, therefore, that the debater prepare his own bibliography. There are three important steps in the process.

(a) List all related topics.—To show the extent of the subject, it is best at the start to make a list of the related topics, under which valuable material may be found. A topic such as “capital punishment” has related to it: prevention of crime, penology, social betterment, crime statistics, lynching, women and children in crime. The topic “Bolshevism” has related to it: anarchism, socialism, Marxism, the Russian Revolution, communistic society. The topic “government ownership of railroads” has related
to it: government in industry, political mismanagement, foreign methods of railroad control, business efficiency.

(b) Classify available sources.—The debater wants to make certain that he covers the field thoroughly. He should add to the lists given here, as much as he can.

(1) Books.—There are textbooks, reference books, and general books. In the textbooks the debater should have no trouble finding useful readings. All textbooks are indexed comprehensively, and are supplied with an elaborate table of contents. A glance at these will tell at once whether they should be listed as sources.

The reference books usually available include:

Who's Who
Who's Who in America
World Almanac
Statesman's Yearbook
The American Yearbook
Census Abstract of the United States
Statistical Abstract of the United States
Lippincott's New Gazetteer
Various Encyclopedias and Atlases

Who’s Who lists the biographies of famous living persons, most of England. Who’s Who in America lists the biographies of famous living American men and women. These books are issued every year or two, and in them can be found abbreviated biographies of any important authorities. The World Almanac is indexed, and contains much useful miscellaneous information about current events as well as past events, and has a large set of statistics compiled on various topics. The Statesman’s Yearbook and the American Yearbook are British and American publications, respectively. They confine their information chiefly to government matters, on which they are extremely accurate and encyclopedic. The United States abstracts give purely statistical information of a high degree of particularity and completeness.

The general books can be selected first by title, and then by table of contents and index. If these are not included in the book, it will be necessary to scan the pages to find whether material is adaptable.

(2) Magazines.—The United States prints more magazines than all the rest of the world. Every field of human endeavor in this nation has its journal or periodical. For debate purposes, the general magazines supply the greater part of useful information. Indices published periodically make the magazine material readily available. Poole’s Index is an index for magazines between the years 1802 and 1906. The Reader’s Guide started in 1900 and indexes all magazines from that date up to the present time. Other indices, such as the Agricultural Index, an index for agricultural publications, provide separate classifica-
tions of material in special fields.

Below is a list of the more important general magazines, and brief comments about each:

**Monthly Magazines.**

*Harper’s.*—Articles on sociology, politics, education, and economics by national authorities.

*Forum.*—Articles cover same field as *Harper’s*, with added features on health, the sciences, and literature. Articles of a controversial nature, and each issue contains a “debate” on some current controversy.

*Scribner’s.*—About half a dozen articles per issue on subjects similar to those in *Harper’s* and *Forum*. Appeals to an intellectual audience. Magazine contains more fiction than similar monthlies.

*World’s Work.*—Contains a large editorial section. Articles are long, and hence each issue does not cover a very wide field. American industry, national prosperity, and sectional problems make up the bulk of article material.

*Review of Reviews.*—Similar to *World’s Work*; large editorial section; has timely articles on politics, science, art, finance, and national development.

*Atlantic Monthly.*—General articles on nature, world movements, science, social problems, and historical events.

*Current History.*—As the title implies, this magazine specializes in current history, sociology, and politics. National interest in these fields is stressed. Only authorities contribute.
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*Foreign Affairs.*—Authoritative articles about world politics and world movements.

*North American Review.*—A review of world tendencies in the fields of history, politics, religion, finance, and science.

*Yale Review.*—Provocative articles of national and international portent. Like the articles in *Foreign Affairs*.

*Congressional Digest.*—Pro and con selections of contributions by Congressmen and men of affairs on debatable national problems. Also digest of Congressional activities.

**Weekly Magazines.**

*Literary Digest.*—A review and digest of newspaper opinion, together with articles in the departments of foreign comment, science and invention, letters and art, religion and social service, and investments and finance.

*Nation.*—An editorial compendium of a radical-progressive flavor on current social, political, and economic affairs of the nation. International interest subordinated.

*New Republic.*—Like the *Nation*. Attempts to stimulate and arouse public opinion by articles written in a radical vein by noted men and women.

*Outlook.*—Editorial section and a few general articles. Somewhat like the *Nation* and *New Republic*, but more conservative. Covers the whole field of national interests.

*Saturday Evening Post.*—Each issue contains arti-
articles written by staff writers or correspondents on some timely, interesting national problems. The articles usually run in a series through several issues.

Besides these magazines, there are many of a technical nature, which, if the subject for debate centers about their respective fields of interest, will help the debater in obtaining useful information of an authoritative nature. The most prominent of these magazines are here listed, their titles being a sufficient indication of their contents:


In the magazine field, there are the English magazines also, and the trade journals. Nearly half the state historical societies publish periodicals, as do organizations advocating some particular social improvement.

(3) Newspapers.—All too often the newspaper is passed by as if its contents were not satisfactory subject matter. This is an erroneous idea. Many of the articles in metropolitan papers are written by correspondents of national prominence. The editorial columns often supply ideas, as do the "Public Pulse" contributions of readers, and gleanings from other newspapers. The student should watch the editorial page of some newspaper daily, and check over all news items each day. Often significant factual matter is thus obtained.

An indexed clipping file or blank book into which clippings are pasted and references made makes each debater's contributions available to the rest of the squad.

(4) Pamphlets.—Whenever a great movement for social or political reform gets under way in the United States, several organizations are formed to support or to combat it. These organizations publish from time to time pamphlets and miscellaneous literature that often put into easily readable form vital statistics and little-known information. The government departments at Washington issue pamphlets regularly, and a card written to a local representative or senator at Washington will direct the inquirer to much free and valuable literature.

An inquiry addressed to the Superintendent of Documents at Washington, D. C., will bring a list of important government publications, from
which a selection can be made.

The Anti-Saloon League, National Manufacturers' Association, National Educational Association, National Child Labor Committee, American Peace Society, Association for the Rejection of the Twentieth Amendment, The Trade Unionist, National League of Women Voters, are a few of the organizations that issue literature on great current questions in which they have a deep interest.

Pamphlet information is highly desirable for another reason. Quotations and quotable matter can be clipped from the pamphlets direct and pasted on cards for ready reference, or the pamphlets can be indexed so that their most valuable contents are readily available to the debater.

(5) Personal correspondence and solicitation.—The constitutions of many debate leagues rule out the use of personal correspondence, since both teams in a debate do not have equal opportunity of gathering evidence in that way. Nevertheless, where such a rule does not exist, the debater can obtain, at first hand, information of a highly specialized character, and sometimes unusually well adapted to his needs, by getting in contact by letter or interview with prominent public men. Senators and representatives at Washington, attorneys, business men, state and city officials, are often glad for an opportunity to help young men and women see their point of view by telling them why they take a stand on this or that side of a public question, and to furnish what literature is at their command. In this attempt to secure material, the debater should be guided by the tests of authority outlined in Chapter IV.

Both public and private library catalogues should be searched for books, magazines, and special documents that might have a bearing on the debate question. Private library material can seldom be removed, but it can be listed in the bibliography, and all of it covered on one trip to the library. The libraries of law offices sometimes yield useful information.

(c) Listing in the bibliography.—Uniform sheets of white paper, about 8 × 11 inches, are convenient for listing the references to be used. Write on only one side of each sheet. Rule off a margin at the top of each sheet, and rule a 2½-inch margin at the left-hand side. Arrange the references in order of location, as: public library, reading shelves, private library, law library, and so forth; and again arrange in order of classification, as: books, magazines, newspapers, pamphlets, or correspondence.

Indicate at the top of each sheet of paper where the material is to be found. Then divide the bibliography into sections corresponding to the classification of material.

When this is done, the material can then be listed with complete references. Magazine ar-
articles should list the title, author's name, volume and page number of magazine, and date. Books may be listed by titles, or better still, listed by title and chapter titles, in case only parts of some books are worth investigating. In such cases, the precise page numbers should be given, so that the reader can turn at once to the useful portion of each book. When it can be done conveniently, the bibliography may be prepared in two parts, affirmative and negative, or articles can be designated by the first reader by the symbols A or N placed after the references in the bibliography. Some articles, of course, cannot be classified as affirmative or negative.

When all listing is complete, the prepared sheets should be bound in some kind of a permanent cover, together with blank sheets for later references discovered during the course of the debate season.

5. Using the Bibliography.

The wide space at the left of the references in the bibliography is for debaters' check marks. The bibliography should be accessible at all times to the debaters. When one has read a certain article, he should place an individual check mark opposite the name of that article, indicating that he has read it. He can mark it A or N at the same time. If the article is worthless, he should cross it out. In this way, the debate group has before it a self-correcting bibliography.
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The check marks help each debater to understand how much reading of the whole bibliography has been made, and the coach can also check up and place responsibility for certain readings.

The bibliographical material may be allocated to different members of the debate squad. Several may be assigned to do all the book readings, another group may be assigned to certain magazines, and in this manner a comprehensive survey of the entire mass of material is obtained in a short time. Later, intensive reading and study by each person may be made on those articles which are found on cursory examination to be most important.

6. Preparation of Notes.

Henrik Ibsen has written, "Don't read to swallow; read to choose, for 'tis but to find what one has use for." A famous philosopher, Francis Bacon, also gives the debater good advice, "Read not to contradict, nor to believe, but to weigh and consider."

A systematic method of keeping notes is as important as a systematic method of reading, for it is only in the accurate preservation of what is read that the debater will gain facility in the use of material he has studied.

There are four ways to preserve the content of articles read: outlining the contents, copying verbatim, abstracting the contents, and indexing
contents. Each of these methods has its distinct utility for certain kinds of reading matter.

(a) Outlining.—Outlining is useful, if it is likely that the entire article will be needed, or if there is no better way to follow the extended argument of the author. Outlines preserve the whole in convenient form, and also show distinctly the continuity and unity of the selection. Sometimes the reader hastens through an article, taking haphazard notes, and later wishes to go through the article a second time. He had better prepare an outline on first reading. With the outline before him, he can insert notes, and he will not find it necessary to reconstruct the mental images that the outline will supply for him as he reads through the article the second time. Outlines should be put upon notebook or business-size white paper, on only one side of the paper, and the subject and reference given at the top, together with the designation A for affirmative and N for negative.

(b) Copying verbatim.—The second method of copying verbatim quotations and extracts is the only way to preserve accurately valuable evidence. During every debate there is a demand made upon each debater to answer in rebuttal by bringing forth from somewhere a crushing fact or statement to prove a point, or to support a point already proved. Where will he get that fact or statement? He has no time to search through magazines piled beside the table. Nor can he hurriedly scan through reference books. He has only a few minutes between speeches to get the precise information. For several years, debaters have had recourse to the card-index box, with its cards containing gems of fact, statements, and statistics, to support their contentions and rebut those of their opponents. These cards are classified and indexed so that it is easy to find the exact information in a few seconds' time. The card-index box is the debater's treasury of "canned" knowledge. It removes from the debater the restriction that a barring of recess or King's X placed upon him. It is said, in truth, that a debating team is as good as the classified knowledge contained in its card-index boxes.

Since the card-index system is the most useful method of retaining in original form excerpts from readings, each debater should purchase a card-index box and a supply of 3 × 5 cards. If the debater can type, he may secure blank cards; otherwise the ruled cards will be better. The 4 × 6 cards are too large to hold conveniently in the hand. In addition, their greater area tempts the debater to copy quotations and extracts too long for practical use in a debate. No card should contain reading matter more than a half-minute long, except in unusual cases. The index for the box of filled cards may be alphabetical; but better still is the index made by the debater with convenient headings made up of issues and points to be proved and substantiated in the debate. Such
headings are supplied by reading the brief. An index of this sort makes the rebuttal and main speeches easier to support in the order of importance and presentation in the debate.

The upper portion of the cards should be divided into two squares. In the left-hand square should be put the classification of the card. In the right-hand square should be put the abbreviated reference. The space below is retained for the extract. No references should be put at the bottom of the cards, since those references will not be seen as the cards stand in the index box and are fingered by the debater in his hurried search for the right card with the right reference.

Writing should be on one side of a card, and only in the case of an extraordinary reference should two cards be used for one piece of information. Pamphlet material may be clipped and pasted to the cards.

Often the debater finds in an article isolated statements which he wishes to preserve, and which are individually too short to quote. If he finds that he can join these statements and not warp the tenor of their meaning, he may combine such excerpts and put them into one as representing the thought of the authority. However, no such extracting should be done if the resulting compendium gives to the author's view a slant different from that which the article itself gives when read in entirety.

The debater should by no means feel that duplication of thought or substance on different cards is forbidden. It is often a boon to have several references on the same point in a debate. As long as the substance is good, the debater ought to collect several cards of similar argument and evidence. Sometimes this is essential to complete proof, as where one wishes to give the conditions within various states to show the truth of his proposition. Unless he has references to conditions in many states, he will not have adequate proof, for conditions differ in different states.

(c) Abstracting.—By abstracting is meant rephrasing the thought of an article or selection in abbreviated form, in the words of the reader. It is especially useful for short articles, where outlining is hardly necessary and where little quotable matter is found. Still, the article may be worth preserving in some form, and here abstracting is best. The reader writes a short review of the substance of the article in his own way, thus preserving the content of the article. Abstractions may be placed on cards, if they can be used as verbatim material; otherwise abstractions are better if placed on notebook paper and filed away with the outlines of other articles for future reference. The abstract method is a substitute for the outline method.

(d) Indexing.—Sometimes debaters have ref-
ferences or pamphlets containing so much scattered information that is likely to be useful that it seems a waste of time to copy it all and put it on cards or in notebooks.

In such cases it is as well that the debater prepare an abbreviated index for each of these references, and paste that index to the front of the book. Sometimes an index can be written or typed on the first page of a pamphlet. The index should indicate the nature of the proof or evidence, and the page number. If whole pamphlets or books are negative or affirmative in content, this should be indicated on the cover by a large $A$ or $N$.

This indexing method is especially useful on government pamphlets and bulletins, and reports of hearings before Congressional committees.

7. What to Preserve.

No one can ever say positively whether one bit of information or another will ever be used in the course of a series of debates. The best plan is to take all that seems of possible use and trust to one's own judgment that some debate will call for what is stored away in a debater's files. A few rules, however, will aid the debater in seeing to what extent the research should go.

Vital statistics should be preserved, if the proposition is one that will demand their use. Moreover, not just one set of statistics, but all that can be obtained, should be kept for ready use. Often one set will refute another. Or the possession of several sets will show the inconsistencies of figures, and thus throw all support made upon them into the discard. Conflicting figures prove nothing. Sometimes it is to the advantage of the debater to destroy the effectiveness of statistics. The way to combat figures is by other figures; next, by their interpretation. The debater learns, therefore, that he must gather statistics not only to build a case but to rely upon in rebuttal, both for attack and defense.

The biographies of noted authorities who are repeatedly writing on the topic to be debated, or who are being quoted with respect to it, should be copied and put on cards, so that it may be known whether there is something in the life of the authority that disqualifies him. (See tests of authority in Chapter IV.) If an authority can be quoted on both sides of the question, so much the better. The debater ought to anticipate getting prominent men's views on both sides of the debate question.

Whatever helps to define the terms within the proposition may prove helpful to the debater, whether it supports or does not support the planned cases. If it does not support the cases, it can be used for rebuttal. An abstract of the history of the question ought to be in the possession of every debater on the team.
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2. Sample of Printed Bibliography.—

BIBLIOGRAPHY I


2. A Brief History of the Movement for the Recognition and Encouragement of Public Education by the National Government, Hugh S. Magill (field secretary, National Education Association), The Smith-Towner Bill: Legislation Commission Series, p. 3-5.


17. Journal of the National Education Association 15: April, 1926 (Editorial).


3. Samples of cards for card-index box.—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE LAWS NOT ENFORCED</th>
<th>Senator D. Fletcher Cong. Dig. Feb. 1923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is argued that the state laws are not enforced; but I answer, who is given the right to pass that judgment? And if that conclusion is true, it by no means follows that Cong. has power for that reason to go into the state and interpose to correct such a dereliction. That would be an unwarranted, bold assumption of power by Cong.

The above card, it will be noted, is to be used to rebut the argument that "State Laws Are Not Enforced," to which it is an answer. The abbrevi-
The debater wanted to have for ready reference examples of Federal encroachment. Instead of relying on his memory he secured a list and put it on a card, where he could easily refresh his memory. The separate items needed no explanation; that he retained in his mind by knowing the substance of each act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIFORMITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How will they secure uniformity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will prevent a state from enacting a better law, that will go beyond that of the Fed. govt.? There is no restriction on what a state may do, in going farther than the Fed. govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So uniformity would not even prevail under our opponents’ plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This card contains an original argument, which the debater has put upon a card so that it will suggest the argument to him on the stand. Then it will also be useful to convey this same argument to a colleague, if he himself, because of limited time for rebuttal, does not have an opportunity to use it. The card serves as a reminder and transfer of material all in one.

The above card is a card of statistics which may be useful in the debate. The reference is definite enough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CHILDREN 10–16 EMPLOYED, 1920</th>
<th>U. S. Census, 1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both sexes</td>
<td>1,060,858, or 8.5% employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>714,248, or 11.3% &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>346,610, or 5.6% &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 13 to 10 was 378,063. None under ten reported by census.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evasion of Fed. Law

The wages of most of the children employed in violation of the law were put in the pay envelope of an older sister or brother, or an older employee who was paid by the piece. Sometimes this older person himself hired and paid the child who assisted him.

This material was clipped direct from the pamphlet No. 78 and pasted to the card. This saves the time of writing out the material on the card.
CHAPTER IV

EVIDENCE

1. Importance of Evidence.

When, in the year 1844, Ralph Waldo Emerson heard Wendell Phillips speak, he made the following record in his journal: "I wish that Webster and Everett and also the young political aspirants of Massachusetts should hear Wendell Phillips speak, were it only for the capital lesson in eloquence they might learn of him. This, namely, that the first and second and the third part of the art is, to \textit{keep your feet always firm on a fact}.

The story is told of Bonar Law, ex-premier of Great Britain, that he owed his rapid rise to parliamentary prominence to the fact that in any debate, just about the time he was being forced to abandon his stand, he brought forth from his pockets facts and statistics that sent his opponents scurrying to cover. He could answer any argument against his position by producing facts at the right moment. There is no gainsaying that he who can place his hands upon the right bit of evidence at the right moment cannot be beaten in an argument.

I might argue at great length with a pugilist that he could not knock me out. In fact, I might have the best of the argument, if he is not so able a speaker as I. But, should he place a well-directed blow on my fragile chin and lay me horizontal, I might just as well stop arguing about it. The cold fact that he \textit{did} what I argued he could not suffice to prove I was wrong. Evidence is just as implacable and merciless in a debate. It supports Pope’s contention, "Whatever is, is right," in so far as what is, is nearer right than what is only talked about. The debater who can produce the right fact at the right time is going to win his debates in spite of all eloquence and strategy used against him.

Cases argued out in law courts are really battles of evidence. The lawyers contrive to introduce or rule out certain evidence. And, since they succeed in placing desired evidence before the jury by direct and cross-examination of ordinary and expert witnesses and by exhibits and real evidence, they succeed in winning verdicts for their clients. It is this continual reliance upon evidential facts instead of opinion, gossip, and hearsay, that has made lawyers a conservative group.

2. Evidence, Argument, and Proof.

The three terms, \textit{evidence, argument, and proof}, will from now on, in this book, be used frequently,
and the student should understand their meaning sufficiently to differentiate clearly these three well-known terms of debate.

By evidence is meant any fact or group of facts used as a basis for proof. Evidence may consist, then, of statements by other persons, statistics, quotations, historical data, reference material, and even the fact that there is no evidence of a particular nature.

By argument is meant the process of reasoning communicated to another to influence belief or disbelief in a certain arguable proposition. Argument is made up of reasoning, but differs from reasoning, inasmuch as the latter does not state its conclusion until it is reached by applying logical formulæ, while in argument the conclusion is given and then justified by use of logical formulæ. Argument, then, must have evidence to work upon, for there can hardly be reasoning without terms to reason from, and terms are nothing but facts reduced to simple form. Argument takes evidence and makes it fit in with the case as foundational to the stand made on the main proposition.

Proof is the sum of argument and evidence used to advance or support a given conclusion; namely, the affirmative or negative of the proposition. Evidence and argument are the materials from which proof results. The presentation of argument and evidence is not proof itself; it is the process by which proof is finally effected.

To draw an analogy, let us illustrate by the construction of a box. The boards and nails would be the evidence. The tools, consisting of hammer, saw, and plane, would be the argument. The process of putting the boards together and making the box would be comparable not to proof, but to the process of proof, while the completed box would be comparable to the proof of the proposition.

In a debate, the facts (evidence) are put together (process of proof) by means of tools of reasoning (argument) to make a completed proposition (proof).


The circumstances of debate preclude the use of some kinds of evidence. For instance, real evidence, which consists of exhibits and substances brought before the eyes of the audience, can hardly be used conveniently in a debate. Moreover, some debate leagues rule it out entirely, as many rule out the use of charts and diagrams. Debaters cannot use oral testimony, for witnesses cannot be called to answer on direct or cross-examination. There is neither time nor facility to have such evidence presented in a debate.

Instead, the debater is forced to rely almost entirely on written evidence. But this increased sole reliance on a few forms of evidence makes
it doubly necessary that he guard himself against the misuse of evidence, since he has little else to fall back upon for support. If his written evidence falls down in some particular, it will cast doubt over all his evidence. If he is found to have a dubious source, in one particular, it will make his audience feel that his other sources are dubious. Let the debater study evidence carefully, and ascertain that his use thereof coincides with the rules for its presentation in a debate.

The evidence that can be used in a debate may be classified into five divisions: the statement of facts and about facts, unqualified facts themselves, expert evidence, circumstantial evidence, and negative evidence.

(a) Statement of facts and about facts.—A debater's information, for the most part, is secondhand. He is not himself an observer of the circumstances affecting the proposition he is debating. Even for facts he must rely on the statements of others. Such statements he will find to be made by two classes of persons: those who merely report facts; and those who use facts, personally obtained, to advance opinions and reasons. We call the first class of persons witnesses, the second class authorities. We are concerned here with witnesses; for the statements of authorities are considered expert evidence, and are treated under that head. (Few texts on debate draw this distinction. Witnesses and authorities are treated as one, although there is a vast difference between the admissible information either class may present for debate purposes.)

Not every one who can observe a fact may make an acceptable statement of it, or about it. The debater must test every witness he calls to the stand, figuratively speaking, to support his case. There are seven general tests of witnesses: Is the reference definite? Did witness have a chance to observe? Is he capable of making an accurate statement? Is he used frequently in the debate? Is he acceptable to listeners? Is his testimony clear-cut and unequivocal? Is his testimony confined to facts?

(1) Is the reference definite?—Of late years, increasing lenience has been given debaters who quote statements from newspapers, magazines, and other printed sources. Debating has achieved higher ethical standards, and no longer is it demanded that a debater give minute references to show he is quoting legitimate evidence.

In quoting from a magazine, the date and year should be given. Often debate teams will conceal the timeliness of their reference by giving the volume number of the magazine. The opponents are left to trust that the information is timely, or challenge the speaker to tell the date when the volume was published. This is, of course, quibbling. To relieve opponents from this dilemma of possibly making an answerable challenge, or
letting a point in their favor go by unnoticed, debaters should give date and year of references. Fairness is demanded at all times in giving references.

Some kind of a qualifying statement concerning the witness must be made, unless he is well-known. For instance, Arthur Brisbane is a professional reporter who is too well-known to need qualification. On the other hand, the name of a reporter or correspondent on the Springfield Republican is not likely to be known by people living outside the reading area of that newspaper; hence, the qualifying statement should be given. If a statement comes from an article, the title of the article is unimportant. Sometimes a statement of the circumstances under which the article was written or suggested is useful, as when a magazine has sent out a special correspondent to report some great controversy.

It is sufficient in most cases to make the reference as follows:

David C. Towne, correspondent for the Associated Press, in a dispatch on April 2, 1927, writes.

George Prillow, county attorney of Dawes county, in a speech at Burke on March 3, 1926, said.

In a release to the Boston Globe on January 3, 1927, Foster Ranking, one of the strike leaders, is quoted as stating.

The reference should answer who, what, and when. It need not answer why, where, and how, but it may, if it will help make the reference more acceptable.

(2) *Did the witness have a chance to observe?* By "chance to observe" is meant an opportunity to get the facts about which the statement is made. During the World War, various accounts of alarming atrocities committed by German soldiers on defenseless women and children were broadcast in newspapers. One of these accounts, telling of ears being cut off and limbs amputated, was traced to a reporter who was never in the war zone, and hence had no opportunity to know the facts. The witness must not rely on hearsay or other evidence. If he does, the debater should make it plain that the information is not second-hand, but handed down through three or more sources.

(3) *Is witness capable of making an accurate statement?*—The witness must be physically capable. If he cannot detect colors, he can hardly give forth a statement relying on his ability to detect colors. He must be in possession of accurate sense observation in the field in which he is reporting. The witness must also be mentally capable. He must be of mature years, and mentally stable, to give forth an accurate statement. He must be capable of retaining sensual impressions long enough to transfer them to written
form or to recite them to another. Lastly, the witness must be morally capable. The testimony of a criminal is seldom taken seriously, for he is considered morally incapable of making accurate observations and reporting them. What he says or writes is likely to be tainted by his warped outlook on human affairs.

(4) Is the witness used frequently to support the case?—If it is found that one witness is frequently called by one of the sides to testify upon a given proposition, it is quite likely that that debating team is restricted in its source of information, or cannot find other witnesses to testify in its favor. This would indicate that their statements are not true or their observation is faulty. On the other hand, the concurrence of many witnesses in their views indicates that what they say is true, and that their observation has been accurate.

The same objection to the frequent use of one witness does not hold true in the same degree with one class of witnesses. If the proposition involves a dispute between labor and capital, it would be quite feasible to have laborers and capitalists from the various states testify by means of statements. However, the time in a debate limits the use of too much concurrent testimony.

(5) Is the witness acceptable to listeners?—Not everyone can be called to act as witness in a dispute. Certain classes of persons are some-

times in disrepute because of the stand they take on problems of reform. Testimony from them would not be readily acceptable, for their statements would be ridiculed and subjected to derision. The statements of rank Bolshevists would be unpopular to Americans at a time of “Red menace.” Now and then one individual is castigated by the public. If he is, it is not likely that a statement from him will be acceptable. As long as it is not, there is no use presenting it in a debate.

(6) Is the testimony clear-cut and unequivocal?—Often the hesitating, equivocal method in which testimony is given indicates that it is spurious and unsatisfactory. One should first consider the statement, and then the source. If any doubt is raised by the statement, the source should at once undergo close scrutiny. If one bit of information from a witness is found to be untrustworthy, it is likely that all of that witness’s testimony is unfit for debate purposes. Offhand statements, made irresponsibly, without regard to the purpose for which they might be used, are likely to be equivocal and unfit for a debater’s use. The circumstances under which the testimony is given often indicate at once that the witness speaking did not expect to be quoted. In such cases the resulting testimony is unsuitable.

(7) Is his testimony confined to facts?—A witness is not an expert. He is only an instrument
through which facts are made available to a larger group. Since this is true, he cannot be expected to give opinions concerning these facts, nor make conclusions, that are acceptable in a debate. If the witness does give such testimony, the tests of authority should be applied, and his evidence submitted as expert evidence, in case he satisfies the tests.

One can be an accurate, impartial observer and still not be competent to make use of the observed facts in a controversy. To rule out all such evidence would reduce the amount of usable fact to so small a compass that debaters would have to spend some of their time afield themselves to gain first-hand information. Authorities seldom observe a general mass of data. If they act as witnesses, they usually do so in a very limited sense, and obtain very little factual material. They themselves rely on the information obtained by those who make a specialty of news-gathering. Testimony by witnesses should be confined to bare, evidentiary facts.

(b) Unqualified facts themselves. (1) Historical facts.—In every debate, use is made of certain facts so well-known that they need no qualification at all. They are known as ultimate facts by the debaters and their hearers. Of such a nature are statements concerning proved historical data—the fact that George Washington lived, that Napoleon was once emperor of France, that Spain once conquered Mexico. Then there are facts of common experience; namely, that rivers flow to the seas, that ice is formed from water, that the sun gives warmth. Another class of facts requiring no witness testimony are those facts accepted by the strength of the hypothesis which formed them; as, that the earth revolves around the sun, that coal is formed from decayed vegetation, that the moon receives its light from the sun.

Often a debater has use for facts of this kind in a debate. If challenged for their authenticity, he should submit it to a decision of the audience, and waste no time upon trivial proof.

(2) Statistics.—Another class of facts comes to the debater in the form of statistics. Usually the source of statistics can be traced, even though the ultimate source is obscured by reason of the joint auspices under which the statistics were gathered or compiled. In the case of government statistics, the authority therefor is usually taken for granted. Since most statistics used are of this nature, we can class statistics under unqualified facts. The treatment of statistics requires considerable care, for figures can "prove" anything. The debater must see to it that those he uses are particular in what they prove. Furthermore, statistics are not very popular with audiences, as proof. They may prove a great deal, but it is difficult proof to assimilate. The selection, pres-
entation, and testing of statistics calls for detailed and careful attention.

(a) Selection of statistics.—In gathering statistical data, the five queries below should be applied:

1. Is the ultimate authority good?—By ultimate authority is meant the organization that made the collection of the figures possible. It should not be a partisan organization. For instance, government statistics are the best obtainable.

2. Do the statistics point both ways?—A warning is made that statistics proving both negative and affirmative issues are not as safe as others pointing to and proving only one side of the proposition. If the opponents have the same set of statistics, they can use them in retaliation with deadly effect. A list of various states might show conditions favorable to the affirmative in some states and unfavorable in other states. Such a list would be dangerous for either the affirmative or negative to use without complete explanation of the whole list.

3. Is too much reliance placed on one set of statistics?—If too much reliance is placed on a few statistics, the same result will be apparent as when one witness is used too extensively. Therefore it is better to duplicate tables of figures, provided they coincide, or do not contradict each other when used in a debate.

4. Is same source quoted frequently by opponents?—If opponents rely upon the same source for their figures, these extra tables of statistics will prevent contradictions from nullifying all numerical data.

5. Are both general and specific statistics available?—General and specific statistics are often contradictory. For instance, the summary figures on the conditions of labor throughout the United States may be contradicted by the detailed figures concerning one section of the country used in the same compilation. If the debate centers about conditions in some one section it is better to use the detailed figures concerning that section. Often an advantage can be gained in this way. It is a safe policy to gather statistics of both general and specific nature.

(b) Presentation of statistics. In presenting masses of figures to an audience there are several simple rules to follow:

1. Never present more than is enough to prove a point.—All too often a whole table of figures will be read when a representative portion of it will suffice. Sometimes parts of a detailed table can be read, and then finished with the remark, “and so on throughout the other states of the union, until we find that the totals for the entire United States are . . .” This method of abridgment should not be confused with the gross inadequacy of such remarks as, “I could quote
many more figures of like import, if I had time,” or “These are only a few of the many statistics available to prove my point.” In the abridgment, what is left out is included in the table, while remarks as those given above do not present evidence; they only hint at it, and hence are a waste of effort.

2. Never present statistics in masses.—It is hard to digest statistics. They are too “rich,” too concentrated. Therefore, present only a few at a time. This should be borne in mind especially when one is debating an economic question. Debaters are prone to make an issue reading, “Experience proves that government ownership is desirable,” and then mass beneath it all the statistics supporting their contention, with the result that the listeners have only a confused jumble of figures at the end of the recital, and no proved issue. Neither should the debater use long columns of figures as “filler,” to take up time. If he finds himself running short of his assigned amount of time, he will do better to sit down before the warning than to consume surplus minutes with an enumeration of facts ruinous to his case.

3. Never present statistics wholly as cold facts. When the debater deduces from the statistics with reference to the crime wave in the city of X that the number of yearly murders is enormous, he need not say, “There has been an average of 3,405 murders in the city of X yearly from 1917 to 1928.” He may just as well say, “For the last ten years there have been an average of 9 to 10 murders a day in X, or one every other hour.” This makes the enormity much more concrete and appreciable. In a recent debate on child labor, one debater presented the statistics and then summarized:

The net result of all this is that we have coming of age now each year 200,000 of these little men and little women, one every two minutes, stunted in mind and body, dwarfed by premature toil.

One newspaper feature writer lately used this method in writing an article on the number of deaths as compared with births. The first sentence of the article was, “You who begin this sentence may not live to see its close.” Thus he was making graphic how many deaths there are a minute—approximately twelve. It takes five seconds to read the sentence slowly.

Another way to make statistics mean more is to draw analogy with home conditions, in case citizens cannot appreciate the unfamiliar conditions which the debater is trying to prove. If, in a debate on the proper housing of factory employees, it is discovered that in some large districts many hundreds are not properly housed, the debater can transfer the conditions closer to home, and say, “Suppose in your own city of
Vernon, where you have a population of 5,000, there were 3,000 factory employees, and only one-third of them comfortably housed. That would mean that almost half of the town would be living in the squalor of tin shanties, dugouts, and barns. Yet that is the condition in some of the larger manufacturing districts of the East.” Such a comparison makes the listener more appreciative of the story told by statistics.

In the same manner, when the debater finds a figure slightly exceeds the round-numbered mark, he can better use the round number than the actual number. Round numbers are much more easily remembered.

(c) Testing statistics. Besides the testing of statistics made in selection, there are other tests to apply after they are sorted out for use. There are seven practical tests:

1. Who compiled the statistics?—As was indicated under the selection of statistics, an impartial investigator should be relied on. Interested propaganda organizations often take accurate statistics and make them yield other conclusions by printing only a part of them. In a recent government table, the number of child workers from the age of 10 to 16 was indicated. An organization interested in keeping children at work presented figures from this list up to the age of 14. Naturally, the bulk of laborers comprised those between the ages of 14 and 16. The partial list of child laborers from 10 to 14 would lead one to conclude that there were very few children employed. It is also necessary to test the investigator and compiler to ascertain whether his source is acceptable to the general public, so that no suspicion will be put upon the statistics when their source is revealed.

2. When were they made?—Timely statistics far outweigh in importance untimely statistics. The United States Census is taken every ten years. Therefore, if an opponent relies on figures that are produced in the interim, they can be challenged as unauthoritative. There is no private organization existing that could afford to make a nation-wide census on its own initiative. To rely on the census means to take the figures of the last ten-year period. However, some state and communities compile statistical data at lesser intervals. To determine whether the figures at hand are the very latest, inquire as to the period intervening between two compilations.

3. Was the source of information open to the investigator?—If the investigator has information that no one else was able to obtain, this query is well directed. Oftentimes it is impossible to get accurate information. A few years ago, a debating team wanted to know the precise cost to the United States of maintaining Marines abroad in peacetime. In the Congressional Record several Congressmen were found to have made remarks...
concerning the cost, and to have given it in various sums. A letter to the Department of State brought an answer that no authoritative figures were available, since no definite allocation had been made. The desired information did not exist. Therefore the Congressmen’s figures were mere estimates and guesses.

4. What method was used in getting the information?—In securing house-to-house data on family conditions, a group of investigators allowed the head of the family to write down the information on convenient blanks furnished him. Some of the questions asked were very personal. It was found afterward that the statistics so gathered were unreliable, for the head of the family, filled with personal pride and pride in his family, often gave untruthful information. The whole set of figures was discredited. In a western town, beet workers must be of a certain age. Parents who had children whom they wished to earn money pulling beets were relied upon to tell their children’s ages. When the records were compared with official records of births and deaths, a great discrepancy was found. The parents deliberately falsified the children’s ages to keep the children at work. The method of securing the data made the resulting information unreliable.

5. Are the conditions the same for taking each set of compared statistics?—To show the trend of affairs, figures from one period are compared with those of another. Unless conditions are the same at the time of taking both sets of figures, no accurate comparison can be made. The World Almanac for 1926 (p. 336), in accounting for the decrease in child labor between 1910 and 1920, according to the census, explains:

This decrease was largely due to the fact that the 1920 census was taken at the beginning of a period of industrial depression, and at a season of the year when employment in many occupations, especially agriculture, was at its lowest ebb (the 1910 census was taken in April; the 1920 census in January). Moreover, in 1920 employment of children was discouraged by a Federal child labor law.

For these reasons, the World Almanac explains, a fair comparison could not be made between the two sets of statistics.

Statistics taken during a time of great national tension, as during a war or other crisis, cannot accurately be compared with statistics taken during a time of prosperity or peace.

6. For what purposes were statistics procured? Statistics gathered for a certain purpose are likely to fit in with the needs of that purpose. If they are gathered only to tell the new state of affairs, they are likely to be as accurate as they can be made. If they are to be used for propaganda purposes, they are not likely to be any
more accurate than the propaganda they are to be used for. If the compilers have "an axe to grind" they are likely to sharpen it with their own statistics.

7. Is the unit-period of time sufficient to use as a basis for forecasts and conclusions?—Let us say that a debater in the year 1925 uses figures showing an increase in water-power leases from 1922 to 1923, and then says that he has no later figures. Can he prove anything by the figures gained from one year? The unit-period is only one year; yet from that unit-period he is drawing a conclusion concerning a period of time of perhaps as much as ten years. He is making his conclusion go beyond his evidence, always a dangerous practice. If, in debating immigration, the debater finds that he can use profitably the census figures from 1880 to 1890, and from 1900 to 1910, can he use increases during these periods as indicative of enormous increases in immigration, if he is debating in 1925? This is frequently done, because the debaters believe that any figures, when they prove their own contentions, are acceptable. Such garbling of statistics is as destructive, when exposed by opponents, as the garbling of statements, and should by all means be avoided. On the subject of immigration, the debater should quote census figures up to the latest census. If they do not favor his argument, he should show by qualifying facts why the census figures are not evidence destructive to his view. It may be that a new law has been enacted, or an old one repealed, or run its time limit. He will, at any rate, gain no ground against a good opponent by being selective in his choice of statistics. His unit-period of time in the statistics should be sufficiently large to allow him to make forecasts and derive conclusions in line with sound reasoning.

(c) Expert evidence.—As was explained in introducing the first form of evidence (that comprising statements of and about facts), there is a great difference between a witness and an authority. A witness is called upon to give evidence much in the same way as a reporter. We are not interested in him, nor his opinions; we are only interested in what he has observed. It is different with the authority, who is called upon to give expert evidence. An authority is one who is especially qualified not only to tell what he has observed, but to comment about his observations, give opinions concerning them, and draw conclusions from his reasoning about his observations. Since he has a special degree of competency to do these things, he is called an authority. His remarks, whether opinions or arguments, are received as expert evidence. In the law court he is called an expert witness, and gives expert testimony. He is called upon to give testimony on questions within his peculiar technical capacity.
to determine. Thus, an alienist can tell more of the workings of a man’s mind than can one who has never studied the matter; and he is therefore solicited to give such information as an expert. Likewise does the debater in his debate use statements from noted men and women who are especially conversant with the subject and who are able to act as authorities.

It is the increasing use of expert evidence in debating that has led many debaters to get the wrong idea of its use. Lay opinion in itself proves nothing. Every man has an opinion about a controversial question. Unless that opinion is supported by reasons it has no weight in a debate. Moreover, the reasons must be given, unless it is generally known why the authority holds his opinion. In a debate on the prevalence of foreign labor in American factories, one debater advanced statistics showing the exact amount of it. He was answered by this remark of his opponent, “Why, I don’t believe those figures. We don’t have anything like that around here.” Debaters are prone to use such expressions, “I think,” “It is my opinion,” “I believe,” whereby they identify their statements as pure opinion, and prove nothing. The debater’s opinion is as good as the opinion of any other layman, but the fact is that bare opinion is not evidence; it is mere assertion, and assertion without proof is a deadly weakness of beginning debaters. The only opinion of value in a debate is that of experts, and even its use is very limited, as indicated above.

Let the debater remember that a recital of the opinions of others is neither evidence nor argument; it is only assertion. A good team will expose the fault quickly.

When a debater calls upon authorities to testify in behalf of his case, he should use only such statements in which their professional knowledge has been brought to bear upon some question in the controversy with the result that what they say is more than unsupported assertion. To guide him in the selection of expert evidence there are six tests of authority to apply to the material at issue:

(1) *Is the authority capable of giving expert testimony?*—The commonest mistake made in the selection of authorities is the mistake of believing greatness or prominence a test of fitness. The president of the United States may be a good authority on government and the business of managing a republic, but his capabilities in those fields do not make him an equally competent authority in the field of engineering or medicine.

The first test of an authority’s capability is: Does he have special knowledge of the subject? Professors in universities and colleges are considered competent authorities within their special fields. The like is true of men who rank high in
their respective professions. Managers of industrial concerns are authorities with respect to their own particular industries. But, on the other hand, political favor often elevates men into offices for which their previous training has not particularly fitted them. Their new official position does not make them authorities. Thus, cabinet officers are chosen from various walks of life, very often quite different from the fields of their new duties. They are not authorities until they "learn the ropes" of the cabinet positions they occupy. They intrust the affairs of their department to minor officials until they themselves are familiar with them. Position, then, is not a test of fitness. Instead, training and past experience, as learned from the biographies of authorities, as found in the references Who's Who and Who's Who in America will tell the debater whether the authority possesses special knowledge that fits him for giving expert testimony.

The second test of an authority's capability is: Does he have an unprejudiced view of the subject? It is this test that rules out the greater share of politicians. When they are advocating a measure, the general public believes they have personal interests at stake. This is, at times, an unjust opinion, but it prevails. Sometimes the president and cabinet officers are advocating a change or pursuance of present policy. If one were to consider them all prejudiced it would be a severe indictment of republican government. One can be overzealous in suspecting prejudice and bias on the part of public men. An example of familiar prejudice is found in the case of protective tariff. Republicans are invariably for protective tariff. Since about three-fourths of political leanings are inherited, there is a congenital prejudice toward that political party's stronghold doctrine. The Anti-Saloon League would not be good authority to quote as saying that prohibition is a success. The National Manufacturer's Association would be prejudiced in the matter of increasing the wages of labor. Labor heads are not authorities of unprejudiced nature when advocating higher wages.

The third test of an authority's capability is: Does he know what his statement is to be used for? An authority who is aware that what he says is to be used for a certain purpose will often guard his remarks or so construct them as intentionally to subserve a personal interest. If he is being hired to give testimony, it will probably favor his employer. If what he says is likely to incriminate friends, and he finds it out, he will speak with his "tongue in his cheek." When one speaks frankly and without any other purpose than imparting desirable information to others for public action, he speaks most capably.

(2) Is the authority reluctant?—Now and then testimony is wrung from a person against
his will. He cannot help himself. He is forced to admit what he would rather not. Such testimony is placed at a premium in judicial tribunals the world over. It amounts to a confession, and a confession lays bare the breast of the confessor to the daggers of his accusers. When the testimony of a man is such as will affect his own interests in a prejudicial way it is considered reluctant testimony, and therefore valuable. The statement of a manufacturer that unsanitary conditions prevail in his factories is reluctant testimony. The statement of an army general, who has the responsibility for the success of his soldiers in war, to the effect that they are poorly prepared is a reluctant statement.

(3) *Is the authority acceptable?*—The same test can be applied to an authority as to a witness, with respect to acceptability. Some authorities are undesirable. They have come into disrepute with the general public. If such is the case, the debater should not use them. The use as debate authorities of men prominent in great trusts during the period when trusts were unpopular would have brought about a very unfavorable reaction in the audience. The statement of a prominent citizen of India on certain aspects of marriage would not “take” with an audience in America, which knows that child marriage is the custom in that country.

(4) *Is reliance placed on one authority?*—

Concurrence of authority is as valuable as concurrence of witnesses. Mere preponderance of authorities is sometimes sufficient to carry a point. On a debate involving a proposed new amendment to the Constitution, a debater piled up authorities in this manner:

Did the people really oppose this amendment? There were 2500 proposed amendments submitted to the Sixty-seventh Congress. Moreover, two-thirds of the senators and three-fourths of the Congressmen voted for it. Three major political parties endorsed the amendment. Twenty women’s organizations supported it. Six other national organizations approved it.

Now, who do we find opposed to it? We find only three organizations openly opposed to the amendment. They are the National Manufacturers’ Association, the Pennsylvania Manufacturers’ Association, and the Southern Textile Association, all of whom have very good reasons, as you already know, for opposing this amendment.

The debater not only showed the authorities favoring his view, but also showed the lack of authorities favoring the other side of the question. Sometimes debaters will make acquaintance with a reference book that yields them many worthwhile quotations, or an author whose trenchant style will improve their own speech, yet, in the use of reference, it is well to remember
that one writer can hardly be referred to in a debate more than three times without becoming conspicuous. When this happens, his evidence will not be accepted at face value, but will be discounted by both the opposing team and the audience.

(5) Do opponents use the authority?—The value of having complete references to the remarks of famous men is that, if the opposing team uses an authority, the other team can win favor by giving a later statement by the same authority. The latest statement by an authority is considered his best, because subsequent events may have forced him to change his views.

Besides the advantage in having a later statement, the debater should remember that, if opponents quote an authority in a late statement, he himself, if he has only an earlier statement, had better omit the authority entirely from his own remarks. In rebuttal his opponent could damage his case with the remark: "Our opponent's case is built up in part about the authority of Mr. Noble, but the statement quoted is that made on February 13, 1903. We have already given you the latest view of Mr. Noble, stated by him on March 30, 1928, indicating that he, too, has seen the reasonableness of our proposal in the light of recent events."

In a debate on immigration, a high school student noticed that Secretary of Labor Davis was quoted by his opponents, while he had used him also as an authority. In rebuttal he essayed the remark: "Now they have quoted Davis, our Secretary of Labor. Why, we quoted Secretary of Labor Davis ourselves, in our own constructive speeches." However, his rebuttal did no more than negate the effectiveness of both arguments. At best the debater only neutralized his opponent's statement. He should have noticed the dates of the two statements, or the circumstances under which they were made, and drawn a conclusion that would place the weight of approval upon the statement which he himself quoted. Then his rebuttal would have had telling effect.

(6) Is the reference to the authority definite? Sometimes debaters attempt to "get by" with their authorities, when they are of doubtful acceptance, by concealing the reference. The source is given as: "a competent authority on this question says," "one of our great political scientists, in a recent interview, made the remark," "a great many of those intimate with the problem are of the opinion," which leaves in the minds of the audience the impression that the authority is not a fair one. If the debater is reluctant to use a certain authority's name, he should omit his statements entirely.

As with reference to witnesses, the questions who, what, and when should be answered, and sometimes why, where, and how. The first-hand
reference should be obtained, if possible. Magazines like the Literary Digest make a practice of quoting from other sources. To make the reference definite in this case requires considerable time:

President Hibben of Princeton University, in an address at London, July 4, 1929, as quoted by the Literary Digest of July 20, 1929, from The New York Times of July 7, said:

The debater can short-cut his reference without making it vague. Thus:

President Hibben of Princeton University, in an address at London, July 4, 1929, said:

or

The New York Times reports President Hibben's speech at London on July 4, 1929, in part as stating:

A precise reference to a statement made before a Congressional committee might be:

Alex Saunders, president of the Midwest Grain Exchange, in testifying before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, 70th Congress, on April 6, 1929, as recorded in Report No. 432 of that committee, page 6,975, said:

A reference so detailed becomes tiresome and wasteful of valuable moments of a debater's speaking time. It would be as thorough to say:

Alex Saunders, president of the Midwest Grain Exchange, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee last April, said:

If Alex Saunders were a man very well known throughout the country, the reference could be as brief as this:

Alex Saunders, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee last April, said:

The reference to authority here is definite and complete.

(d) Circumstantial evidence.—Circumstantial evidence is also termed indirect evidence, although the former term is the more common. It consists of facts that do not directly prove one or more of the contentions in the debate, but from whose proof inferences are derived that do prove or help to prove one or more of the contentions.

Before circumstantial evidence can be relied upon, it must be so conclusive that only the inferences derived can reasonably follow the analysis. Usually circumstantial evidence leads to many inferences. If it does, all of these, except those relied upon, must be proved to be unwarranted. If other inferences are as reasonable as those relied upon, circumstantial evidence is not conclusive. An example of this is given in Burrill's Treatise on Circumstantial Evidence: "A man was convicted and executed for stealing a horse, on the strength of the presumption of the animal's being found in his possession on the same day on which it was stolen; but it afterwards appeared that the real thief, being closely pursued
by the officers of the law, had met the unfortunate man, to whom he was a total stranger, and requested him to walk his horse for him a while. He had then escaped.”

We often say a man is a “victim of circumstance.” By this we mean that no effort on his part could have helped to relieve him from suspicions that attach to him by inferences drawn toward him from his environment. Circumstantial evidence as it appears in a debate is the result of drawing inferences from the statements made by witnesses or authorities, within the texts laid down in the first two groups of evidence explained in this chapter. The example given on page 79 is an application of circumstantial evidence. The debater wanted to show that the people favored an amendment. No vote was taken by the people, nor would one be taken. The debater then deduced that, since by far the most of the people’s representatives, and practically all national organizations of people, favored the amendment, therefore public opinion favored the amendment.

Circumstantial evidence as used in the detection of crime has been explained as follows: “In practically all cases, then, the prosecution builds up a framework of evidence which converges on the hypothesis that the accused is the guilty man. The two facts to be connected are the crime and the individual charged with its commission. The evidentiary facts are shown to converge upon such a suggested connection. The figure most frequently employed is that of a chain, but the analogy has a weakness in that it implies that the disproof of a single link will break the chain. As a matter of fact, the connection is more like a cable woven of strands than a single chain. When each single inference from a circumstance to the issue is probable, the combination of these separate probabilities may lead to a moral certainty through the impossibility of finding an hypothesis, other than the one championed, which will cover them all.” (Sellars, “Essentials of Logic,” p. 277.)

The finest example of the application of circumstantial evidence to the solution of a problem, in literature, is that in A. Conan Doyle’s tales of Sherlock Holmes. In these stories Dr. Watson, Holmes’s partner, always tests other hypotheses to find them unsupported by the circumstances of each case. It will be found, however, that other hypotheses could be justified besides those which Sherlock Holmes uses to solve the crimes which he unravels.

The debater’s study and application of circumstantial evidence will convince him that too great reliance cannot be put upon it; that, at most, it should be used in conjunction with the other forms of evidence.

(e) Negative evidence.—The last form of evi-
vidence is really the absence of fact instead of the presence of fact. When no evidence is found upon a certain tenet, one fact remains; to wit, that for some reason no evidence prevails. This absence of evidence is often used to indicate what circumstances account for its absence, thereby drawing an inference from silence.

If, in proving that a proposal has the support of noted men, a debater can find many men who make statements in the affirmative and none who make statements in the negative, he is led to believe and can lead others to believe that the proposal has no strong antagonists.

If an attorney tries to incriminate a person who has just committed a crime by proving that he is a habitual criminal, he must find the necessary evidence in the man's past. If the man's record, as reconstructed by the testimony of witnesses who have been associated with him throughout his life, accounts for every year in such a way that there is not a blotch on the man's record, the absence of any criminal tendencies will disprove the attorney's contention that the person at bar is habituated to crime.

Historians use the principle of negative evidence again and again in reconstructing the story of the past from diaries, court records, and chronicles kept by men of an early day. There may be a suggestion that during a certain year famine decimated the population of England.

But if none of the chronicles or histories reveals a word supporting that suggestion, it is not likely that the calamity occurred. As long as it is of great enough importance to be recorded as a historical fact, it is likely to be significant enough to come to the attention of early chroniclers. In this case the absence of evidence, instead of its presence, supports the hypothesis.


With the above analysis of the five kinds of evidence, a note of caution is relevant. Never should the debater allow assertions to be made without proof, either in his own case or in that which he opposes. Debaters must stand firmly on facts. Mere assertions are as proof-yielding as the following colloquy that was heard in the United States Senate recently between two Congressmen:

Mr. T: Add up your million.
Mr. N: I could go on and give more.
Mr. T: Do it.
Mr. N: I will not do it.
Mr. T: The Senator cannot do it.
Mr. N: I can do it. The Senator must not think he can outline a course for me to take.
Mr. T: The Senator cannot do it.
Mr. N: Of course I can do it.
Mr. T: Do it, then.
Mr. N: I am not going to please the Senator that way.
Mr. T: Of course the Senator is not—because he cannot.

This interchange of “can” and “cannot” indicates how illuminating mere assertion is when unsupported by proof.

Another error in using evidence is to allow the mind to jump to conclusions. Not until one knows every known fact in the world can he essay to draw final and irrevocable conclusions from the facts at his command. Never can one be absolutely certain of anything in a debate. Proof is no stronger than what goes to make up that proof, and, if an opponent can produce something new, it may shatter completely the logical and evidential structure that a debater has erected in support of his side of a proposition. Do not let conclusions surpass the evidence that upholds them. Even when putting figures into round numbers to make them easier to assimilate, do not allow exaggeration to creep in. Be a little conservative, rather than overanxious to stretch evidence beyond its legitimate limits.

Lastly, do not consider that evidence is just so much filler. Use discretion in its selection, for any wide-awake debater will accumulate far more than he has time in a debate to make use of. A judicious selection and variety must be made, and in this the debater has little to guide him except his own common sense in ascertaining what is potent, what is desirable, and what is crucial.

Chapter V

ARGUMENT

1. Argument and Its Use.

Argument was defined in Chapter IV as the process of reasoning communicated to another to influence belief or disbelief in a certain arguable proposition. The distinction between argument and reasoning was also pointed out in that chapter. Argument is always looked upon by the uninitiated as some kind of a scheme or phantasmagoric formula whereby an individual can be inveigled into believing or disbelieving otherwise than he desires. It takes on the appearance of hypnotism.

In fact, argument is only a normal system whereby the mind is brought from certain known facts to believe in what is at present unknown. It is based primarily and finally upon fact. No amount of skill in logic or cunningness in constructing arguments can overcome trustworthy facts. On the other hand, a mind plentifully stored with accurate facts takes to reasoning about those facts with a sort of inborn facility. That is why many prominent men are able to argue successfully, although they have had no
training in argumentation. They have the facts, and the facts verily make their own arguments.

The fundamentals of argument should be known, then, not to serve as a substitute for evidence, but rather to make evidence more useful to the debater and to enable him to employ facts to their utmost advantage.

The reasoning processes that make up argument merely take the mind from acknowledged facts to unacknowledged conclusions by such an obvious route that the conclusions become in turn acknowledged facts. The processes must be simple. If they were complex, the mind would hesitate to accept the conclusions. At most, there are only two or three steps in every reasoning process.

2. Logic and Argument.

There should be no confusion between logic and argument. Argument is a form of applied logic, as is mathematics. Logic is the science of exact reasoning. Its purpose is to help men to discern good and bad reasoning. The purpose of argument is to influence other people’s minds to belief or disbelief. Argument uses logical formulae, but the terms of logic are not the terms of everyday life, so that logic is impractical for debate, while argument is practical.

It is seldom in real life that arguable propositions can be reduced to the simple terms de-

manded by logic. When they can, however, logic often aids in solving what appears to be a puzzle in reasoning. Logic further fails to yield practicability at every turn since it does not take into account a single circumstance outside the terms in the proposition from which a conclusion is to be drawn. In this respect, again, logic cannot be applied to many life situations.

In spite of all the drawbacks of logic, all argument is based upon it, and an understanding of syllogistic logic will enable the student to see clearly how simple the processes of reasoning are out of which arguments are made.

3. Deductive Reasoning.

(a) The syllogism.—The syllogism is basic to all deductive reasoning. Deductive reasoning is the process of deducing from a general law certain particular conclusions. Let us say that:

A president of the United States is thirty-five years old or older;

Herbert Hoover is president of the United States;

Therefore, Herbert Hoover is thirty-five years old or older.

This is a typical example of a categorical syllogism. The first statement is called the major premise, the second is called the minor premise, and the third is called the conclusion. The premises must first be established. If they are
accepted as true, then the conclusion inevitably follows. If they are not accepted as true, they must first be made true by inductive reasoning and observation, before the truth of the conclusion can be accepted. The syllogism aims at validity instead of truth; that is, that the structure be perfect in all its parts. Before the truth of a conclusion can be affirmed, the logician must first make certain that the premises express truths.

There are certain rules of the syllogism which aim to make it faultproof. The five principal rules are given here:

(1) There must be three and only three terms in the premises, and they must be used throughout with the same meaning. A typical example of a faulty syllogism by a violation of this rule is the following:

Nothing is better than heaven;
Living is better than nothing;
Hence, living is better than heaven.

This often stumps the student of logic. An analysis will show that here the word “nothing” carries two meanings in the two premises. Therefore rule 1 of the syllogism is violated. Another commonly quoted example is,

No cat has nine tails;
One cat has one tail more than no cat;
Hence, one cat has ten tails.

In this syllogism “no cat” carries two meanings. Sometimes it is difficult to detect this dual meaning of a word. Equivocation is shown in the word “poor” in this example: This girl is happy, though poor. How can she be poor when she is happy? In the first sentence “poor” refers to the girl’s worldly destitution; in the second, to her spiritual destitution.

(2) The middle term must be distributed at least once in the premises. The fallacy resulting from a violation of rule 2, is indicated by this syllogism:

All fat men are policemen;
These men are policemen;
Hence, these men are fat.

(3) No term must be distributed in the conclusion that is not distributed in the premises. Notice the error here:

All fat men are policemen;
This person is not a fat man;
Hence, this person is not a policeman.

(4) No conclusion can be drawn from two negative premises. The impossibility of drawing a conclusion is illustrated herewith:

No American is immortal;
This man is not an American;
Hence, this man is immortal.
(5) If one of the premises is negative, the conclusion must be negative. This rule has such everyday application in arithmetic that no examples need be given here.

The syllogism assumes other forms. In the hypothetical syllogism the major premise is hypothetical. As,

If they pass a high tariff, it will protect industry;
They have passed a high tariff;
Hence, it will protect industry.

The disjunctive syllogism has a disjunction in the major premise. As,

This dress is either pink or red;
It is pink;
Hence, it is not red.

The alternatives in the major premise must be exclusive. If this is not true, the conclusion will not follow. Suppose we say,

He is either fundamentalist or modernist;
He is not a fundamentalist;
Hence, he is a modernist.

The man may be a rank heathen, in which case he is not included in the alternatives of the major premise, and therefore the conclusion is false.

(b) The Enthymeme.—Sometimes one of the premises will be taken for granted, or presented in elliptical form. The resulting structure is called an enthymeme or abbreviated syllogism. Thus the statement, “War is abhorrent, being un-Christian,” is expanded into the following syllogism:

Whatever is un-Christian is abhorrent;
War is un-Christian;
Hence war is abhorrent.

The enthymeme has the same practical effect as the syllogism, and is attacked the same way.

(c) Prosylogisms, episyllogisms, and polysyllogisms: Premises of syllogisms are justified by making them conclusions of other syllogisms. Conclusions may in turn be used as premises. It is possible, therefore, to have syllogisms superimposed, one upon the other, to yield conclusions from distant premises by intermediate steps equally justified and justifying by alternate service as premises and conclusions. Linked syllogisms are singularly called a polysyllogism. Any syllogism therein whose conclusion is used as a premise in another syllogism is called a prosyllogism; while a syllogism which uses this conclusion as one of its premises is called an episyllogism. Thus we have:

Any group that suppresses free speech is un-American;
Any secret organization suppresses free speech;
Hence, any secret organization is un-American (prosyllogism I)
Any group that does not reveal its purposes to the public is a secret organization;
This group does not reveal its purposes to the public;
Hence, this group is a secret organization. (pro-
syllogism II)

Any secret organization is un-American;
This group is a secret organization;
Hence, this group is un-American. (episy-
syllogism)

The two prosyllogisms and the episyllogism make a polysyllogism.

(d) Sorites.—A sorites is a series of premises of syllogisms with the intermediate conclusions left out. Any two successive premises must contain a common term. There are two types. In one the movement is from the least inclusive term to the most inclusive term, or the progressive sorites; while in the other the movement is from the most inclusive term to the least inclusive term, or the regressive sorites.

Progressive sorites
All four-footed beasts are quadrupeds;
All quadrupeds are vertebrates;
All vertebrates are animals;
All animals are sacred;
Hence, all four-footed beasts are sacred.

Regressive sorites
All animals are sacred;
All vertebrates are animals;
All quadrupeds are vertebrates;
All four-footed beasts are quadrupeds;
Hence, all four-footed beasts are sacred.

An ingenious paragrapher contrived the following absurdity in soritical form:

The more you study, the more you know;
The more you know, the more you forget;
The more you forget, the less you know;
So, why study?
The less you study, the less you know;
The less you know, the less you forget;
The less you forget, the more you know;
So, why study?

The debater will at first find difficulty in applying syllogistic logic to his debate practice. This is due to the fact that arguments are not given in their complete logical form; syllogisms themselves are usually expressed as enthymemes. In a debate, they are concluded by words that express more than the terms of the proposition; they express the attendant and correlative ideas as well, and from the concealment of verbiage it is difficult to bring to light the skeleton of argument, the syllogism. There should be no discouragement in this. An understanding of how conclusions are reached in the syllogism should help the debater to realize that they can only be drawn from premises that make a conclusion obvious beyond all doubt. If there is doubt in the conclusion reached in any argument, then the debater should apply the tests of syllogistic logic and satisfy himself that the conclusion is or is not a valid deduction of the premises.
4. Inductive Reasoning.

Inductive reasoning is the derivation of laws from instances. One throws a ball into the air; it falls to earth. An arrow shot into the air returns to earth. Fruit falls from the tree when it is ripe. From these instances the mind is led to accept as true, that "what goes up must come down," or the law of gravitation. This is induction, or inductive reasoning. The mind makes a leap into the realm of the unknown, called the "inductive leap," and after the leap returns with a law or rule in its grasp that henceforth is accepted as approximately true.

Inductive reasoning usually occurs concomitantly with deductive reasoning, for the premises of the syllogism can only be established by inductive reasoning. The two go hand in hand to test our reasoning faculties.

Man continually observes particulars for he must derive laws from these particulars. If he is able to isolate all particulars to be grouped by their characteristics under a general law, and make an induction that takes all members of the class into account, he is said to make a perfect induction. Investigation will yield the fact that each state in the union possesses a republican form of government. Forty-eight instances make this fact true. There can be no controversy over this fact, if all instances have been observed to have the one essential characteristic. Perfect induction seldom occurs in a debate, for it is not open to controversy. It is so obvious that the debater need not attempt to prove such induction.

However, from the particulars or instances coming within his observation man often makes inductions to laws, well aware that he has not made perfect inductions; such induction we call generalization. In generalizing, approximate truth is expected, never absolute truth; for not until all the particulars of the class are examined can the truth of an induction be considered established.

(a) Generalization. — Hasty generalization gives rise to some of the absurdities of reasoning prevalent in everyday life. A visitor to a small-town hotel notices one or two bugs on the bed and at once cries out, "This room is alive with bugs." Sometime, in the "Dark Ages," a lady discovered on several occasions that the simple harmless act of a black cat crossing her path was followed in every instance by some misfortune. Several more such observations, and the generalization gained acceptance that a black cat crossing one's path is a sign of bad luck. Thus does superstition thrive on hasty, imperfect generalization and induction. The man who calls all preachers hypocrites usually makes his induction by the observation of only one preacher—the one in his own church.
Every generalization should be tested in three ways: Are enough instances observed to make a generalization? Are the instances observed similar in all vital particulars? Is the resultant generalization reasonable?

(1) Are enough instances observed to make a generalization?—Eskimos have difficulty believing that part of the world is as warm as their part of it is cold. Hawaiians find it hard to imagine that snow occurs in northern countries. Children assume that since candy, cake, and cookies are sweet and good to eat, therefore sweet rat paste is also good to eat. Too often persons will generalize before they have observed a sufficient number of instances to warrant the generalization they make. Their instances are all taken from their own experience and with no effort to ascertain possible degrees of dissimilarity. A European farmer might visit all of the Middle Western States. Since corn and wheat are the predominant crops there, he would return to his native country with the impression that corn and wheat predominate as crops everywhere in the United States. Many foreigners have the impression that all parts of this nation are like the district immediately surrounding New York, since that is all they have seen.

It is necessary that a sufficiently large number of instances be observed in a class so that the probability of a coincidence is more than offset by the support given the generalization through much observation.

In some cases it is extremely hard to generalize until nearly all members of a class are observed. Let us say that we wish to make a statement that all criminals in a certain state are more than 25 years of age. We might examine the records of 900 out of 910 criminals and find they are past 25 years of age. Still we could not say “all” criminals are of that age, until we had examined the other ten. We could say that “practically all” or “by far the majority,” but no generalization could be made of 910 until 910 specimens were examined. In some cases we will find that a sweeping generalization must be supported by perfect induction, where no relationship exists between members of a class.

On the other hand, scientists often make generalizations by observing phenomena of reactions in single instances. They are warranted in doing this because matter reacts according to fixed universal laws, and always reacts the same. Therefore, they have no need to observe more than one instance.

Not long ago a “suicide wave” was said to be sweeping the country in university circles. After the flood of newspaper comment had ebbed, a check revealed the fact that no more suicides had been occurring than in previous years. It happened that some individual prone to generalize,
had noticed several newspaper stories of suicides at about the same time, immediately looked for a few more, and then started a story circulating that there was a suicide wave. Later facts revealed only a normal condition.

(2) *Are the instances observed similar in all vital particulars?*—An examination of several pine trees will lead one to generalize that all pine trees have needles instead of leaves. This is a safe conclusion. But we do not feel that it is a safe conclusion, if we say that all houses are frame houses, since we can find no others. Might we say that the conclusion about the pine trees is inaccurate since there might be other pine trees which have leaves? We do not have such anxiety concerning the conclusion in the first instance, for our study of nature tells us that pine trees are alike in all vital particulars. The natural world, however, does not construct houses. They are made according to the whimsical ideas of man, and there is no reason why two houses should ever be made alike. If the houses are in a locality where no building material except wood is obtainable we might conclude that all houses in that locality are frame houses. But then our instances would be different, for they would embrace specimens forced to be similar in that one particular; that is, that they be made of wood.

Debaters are likely to pick their examples, from which they make generalizations, according to whether they favor or support their contentions. Due regard should be given, however, to whether or not they justify a generalization of the entire class. If they do not, the debater can reasonably expect to be answered in rebuttal by the revelation of that fact.

Now and then the acceptance of one fact will enable us to support generalizations, even if we do not know that we have similar instances. For instance, the influence of custom amounts to law in many places. It is the custom, we learn, in China, to worship ancestors. Knowing this is a custom, one or two observations make a generalization justified, for the force of custom on a backward nation has been tested by other generalizations in times previous.

A common generalization that is faulty because of dissimilar instances is, that a college education does not pay. A few of the poorer class of students are observed in a community, trying to earn a living; and at once someone of a conservative nature makes the sweeping statement that a college education does not pay. He has observed a few instances which are not similar in vital particulars to those of the class. The class "college graduates" should not be judged by its lower element. Instead, the average should be used. Likewise it is unfair to say that a college education pays big sums by counting the income of superior students, who have become famous
and have their names in *Who's Who in America.*
(3) *Is the resultant generalization reasonable?*—This process of forming laws from instances may lead us astray at times. It is not a perfect, fool-proof system of gathering truths or approximate truths. Superstition is rash generalization, but even if it were not rash generalization, the tenets it secures from observation of certain phenomena may be untrustworthy because of the unreasonableness of the phenomena. Thus, the incident of the black cat crossing one’s path might be followed in every case by a misfortune. The same thing might be true in the lives of other individuals. There might not be an exception. Still the conclusion can be tested by determining whether it is reasonable to suppose that the incident of the black cat crossing the path caused or attributed in any way to the misfortune that followed. Is there any conceivable relation there? It might be mere coincidence, as in the case of two persons thinking of the same thing at the same time. Until mental telepathy is proved to be a fact, the event will be passed off as a coincidence.

The fact that the weather turns rainy during every commencement week arouses in some indignant alumnus the conclusion, “It rains every commencement week.” The unseemly regularity does not establish any relation between the two “events.”

Such generalizations are tested by the reason-
Outside the harbor the measureless expanse of smooth water lay sparkling like a floor of jewels, and as empty as the sky.

He resembled a bundle of wet rags.

He looked as ridiculously lamentable as a doll that had lost half its sawdust.—Conrad, “Nigger of the Narcissus.”

The parables of Christ are analogies of this type. Comparison with the lilies of the field, the parable of the mustard seed, of the vine, of the sower, of the two debtors, of the light under the bushel. In addition, the homely proverbs, when used to justify a course of action, are figurative analogies:

A stitch in time saves nine.
A penny saved is a penny earned.
A small leak will sink a great ship.

Poor Richard’s Almanac.

Metaphors are also figurative analogies:

The Russian soldier is a bear.
Mr. Johnson is a banana king.
This little girl is an angel.

In the year 1795, in Paris, an interesting application of the analogy occurred when two soldier-philosophers, Gaston Gourmet and Paul Toutete indulged in conversation. In the course of the talk Gourmet said he was fond of all vegetables except spinach. Toutete, a Republican, saw in this partiality the taint of monarchism and privilege.

“Well, you know,” he demanded, “that all vegetables were created free and equal? Is spinach any less in the eyes of the Supreme Being than green beans or Brussels sprouts?”

“Well may be,” replied Gourmet, “but the fact remains that I dislike spinach.”

“Be careful, my friend,” warned Toutete, “this is a dangerous doctrine of yours. All special privilege and prejudice must be rooted out. . . . If you deny justice to the lowly spinach, how can the Republic be sure you will not try to restore the prejudices of the Old Regime?”

At this, Gourmet flung his glass of wine into Toutete’s face, whereupon the latter reported the incident to the Committee of Safety. Gourmet was promptly brought to the bar, declared guilty, and guillotined as a royalist.

The most practical type of analogy, however, is the literal analogy. In this form, a comparison is made from one instance whose attributes are accepted as true to another instance whose attributes are not all accepted as true. This amounts to a generalization from a single instance. It is trustworthy only if the two instances bear more resemblance than difference.

In long distance airplane flying an analogy was drawn from the fact that an airplane could remain in the air over solid ground for fifty hours
and travel all that time at 80 miles per hour or more, that therefore an airplane could cross the ocean. The analogy was apt, except in one particular; that is, that the weather conditions are different on the ocean than on land. Likewise after the first airplane flight across the Atlantic from west to east, European aviators drew the analogy that a flight from east to west was also possible. This analogy was also faulty, for weather conditions are usually more adverse when traveling west than when traveling east.

A great deal of human rashness is due to faulty analogy. That Edison can exist on six hours sleep or less does not mean that anyone can do so. "If he can do it, I can do it," has cost many lives, for two persons are not similarly constituted, as any prize fight will demonstrate. Neither can any prediction be made with certainty that since one person can, another can too. The human body is not subject to the same tests of capacity as a machine. If an automobile runs 1000 miles without engine trouble, one can expect it to run another 1000 miles without developing engine trouble; but if a man can eat 30 bananas one hour, it does not follow he can eat 30 bananas the next hour. In both cases fuel is consumed, but in the one case it is consumed as fast as it is fed, and in the other case it is not.

A frequent analogy made in scholastic debating is that of conditions in the United States and foreign countries. In a debate on the establishment of a Department of Education in the United States, one debater reasoned that such departments were successes in European countries, and therefore such a department would be a success in the United States. His opponent broke down the analogy as follows:

The conditions in the two countries are vastly different. In the first place, ours is a representative form of government, and each state has jurisdiction over education within its boundaries. We would have, in fact, forty-eight departments of education, if we were to draw an analogy with foreign countries.

Moreover, European nations are so much smaller than the United States that one department will suffice for each of them, while the United States is as large as all Europe, and with conditions so different in the various states one department would have vastly different problems to handle from those which such departments in European nations have.

An analogy was then drawn to show that the United States has a poor system of education because it ranks ninth among the great nations in per cent of illiteracy. This analogy was broken down in this way:

Again the comparison between the United States and foreign countries with respect to illiteracy is unfair. In the first place, the United States is a young country compared to European countries, and hence it has not had enough time to remove the illiteracy of natives. Furthermore the United States re-
ceives vast numbers of immigrants who rank low in literacy. This immigration lowers our literacy score and raises that of foreign countries from which the immigrants come.

Lastly, the analogy is unfair unless it takes in all Europe in comparison with the United States. Iowa has less than 1% illiteracy. This compares favorably with the first four nations of the world in percent of illiteracy. On the other hand, if all European nations are compared to the United States we find that the illiteracy in the United States is less than that of all Europe. The gentlemen of the opposition have made comparisons between the best of European nations and the United States instead of between the average of European nations and this country.

Senator Glass of Virginia destroyed an attempt to draw an analogy between the attitude of the South on the question of negro suffrage and the position of persons intent upon nullifying the eighteenth amendment by this statement:

If one were to impute literal truth to the alleged analogy, the conclusive answer would be that the South's resistance to the fifteenth amendment was intended to avert the wretched consequences of the unspeakable crime involved in the adoption of the amendment. It was done in the passions of war, and constituted an attempt to destroy white civilization in nearly one-third of the nation and to erect on its ruins an Ethiopian state, ignorant, profligate, corrupt, controlled by manumitted slaves not one per cent of them semi-literate, and these led by a band of white miscreants, execrated figures in the nightmare of reconstruction.

On the other hand resistance to the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment and the statute enacted in pursuance thereof is not designed to avert crime, but to facilitate it. In effect, it amounts to condonation. It is intended to stimulate defiance of both the constitution and the law.

At the time of the World War people drew the analogy that because Napoleon, dreaming of world conquest, was a menace to the safety of mankind, therefore Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany, also dreaming of world conquest, was a similar menace, and hence should be vanquished.

The tests of analogy are three: (1) Are the two instances alike in enough particulars to warrant the conclusion? (2) Are the facts supporting the two instances accepted as true? (3) Is the conclusion reasonable?

Analogy is a stimulative form of argument. The conclusions reached by analogy are never firmly established until they are authenticated by other types of argument. The fact that analogy can be made should stimulate the debater to find other kinds of argument whereby he may support the conclusion from analogy. Analogy is a popular form of argument because it makes a vivid impression upon the mind, and because it is very easy to understand.

(c) Causal relation.—Argument, by means of the causal relationship existing between two objects, consists of three classes: (1) argument from effect to cause, (2) argument from cause to effect,
b. Could other causes conceivably operate to produce the effect?—An anemic youth fails to get his lessons. He is found to be delinquent in studying; in fact, he will not study except when forced to do so. The instructor concludes that he is lazy. The modesty of the youth may conceal the real cause, namely, that his eyes are strained in studying, and hence he cannot study except a few minutes at a time.

c. Did the supposed cause take place?—A farmer notices that his stock is becoming thinner and thinner. He is told by another that a certain weed common in pastures is poisonous, and probably the cause of the impoverished condition of the stock. The farmer might accept this statement as true, but if no poisonous weeds are found in the pastures frequented by his stock, he must conclude that the supposed cause is not the real cause.

(2) Cause to effect.—The purpose of this class of argument is to prove that a certain known cause is due to an unobserved effect. Predictions and forecasts are the result of cause-to-effect reasoning. By observation of certain antecedent incidents a conclusion is reached that these incidents will result in a certain effect. This is called a priori reasoning.

This is a familiar type of argument in criminal trials. Attorneys attempt to justify a criminal’s actions by showing that certain known causes were operative, and that these causes could only produce one effect. Let us say a boy is accused of having robbed his mother. It is shown that he has huge gambling debts, that he has no job from which to secure money to pay these debts, that he knows his mother has money, and where it is hidden, that he has on a previous occasion stolen money from her; therefore because these causes are operative suspicion should focus on the accused son.

Before accepting the conclusion of cause-to-effect argument the following tests should be satisfactorily met by the case:

a. Could the cause expressed produce the alleged effect?—A small cause can hardly produce a large effect, unless it is a strong cause. In the above example, if the boy was in debt for the sum of ten cents it is hardly probable that he would steal a large amount of money from his mother to pay back the ten cents.

b. Must the effect inevitably follow from the cause?—Before the relationship of cause to effect can be accepted, it must be shown that the observed causes and no other causes produced the effect. This rule is tested by experience. If spring rains continue for weeks we can say that rivers will rise as a result. Knowing there have been heavy snows in the mountains, the same effect might result without spring rains.

c. Is there a counteracting force to prevent
the effect?—A scarcity of laborers may prevent full operation of a factory. This would result in increased prices for the restricted supply of the commodity. At the same time the increase in prices might be offset by a corresponding decrease in the cost of raw material from other regions. The cause “scarcity of laborers” would not operate to produce the effect “increased prices” because of a counteracting force “decrease in cost of raw material.”

(3) Effect to effect.—The argument of effect to effect purposes to prove that a known effect, resulting from a known cause, is evidence that an unobserved effect elsewhere has also resulted from the known cause. It is a fusion of the two classes of argument, effect-to-cause, and cause-to-effect.

In the spring one notices that fruit trees blossom, the birds return from the south, and all vegetation about the house begins to grow abundantly. These effects are the result of the temperateness of the spring weather. Observation of these effects leads one to believe that violets and other wild flowers are blooming in the woods, and a trip there proves that this reasoning is correct.

What steps are involved in this bit of reasoning? First, from the effects of spring one learns the cause. Having learned the cause, he deduces from it other effects. It is the joint use of the first two types of causal-relation arguments that enables him to reach conclusions that seem to result

from effect to effect. Therefore the test of validity of such reasoning consists of the tests for the former two types of causal-relation reasoning, which are described above.

5. A Final Word about Argument.

When the student looks at his evidence and then at the choice of argumentative method available he will be bewildered to know just how to proceed. How will he put his evidence into syllogistic form, how will he establish analogies, causal relations, and make them apparent to an audience?

It is not only difficult but impractical to attempt to use evidence only by applying the forms of argument. Evidence alone is material for proof. Argument makes its use more effective and makes it go farther in the direction of proof.

If the debater can find reasons for his proposition, and use evidence in support of those reasons, he will unconsciously be applying the forms of argument given in this chapter. He should not feel that he must be conscious of every argumentative process before it is used. Argument, for one who can support his position by thinking and reasoning, takes care of itself in an unobtrusive way, as it should. In most debates it is not skill in arguing, but skill in presenting evidence, that wins the decision.

The debater can well disregard a close study of
argument, if he finds himself making good in his reasoning. Later he can revert to it to strengthen his point of view, and to test his reasoning. The forms of argument do their most good in review, rather than in the formulation of cases.

Most everyone uses the forms of argument every day, but since they are not classified or recognized by symbol, he is not aware of the structure of his own arguments. It is for the sake of testing inferences that argument is most commonly studied in connection with debate.

Chapter VI

Assembling the Proof

Once the student has before him his material and his tools, and knows how to use the latter, he is ready to begin the construction work—building the case. The building of the case involves the assembling of proof, formulation of a brief, and the final composition of the speeches. These three steps are the subject matter of the following three chapters.

1. Clarifying the Proposition.

The first important requisite in using materials is to know what they are to be used for. In debating little systematic construction can proceed until the proposition itself, on which the superstructure of proof is to be built, is clearly understood in all particulars. The clarifying of the proposition, which furnishes material for most first affirmative speeches, is a fourfold task. The four divisions of this task will be taken up in the order of importance:

(a) Explaining the terms of the proposition. The terms of the proposition are the nouns, phrases, and clauses which make up the subject matter. In the proposition, "Resolved, that the
United States government should own and operate the railroads,” the terms are “United States government,” “own and operate,” and “railroads.” Most propositions involve one or more terms that have a vague or ambiguous meaning. If the debate proceeds without an interpretation and agreement of the terms, there may be no clash of argument. The teams may be arguing about different propositions. To the affirmative is given the burden of defining the terms, and since this task should be done early in the debate, the first affirmative speaker assumes the task. If the explanation which the first speaker makes is left unchallenged by the negative, it is deemed acceptable. If the negative prefers to dispute the explanation, the first negative should do so, stating his reasons.

In explaining the terms of the proposition it is not always necessary to define them. Merely explaining the sense in which they are used in the debate, their inclusive or exclusive properties, is all that is required. Definition is sometimes the easiest way to give a full explanation. Dictionary definitions will be found unsatisfactory, as a rule, for the terms have a different meaning within the proposition, in most cases, from that which they have when isolated from their text. The dictionary gives only their isolated interpretation. Debaters are called upon to formulate their own definitions at times, and a common-sense interpre-
is only a privilege that debaters have in order to make the way clear for their case, and to eliminate what they deem superfluities.

Waived matter consists of matter that the two teams agree to put aside in the debate, in order to narrow the point at issue and restrict the grounds of the debate. Often waived matter is stated in the question, as, "Resolved, that Congress should adopt the Curtis-Reed bill, constitutionality waived."

(c) Cause of the discussion.—A statement as to the cause of the discussion will often make clear what aspects of the question are vital. It will also tell what later developments have done to put a new slant upon the proposition. Giving the cause also serves to aid in gaining the attention of listeners who have a contrary view as to the cause of the discussion.

(d) History of the controversy.—An understanding of the history behind the controversy provides background for the dispute, and in some cases it is essential to a clear interpretation and knowledge of what is at issue. A question of policy invariably calls for a history of the question. The advisability of a change in policy, or the creation of a new policy cannot proceed very far until the past policy is revealed in the light of history: In the proposition, "Resolved, that cabinet members should have a right to the floors of Congress," it is fundamental to know by what law or rule they are excluded. This involves searching the past. Have they ever had the right? Have such measures ever been before the public before? Is this an old controversy, brought to life again? Is the reason for their exclusion at some previous time still operative? Is it a question of precedent? Only history will answer these questions to the satisfaction of the audience and the debaters.

Usually there are plenty of historical data on every widely debated proposition. The debater finds his chief difficulty in excluding the non-essential details and reducing his exposition of the historical background to a few minutes' speaking time. The history may be basic to argument, but it is not argument; and the debater does not want to present any more than is essential to his case, and to a clear understanding on the part of his hearers as to the basis he proceeds on in his reasoning.

If the history of the question reveals some fact detrimental to the affirmative case, it should not be concealed. Let it be known, for it is certain to crop out in the course of the debate sometime, and with damaging reflection upon him who recited the history.


The determination of the issues for a debate is one of the most vital of all steps leading to the
debate. The selection of issues enables the debater to include or exclude certain evidence and argument; and if he is injudicious in the selection and determination he may find himself confronted with a lot of proof which cannot be used because it does not fit under the issues.

(a) What are issues?—By issues are meant the principal questions of dispute, the proof or disproof of which is necessary to establish the affirmative or negative contentions. The issues, then, are the big "points" to be proved in the debate. In exact use of terminology the word "issue" refers to a question. In debate circles, however, it is common to speak of the affirmative or negative declaration of this question as an "issue." Thus on the proposition, "Resolved, that a system of compulsory voting should be adopted in the United States," one of the issues might be:

Is it compatible with the Constitution?

The affirmative case would contain as one of its main points to be proved, the contention that such a system of compulsory voting is compatible with the Constitution. The negative case might contain as a major contention the exact obverse of this statement. It is common to speak of these declarations of issues as issues, although they are only affirmative and negative contentions about the issue. They are spoken of in this book, however, as issues, since that is the common usage of the term.

(b) How are the issues found?—There is no royal road to the finding of issues. They are not snatched "aus der blau"; no witchery or thaumaturgical skill yields them to the waiting hand of the debater. They are ascertained from reflection upon the proposition after a thorough study of both sides of the question. The issues lie in wait, and are determinable by the orderly process of thinking out for oneself what is involved in the proposition. They cannot be conjured up by will or skill; they reveal themselves automatically when the debater knows with a high degree of certainty what the controversy is about.

The surest way to arrive at issues is to contrast the strong arguments favoring the two sides. Where there is an affirmation and negation of a certain point in dispute, one is likely to deduce a sound issue. One-sidedness in a point advanced by either side is almost conclusive proof that that point is not an issue, or indicative of an issue. Every issue is about equally arguable by the affirmative and negative. Besides the contrast of arguments, a way to ascertain issues is to ask the question: What is vital for the affirmative or negative? That is, what is there in the proposition that either side cannot leave out of its proof, and win. If certain proof is absolutely essential, it is invariably the sign of an issue.

(c) Stock issues.—Debate handbooks and brief books use stock issues over and over. Stock issues
plex a proposition for debating that would yield a dozen issues. At most a debater will find only three or four issues in a debatable proposition. Let him then not expect to find a Pandora’s box full of issues. Sometimes there is only one issue in a debate proposition, often only two.

The fault inexperienced persons commit is that of thinking issues are determinable by the number of persons speaking on a side. If two speakers, then two issues, or multiples thereof. If three speakers, then three issues, or multiples thereof. The partitioning of speeches among team members is in no way associated with the selection of issues. Let that be understood. It is convenient to have the same number of issues as speakers, but not at all necessary. Any attempt to make issues and speakers agree numerically is likely to be ruinous later on. Two issues can be allocated to three speakers as easily as three issues. So can one issue be divided among three. One speaker can prove part of one contention in support of an issue as easily as he can prove all of it, and there need be no awkwardness in announcing that “the next speaker will continue the argument in support of this contention.”

(e) Wording of issues.—Issues should be announced in the first affirmative speech, as the affirmative has analyzed the question. They should be worded simply and in unequivocal terms, so that only one meaning can be assigned
to them. The longer one considers the wording of an issue, the shorter it can be made. Brevity, however, should be sacrificed for the sake of clearness and definiteness. In turn, the contentions resulting from the issues and around which the proof is centered should be made brief and explicit.

(f) Inclusiveness and exclusiveness of issues. —It should be possible for most of the accumulated proof to be pigeonholed under the issues taken as a whole. If they do not permit this, it is likely the issues do not take in all that is essential in the proof or disproof of the proposition.

Likewise the issues should be mutually exclusive. No point in advance of one issue should fit in under another issue for proof. If the issues are not mutually exclusive, they are probably not accurately worded; or, as sometimes happens, there are two issues worded where one will do. If some point in proof will fit in under two issues it is indicative that the two issues are not exclusive.

3. The Affirmative Case.

The debater assails the affirmative case with one principle in mind; that is, that the affirmative has the burden of proof and must uphold it. What "burden of proof" is, is not so definite, but the expression "the affirmative has the burden of proof" occurs so often by challenging negative speakers in debates that even the general public accepts the phrase.

The affirmative case is one advancing something new, whether a new fact or a new policy. It must have reasons for advocating something new. The obligation of advancing reasons in support of a departure from present fact or policy is called the burden of proof. In debate the side that has the burden of proof will lose if it does nothing. If the negative does nothing, it still may not lose, for the affirmative may not do anything; but if the affirmative does nothing, the negative can’t do anything. The burden of proof may shift to the negative in case the negative advances a plan that is new. In strictness this is not a shifting of burden of proof, but a shifting of the burden of proceeding. In reality the burden of proof never shifts, but remains with the team that carries the obligation of something new that is advocated. It is the burden of proceeding that shifts from one side to another; it is the burden of coming forward with evidence to meet a preponderance of it on the other side. Therefore, if the negative wish to meet the affirmative case with an alternate plan they have the burden with respect to that plan as well as the burden of proceeding against the affirmative case on its other issues.

Most affirmative cases are strong in resemblance, for there is not much variation possible on
the affirmative side. With the burden of proving the “Why” of its proposal it has sufficient foundation on which to build a strong case. The fact that the negative can anticipate the trend of an affirmative case more easily than the affirmative can anticipate a negative attack does not mean that debate favors the negative. The presumption is always with the present state of affairs, but he who is content with things as they are is not likely to find all possible reasons why things should be as they presently are not.

The affirmative case must establish beyond doubt the crucial issues in the debate. All issues are not crucial, for sometimes issues are only additional props to which the controversy can shift in case others are settled. Suppose the proposition is, “Resolved, that Congress should pass a ‘Department of Aviation’ bill.” Necessity is likely to be a crucial issue in a debate on that proposition. The affirmative case must make proof of necessity its first goal; if it finds that the constructive argument of necessity does not stand up under the negative attack, it should arrange the remaining affirmative speeches so that constructive rebuttal can be inserted to bolster up the crucial contention. The use of compartment speeches, to be explained later, makes such rearrangement of speech matter possible.

A variation from the usual affirmative case is brought about by putting all the constructive argument in all but the last main speech. The time of this last main speech is then taken up in constructive refutation, on an issue devised as soon as the negative contentions are announced. There is a forced clash on at least one main issue. The issue may be:

The affirmative plan does not introduce the evils the negative complains of.

or

The affirmative plan is not guilty of the faults the negative has proposed.

It is likely that the negative will advance a counterproposal; then the constructive refutation will be on this contention:

The negative plan will not produce the benefits expected of it.

The last speech is then extemporaneous refutation, which the last speaker has organized after hearing the negative case. If the negative counterproposal is left till the last negative speech, of course, the affirmative will have no chance to use constructive refutation against it; it will have to attack in rebuttal.

Constructive refutation is deadly, for it is an offensive weapon used by a commonly defensive side. It cannot be handled successfully except by experienced debaters, for skill in grasping on the moment the gist of the opponents’ arguments
and formulating a strong reply is required in good refutation. There is a limit to the amount of constructive refutation that can be used, for the affirmative must have sufficient time to present a case for attack. Certain constructive argument is vital, for the affirmative has the burden of proof. However, it is not necessary for all affirmative speeches to consist of constructive argument; one can very well spend his entire speech refuting the strong points of the negative. This makes the clash in the debate so much sooner, and the interest in the debate correspondingly increases.

When the affirmative are advocating a change of policy, and are burdened with suggesting and proving the efficacy of a certain method or plan to bring about this change of policy, they have recourse to considerable originality. They may not suggest the plan until the last speech. Although this is not considered in all circles as ethical, nevertheless the last speech is the logical place for the new plan. In the formulation of this plan the affirmative have a chance to support their case strongly. In presenting a new plan, one entirely unknown or untried in any particular will create a presumption against it. It is better to present a plan which is, in some way, analogous to one that has been tried elsewhere and proved a success. It is pure folly to expect debaters to invent a scheme that will do wonders, which experienced men have never thought of. But withal, the affirmative can put novel ideas in their plan that will be hard to meet by the negative team.

If the proposition is negatively worded the affirmative is confronted with a novel situation. Suppose the question reads: "Resolved, that force should not be used in the settlement of labor disputes." In this question the affirmative need only prove that force should not be used. However, if nothing else is done, the audience is left with a question before it. If not force, then what? "You of the affirmative propose to better conditions, yet you take away one remedy and leave none in its place." Strictly within the confinement of the question, the affirmative have no obligation to suggest something else than force; but the unsettled state in which this leaves the question makes it almost imperative that the affirmative suggest another plan. A late debate question read: "Resolved, that the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands." That question does not force the affirmative to say what the United States should do to protect capital, but if that is not done the situation is left worse than it is; and debating should be practical rather than technical upon such matters. Another point to consider is that only debate coaches and debate students are familiar with this technicality, and
if the debate is a decision debate, it is better to assume the added burden on the affirmative.

Affirmative analysis of a question sometimes calls for close attention to the phraseology of the proposition. In the one just quoted, “Resolved, that

1. the United States should cease to protect
2. by armed force capital invested in foreign lands,”

the affirmative might make the mistake of thinking it had to debate 1 and 2, that the United States must no longer protect, or it might argue 1, 2, and 3, that from now on there is to be no more protection by armed force, or it might mistakingly argue 1, 2, and 4; that capital is to go unprotected. But what the affirmative should argue is 1, 2, 3, and 4. Therefore the affirmative can argue:

That although the United States should cease to protect, it does not mean that the United States, if party to an international agency that will not cease to protect, is doing the protection that the question implies,

or

That capital is still to be protected, although it is no longer to be protected by armed force.

Analyses of questions are not always easy. On the question, “Resolved, that the nineteenth amendment should be adopted,” numerous debate teams used as a contention, “The amendment is unconstitutional.” This is the error that stock issues lead one into committing. The debaters that declared the amendment unconstitutional were missing the entire point under discussion; namely, that this amendment be made constitutional. The fact that it is now unconstitutional was at once admitted by the other side, who thus completely negated the erroneous contention; they then went ahead to advance their reasons in favor of making the amendment constitutional.

An outline of an affirmative case, including all essentials that should be presented in every debate, is here given, to help the student in not overlooking what he must consider in building up an affirmative brief:

1. Statement of question, and restatement.
2. Explanation of terms.
3. Narrowing of question.
4. Why it is a current topic for discussion.
5. History of the question.
7. Proof of contentions, etc.
8. Summary.

4. The Negative Case.

The negative case admits of much more variation than the affirmative. The negative side is the side of attack; it is offensive in form. The negative is also the questioning side. Why
change? How do you know that is true? Who wants this new policy? What makes it essential? Negative speakers are conservative in their attitude toward the affirmative. They have the "show me" point of view; their motto is, "Prove it."

Besides bearing in mind that the negative side is the side of attack, one must consider that the attack be directed to the affirmative stand taken in the debate, not any affirmative stand. The attack must be upon the position assumed by the particular opposing team in the debate.

There are four possible lines of attack that the negative may take. It may make a denial of the affirmative case, and prove its denial either by disproving affirmative contentions, or by supporting the present situation. The negative may gain ground by admitting the affirmative contentions demanding a change from the present; and either present a different plan entirely new, or one based upon rehabilitation of a present plan. These four possible lines of attack, put briefly, are:

**Denial.**


b. Refutation by upholding the present. Part defensive.

**Admission.**

a. Admit change necessary; present better plan. Offensive.

b. Admit change necessary; show advantage of improving present plan. Part defensive.

The negative case builder must remember that if the affirmative prove the need of a change, the case is not complete. The affirmative still must present a "best" plan. Therefore, with a case incomplete on proving the first contention of "need," if that is the first contention, the negative may admit the need, and deny the method; and win.

The first method, that of pure refutation, consists of refuting the affirmative contentions by anticipating them and organizing carefully the refutation and rebuttal. Under this plan the negative speeches consist entirely of adverse proof on major points. The fact that the negative proof does not in every way correspond and clash with the affirmative makes no difference provided the negative analysis has penetrated deep enough to reach and attack the issues. The negative case presents adverse proof on all issues.

The second method, that of upholding the present, takes advantage of the fact that the present state of affairs is considered ideal until proved otherwise. Instead of directing an attack against the affirmative contentions, the negative says to his opponent, "Regardless of what arguments you have, here are the present conditions. What's wrong with them?" This is a very conservative stand for the negative to take, and should be used in connection with the first method to make a strong case. Then the nega-
tive has a double-barrelled attack, and should it fail to prove one of the contentions, the other might still be defensible.

To admit anything in a debate is playing a dangerous role. Nevertheless if the negative finds that the affirmative is advancing a fallacious plan, it can sometimes show an apparent invulnerability in its own alternate plan by admitting part of the crucial contentions of the affirmative, and thus shift the debate over to the comparison of the merits of the two plans. As mentioned above, the negative can devise an entirely new plan, or it can make a variation of the second method, and stand for mere improvement of the present plan of operation. Then the negative adopts the standpat attitude, but one that is frequently in favor with audiences on local problems. Man is by nature conservative, and when a team advances a plan novel and daringly unique, it has the prejudice against it to contend with and overcome. No one trusts a debater with finding the elysium of social machinery. Therefore, he had better trust to what has gone before, or what is recommended on high authority, rather than become an innovator of too novel ideas.

In a debate on child labor, the affirmative spent two speeches showing the evils of child labor and the consequences thereof. It then advanced an amendment to give Congress regulative power. The negative team admitted the evils and consequences; it then went on to show that the evil was due to the wrong method of treatment, namely, legislation, and since state legislation had failed, so would national legislation. The negative next advanced a program of education. The affirmative had taken for granted that legislation was the only means to curb child labor. This being so, it was taken by surprise and its case fell for want of striking rebuttal on the unusual negative attack.

In these four lines of attack which the negative may make there are several successful combinations possible. A combination of different lines of attack gives the advantage of propping the negative case up on several "legs." One may be demolished, but there are others to support the case. The fact that one issue, if disproved, will ruin the affirmative stand, does not sanction the negative basing all its strength upon this one line of attack. After all, the audience, being human, looks at the two cases as units opposed, and it is the whole affirmative case against the whole negative case that stands out in the minds of judges and other hearers.

A debate squad that prepares affirmative and negative cases simultaneously is apt to phrase the negative main contentions like the affirmative, except that they are negatively worded. The affirmative contention "It is a justifiable policy" becomes "It is not a justifiable policy," and so
the two briefs are directly counterpoised. A squad should not feel that there is direct relation between affirmative and negative contentions except insofar as they represent pro and con arguments on the same proposition. Sometimes a better negative case can be made by forgetting the affirmative analysis, and reanalyzing the whole case in the light of accumulated negative evidence. It is not advisable to copy main points from one case to another. Each side in a debate has a different aspect toward the question, or should have, than that expressed in the words "for" and "against."

The essentials of a negative case are:

1. Accept or reject explanation of terms; or supply, if omitted by affirmative.
2. Accept or reject statement of waived matter; challenge irrelevant matter if not irrelevant to negative point of view.
3. If history of question needs revision, revise it.
4. State negative issues.
5. Disprove affirmative contentions, or make other attacks.

CHAPTER VII

BRIEF CONSTRUCTION

1. Why Make a Brief?

When the debater begins to assemble the proof he finds that he will never be able to use all the material he has gathered in a debate. There must be some selection, and selection on an organized basis. Merely evaluating individual bits of proof, weighing arguments, estimating the sufficiency of evidence, will not do. The construction of a brief is the solution to the problem.

The brief is an outline of the materials of proof, together with the heads and subheads linking them with the mass that makes the proof of the proposition. A detailed brief, then, is the skeleton of the speeches which are to follow in order of construction.

When a brief is to be made the proportion of different arguments and evidence in the whole case becomes apparent. Not until this time can one accurately determine just what amount of time to give to the proof of one point and the proof of another. The brief enables this difficulty to assume definiteness, so that it can be cared for.
In briefing, proof sorting is accomplished. That which is not so valuable can be eliminated, or put into the secondary file, for later use, or for card indexing. The unfinished brief enables one to ascertain what proof is not at hand, and what must be obtained to substantiate certain desirable and essential points in the plan of the case. In listing the proof under the proper divisions in the brief, the debater learns where the leaks are, and where bolstering up must be done to make the case strong on every point.

Once the brief is completed the organization of the whole case is also complete. The briefing process is one of calculating how the proposition is to be proved in an orderly, logical way, and then listing the points and their proof in order of presentation, so that that aim is accomplished. The unity of the case is guaranteed by a good brief. The debater sees the case in entirety. If he is planning the affirmative brief he can make his rebuttal plans from the brief; by noting where, in his own case, the negative is likely to make their greatest attack, and how. From this foresight he can lay his plans for bolstering up in a defensive way his own case, and at the same time find corresponding weaknesses in the negative case.

Brief making is one of the dreaded but necessary steps in sound preparation for modern debating.

2. How the Brief is Made.

The brief is made by assembling the contentions, together with their substatements and proof, in order of presentation in the speeches. To accomplish this the form given here is most satisfactory:

I. The contention.
   A. A main point.
      1. A minor point.
         a. Proof.
         b. Proof.

This form of subordination presents the proof and ties it up with the proposition in a logical way. The stepping down from one division to another is not done haphazardly, but with a view toward building a logical structure of proof. The connection between I. and A. and between A. and 1. is supplied by mentally inserting either the word "for" or "because" after each step—thus:

I. The contention is true, for
   A. The main point is true; and it is true, for
      1. This minor point is true; and this is true, for
         a. Here is the proof, and
         b. Here is more proof to support it.

Applied to an actual contention in a debate, we have:
I. Government operation of railroads is practical, for
   A. It was practical during the World War, for
      1. In that period railroads prospered, for
         a. Their earnings, in proportion to
            their expenses, were greater, as is
            shown by the following facts:

   As will be seen the various steps preceding the one
containing the proof are not proof, but state-
ments about proof. The proof is left to the last
step, where it makes the preceding chain of rea-
soning sustained as proved.

   There can be a duality of points just as well as
a singleness of points, as:

I. Government operation of railroads is practical, for
   A': It was practical in the United States dur-
   ing the World War, and
   A'': It was practical in Europe for many years
      prior to and during the World War.

As will be seen, the brief is divided into its larg-
est divisions by the major contentions to be
proved, inasmuch as these are the most inclusive
points raised in the debate. The number of
speeches used to present the case in no way affects
the construction of the brief or its partitioning.
That is governed wholly by the construction of
the case itself and expediency. If the conten-
tions, then, are pro and con statements of the
issues, the issues themselves are revealed in the
largest division statements in the brief.

With the major contentions before him in the
unfinished brief, the debater must analyze and
deduce the main and minor points from the im-
pressions in his mind, a review of his notes, his
evidence cards, and his general concept of the
problem. Keeping in mind the rules of brief
making which follow, he need have no trouble
preparing the outline which is to serve as his
guide in presenting his argument in the speeches.

The only addition to the brief that is feasible,
outside of the actual outline of the proof, is the
outline of the introductory matter to be used by
the first affirmative speaker. This may as well
be included in the brief, for it usually takes up a
considerable portion of the speaking time.


Although there is no secret in making a brief
of a case any more than there is in making an
outline of a composition or article, still the fol-
lowing rules will help the beginner in determin-
ing how to keep on the right track and eliminate
roundabout methods:

(a) Use the same symbols throughout.—The
symbols used in this chapter are handy, and al-
most universally used. The contentions are pre-
ceed by Roman numerals. Then the capital letters are used, followed by the Arabic numerals, and then the small letters. With the use of the same symbols throughout the briefs, a glance at any of them will tell how many steps lead to proof, what the general organization is, and where stress is being laid. It will also give a clearer view of what comprises the whole case. There is no confusion.

(b) Use only three steps in presenting proof. If too much subordination is inserted the reasoning will be hard to follow. Nothing complicated should result from a brief, for its purpose is to simplify and make clear. Three steps of subordination before proof insertion are sufficient. Three are used in the examples in this chapter. The fact that a maximum is here stated does not mean that there cannot be less than three steps. Sometimes there must be. There may be no subordination under the contention at all. It is possible to have a contention followed directly by proof, with no intermediate steps. The key to the number is, what do the circumstances and the available proof require?

(c) All points should be stated in direct, declarative form.—If this is not done, the brief will not be so easy to understand, and there is likelihood of ambiguity. Suppose a brief were prepared with such incomplete statements following the contention as this:

I. Capital punishment is un-Christian.
   A. The taking of life.
      1. ..............
         a. ..............
   B. Injustice of it.

The "taking of life" might mean "taking of life is justifiable in only certain instances," or "taking of life is in no case justifiable," or "taking of life is contrary to the teaching of the Bible." One does not know the complete meaning from the incomplete statement. "Injustice of it" may mean "Injustice of it makes it un-Christian," or "Injustice of it is revealed by the sixth commandment," or still other meanings. The debater's mind is already filled with multitudinous ideas without adding unnecessary facts to be retained there, when they can be recorded correctly so easily.

The sample brief at the end of this chapter is made up of complete declarative statements, and its full meaning should be clear to anyone who can read it.

(d) Be careful in wording statements.—The statements should state the exact meaning desired, and in clear unmistakable terms. All too often thoughts come more quickly to the debater than he can well phrase them. Jot them down with catch phrases, but do not consider the brief complete until the statements made from
these jottings state precisely the thought desired. Then cut out surplus wording, Latinized words with equivocal meanings, and phrases that obscure the precise meaning. The debater should remember that this phrasing and wording of statements is valuable, for most of these statements are taken verbatim from the brief and inserted in the speeches. They are not only to guide the debater, but to serve as signposts in his finished speeches. Therefore, care now will save precious minutes of explanation later.

(c) Brief must be complete.—Do not let the brief stand complete, if a single point does not "tie up" with the preceding point by the word "for" or "because" inserted before it. Only in this way can the logical structure of the brief be tested quickly and accurately. Debaters are apt to scoff at this suggestion. Nevertheless for many decades it has been proved to be the only reliable offhand test to apply to a classification of arguments, such as the brief is, to guarantee the validity of the chain reasoning employed.

4. Example of a Good Brief.

Notice how the following brief, made up of complete statements, presents the argument of the case so lucidly that any reasonable-minded person, without any knowledge of debating or the problem of child labor, can tell at once what the whole brief is about:

**Affirmative Brief.**

**Proposition:** Resolved, that Congress should submit to the several states a new child-labor amendment.

**Introduction**

The introduction will include a restatement of the question in the light of the definitions of the term "child labor" and "new" amendment. Also a narrowing of the question, a history presented with emotional appeal, and a statement of the issues.

**Brief Proper**

I. A change of policy is necessary (for)

A. Child labor is a national menace that needs regulation (for) (Emotional appeal by recitation of horrors of child labor in typical industries)

1. It is nation-wide.
   a. Forty-eight states have it in varying degrees.

2. There are large numbers involved.
   a. The United States Census shows 1,060,858 between the ages of 10 and 16 gainfully employed.

3. It is on the increase.
   a. Latest estimates by Children's Bureau show increases in representative cities as high as 100% since 1920.

B. The present policy has failed (for)

1. Present laws are inadequate.
   a. The provisions are not extensive enough.
MODERN DEBATE PRACTICE

b. The provisions are weakened by exemptions.

2. Present good laws are not enforced.
   a. Specific examples show this to be true.

3. There is no hope that the present policy will improve.
   a. There has been very slow improvement in the past.
   b. States admitted lately that the Federal control was good, but it has not encouraged better state laws.
   c. Great corporations get a stranglehold on state legislatures.

II. An amendment giving Congress the power to control is the only satisfactory way of handling the problem.

A. Some problems Congress alone can handle.
   1. Interstate problems cannot be handled by the states.
      a. New York-New Jersey case is proof.
      b. Migrations from state to state show this to be true.
      c. States do not hold themselves responsible for migrating children.

B. Congress would better enforce such a law.
   a. States have admitted a Federal law commanded greater respect, and that fewer violations would occur under a Federal law.
   b. States admit Federal law always better enforced.

BRIEF CONSTRUCTION

C. It is a matter of maintaining high standards of citizenship and that is a matter of national concern.
   a. Example of how weak our soldiers were under the draft proves this.
   b. England's example in the Boer War shows what may result.
   c. This is no radical departure from a settled conservation policy.

D. We cannot rely on the states.
   a. Example of the quarantine law supports this point.
   b. Example of the Pure Food and Drug act, etc., also shows weakness of states.
Chapter VIII
PREPARING THE SPEECHES

1. Before Composition.

The substance of this chapter is applicable to the composition of both the main speeches and the rebuttal speeches. However, since the main speeches are prepared carefully before the debate, most of the subject matter is to aid in the preparation of main speeches rather than to lay down principles applying to extempore rebuttal speeches.

How many speeches should there be, and how long? Three main speeches on a side is a sufficient number. To have more means that each speaker will be allotted so little time to speak that he cannot do justice to any topic. To have six main speeches and six rebuttal speeches in addition means a debate lasting almost two hours. A main speech that extends beyond ten minutes is long, and a rebuttal period of that length is also long. The period of rebuttal should be somewhat shorter than the period of delivering main speeches.

It has been pointed out previously in this book that there should be no conscious dividing of speeches according to the contentions made by either side. One issue can be discussed by two speakers as well as one. So three contentions may be divided between two speakers, either by having the first take contentions 1 and 2, or only 1. The choice lies in the amount of time it takes to prove one as compared to the time it takes to prove another.

The question is raised frequently, should the main speeches be written out, or just planned? Remember, we assume that the briefs have been carefully prepared. With these briefs the planning of speeches is already accomplished. The brief is the skeleton of the speeches. However, one factor enters into a debate that is not met with usually in real life, and that is the factor of time. A debater has to "put over" a great deal of organized argument and proof in a few minutes. How will he do it? If he does not prepare his speech carefully, he is apt to wander and digress; he will be running out of time before he has presented his material for proof. Once he fails to do so, the case lacks that essential proof, for his colleague cannot supply it, not having the same familiar acquaintance with it, and having plenty of substance to deliver himself. It would therefore seem best to write out speeches once, so that the debater can estimate how much time is going to be consumed in delivering his part of the case. But as discussed later under the chap-
ter on Delivery for good extemporaneous speaking he had better throw away the speech after he has written it or lay it aside only for reference purposes; he will use his brief or an outline to speak from.

All speeches except the first affirmative should be planned to consume two minutes or so less than the allotted time. This period should be used by the debaters in refutation before the main argument is resumed. That is, the clash of arguments starts early in the main speeches, to make the real issue more apparent, and to lay the groundwork for the rebuttal controversy.

Speech composition is not commenced until all the preliminary work of debating is done. The materials should all be at hand, the analysis accomplished, issues decided upon, and briefs made, before one word is written in the speeches. Definitions, of course, may be planned ahead to help in analyzing the question and constructing the briefs.

2. General Principles.

In speech preparation, both conviction and persuasion should work toward influencing belief or disbelief. Persuasion in speech preparation consists in using sentences that arouse emotional interest, while conviction is the use of sentences to arouse the approval of one's reasoning powers. Persuasion is a broad subject which cannot be
dwelt upon at length here. It should not be discounted, however, for that reason. Its use will sometimes go a long way in making a weak argument effective, and in utilizing to the full strength of reasoning behind a case. In a debate on the wages of labor, a picture of conditions in a miner's home where destitution is prevalent will sometimes arouse sympathy that sells a case better than sound reasoning.

(a) Unity.—The case must stand or fall as one structure. To make it appear as a unit, references back and forth ought to be inserted frequently. "As my colleague just pointed out," "As you noticed in the second speech," "It is apparent then that the three important fundamentals are, as we explained": such connecting and unifying statements as these will help the audience to see the case as a whole. Unity is otherwise obtained by eliminating all deviations from the case. Funny stories may be told, but they should be short. If they are not, they tend to obscure the chain of thought. The brief is a good guide to retain and assert unity in speeches.

(b) Clarity.—Clarity consists of many attributes. Brevity makes for clarity. There should be no waste of verbiage, and yet no skimping if it interferes with clarity. A sentence should not contain complicated grammatical constructions. The thought should be apparent on first reading. Concrete illustrations, homely analogies, figures
of speech, and other aids to visualization, make speech making a bit harder, but considerably more effective. Statistics, for instance, as pointed out in Chapter IV can be made easy to understand, if a little care is used in presenting them properly.

(c) Emphasis.—How may emphasis be acquired? By composition and presentation. In composition emphasis is aided by reiteration. This is the Biblical method. "Blessed are the pure in heart. . . . Blessed are the merciful," "Thou shalt not kill. . . . Thou shall not steal," are typical examples. Continual use of striking phrases that sum up complete arguments so that they burn into the memory and last till long after the debate, these make for emphasis. Sentence structure is also an aid. Putting the strongest point of a sentence at the beginning or end makes it stand out clearly, as in the sentence, "There is only one man who stood between Burr and the presidency: Jefferson." Parallelism brings emphasis through rhythm, as "The rains descended, and the floods came." The frequent use of figures of speech, avoidance of passive voice, climactic order helps to emphasize thoughts that would otherwise command interest only by their meaning.

(d) Style.—There are four recognized styles of debate speaking: declamatory, conversational, oratorical, and dramatic. The declamatory style

is that used in lower grades. It consists in giving a memorized speech according to a prepared formula. It is characterized by its artificiality, and seldom carries conviction. The conversational style is the style of William Jennings Bryan. It is undoubtedly popular and convincing. It consists in talking with and to an audience instead of at an audience. The speaker gets as close to them as he can, and uses the same simple words and offhand expressions as he does when speaking in conversation with an intimate friend. There is no shouting, no declamation, no bombastic oratory; only a soothing sort of thought communication which reaches out and convinces almost at a touch.

The oratorical style is still used sparingly. It accomplishes admiration for the orator rather than for what he says. It is a style of personality, in the sense that the thought of the hearer is directed more to the person than to the remarks. For that reason, unless the audience is highly emotional, it thwarts the aim of debate speeches—to convince by argument. Let the oratorical style be used only on special occasions, and to an audience more easily convinced by emotion than reason. The dramatic style is akin to the oratorical style, but differs from it by the portrayal of images which it arouses by "acting." Like the oratorical style its use is limited, only in this case by suitable subject matter. Few instances
arise in a debate where the dramatic style finds a legitimate place.

3. Speech Composition.

With the brief before him the debater may set to work to clothe the bare skeleton of argument with words that make it read effectively, and carry conviction. One rough draft should first be made. Then it should be tested for length. Revision may then follow, provided enough speaking material is at hand. If not, the filling in should next be accomplished, after which another time test may be made. There should be no hesitancy in revising a speech. No one can make a perfect speech on first writing, nor on later writings. But practice will undoubtedly improve the style and effectiveness of the composition.


The better method of compiling material in the form of speeches is the compartment system. In this plan the speech is considered as made up of many units, a unit being one point and its proof, one main point or one minor point and the corresponding proof. These units are known to take a certain number of seconds for delivery. Each part of the speech is timed for length. The time of each portion is marked on the manuscript, and when the speech is transferred to cards for handy reference, the divisions are made by cards. There are many advantages in this method. Suppose an argument is anticipated by the other side, and the debater wishes to destroy the effectiveness of such anticipation. He can take that part of his speech out, and insert some other material, prepared beforehand, which will substitute something else almost as good. Or he finds himself allotting too much time to his refutation at the commencement of his speech. Crowded for time, he leaves out one compartment, and no one knows the difference except his colleagues. He can insert as well as take out, and he can thereby automatically adjust his speech to the exigencies of the time-allotment. It is a very mechanical but efficacious way to overcome the time handicap in a debate, as well as a means of working out strategical positions of attack and defense in the main speeches. Adaptation to the emergencies of the debate is possible with compartment speeches as in no other kind of speech arrangement.

5. Transitions.

As the mind of a person down front follows the train of thought from the speaker on the stage he instinctively forms concepts as perspicuous arguments are presented and clinched. How is he to get a mental outline of all the arguments? How will he duplicate in his mind’s eye the brief
from which the debater is speaking? This is done by the use of transitional passages, well prepared, and better, completely memorized, which carry the thought from one place to another in the chain of argument making up the case. These transitions are often neglected in the preparation of a speech. The debater thinks only in tune with his points, and the connecting up he considers automatically made as he starts speaking on another part of his speech. But the mind can only go where it is led, when its sole concern is reception of another's ideas. Without the transitions few can reconstruct mentally the whole outline of a debate; it is too long. If the audience had studied the question for six months before attending the debate, the reconstruction might partially succeed; but coming to a debate with no preparation to receive certain arguments and arrange them, this task must be assumed by the debater intent on winning. Notice the transitional passages in the specimen speeches in the appendix. Notice how they connect argument with argument and point with point.


How often should one summarize? Should it be done after every speech? Too much summary gives the impression that the debater is using the summaries for "filler," and has run out of argument. Summaries take the place of tran-

sitions, but not as effectively. There should be some summary, but it should be only a brief recital of the main points proved when it summarizes the whole case, and only a recital of one or two main points with subordinate points, when it summarizes only one speech. This does not apply to the comprehensive summaries used in rebuttal which are in fact rebuttal arguments; they are treated in the Chapter on Rebuttal.

Summaries, also, need not be presented with a numerical formula for listing points proved. The points can be connected without the use of numbers. Numbers make the debate too much of a mathematical proposition. A typical summary for the end of a speech is:

Thus it is proved that the United States’ retention of the Philippines is the only feasible plan to follow, for independence is undesirable, their disposal to another power is inadvisable, and the establishment of a protectorate is impractical.

A typical summary for all speeches, to come at the end of the last main speech, would be:

Thus the affirmative have proved to you to-night that the United States should permanently possess the Philippines, for it is the only feasible plan, it directly benefits the United States, and it is a benefit to the islands themselves.

Since a comprehensive summary is usually undertaken at the end of the last rebuttal on either
side, a summary at the end of each main speech is sufficient, each summary consisting of a review of the principal points proved in each speech. If crowded for time, all summaries may be dispensed with except the last one. The debate should be summarized, that is the all-important fact to remember; that it be done in parts or as a whole the exigencies of the debate can better determine than any preconceived thought on the subject.

7. Examples.

In Appendix I are the speeches prepared from the briefs given at the end of Chapter VII. Notice the summaries and transitions, as well as the clarity of language, the persuasiveness, and the ease with which the arguments are presented in verbal form.

PART II

SUPPORTING THE CASE

Once a manufacturer has completed a product he still has his greatest task before him—that of disposing of it. It must be sold, somehow, and in such a way that it brings to him returns commensurate with the work put into the making of that product. The debater has the same problem to face. “Anyone can write a speech,” is a familiar saying, and it is especially appropriate to debates where there is only a formal recitation of a written argument. Alternate giving of prepared speeches does not make one a debater; once the speeches are prepared anyone can be called upon to recite them. But to support the contentions within them, to fight for what those words convey by also attacking the case of the opposition, and to combine physical delivery, mental alertness, and the auxiliary aids of personality and sportsmanship in proving that one side of a proposition alone is sustainable, is real debating.

This part of debate training is squeezed into but a single chapter in many debate books. Some have two chapters, one on “Rebuttal” and another on “Delivery.” Yet most debates are won
and lost, not on speech contents, but on the support given or failed to have been given to such contents, and the various factors discussed in the succeeding chapters. Moreover, this matter of supporting the case once it is constructed brings one closely in contact with problems such as the debater will face in life afterward. Life situations stress more the selling aspect of a mental production than the mere existence.

Let the debater study closely, then, the chapters in Part II. In them, he will learn some of the secrets of good debating, and at least the general principles of applying the knowledge of the subject to the exigencies of the occasion, as presented to him on the platform.

First are treated “Refutation” and “Rebuttal,” the “Twins of Attack” that make such an important part of every debate. Following these two chapters, comes the one on “Overthrowing the Opponent’s Proof,” dealing with special methods of meeting arguments as well as constructive methods anticipatory of rebuttal needs. The chapter on “Offensive and Defensive Tactics” will show, as no other part of the book, what real mental gymnastics are brought into play in a debate. This chapter shows what is meant when we call debate a game, instead of an art or a science. The various tried methods of gaining the advantage discussed in this chapter will help suggest to the debater other skilful means of using the tools of intellect to his benefit, in a debate.

The chapter is not at all comprehensive, in spite of its length; it is meant to be more suggestive than anything else.

In the later chapters are treated the auxiliary aids of debate, which so often are neglected by teams who are too hurried in their debate preparations. The finished product as it is presented to the audience should have in it a certain quality. That quality is begot only by putting the finishing touches on the work of each individual member of the team. A certain personal responsibility must be borne by every debater in this respect. It is impossible for a teacher, coach, or textbook to inculcate into an indifferent debater the spirit of true debating, as the last chapters make apparent to the thoughtful reader.
CHAPTER I

REFUTATION

1. Refutation and Rebuttal.

There is a clear distinction between refutation and rebuttal as these terms are applied to a formal debate. By refutation is meant the destructive extempore attack of the preceding speeches of the opposition, contained in the main speeches of the two sides. By rebuttal is meant the more formal "reply" speeches which follow the main speeches, consisting of a speech by each member of the two teams, about half the length of the main speech. Sometimes teams adopt the strategy of incorporating rebuttal in their main speeches; but it is still rebuttal. However, as the terms are used in these chapters, and in their more technical sense, refutation is the attack in the main speeches, and rebuttal the attack in the rebuttal speeches.

2. Purpose and Use of Refutation.

Refutation serves to inject the spirit of a real contest into the debate. There is nothing more psychologically effective in a debate than to see the first negative speaker rise after the first af-
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There is a clear distinction between refutation and rebuttal as these terms are applied to a formal debate. By refutation is meant the destructive extempore attack of the preceding speeches of the opposition, contained in the main speeches of the two sides. By rebuttal is meant the more formal "reply" speeches which follow the main speeches, consisting of a speech by each member of the two teams, about half the length of the main speech. Sometimes teams adopt the strategy of incorporating rebuttal in their main speeches; but it is still rebuttal. However, as the terms are used in these chapters, and in their more technical sense, refutation is the attack in the main speeches, and rebuttal the attack in the rebuttal speeches.

2. Purpose and Use of Refutation.

Refutation serves to inject the spirit of a real contest into the debate. There is nothing more psychologically effective in a debate than to see the first negative speaker rise after the first af-
firmative speaker has sat down, and crisply point out at once some defect in the affirmative case outlined, or in the speech just presented. The speaker following an opponent must somehow overcome the effect of that speech and the preceding speeches delivered against him, and it is to that purpose that refutation is directed. It starts the conflict soon; it enables the audience to determine the issues quickly. Besides the objective values, it shows that the debater is facile and bold with his materials, in making them aid him in upholding the position he has assumed in the debate.

Refutation is not always to destroy, but always to question. It is not always to convince the audience, but it is always to keep them on inquiry. The debate may not yet have advanced to the point where they can see one side’s view clearly; then the debater wants to keep their opinion still in abeyance till his own case becomes clear with further exposition in later speeches. There is no cut-and-dried debate when refutation is present. There is, instead, a lively manoeuvring for vantage of position right from the start; and the debaters as well as the public become more interested in the contest.

3. Extent of Refutation.

It is apparent that all main speeches can have some refutation in them, except the first affirma-
tive speech. Sometimes debaters, zealous to an extreme in showing they know how to meet every argument of the opponent, forget that they have a main speech to deliver, and go into a long refutation that finds them at the end of their speaking time with nothing constructive accomplished. Refutation is not meant to take the place of a main speech; it is only an adjunct to it. The main speech is all-important, for without it a team can seldom put over its proposition, and never with telling effect.

Refutation should never consume more than one-third the speaking time allotted to a main speech. The amount of time to be consumed in refutation should be determined ahead of time. The main speech should be condensed so that it will be deliverable in the time allowed for it, together with a short summary at its end, if it is found desirable. If the main speeches together with the refutation are to be ten minutes long, confine refutation to three minutes or less. One or two minutes of refutation suffices, and sometimes one single point having severe destructive effect, as showing conclusively that the opponent has been arguing beside the point, is enough to pave the way to a receptive attitude on the part of judges and audience toward the forthcoming speech.

Refutation also consists in adapting one’s own arguments to those of the opponent as one goes
through his own main speech. If the other side has discussed a point that is in direct controversy with one now being presented, the debater should make the connection for the benefit of the audience, and at the same time show the merit of the two views when compared.

Teams who make a practice of using the last main speech as rebuttal dispense with refutation entirely and bring it in in the form of rebuttal, combining the short, crisp attacks of refutation with the larger, more extensive attacks of rebuttal. A common term applied to this practice is constructive refutation.


(a) What speeches to refute.—The first negative usually has a very set bit of refutation to deliver; namely, criticizing the issues as laid down by the affirmative, and the entire analysis as it appears to him from the superficial presentation of the opening speech. He may question definitions, revise the interpretation of the history of the question to his own advantage, or pick out certain important points to refute, just to show the contentious qualities of the subject and the weaknesses of the affirmative stand.

In a debate on protection of capital abroad, the opening affirmative speaker spent much time condemning protection by discussing imperialism and its evils. He was answered on this point decisively, when the first negative speaker arose and pointed out to the audience that the affirmative had discussed imperialism in a very scholarly manner, but had ignored the vital proof needed; namely, proof showing that imperialism was involved in the question at all, and was a necessary and inevitable corollary of protecting capital abroad.

The second affirmative and second negative speakers in refutation should endeavor to do more than attack the preceding speech. They should try to connect up both preceding opposing speeches in their refutation, besides supporting the first speech on their own side of the case.

The last speakers, assuming there are three on a side, have the added burden of directing their refutation, not at the preceding speech only, but at all preceding speeches delivered by the opposition. This cannot always be done easily, but to make refutation most effective it should be delivered against all preceding main arguments of the opposition.

A clever bit of refutation practice is to deliver refutation on the last point given by the preceding speaker the moment the speaker gains the floor. It has the effect of reviving the audience’s interest and in making them feel this debater “has the goods.”

(b) What substance to refute.—It must be borne in mind that refutation, besides not being a
substitute for a main speech, is not a substitute for rebuttal. It relieves the debater of packing too many points in his rebuttal, but the refutation is not the place to pack in a lot of minor points which can be delivered easily. Instead one should constantly keep in mind the purpose of refutation; that is, to gain the advantage and destroy the effectiveness of the preceding speech does not depend so much on a broadside attack as on a few points subtly delivered, and aims not so strongly at the merits of the case apart from its presentation in this particular debate, but rather at the debaters' handling of material in support of that case. Refutation is something like repartee in polite conversation. The personality of the debater features considerably in making refutation effective. It is clear, then, that refutation is more offensive than defensive. It is not so much to support one's own side directly, as it is to accomplish the same purpose indirectly, by showing specious reasoning on the part of an opponent, or a misinterpretation of the question.

A crucial error in quoting an authority, or omitting to quote an authority will often go right to the heart of a speech just delivered. In a debate on Farm Relief it was valuable for one side to use the National Grange as an authority. Opponents, in reply, said that the National Grange was one of the smallest farm organizations in existence. In refutation it was pointed out by a citation from the World Almanac, precise and definite, that the National Grange was the largest farm organization in existence. No more need have been said. The audience at once questioned from that point on everything said by the other team in the debate, as well as revised the impression it had formed of what had been said before.

Some arguments that are easily refuted present themselves later on one side of the debate than on the other. Thus the affirmative may use the stock issue of "necessity" in its first speech, and the negative use the negative form of that issue in the last speech. The first negative speaker can refute one or two points, and then point out that the last negative speaker will dwell at length on that particular subject and will answer the first affirmative speech in detail. The third negative speaker then has the duty of adapting his speech "in toto" to the first affirmative speech rendered.

The substance of most refutation will be made up of one or more of the following devices:

1. Showing misinterpretation of the question.
2. Revealing faulty reasoning.
3. Pointing out irrelevancies.
4. Direct attack on minor points to show debaters have not handled the subject well, or are not delivering proof with a high degree of credibility.
5. Adapting arguments to the advantage of the other side.
6. Using the various means of attack explained in the chapter on "Overthrowing Opponents' Proof."

7. Clarifying the entire opponents' case so that its faultiness is more apparent, and the issues stand out clearly; of course, to the advantage of the one who is refuting.

5. Refutation Method.

Any answer or counterproposition must consist of three parts: (a) statement of what is being answered, (b) the answer, (c) explanation of how the answer benefits the position taken by the speaker.

These three essentials appear in every refutation point and rebuttal point that a debater delivers. He must first tell the audience what his opponent has said that demands refutation, then give the answer, and lastly "tie up" that answer with his own case to show how it works to his own advantage. This last step is more essential in rebuttal than in refutation, but it can hardly be dispensed with in refutation; for its usefulness lies not in its completeness, but rather in making the audience and the judges see that everything said has a direct bearing on the case being supported. All too often the debater takes for granted that his listeners know why he is making certain assertions. But very few persons can think as fast on a strange subject as one who has studied it for months. This must be taken into consideration in phrasing any kind of an answer, whether in refutation or rebuttal.

Once refutation points are delivered thus completely the debater should make the transition into his main speech as adroitly as possible, so that the refutation seems to be a part of his whole plan of attack, and not just an added bit of flourish to show he can refute if he wants to.

Some refutation can be planned ahead of time. An analysis of the question will reveal many pitfalls into which an inferior team may involuntarily place itself. The mistake of arguing from false premises is a common one. Setting forth issues but ignoring those that are vital as proof in order to establish a case, is another error teams are apt to make. If the first affirmative speech does not clearly lay down the issues, the first negative can at once help the audience to see what the debate really involves by assuming the affirmative duty of showing just what must be proved by that side before it can win the debate. Even dilemmas and inconsistencies can be foreseen, and if it is apparent that the rebuttal time will be too short to get in all important attacks some of these can be used in refutation. Questions may also be raised in refutation as well as in rebuttal by way of attack, and anticipatory of making the other team take a direct stand, where it is more easily assailed. Refutation is not susceptible to close planning as is rebuttal, but it
need not be done at haphazardly. A team that has made a thorough case analysis will be able to arrange some refutation tactics in advance.

Lastly, the refutation should not take on the character of being used to irritate opponents and to "show off" to the listeners. It should be conducted with sincerity. There is no place for browbeating anywhere in a debate. To overcome the effect of another speech does not require ridicule and sarcasm, but straightforward inquiry and questioning on the merits of the case. *Keep in mind the purpose of refutation.*

Much of the material presented in the next chapter on "Rebuttal" is useful in studying the methods of refutation, inasmuch as the two have much in common.

**Chapter II**

**REBUTTAL**

1. What Is Rebuttal?

The real debate begins with the rebuttal. This is the opinion expressed of the latter half of the debate by devotees of the game. It is an opinion well founded, for it is the rebuttal that proves whether one is a debater, and it is the rebuttal that further proves whether one team or another has so mastered its material as to deserve the victory.

The rebuttal consists of "reply" speeches by all the debaters, alternately, beginning with the first negative speaker and ending with the last affirmative speaker. The order of speakers in rebuttal may be different from that in the main speeches, except that no person speaks twice in rebuttal. The substance of these rebuttal speeches consists entirely in supporting the case presented; not by new arguments but by reaf irmation of the old and introduction of new evidence, by attack of the opponents' position, by clearing the case to one's own advantage, and by showing that an "attack" has not in fact been an attack. It is often said that no "new" ma-
2. Kinds of Rebuttal.

There are three principal kinds of rebuttal: (a) the memoriter, (b) card system, and (c) support-of-case rebuttals. The advantages and disadvantages of each are briefly described below:

(a) The memoriter rebuttal or "canned" rebuttal.—This form is still found where attention is directed more to the delivery aspect of debating than to the real subjective values. It consists in anticipating what is likely to be said by the other side, and then writing out and memorizing, word for word, a rebuttal speech of the required length. It is quite obvious that debaters who use this plan miss all the usefulness of debate. It is not really debating. The debate deteriorates into a mere recitation or declamatory contest. Yet in some places this is considered debating, largely because the idea originated in the grade schools and was carried to upper grades by the teachers who found it useful for younger children. There is hardly a single advantage in this kind of rebuttal except that one is certain to have plenty to say, since just enough is prepared for the occasion, and it is previously timed. But in meeting a team that uses one of the other methods of rebuttal the memoriter debater will show up hopelessly out of place. The points anticipated may miss the whole opposing case. Then the debater is rebutting what has not yet been presented against him. Being memorized, there is no adaptation whatever to the exigencies of the debate. The spirit of debate is not felt where two teams using this method of rebuttal participate in a forensic contest.

(b) The card-system rebuttal.—This system has a wide use, and comes very near to being a replica of the methods of attorneys. It consists in having before one a card-index box containing various classified answers to anticipated points that are likely to arise in the opponents' case.
(See preceding chapter on "Gathering the Material" in Part I.) As these points are made the debater goes to the proper index in his box of cards, gets out the answer, or several answers, and files them beside him, making an entry on the cards of what his opponent has said. When he speaks he lays the cards on the rostrum or keeps them in his hand and extemporizes the interlocutory remarks which are supported by the evidence on his cards. He does not read from the cards; the cards are only suggestive, unless, of course, there is a quotation or set of statistics to be given, in which case he reads direct from the cards that contain that information. The plan works well in any debate, and is as efficient as the debater has made his card-index box complete with answers. Its great disadvantage is that the debater is likely to lean too much on his indexed material, and if he finds no answer to his opponent in his cards, he is likely to be puzzled, and probably not plan an original reply at the moment. If the debater comes to this pass in the use of his indexed material it ceases to help him. However, the suggestiveness of a mass of carded answers properly indexed is enormous, besides the confidence it gives the embryo debater; and seldom does one find that a debater with a complete index box of replies cannot make associations from those answers and meet almost any argument brought forth by the opposition.

The cards contain not only quotations, references, and citations, but also statistics, new arguments or new versions of old arguments, dilemmas, inconsistencies, and all the other devices used in answering an opponent. In the chapter on "Gathering the Material" is a description of the card-index system more in detail.

(c) Support-of-case rebuttal.—This kind of rebuttal is more popular in universities where students spend less time in preparation than in the colleges and high schools. It more closely resembles refutation than rebuttal. Instead of looking up a mass of material on the other side of the question the debaters content themselves in rebuttal in showing how thorough their main arguments are, how strong their case is as a whole, at the same time attacking their opponents not so much with facts taken from cards or other sources as with clever devices of persuasion, using strategy in lessening the convincingness of the other side's case, and, in general, relying on ingenuity to turn an adverse situation back in favor of the speaker on the spur of the moment. This style of rebuttal is undoubtedly useful as a mental exercise and a test for intellectual alertness, but it does not convey to an audience what is most desired; that is, not skill-exhibitions by the debaters, so much as an exhibition of the merits of the two sides of the debate question. This method should be combined with the card system method for the best results.
3. Preparation for Rebuttal.

Rebuttal can be prepared and yet not "canned." A study of both sides of the question is the foundation of good rebuttal. From a study of the other side of the proposition one can very well map out nearly all the possible stands that the opponents can take on a given proposition. Certain fundamental arguments cannot be left out. To these one can arrange various modes of attack. If the other team leaves them out, they are open to attack for the omission. If they put them in, they are met with the anticipated rebuttal.

But the most neglected preparation for rebuttal is that of knowing thoroughly one's own case—not just the main speech of the rebutter, but the others as well, so that at any time in rebuttal the speaker has before him a clear image of the whole case he is supporting. Why is this necessary? Throughout his rebuttal, unless he shows the case he supports, the audience will not be carried with him in appreciating the effectiveness of his rebuttal. He cannot resort to a written outline or brief of his case, for that consumes too much time. Here is one place in the debate where memorization has an important function to perform. It is better to have the main arguments and the subpoints memorized, together with a thorough knowledge of all the evidence inserted to support them.

Other preparation for rebuttal includes working out summary statements ahead of time, and putting questions, contained in main speeches, down on separate cards or slips of paper to remind one to repeat them in rebuttal, if they have not yet been answered. To put a question, and fail to mention it in rebuttal as unanswered, means that the putting of the question has been useless. The support of one's own case includes the reiteration of those salient challenges that have been put and which remain unanswered. Too much should not be left to the memory in rebuttal, for the mind is under a peculiar kind of tension in a debate, and all the possible sources of rebuttal material cannot always be thought of.

4. Division of Rebuttal.

One of the great problems in rebuttal is that a speaker, who has spent all his time in knowing intensively the issue he supports may find that the preceding debater speaks on an issue for which a colleague has drilled intensively. That is, the first affirmative speaker may dwell on necessity, the first negative speaker on practicability, while the third negative speaker also speaks on necessity. To assign the rebuttal of the first affirmative to the first negative speaker means that the first negative will have the usual amount of time to prepare his rebuttal, but will suffer the handicap of not knowing the issue thoroughly.
While to assign it to the third negative speaker means that that man will be well prepared to answer the opposition but will have little time to get ready for his rebuttal speech, assuming that the same speaking order is retained in rebuttal as in the main speeches. It is a question of considering which of the two evils is the greater. On the one hand there is the lack of time, and on the other the lack of information. Of these two, speaking without thorough knowledge is perhaps the greater, and therefore the division of rebuttal is best done by allotting to each man the reply to the issue or issues of the opposition that more nearly correspond to his own issues.

If there is no similarity whatever, a very unlikely occurrence, the captain should arrange beforehand, or as soon as the opposition states its stand, that each debater “cover” either a certain debater or a certain part of the case. The most important fault to obviate is that of having two gather rebuttal for the same part of the other case, leaving the division of the rebuttal to chance. The rebuttal burden should be divided so there will be little or no overlapping. Emphasis by reiteration is still possible and in some cases a boon; but the debaters by dividing the rebuttal will be able to cover the entire case thoroughly and completely, as well as be able to present to their listeners a unified, coherent rebuttal.

It is better that the rebuttal of major points follow in the order that those points are presented; that is, the debater who handles the first speaker’s part of the case should speak first; and then the debater who has “covered” the second speaker; and so on. But this arrangement is not at all required, and most judges give credit for rebuttal on the basis of points refuted, and check off those arguments that are met as soon as they are handled properly by the other debaters.

The important consideration is that the captain of the team should see that there is some plan of rebuttal attack before the team goes on the platform; then no “platform conferring” will likely be necessary.

5. Rebuttal Methods.

How shall each debater handle his own rebuttal? Many conventional methods are in use, and all of them have some merit and usefulness.

(a) “Variety” method of rebuttal.—Beginning debaters are likely to fear they will not have enough to say in their rebuttal time, where rebuttal is prepared on the platform, and therefore make notes of all the big and little points that they can answer. Every answerable argument is fodder to them. When they give their rebuttal, the general impression is that of a charge of bird shot against a wall: it seems to cover well, but there is no force or penetration. This variety of rebuttal never produces much impression on the
case it attacks. It is well to attack some minor points that tend to reflect on the credibility of all opponents' statements, but unless they have the effect of great force they should be omitted in favor of the points that have more probative value. "Hitting" every point that is "hittable" makes debating a sophistical performance.

(b) "Attack of major points" method.—A better way to rebut is to pick out all the important points that are used to support the issues and frame strong answers in reply to them to show their weakness or inappropriateness. No particular order is used; the debater relies on the cogency of his own proof in rebuttal and the selection of major points to refute, for his credit in rebuttal. This is a much better method than the preceding one, but it is still not as satisfactory as where the rebuttal is an attack, not on points, but on the whole case.

(c) "Attack of case as a unit" method.—Going after the whole case is the ideal rebuttal method, and also the most difficult. It consists in looking at the arguments and evidence of the opposition as one unit, and dissecting it for destruction with scientific exactitude. The issues are criticized, assertions without proof gleaned out and massed together to show the faultiness of the whole structure of proof presented, and arguments are shown to have no force as proof by reason of admission or begging the question.

In going after the whole case, the customary style is to take up the case issue for issue, making the direct attack, then contrasting to support the speaker's case, and then making the summary to show in whose favor lies the advantage on that particular issue or set of issues.

A more difficult procedure, yet one that has some popularity, is that of attacking first the arguments, to show that they are specious and untrustworthy, and then attacking the evidence en masse or in part. Although likely to make for thoroughness, this style of attack has the disadvantage of confusing the audience as to just what is being done. It cannot be explained from the platform without embarrassment, and unless the listeners know what is being attempted, they are likely to get the impression that the rebuttal is not organized.

6. The Various Rebuttal Speeches.

The first rebuttal speech on each side should criticize the opposing case as to choice of issues and general plan of proof. Probably some of this burden will already have been assumed in refutation by one of the debaters, but it should at least be cared for before the first rebuttal speaker is through, for it goes to the heart of the debate at once, and saves arguing over unnecessary and irrelevant topics. Besides, it is a good offensive measure. The first rebuttal speeches should also
summarize briefly what the speaker’s side has attempted to accomplish so that the audience will see at the start how the two sides compare before the rebuttal is entered into. Following this, the time may be consumed in straight rebuttal work, with a short summary at the end to show what has been accomplished.

The intermediate rebuttal speeches have no peculiarities except that besides the rebuttal there should be a transition made from the previous rebuttal, and a constant effort put forth to show the effect of each rebuttal point on the two cases. The final rebuttals should end in a comprehensive summary, either a double summary or a single summary. The subject of summary is treated in a separate section in this chapter, where double and single summary are discussed. Other than the comprehensive summary, the final rebuttals consist of the usual attack and support of cases, with some emphasis on the cases as a whole instead of on separate issues. The final rebuttals must leave an impression that the two cases bear a certain relation to each other as the result of the debate, and that that relation is not to parts of the two cases, but to the cases as a whole. The final rebuttal speaker, therefore, has the added task to rebut from the standpoint of a case general, not a case particular: from him the audience must get an idea what the “fait accompli” is on the two sides of the proposition, and their minds should not be led astray by ungathered ends of arguments started and not completed, or brought within the final fold of the one case or the other, as they stand at the end of the debate.

7. Rebutting a Point.

As discussed under “Refutation” each rebuttal point consists of three parts: First, the debater must state what he is going to answer, either by stating the exact words of his opponent or by referring to some remark which will revive it for the audience. Unless this is done his answer will be incomplete. Second, having done that, his next duty is to give his reply, either in direct attack, or by showing the irrelevancy, inappropriateness, or ineffectiveness of his opponent’s remark. This answer may be a single answer, or several answers. For instance, the opponent may bring out proof that between 1910 and 1920 there were 20 industrial disputes settled by compulsory arbitration in the United States. The answer might include: evidence by quoting a labor encyclopedia showing that no industrial disputes had been settled by that means in that period; further, that Mr. X, head of the American Federation of Labor, said recently that compulsory arbitration had never once been used in settling an industrial dispute; further, that such noted authorities as the U. S. Department of Labor, and the National Association of Manufacturers, deny that there has
ever been any compulsory arbitration in the United States. Here is a multi-answer that completely fills the bill, and convinces the audience that the debater knows what he is talking about and has searched the records to the bottom.

Having stated his answer, there comes the third and hardest step in making the rebuttal point, and that is in "clinching" it, showing what effect the answer has on the relative merits of the two cases. This last step is the one which is so often neglected by debaters. Once they have answered they feel that the audience should very easily make the connection of that answer to the cases, and yet few people can do it without the debater's aid. After making his answer the debater should say in effect something like this: "Therefore, it is apparent at once, ladies and gentlemen, that our opponents have relied on another faulty bit of evidence to support their contention that . . . , indicating that our own argument, namely, that . . . finds still more evidence in its favor." This serves additionally to tell the judge under what part of the case the speaker expects credit for his rebuttal point.

8. Rebuttal Attitude.

The chance to "come back at the other fellow" is always a time when one is apt to forget his demeanor and descend to the use of ridicule and sarcasm to demonstrate his contempt for the other person's views. The rebuttal period should be entirely free from this low type of arguing. Personalities should not enter the debate at all, and during the contest both sides should treat their opponents' opinions as worthy of consideration. The very fact that one is debating the other team on the platform evidences the trust reposed in them as worthy competitors. It is to the debater's advantage to increase respect for his opponents rather than to decrease it; otherwise his opponents are not deserving as debaters, and hence his own choice of them as his opponents indicates in a way that he is debating an inferior team. Hence there is much less honor in defeating them.

Clever repartee in which light thrusts are made at the opposing team is entirely commendable. Debate is not meant to be a namby-pamby touch-me-not contest; it should have all the vigor and fight in it of a good football game. But uppermost is the necessity that courtesy and fair play receive first attention in dealing with the opposite team. This is another way to gain the good will of the audience. The team that attempts to win by base methods and indulgence in personalities will find less favor in the eyes of the judges than a team that is gentlemanly throughout, and when a judge is antagonized against a team because it uses irritating methods, no amount of good argu-
ment will sway his bias back to the point of reason.

Wounding an opponent is an old trick, hardly respectable in any debate. It is used much in political campaigns, where politicians discuss men rather than issues, and make the whole contest obnoxious to public taste. Direct the attack at the ideas, not the debaters. The debaters, after all, are only mouthpieces of the ideas they express.

The debater should close his rebuttal on time. If warning is given he should heed it at once, and the limit of speaking after the final warning is given is enough to finish the point one is speaking on. If one has not allotted time for a summary statement, he should dispense with it, unless it is very short. To stop on time is much more certain to win approval than to make another point or to summarize after the time has expired.


(a) "Usual affirmative or negative" rebuttal plan.—Since much of the rebuttal can be anticipated it is desirable that members of the team practice rebuttal on those points that are certain to need answering. The best way to do this is to plan out a "usual affirmative" or "usual negative" case. In fact it can be written out in brief form. The readings of the debaters will indicate to them what are strong arguments for the other side, and what is good evidence. The various points that will arise for rebuttal should be listed, and each debater assigned certain stock rebuttals, both to allot the rebuttal among team members, and to insure that the answer for the argument will be somewhere in the mind of one of the debaters for instant use. The arguments can be given abbreviated names, such as "public opinion," "sectionalism," "uniformity," "socialism," "constitutionality," "interstate problems," "paternalism," each suggesting the argument that is likely to need answering somewhere in the debate.

A rebuttal assignment sheet looks something like this:

Rebuttal for Affirmative Team.

Byron, First Speaker: 1. Sectionalism.
2. State laws inadequate.
3. Reduction due to Federal law.
4. Why have our policy.
5. Why never proposed before.

Allison, Second Speaker: 1. Public opinion.
2. No machinery.
3. Cost prohibitive.
5. District of Columbia.
6. Immigration law.
7. Inconsistency; watch for it.
2. State rights not interfered with.
3. Congress will not abuse power.
4. Standardization.
5. Bureaucracy.
6. Paternalism.
7. Can’t control by law?
8. Idea of attacking cause.

(b) "Mock debate” rebuttal.—Good practice is obtained by having someone of the debate squad select hurriedly from a list arguments to be answered, and then calling debaters at random to answer the arguments. The arguments can be presented by the squad member in elliptical form, as: “Another reason why the proposed law should not be adopted is that it will lead to paternalism.” This statement is followed by some sort of proof, after which the debater who handles the argument of paternalism gives a good strong rebuttal argument against the proof advanced. Such practice assumes the reality of debate on the platform, and serves to show when the team is well prepared.

(c) Check-up of essential points of rebuttal by team.—Another good plan is to have the team get together and write out a list of what vital rebuttal should be known. A list of essential points that can be answered is made, and then the debaters check to see how many can make a satisfactory reply to each one of the listed points likely to arise in the debate. Many of these points of course will be the obverse of the team’s own contentions, but the element of foresight helps to make one prepared for most any ordinary emergency. Debating, as is apparent, is not conducted on a guess plan. Most of the rebuttal can be sufficiently planned before the debate starts, so that the fear of surprise should cause no worry to the participants. After all, in debate there is very little of the surprise element, except from the listener’s point of view.

(d) List of possible plans likely to be advanced.—Where the opposite team is likely to produce a new plan to remedy the situation (a very common negative attack on an affirmative change of policy), it is not at all hard for the affirmative to plan ahead what possible new plans are likely to be advanced. Separate answers can then be studied out for every new plan that is likely to be brought out in the debate. Even here, then, the affirmative team need not be taken by surprise, for there is only a limited number of feasible substitute plans that any negative team may offer, and practically all of them can be foreseen by an alert affirmative team.

(e) Outline of possible stands by opponents, and counterattacks.—Another aid in rebuttal is
to write out on separate sheets of paper outlines of possible stands the opponents may take. At the debate, when it is apparent that one of these stands is taken, this one sheet is put on the table before the team, and the captain points out what part of that stand each debater will assume in his rebuttal and refutation. By this method the team is able to make a direct counterattack on the whole proposition, having beforehand arranged tentatively a complete attack on every possible stand that the other team can take. This may seem to make “air-tight” rebuttal, but it does not; there is still much room for ingenuity. Even to foresee and foredetermine takes ingenuity and only the team that is out to win on its merit of having studied the question thoroughly will adopt these tactics to insure victory.

10. Summaries.

There is some need for summary in the main speeches, but not a great deal. Chiefly at the end of the last constructive speech on each side is there some necessity for summarizing the whole case as it has been presented. A short summary statement is all that is required for a usual main speech; as, “Thus I have proved to you that there is no justice in the policy of the affirmative; first, because it is contrary to the rights of smaller nations as evidenced by the principles of Christianity; second, because it is contrary to inter-

national law; and third, because it is an arbitrary policy.”

(a) Meaning and purpose of summary.—But in rebuttal, summary becomes more important. After the constructive and destructive work has progressed, the debater must explain how the two cases stand, or how his own case stands, or how his own part of the case stands. By summary is not meant a continual repetition of one’s own case in words of the stock issues, as filler in rebuttal. This is the fault junior debaters fall into. They summarize at the beginning and at the end of rebuttal, and accomplish little rebuttal work. Also there is nothing gained in pointing out that the other side has made a certain argument, and then saying, “Why, I covered that in my main speech.” The audience knows that, perhaps; however the remark is not at all refreshing or convincing; instead it is depressing. The audience wants the debater to do something, not to say he has already done it.

The purpose of summary is to show the organization of the case at the instant, to recall important points not to be overlooked either by the other team or the audience, and to make the debate a complete one. In no case is its purpose to convince, or to take the place of argument.

(b) Single—and double—final summary.—But the summary that is all-important is that which comes in the last rebuttal speech. This summary
may be a single summary, taking into its scope only the new status of the speaker's case as the result of the debate, or a double summary, including a summary of both cases, and a comparison in favor of the speaker's side of the proposition. The double summary is by far the most effective and also the most difficult. The last rebuttal speaker must outline the opponent's case on a piece of paper or on cards, and notice carefully what proof it contains. He must also notice how his colleagues have handled the various points in that case, and see that it has been attacked in all particulars. When he ascends the stand he then announces: "Now let us see how the debate stands to-night. Our opponents have ably argued; first, that—; second, that—. Now under their first proposition you will have noticed that their proof rested largely upon statistics gathered from the United States Census. My colleague immediately pointed out to you that those figures were accurate, but susceptible of many interpretations, and showed you that the proper interpretation was not that assumed by the opposition." Thus he goes through the entire case of the other team, analyzes it, states it better than they did, if possible, and then exposes all its weaknesses once more. Then he takes up his own case point by point, shows attack advanced by his opponents, and gives reasons for futility of attack.

It is apparent that such a summary takes up considerable rebuttal time, no less than four minutes. Nevertheless it is worth all the time it takes, for by the impression it leaves, when skilfully handled, the audience feels beyond a doubt that the debate has been much in favor of the speaker's side. If both last speakers use the double summary an interesting comparison awaits the judges of the debate. But if both do not use it, the side that does closes the debate with an added mark to its credit in the final appraisal.

It is well to have a summary of the speaker's case drilled upon for time limit. This cannot be done with accuracy, but it can still be accomplished so that the last rebuttal speaker will not be more than a minute off, and then he can condense the summary of his case to fit in the time. Knowing the length of his own summary he can present the summary of his opponents' case first, then fill in up to the time of his own summary with rebuttal in addition to the summaries, and then attach his own summary. His speech will consist of three parts: (1) summary of opposition, (2) rebuttal up to warning, and (3) summary of own case, timed. This is one method of insuring that both summaries get in the final rebuttal speech, and that no overlapping of the time limit occurs. It is extremely difficult to time a speech containing two summaries, the length of one being unknown. Another variation is that of putting
the summary of the opponents' case in the next to the last speech in rebuttal, and letting the summary of the speaker's case remain to the last rebuttal speech. This method is almost as effective as the "double summary" method, and in addition some advantage is gained by preventing the crowding of summary material into one speech.

CHAPTER III

OVERTHROWING OPPONENTS' PROOF

In rebuttal and in refutation much "strong" evidence can sometimes be rendered useless and valuable moments saved by showing that the arguments employed in the use of that evidence were fallacious. In fact, good debate teams rely more on their skill in overthrowing proof by showing its fallaciousness than by the introduction of evidence to outweigh it. For a full understanding of the possibilities of rebuttal and refutation it is essential to know just what are the devices by which this saving of time and research work can be accomplished. Facility in turning the opponent's evidence back upon him to his own discomfort is more effective and strategic than to produce a preponderance of evidence of like nature to offset it. And since the former can be done in less time than the latter, when it can properly be done, it is the best way out of the difficulty.

It is not advisable to give all conceivable ways in which proof can be overthrown by other means than the use of counteracting evidence. In this chapter, only those methods which are likely to occur in formal debate are offered, leaving the
others for those who desire to make debate a companion study to logic, where this subject is treated at considerably greater length.

1. Fallacies.

A fallacy is an error committed in reasoning from facts. It is not as easy to detect fallacies in reasoning in a debate as when naked examples are given in a book. When the thought is clothed with many words in a variety of sentences, fallacies are not very easily discovered. Practice alone can give to the debater the ease of going at once to the heart of his opponent's contention by showing the error in reasoning which he has made. It is therefore suggested that the student learn the outline of fallacies given in this chapter, or sketch that outline on a separate card and refer to it constantly in practice debates to see how skillfully he can apply the tests given below. In the chapter on "Argument" in Part I these tests are enlarged upon. The reader by reference to that chapter can obtain a fresh understanding of the tests which he cannot comprehend from the statements below:

Deductive Argument.

The Five Fallacies of the Syllogism.
1. Having more than three terms in the two premises.
2. Having an undistributed middle term.
3. Distributing a term in the conclusion not distributed in the premises.

4. Drawing a conclusion from two negative premises.
5. Drawing an affirmative conclusion when one of the premises is negative.

Inductive Argument.

The Three Fallacies of Generalization.
1. Generalizing from too few observed instances.
2. Generalizing from dissimilar instances.
3. Deriving an unreasonable conclusion from the instances.

The Three Fallacies of Analogy.
1. Drawing an analogy from two dissimilar sets of facts.
2. Using facts in analogy not accepted as true.
3. Deriving an unreasonable conclusion from the comparison.

The Three Fallacies of Effect to Cause.
1. That the effect was produced by another cause than that alleged.
2. Although it is not proved that one cause produced the effect, it is proved that other causes might have produced the same effect.
3. Arguing that a certain cause produced an effect when the cause did not in fact operate.

The Three Fallacies of Cause to Effect.
1. The alleged cause could not conceivably produce the effect.
2. The effect might have followed from some other cause.
3. There might be some counteracting force to prevent the effect from occurring from the cause alleged.

Very often evidence is introduced into a debate which is unquestionably good evidence for some purpose. Whether it is good evidence in this particular debate is for the debaters to ascertain. If they find the opposition using evidence not properly inserted, they should expose that fault so that the evidence is rendered useless for probative purposes. The most common methods of doing this are by applying the tests of evidence given in Chapter IV in Part I, exposing inconsistencies in the use of evidence; and by using evidence introduced by the other side for one’s own purposes.

(a) Tests of evidence.—Since the tests of authority, witnesses, and statistics are given in detail in Chapter IV in Part I, they will only be outlined here:

Tests of Authority.

1. Is the authority an expert?
2. Is the authority reluctant?
3. Is the authority acceptable?
4. Is reliance placed on one authority?
5. Do opponents use the same authority?
6. Is authority definitely referred to?

Tests of Witnesses.

1. Is the reference definite?
2. Did the witness have a chance to observe?
3. Is the witness capable?
4. Is the witness used frequently?

5. Is the witness acceptable?
6. Is the testimony clear-cut and unequivocal?
7. Is testimony confined to facts?

Tests of Statistics.

1. Were they compiled impartially?
2. When were they made?
3. Was source of information open to compiler?
4. How were they gathered?
5. Were compared statistics taken under same conditions?
6. For what purposes were they procured?
7. Is the unit-period of time sufficient for a basis?

(b) Inconsistencies. (1) Evidence inconsistent within itself.—Very often debaters find conflicting evidence in an opponent’s case. Under one issue, evidence is adduced which points one way; and under another, evidence is adduced which points in a different direction. As a result the evidence is inconsistent within itself. Since, for the support of a case, all evidence must tend to produce proof in the same direction, all of it is not useful, and the fact that there is a conflict casts doubt on the sincerity with which the case containing the inconsistency has been built.

As an example, in a debate on whether a Federal Department of Education should be established, the negative built up its case against such a department on one issue, to the effect that such a department would not be of any more use than a bureau (which at present handles all the necessary gathering of statistics), for the affirmative
their first proposal. In order to accomplish much good a bill must give more than a little power; it must give virtual control.

(2) Evidence inconsistent with known facts.—Evidence may be introduced which is not inconsistent with other evidence in the case, but with known facts. For instance, in a debate when certain labor statistics were in question, the proposal was made that the evidence was unsatisfactory for it included farm labor as well as industrial labor. However, the opponents showed that the labor statistics were gathered in January of the year when agricultural activity was at a standstill, and thus the statistics really included only industrial labor.

(3) Evidence inconsistent with experience.—The third type of inconsistency is quite similar to the last type mentioned above, except that the evidence is inconsistent with experience instead of known or quoted facts. This type of inconsistency is evidenced by the layman’s answer to an arguer, “You can talk all day long, but I know it isn’t true.” His experience teaches him that the fact asserted and proved simply cannot be true, since it is inconsistent with his own experience. Experience in the case of a debate must be the common experience of the audience, not that of the debater. An instance of how glaring can be the fault of invoking the experience of the debater is one which occurred in a debate involv-
ing the safety condition in factories. In reply to
evidence given, a debater said in effect, "Why, I
was in one of those factories just last summer and
I didn’t find a single guard on any cog wheel, or
any signs to warn laborers about the danger of
their occupations."

(c) Using other team’s evidence to your own
advantage.—Evidence may serve both teams in a
debate. The team that discovers the other team
using evidence that helps its case is not only
making that evidence innocuous for the other
team, but strengthening and corroborating its
own evidence, thus doubling the effectiveness of
its proof.

Thus in a debate which involved a discussion
of deplorable conditions in industry and a pro-
posed remedy, the affirmative made much of the
conditions for which they advocated a certain
remedy. The negative took the stand that these
conditions did exist, and the fact that they did
exist as widely as the affirmative had explained,
proved that the affirmative remedy was altogeth-
er inefficient and inadequate to cope with the situa-
tion. The negative then went on to provide a
more adequate measure of relief for these condi-
tions. Thus the negative not only could lessen
the time spent in its main speeches on the dis-
cussion and picturization of the present evils, but
could take over the affirmative’s evidence on this
same point to help out the negative case.

OVERTHROWING OPPONENTS’ PROOF

The affirmative had not used improper evi-
dence. It was a case where the affirmative had
introduced evidence that fitted in well with the
negative case. With the shifting of the debate to
the issue as to what was the best remedy, the
affirmative had to start with a disadvantage
caused by losing entirely the effectiveness of its
first proposition, even though it did support its
own plan.

3. Failure to Perceive Ultimate Worth of
Evidence.

Under this head are included the devices which
are used to show that sometimes evidence, al-
though properly introduced, leads to conclusions
not desired by the one introducing that evidence.
The evidence so introduced, however, is handled
by the opposition in such a manner that it se-
verely discredits the proponent of the evidence
and puts him in disfavor unless he can extricate
himself from the position into which his opponent
forces him by the revelation of the effect his evi-
dence has. Inasmuch as we are dealing in this
chapter with attack only instead of corroboration,
this latter step is not discussed here.

(a) Reductio ad absurdum.—By this term is
meant the application of the evidence in such
a way as to reveal that an absurdity or entirely
illogical result follows from its use. It is
evidence that does prove, but it proves more
than its proponent desires. In a debate on the
delegation of certain state powers to the Federal government, the statement was made that since a certain evil was prevalent in many of the states, it was therefore a national problem. This was reduced to an absurdity by showing that on the same line of reasoning any evil present in several counties was a state problem, and any evil present in several townships was a county problem, bringing one to the place where he would have to admit that similarity of conditions made mass regulation a necessity in every instance.

One often hears the objection to trying out a new policy on the ground that it has never been tried before, and that there is no evidence produced to show it is practicable. Many a debater has rendered such an objection innocuous by pointing out that an application of this same doctrine would mean that no progress whatever could be made in any line of endeavor, since it would first be necessary to prove that the new plan was workable before it was ever brought into existence.

A common belief that is easily dispelled by this argument is that of thinking the greatness of a man makes him great in every particular: therefore, if a prominent man advocates a proposal it must be good for all people. This reduces itself to the following absurdity: Since a certain great man smokes, drinks, and swears, it must not be harmful.

(b) Method of residues.—The residue plan of attacking evidence consists in showing first the conceivable conclusions of a proposition in dispute, including those given by the opponents, and then showing the fallaciousness of all but one which the opponents have not supported and which the speaker does.

The most conspicuous example of this plan of attack is that given in Burke’s “Speech on Conciliation,” in which he finds but three ways of dealing with the American colonies, and eliminates all but the one way he advocates, thus:

As far as I am capable of discerning, there are but three ways of proceeding relative to this stubborn spirit which prevails in your colonies, and disturbs your government. These are: to change that spirit, as inconvenient, by removing the causes; to prosecute it as criminal; or to comply with it as necessary. I would not be guilty of an imperfect enumeration; I can think of but these three . . . If, then, the removal of the causes of this spirit of American liberty be for the greater part, or rather entirely, impracticable; if the ideas of criminal process be inapplicable, or, if applicable, are in the highest degree inexpedient, what way yet remains? No way is open but the third and last, to comply with the American spirit as necessary; or, if you please, to submit to it as a necessary evil.

In a debate on the rejection of a proposed amendment which was being submitted a second time to the states the negative employed the following use of the residue plan:
Why did 36 states refuse to ratify the amendment? Either the amendment itself was unsatisfactory by reason of some of the provisions being unfair or unwarranted, or they were opposed to the principles for which the bill stood. One or the other of these reasons caused them to vote against the bill. A third reason can conceivably be thought of, that they were so swayed by propaganda that their vote against the bill was not the deliberation of reason acting on this measure. But this latter reason is too severe an indictment of our form of government and too preposterous to bear consideration. We have then the other two conditions. As to the first, we find that none of the legislatures in rejecting the amendment levelled any attack at the merits of the bill itself; they attacked it neither in words or in its parts. Instead they said their action was based on the obnoxious principle which gave birth to the bill. Since that is true, why submit another amendment which embodies the same principles, but slightly different provisions? It will meet the same fate as the former amendment.

A similar use of residues is found when the affirmative propose a plan or the negative propose a plan. It is well to state the more practicable plans and then show the reason why only one is really desirable, thus eliminating all others, including the plan of the opposition. The reside method is very popular in debates and is easily adaptable to such use.

(c) The dilemma.—The dilemma is a very frequently misunderstood tool of the debater. Many debaters look upon the dilemma as some kind of a little giant that is discovered in the debate material like a gold nugget in a mountain stream—that it is luck that procures it. This is entirely wrong. The dilemma can be constructed like any other bit of forensic apparatus, and when used skilfully it is one of the most deadly weapons to use against an opponent. Broadly speaking, the dilemma consists in presenting two or more alternatives which the opponent must accept, all of which are equally destructive to his case. There are various forms of the dilemma, but in debate work the simple dilemma is most often used; it alone will be treated here. The dilemma is easily illustrated by imagining a situation in which one is bound to enforce a law against his own friend. Should he enforce the law and lose his friend, or not enforce the law and lose the respect of those who have employed him?

Before one can construct a dilemma he must be certain to have a dilemmatic situation. A typical student dilemma used in a debate on illiteracy in the states took the following form:

The negative will have to admit in the light of these census figures on illiteracy that either the states have not required enough education, or that they are not enforcing the requirements they have. In either case they must admit that the present conditions need improvement.

A famous dilemma in history is that known as Morton's Fork. King Henry VII had a minister named Morton, who informed the people that
those who lived extravagantly could easily afford to make a gift to the king, since their expenditures showed they had money; on the other hand, those who lived frugally could afford a gift since by their frugality they must have saved much money.

The debate dilemma is often brought into play by asking a question of the opposition, who in answering either way expose themselves to the horns of a dilemma. Thus the question: "Do they or do they not favor Federal aid," was prepared with these two answers:

If they favor Federal aid, then we will attack it as undesirable.
If they do not favor it, then we will show how it comes in under their own bill, and how, therefore, they are not consistent with their own plan.

W. J. Bryan, in his famous tariff speech before Congress on March 16, 1892, provided this dilemma:

I submit this proposition: either a tariff is needed or it is not needed. If a tariff is needed, it is in order to add the amount of the tariff to the price of the home article to enable the American manufacturer to compete with the foreigner. If it is not needed, who is going to justify it? Now, which horn of the dilemma will you take? Will you say that this tariff is needed and used; or will you say it is not needed and ought to be abolished?
If, then, that is the purpose of a tariff—to make the man who buys the protected article pay more for that article than he would pay without the tariff, it means simply this: that the law should transfer so much money from my pocket to the pocket of somebody else. You cannot in this way raise an "infant industry" without putting the burden somewhere. Whenever you see the government by operation of law send a dollar singing down into one man's pocket, you must remember that the government has brought it crying up out of some other man's pocket. You might just as well try to raise a weight with a lever without a fulcrum as try to help some particular industry by means of taxation without placing the burden upon the consumer.

No dilemma is unanswerable, but to make it nearly so one must be certain that he includes all alternatives. If the opponent finds a third alternative he need not accept the other two. He may also crawl out of the dilemma by accepting one of the alternatives and showing that what is asserted as following from that alternative does not in fact follow. It is sometimes possible to meet the dilemma with another dilemma, although this is very difficult to do, and can only be done where there is a duo-dilemmatic situation. An example is given in the next chapter under "Defensive Tactics."

4. Ignoring the Proposition.

To show that the debate has shifted to something not really involved in the proposition laid down for debate, by reason of an opponent's error in introducing material beside the point, helps
one to lead the audience into considering only the true debate proposition and the relevant proof that accompanies it.

(a) Begging the question.—Sometimes a debater will beg the question for debate, meaning that he is arguing around the subject instead of on the subject. It may be done by use of question-begging words, as in the statement, “The insidious practice of settling labor disputes by collective bargaining should cease.” Here what is in dispute is called an “insidious practice.” This is an unwarranted assumption until the debate proves it is an insidious practice.

Question begging also consists in arguing in a circle, a very subtle error hard to detect when accompanied with much verbiage. Take for instance the statement “Playing football, an excellent form of exercise for youth, is highly advantageous to the country, for it is to the best interests of the state that young men have abundant opportunity to develop their bodies.” This statement says practically nothing as a reason why football is advantageous to the country, since it states the same proposition over again in another form as the reasons for the first statement of the proposition. Another example of arguing in a circle is illustrated by the statement: “We know that God exists, because the Bible tells us so; and we know that whatever the Bible affirms is true, because it is of divine origin.”

(b) Argument “ad hominem.”—An excellent example of argument “ad hominem,” which is an attack on the opponent’s personal qualities rather than on the proposition he supports, is the first part of Webster’s “Reply to Hayne,” in which the noted lawyer abuses his opponent at great length for a feigned attack on Webster and his New England colleagues because of their stand on the Foote resolution.

This type of argument ignores the proposition for debate, for no proposition involves a criticism of the debater’s personality, and that is the substance of this type of argument. The assumption maintained in this form of attack is that a man who has personal disqualifications is never associated with a proposition of worth, and likewise a man who has unimpeachable integrity never supports or is associated with a proposition that is worthless. Neither one of these assumptions is maintainable according to the dictates of sound reason, and thus the argument “ad hominem” is in effect a fallacy.

Whenever any proof points not to the truth or untruth of a proposal which is debated, but rather to the character or record of an advocate or opponent of that proposal it is an argument “ad hominem.” The debater should expose any such proof used against his position, for it completely ignores the proposition for debate.

(c) Argument “ad populum.”—The use of
facts showing public opinion is for or against a measure is the argument “ad populum.” It is based on the false assumption that the people in general do not support a measure that is not worthy, and that they do support any measure that is worthy. Public opinion is at most an illusive sort of proof, for it is almost impossible to get any accurate facts concerning it. It can be sensed by an audience more easily than it can be proved to them. Nevertheless, debaters often find that certain organizations favor a proposal of national importance, and at once deduce that since so many people favor the measure it must be a good one. The speciousness of this argument is easily exposed. No one knows why the people advocate the measure, and it cannot be determined. There may be base motives behind their advocacy, or an entirely different set of motives than those who use this type of argument believe. There is an example of “ad populum” argument used as an example of something else in this book. Can the student find it?

The danger in attacking the argument “ad populum” is that it is attacking the public in general. Many a politician has found himself confronted with a dilemma in the use of this argument, since an answer may mean a censuring of the body politic, not a wise step to take.

For a classic instance of the use of this argument the reader is referred to Mark Anthony's speech to the Roman mob in Shakespeare's play “Julius Caesar.” As the play indicates, appeal to group feelings may result in action, although the basis of such action is not founded on reason.

This same type of argument appears where the sympathy of the audience is being solicited to support a cause. Working on the emotions of a group is argument “ad populum”; it is another type of persuasion.

(d) Argument “ad ignorantiam.”—Whenever an argument is advanced which shifts the burden of proof upon the other party simply because there is no evidence that can be produced by that party, it is resorting to this peculiar species of argument begging the real issue in the debate. The argument assumes that an absence of proof means that a certain proposition is true. One man attempted to prove perpetual motion as being an impossibility by this proposal:

Perpetual motion is impossible,
For no one in 2,000 years has succeeded in demonstrating it.

This is a somewhat convincing argument, but it is not entirely so. There may not have been a single attempt to discover perpetual motion, in which case the argument is groundless.

When an argument is supported by the lack of proof on the other party instead of by showing the truth or falsity of a proposition the proponent
is not giving his listeners anything of substance to judge of the merits of his proposition. He is simply relying on the ignorance of his opponent, which is the effect of the argument "ad ignorantiam."

(e) Argument "ad verecundiam."—This type of ignoring the question is found when a speaker calls upon the audience's reverence for a certain idea to support it as being true; or respect for a certain man, to believe what he says. Thus, all people have respect for a very old man, so much so that he is looked upon as some sort of a sage, and what he says on a subject involving judgment is taken to be nearer the truth than a similar statement made by a young or middle-aged man. This is argument "ad verecundiam," an appeal to the sentimental respect in a person to gain support for a proposition.

This argument also occurs where a great authority is called upon as an authority in a field in which he knows little; as, quoting an eminent man of science on a problem of statesmanship. To the superficial thinker, it is often accepted as true, that a great man in one field is equally great in other fields, since his greatness comes not from a specialty but from some gift of the gods. The small boy uses this argument, sometimes with considerable success, when he says to his mother, "Dad does it, so I ought to be able to do it, too."

Chapter IV

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS

The artifices of debate are by no means exhausted by the suggestions in the preceding chapters. Debate reaches its highest form when debaters resort to their intellectual versatility to win a decision after a question has been discussed on its merits with equal skill by both parties. If debate were never to reach this stage there would be no premium on experience in debating.

As in any contest or game there are tricks in the debating field which, when resorted to, often compel a favorable decision in spite of odds against one on the side of pure proof. To favor such tactics is not contrary to the spirit of debate or its purpose, for as was remarked in an earlier chapter, debating is after all a game. It is not entirely a search after a truth, since such truth is unattainable in almost every debate proposition.

A study of the following methods, all of which have been tried out successfully in debates, will reveal to the debater how highly developed debating skill can become, and what an opportunity for quick thinking and training in mental alertness is afforded in debate practice. To make this chapter more useful the methods below have been
divided into offensive and defensive methods. The two overlap at times, but the demarcation is clear enough to warrant the bifurcation attempted.

I. Offensive Tactics

A debate between two experienced teams is a continual striving on the part of both parties to put the other on the defensive. Logically the party who ends the debate on the defensive should be the loser; practically the same result usually follows, but not always. Whenever a team is on the defensive a layman who has followed the debate carefully can detect it; and as soon as he detects it he begins to look askance at that team and what it henceforth produces. The same effect is made upon the mind of a judge, either consciously or unconsciously. Likewise do the debaters know when they are on the defensive, and must strive with more than usual effort to once more “come out on top.”

The team that is on the defensive is put in the position where it must spend its time rehabilitating its own case, clearing up inconsistencies, explaining certain evidence that has been questioned, justifying all over again in rebuttal its choice of issues, and in general spending its precious moments of speaking time not in hammering away at the opponents’ case but in making its own case as good as it was when first unattacked. The defensive position cannot be entirely ignored, although there is good strategy in doing this, if the original case presented is sound to a reasonable degree. Then a team will do well in ignoring the attack made upon it for the simple reason that it will take too much time to answer it, and instead attack in turn with strong rebuttal the case of the opposition. This serves to distract the minds of the audience completely from the weakness of the speaker’s case, injured by the attacks upon it, and focuses its attention on the case of the opponents, now being riddled in similar fashion. It is hard for the human mind to keep the comparative status of the two cases in mind at the same time, and this frailty of human nature makes the strategy just outlined entirely suitable where the occasion arises.

Since it is to the advantage of a debater to stay off the defensive he should prevent it as much as possible by the use of offensive tactics. A partial list of these is outlined and explained below:

(a) Stating the essentials of proof for the opponents.—This device is a frequent tool of the first negative speaker, although it can be used with equal force by the affirmative team, and by the negative at some other stage of the debate besides the first negative speech. As used by the first negative it consists in making plain to the affirmative, and incidentally the audience, just what comprises the burden of proof for the
affirmative. Since the affirmative are advocating a departure of policy, something new, they have the burden of proof (see Chapter VI). To emphasize this burden and exaggerate it serves to upset an affirmative team that has not thought of its burden seriously before, or which cannot adequately answer an exaggerated statement of it. Besides this advantage, there is another one in making the audience feel that you are going to stand behind your guns and make the other party fight its battle where the fortifications rightfully are placed.

They will not be allowed to shift ground or to beguile the audience by speaking off the subject. A clever misstatement of the burden, also, may be accepted by the other team without analysis. In other words, that team may assume the position of proving more than it needs to prove. Since each team should know what it must do to win, it is hardly trickery to inveigle an opponent into such a trap. Debating is not a parlor game. Some ruthless treatment of the opponent is ethical, and since debate is to a great extent a game of wits and courage, such practices are more to be applauded than condemned.

At various times in the debate a debater can reëmphasize just what burden still rests upon the opposition, either as a whole, or as it rests upon some one speaker who has advocated a certain part of the case.

A variation from the affirmative statement of the burden as it appears to rest on the opposition is sometimes resorted to, consisting of a list of questions aimed at the proposal put forth by the affirmative. A broadside of questions is given and closed with the remark, "Until they have answered all these questions satisfactorily, they have not proved their case." This is a good offensive measure. The way to handle such an onslaught is to accept the list, if it is reasonable, and state from the platform that the questions will be answered to the entire satisfaction of the proponents somewhere in the course of the debate, if they will kindly pay attention to what is forthcoming. It is never incumbent to take up such a list and answer it. To do so would be utter folly, since often it is impossible to answer the list in the time allowed for all the main constructive speeches. A wise debate team will not sidestep the challenge but will explain that the questions have been adequately cared for in the preparation of the case.

In his famous speech on the tariff William Jennings Bryan ably stated the position of a protectionist:

The man who justifies protection as a principle must prove three things: he must prove that the principle is right; that the policy is wise; and that the tax is necessary.
(b) Resort to indefiniteness.—It would seem at first view that definiteness in debate is always more expedient than indefiniteness, but such is not the case. Sometimes a debater will find it useful to make his stand indefinite on a certain proposition in the debate. Definiteness exposes him to direct attack; indefiniteness, to no attack, except an attack on not having taken a stand. This is always weak, since there is nothing susceptible to direct contradiction or disproof. An affirmative team finds it valuable sometimes to pass by the matter of defining words or phrases in the statement of the issue, for the reason that to do so exposes it to the opponents’ attack too easily. If the opposition does not challenge the omission, or does not press its challenge, once given, the affirmative may get entirely through the debate without being attacked directly on the lack of definitions. Then, if the negative sees fit to restate the challenge late in the debate, it exposes itself to the censure of pressing a minor point rather late in the debate, instead of pressing the contentions on major issues.

Such strategy is often used where a proposition for debate is so worded as to give the affirmative an initial handicap. By passing over the usual preliminary matter of defining the proposition accurately the affirmative attempts to get the negative to waive a closer defining. If the negative passes by the usual challenge in the first speech it can very well be considered by the affirmative to have waived definition.

(c) The use of questions.—Several judges of the author’s acquaintance have said to him that in a debate they watch particularly to see what questions are asked that go unanswered. The team that does not answer a question put squarely to it may be considered incapable of answering it; if it is crucial, then it is evading the matter at issue. This statement is also affirmed by the author’s experience as a judge. Questions are challenges, and challenges or “dares” must be met or treated in some way. There is no use sidestepping them. They will persist, and if the questioners repeat them, it is a doubly effective offensive move.

Knowing this, why not build certain important questions in the main speeches themselves? Such case construction makes good offensive strategy, especially when a reply is formulated for any conceivable answer that such questions may invoke. Questions on crucial points at issue may be so worded that the opposition will be entrapped into taking a stand from which they cannot extricate themselves without difficulty and loss of time. Furthermore, questions may be leads to dilemmas, so worded that an answer of any kind will expose the opposition to a direct attack of a criminating nature. Their wider usefulness is in clarifying the issue in favor of their
proponents and in aiding in the establishment of salient points. Questions should not be made offhand; their wording should be carefully studied and decided upon.

When questions are put, time should be given to the opposition to answer them. Then if no answer is forthcoming, the questions ought to be repeated. If no answer comes up to the last rebuttal, then the last rebuttal speaker can include the unanswered questions in his rebuttal as evidence that the opposition will not meet the case on common ground.

Not many pertinent questions can be asked in the course of a debate. A long list of them arouses suspicion, and no reasonable debate judge will expect an opponent to spend his time answering a long list of questions involving the substance of the entire debate itself. Only when a question is used to make the opposition take a definite position or state its case should it be used.

(d) The value of reiteration.—A very clever form of strategy is to reiterate the strong points of a case in spite of the attack made against them. Even if an argument has been answered fairly satisfactorily, a complete ignoring of that answer will tend to discredit it, and make the listeners feel that the argument still stands untouched by a “futile” reply. Besides having a psychological effort on the audience, it disconcerts an opponent to find his answer has been ignored, and he can do little to reaffirm it. He must resort to the same strategy. “Harping on the same issues” is a method by which many a team has coasted through to a victory where defeat was almost certain. Not having anything else to rely on, one team went back over its case stating with renewed vigor the faultlessness of its logic and the impregnable character of its evidence, to its opponents’ consternation, and thus won a lost debate. Such aggressiveness in any event will receive the hearty commendation of a judge or audience, and do more to credit than discredit a team.

The author has seen a team wilt under a repeated affirmation of points already handled, by debaters making them think that they could not meet the arguments when as a fact they had already been taken care of. One member of a team went so far as to finally admit an argument as unanswerable, because it was continually emphasized by the members of the other team, although it had long since been answered. The debaters made the other side forget its own answer, and since that side never again invoked that answer, it gave the impression to the listeners that it had lost faith in its own response originally presented.

(e) Multifold answers and arguments.—To be content with a single answer or reason is stak-
ing a debate on too small a margin of safety. At least other corroborative material should be close at hand for use in rebuttal. But a further use can be made of reinforcing material by employing it at the same time to make the argument thus supported appear insuperable.

A similar offensive move can be made in rebuttal where a debater instead of relying on a single shred of evidence to refute a point, calls forth from his card-index box, or other sources, about four separate pieces of evidence to meet a point advanced. In this way the impression is given that the evidence is all one way, in favor of the rebutter; or at least makes it incumbent on the other part to again handle that point to gain an advantage on it. It is always valuable to have several sets of statistics where they support one’s case. In case one set is rendered harmless there is additional evidence, and in case the evidence is used in attack it can be piled up until there is a mountain of it to be overcome by the other team.

Multifold answers further advance the cause of the user inasmuch as they make a listener feel that this debater has an inexhaustible supply of material, has searched the records thoroughly, and is competent to handle any point that comes up; ergo, he is likely to be thought of as a winning debater on a winning team.

(f) Forcing the opponent to shift ground.—

Here is an adroit method to lead an opponent into difficulties. It is accomplished by raising, somewhere in the course of a debate, inquiries concerning mooted problems which really have no bearing on the real question at issue, although they have an apparent bearing. Without spending any time on such inquiries himself the debater introduces them with the remark, “But what of the... which is a likely situation that the opponents have not yet told us the answer to,” as if he were placing much stock in the answer to the question when he in fact only puts it to lead his opponent to answer it and discuss it so as to make him consume his valuable time on what is valueless as a point in winning the debate.

Later the debater who proposes such inquiries makes the uselessness of his opponent’s discussion stand out by his ignoring the whole substance of the point with the remark that “that has really no vital bearing on the subject we are debating.” Considerable astuteness and understanding of an opponent’s susceptibilities is necessary to make an opponent shift ground. Sometimes an opponent must be led unwittingly into a discussion by repeated queries. If he is once led astray the deviations into which he may go are endless. The hardest task is to get him off the subject; once that is done, he is usually amenable to further misleading.

(g) The complicated plan.—Both the affirma-
tive and negative have recourse at times to a plan to take care of existing evils under a proposition used for debate. The affirmative often must present a plan to make their policy a concrete one, while the negative resort to a substitute plan to offset the plan of the affirmative. A plan consisting of few parts, simple to comprehend as to the underlying principle, and the additional parts that support it, is easily attacked and less easily defended. On the other hand, a complicated plan as to its particulars, but simple in underlying principle, is hard to meet without misgivings. The principle alone cannot be assailed, for the proponents can well beg off by showing from the particulars that the principle has been misunderstood. On the other hand, a complete assailment of the parts calls for quick brainwork and probable waste of time. It is in this dilemma that the complicated plan shows its real offensive power.

By complicated, it is not meant that the plan is not easily understood. Instead, by that word is meant that the plan consists of so many parts that its ultimate effect is hardly predictable except by the proponent who has studied it and who has plenty of anticipated support for it. Since its effect is unpredictable, what kind of a direct attack can be made upon it? None of much convincingness is likely to proceed in answer, and in that fair certainty lies the effectiveness of the complicated plan as an offensive weapon.

There is no element of unfairness in delaying the presentation of a plan in the main speeches. However, there is also little to be gained in doing so. Usually the plan fits in better in the last main speeches, and therefore it is ordinarily placed there. Under no circumstances should it be presented in rebuttal, not only because it violates the rule of what the rebuttal must consist of, but also because it is unethical to give the opponents so little time to make an attack.

(h) Inviting to attack a strong position.—Some portions of a case are more supportable than others. The debater knows this by the evidence that he accumulates on one part of the case in contrast with the disparity of evidence on some other part. Where he has much ammunition he should invite his opponent to attack. In rebuttal he will be able to make a strong stand, while his opponent fails to gain his rightful returns on the weak parts of the opposing case.

There is seldom any difficulty in accomplishing this bit of intrigue on an unsuspecting opponent. He is challenged peremptorily to show the weakness in a certain issue; he is questioned concerning it; he is in fact made to feel that if he can "hit" that issue hard he has the opposition where it cannot recover, since it seemingly is depending solely on the strength of that particular issue. The opponent gets his surprise, then, when
he finds he has struck a "beehive" and that the strategist has purposely made him attack that issue because of the preponderance of strong evidence that is available for his own use. It is a case of giving the other man enough rope to hang himself.

Besides being an easy bit of manoeuvring, it is one whose force is discernible rather quickly by an average audience, who delight in finding that the scheme has worked perfectly.

(i) The last affirmative rebuttal.—The last rebuttal on the affirmative is the last speech in the debate, and is a time for extreme aggressiveness in summing up the two cases. Sometimes debaters abuse the privilege they have in the very last rebuttal and insert unfair comments about the debate to the advantage of the side they represent. Thinking they have a free field to say the last word, they contrive to say things not strictly authentic. Although the last rebuttal is a strong offensive instrument it should not be misused. Instead, the last rebuttal should include a strong, biased summing up, together with a repetition of challenges unanswered, some crashing rebuttal in answer to the last opposite speech, and a favorable survey of the whole debate. The summing up especially can be prepared and delivered as a one-sided accurate picture of the debate. The debater should be warned that his freedom from reply does not give him license to say anything he wants to. He must be guided by the good sense of a debater, fairness with which his opponent is to be treated, and an application of the Golden Rule.

(j) Constructive refutation speech.—The debater is referred to the chapter on "Assembling the Proof" for this example of offensive tactics incorporated in the main speeches.

II. Defensive Tactics

The tactics described here are not tactics to get one on the defensive, but to get one off the defensive when the effort made in that direction by the other team seems to have fairly succeeded. The difference between this group of tactics and the one just discussed lies not so much in the purpose as in the occasion which will cause one or the other to be used. Offensive devices can be used at any time; defensive devices are emergency measures to equilibrate a contest that has temporarily assumed a one-sided character.

As was explained at the head of this chapter, no team wants to be put on the defensive. But a clever team may still find itself on the defensive when debating an equally strong team; and it is on that occasion that the following kind of tactics comes into play. As with the preceding list of offensive devices, the list is only suggestive. All the exigencies of debating cannot be foreseen by any human mind, nor the circumstances which
give rise to the various methods employed by debaters in winning by pure strategy. By studying the material below the reader will get a fair idea of what possibilities are available in getting off the offensive in a debate.

(a) Evading a direct answer.—When questions are put and are pressed for an answer what is the debater to do but to answer? If an answer can be given without serious impairment of one’s chances to win, the answer should be given. However, sometimes a team that resorts to questions will not press them on an opponent. In this case one can often evade an answer entirely by stating the question over and immediately following it with argumentative material that does not in fact answer that question. Often the questioners will fail to see the connection between the question and what is presented for an answer, but thinking they have not been keen enough to grasp that connection, will not challenge or question the “answer” given. In this way the question is set aside; perhaps a keen-witted judge will give no credit to the replicant, but he can give little credit to the antagonist who fails to take advantage of the misfiring reply.

This method is also used where no question is asked. When an argument is used that appears almost impossible to meet it can be side-tracked neatly against some teams by pretending it is being handled, when in fact it is not touched upon at all. A certain volubility in speaking is necessary to accomplish this desideratum so that it is undetectable, but several attempts will convince the debater it is a faculty well worth acquiring. A species of bravado makes up the whole gist of this strategy; one must take the bull by the horns and throw it under the cloak of duplicity. Debaters refrain from this method of meeting an impregnable case largely because they feel they are not handling it. They must remember that their thorough study of the question has given them a mature viewpoint of the whole, and an impartial judge and audience is not so quick to perceive such subtlety as the debaters.

(b) Restating opponent’s position.—A clever circumvention is in restating the opponent’s position better than he has. This was a frequent resort of Abraham Lincoln. He would take the position of his opponent, and show it in concrete terms to be almost impregnable; he would make much of its apparent plausibility so that his audience got the impression that he was going to concede the point. He was acting on the defensive purposely, because the argument was admittedly strong enough for that anyway. Then from this point he would commence to dissect that position of his adversary step by step, showing in a careless sort of way that he himself was discovering it not to be as sound as he first thought. And he would end by having completely demol-
ished his rival’s position as if it were the most
natural consequence in the world. At the same
time he would seem to be utterly oblivious of
what he had done, and his audience would mar-
vel at the skill of a man who could do such things
as if they were everyday occurrences.

The debater also can sometimes restate his op-
ponent’s case and then after having made it
appear strong in every particular, find a single flaw
in it and then unravel it till not a shred of truth
remains in it. The worth of this method lies in
its apparent artlessness. The debater gains a
moral advantage as well as winning the point.
He feigns the appearance of first being stumped
by his foe’s argument, then he begins to see a
ray of hope, his audience sympathizes with him,
then it follows him to victory and he retires a
modest winner while the audience cheers his
genius.

(c) Feigning ignorance.—Somewhat similar to
the tactics of restating an opponent’s position is
the plan of not heeding an opponent’s attack un-
til it has been repeated several times. The de-
bater finds his antagonist asking him to take a
certain stand; then his antagonist grows enthus-
asiastic and says he dares not take that stand;
finally he waxes still warmer and shows the audi-
ence the danger to his opponent if he does take
that stand. Having made a brilliant display of
challenging, his opponent then comes forward
meekly and acknowledges that he has been chal-
 lenged, and forthwith gives very coolly a com-
plete answer to his opponent, making it so all-
inclusive that his opponent has no reply to make.

The psychological effect of this method is very
great. Moreover, the situation arises in almost
every debate, although often overlooked. It can
be deliberately planned, by one side leaving out
a much-discussed but not all-important point of
proof. The assailant will seize the omission as a
golden opportunity, only later to be rebuffed
abruptly.

An air of nonchalance or indifference should be
worn while the opponent is making his cumula-
tive onslaughts, and when the answer is later
given it should be presented as if the deliverer
were aware of that answer all the time, but did
not deem the point sufficiently important to de-
serve his valued attention.

(d) Reversing opponent’s position against
himself.—A question of some importance, or a
dilemma, which a debater does not care to an-
swer, can be turned back upon an opponent in
some instances so that further handling of that
matter is made unnecessary.

For instance, an opponent may ask a vital
question. It has a direct bearing upon the sub-
ject at issue. Need it be answered? If that
question could be as appropriately asked by the
other side (had they prepared a reply to the re-
mark that the question is expected to invoke, they might as well reverse the question with the remark:

This question seems to us to be an entirely fair one; what puzzles us is why the affirmative do not themselves state to us what their position is on this same question. It is as useful for us to know that as it is for them to know our position.

Although this is "passing the buck" pure and simple, it usually works; and an audience feels commiseration for the team that has been so imposed upon as to be expected to answer a question which the proponents themselves can well answer.

To reverse a dilemma upon an opponent is not an easy task, especially where the dilemma is skilfully constructed. When it can be done, there is perhaps no better defensive play in all debating. A classic example of this type of reply is the story "Litigiosus" where Protagoras had agreed to teach Euathlus rhetoric for a certain fee, half of which was to be paid when the pupil had been taught, and the other half when the pupil won his first case in court. Euathlus did not practice law for some time, so to hurry payment Protagoras brought suit against his pupil, and presented this dilemma as an argument to the court:

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE TACTICS

Should my pupil lose his case now before the court, then by order of the court, he must pay. If he wins the case, then he ought to pay by his own agreement. Since he will either lose or win it, he ought to pay.

The pupil replied with this counteredilemma:

Should I win this case, then by order of this court I need not pay; on the other hand, if I lose this case, then by my own agreement I should not pay.

Since I will either lose or win it, I ought not be required to pay.

(e) Trapping "canned" rebuttal.—Although not strictly a defensive weapon, since canned rebuttal seldom is harmful, still a team not used to meeting it can better handle it by anticipating it in some way. Canned rebuttal is most noticeable when it "misfires," when it rebuts what has not been presented in a debate. Knowing this as its chief characteristic, a bit of strategy can be employed in exposing it directly by omitting to use certain popular arguments. A canned rebuttal never omits such arguments. It is a rebuttal against arguments which the debater is so certain will be used that he thinks his rebuttal will clash with the opposing case. By omitting to use these arguments the debater can then show to his audience the artificial character of his adversary's attack, by revealing that it fails to attack the opposing case, and instead rebuts what is not presented for rebuttal.
The effect is ruinous to the one using canned rebuttal, and also excuses the debater from any attempt at abusing his opponent for the misadventure. Usually a good debate team resents canned rebuttal. Its emotions are aroused and unleashed to the discomfort of the audience. A planned attack will destroy the likelihood of using wrong methods in meeting canned rebuttal.

(f) Issues out of natural order.—Similar to the fault of canned rebuttal is the canned speech with canned refutation. Such a speech anticipates that issues will follow in natural sequence, and that the first affirmative and first negative speeches will be on “necessity.” By putting the “necessity” issue last, if it is used, very little disad- vantage results, and any team that uses a speech anticipatory of a certain order will find itself hopelessly lost in the use of that speech. Nothing is so pitiful as to see a first negative speaker get up and deliver a speech built upon the idea that the first affirmative speaker would speak on “necessity” when in fact such a speech was not used. The artificiality of such debating is at once exposed, and no further comments need be made by the debaters about the unwise tactics employed by the other team.

(g) Use of reserve force.—Defensive work consists also in not using the full force of one’s arguments until the rebuttal period. The main speeches are upheld blithely, and refutation is sharp and eager. But no attempt is made to make a “show” of one’s abilities until the latter period of the debate. In this period all force possible is used against the opponents. Points formerly left unanswered are dismissed with strong replies, questions are handled effectively, and the whole appearance is that of an army making a new attack along its entire front, routing the enemy that has lately basked in the self-confidence of victory.

It is “display” type of debating, expecting the impression to count for much in making the judge feel that the team that can come back strong in rebuttal has the more reserve and margin of success in debating that particular question.

In this type of rebuttal little organization is needed. Once a broadside of arguments is launched, the effect is overpowering; and no one expects a team to follow the opponent’s case from one point to another as long as the attack is overwhelming in extent. Rapid speaking is required, and is more effective in fact in this type of rebuttal than slow speaking. It gives the impression that the debater is so full of material to answer his opponent that he cannot get it all out before his time is up. He asks by his appearance the indulgence of the audience and his opponents in paying close attention to the many rapid-fire replies he has to make in his limited time. The
result on an audience is immediate, and conclusively in favor of the debaters who have withheld their reserve till the last part of the debate, and then have come from behind to snatch away a victory nearly sacrificed.

(h) Miscellaneous devices.—The debater must use his own ingenuity in fashioning out for himself tricks of the debate trade to help him when arguments and evidence will fail. He will find it helpful sometimes to avoid the use of catch words denoting issues and points, such as "uniformity," "constitutionality," "practical," "justifiable," for these terms will fit in well with the divisions of the other team's main speeches, as well as their card-index rebuttal. If instead of uniformity the term "standardization" is substituted, there is enough off-color inserted to wilder the opponent to the extent of making him feel that his prepared material on "uniformity" does not fit in. The ruse will work, for the author has seen it done in practice with considerable success.

In one debate a proposal that authority be given a board "with plenary power" upset the other team, who hurriedly called for a dictionary to find out what plenary power was, the word not being familiar to them. Likewise it was not familiar to all of the audience, but the skilled judges of mature training knew very well what "plenary power" was; and the audience on such occasions is very willing to pretend that they know.

Questions may sometimes be postponed for answering, and then entirely forgotten. If the other team does not again bring them to attention, they are summarily dropped from consideration. If the proponents again mention them, they should not again be sidestepped. In the same manner questions need not be answered directly; if an answer in part is given in the course of the debate the debater may well reply that the question has already been answered in the course of the debate, although not directly. In this way he does not shirk his responsibility, and yet escapes the direct censure which that answer would give him. His opponent should pay attention to his case so that he will catch the answer, no matter how artfully concealed.

Previous chapters have also suggested methods of evasion and strategy. New devices are continually employed, and those discussed in this chapter are meant to make the student think for himself how a team may be caught napping or led astray by inattentiveness at some time during the debate. Close study of the subject of debate and analytical observation of debates between good teams will indicate to the debater still other ways of making his debate work interesting as a study in human nature and psychology.
Every proposition for debate has its own characteristic features which enable a debater, by close analysis, to discover where it is possible to apply strategical methods in upholding or attacking it during the debate. Different propositions require different treatment, not only in the organization of the cases themselves, but also in the manipulation of the material within them. Strategy, like rebuttal, can be planned out ahead of time; not absolutely, of course, but to a larger extent than most embryo debaters realize. Again let it be known to the student that perfect debate technique comes from concentrated preparation.

Chapter V

THE DEBATE TEAM

I. Team Organization

1. Personnel of the Team.

A debate team should look like a team; that is the guide to selecting it when other qualities of the squad are equal. Even such uncontrollable factors as size, build, and voice must be taken into account. A team consisting of three young men of the same size and build, with equally strong voices and delivery, carries the impression of being a debate team. While a team consisting of one man six feet tall and two five feet tall, one of which weighs a hundred pounds and the other two hundred, may be a debate team, but it does not look like one.

What is said here is not in discouragement of unevenly balanced teams. It is only meant to act as a guide where some adjustment toward greater potential force is possible by the personnel of the group that proves usable debate material.

The external features of the group convey a better impression than is sometimes anticipated. The team should be as nearly homogeneous in appearance as possible, after taking into consid-
eration the other factors enumerated here in Part I. On the platform the team should be dressed plainly and uniformly, to give some semblance of order in the team. Where two men are dressed in dark suits and another in a flashy light suit, the latter seems to be an outsider brought in to substitute for the team.

Where a squad furnishes girl debaters who have made themselves eligible to debate, the same care in choice of a team should be followed. It is better that a squad be divided into mixed teams than teams made up of the same sex, unless girl debates and boy debates are to be had. A mixed team is ideal, where all members are equally good debaters. The girl debater as a rule lacks some of the vigor of a man, but at the same time she has greater persuasive qualities.

In the building up of teams the delivery of the respective applicants must also be taken into consideration. If not all debaters have pleasing delivery those who do have should be apportioned among the various teams so that there is no handicap suffered by any team in delivery. The goal on the part of all debaters is a pleasing delivery, but when it cannot be attained the next best move is to divide those of pleasing delivery so that all teams can be judged to some extent on this aspect of debating, without too great loss.

The personnel of a team is also to be determined by the respective abilities of the debaters. Some debaters have a ready facility in formulating answers to arguments. They are "feeders." Nothing is said that they cannot find an answer for, either by looking up in their assembled material on the platform, or by their quick-wittedness. At the same time they may not be very good at delivery. One "feeder" is an asset to any team. He can keep any team from getting stumped, and although it is inconvenient to transfer such material and knowledge back and forth between two team members, it is now and then the only way to win a debate. Other debaters are better on delivery, and talking about the subject. They are not strong analysts nor quick thinkers, but they are suave in convincing others by their happy faculty of speaking well. Another variety of debater often found is the debater who can in a brief moment find just what his opponents are driving at. He quickly sees their plan of attack, and what must be done to forestall it, or to meet it. He looks at the debate more as a whole than as an aggregate of separate arguments and issues.

The fact that the respective abilities of debaters differ, must also be taken into account in selecting a team. One must first start by deciding upon how many teams must be in the field at the same time. If only one, the problem is simple: put the best debaters on that team. If several teams must be debating at the same time,
the good material must be divided among them, unless one wishes to sacrifice one debate in the hope of winning another by massing good debaters. This, however, seldom yields much fruit, and it is unfair to the debaters who are thus seeded to lose instead of to win; they are expected to win in spite of their great handicap.

2. Speaking Order.

Likewise some attention should be paid to the speaking order of the debaters within the team. It is usually better to put the best speaker first in the main speeches, and last in the rebuttal speeches. This gives him ample time to arrange his comprehensive summary, as well as plan his rebuttal and help in the preparation of his colleagues' rebuttals. However, it happens that the best speaker is not always the best rebuttalist. By all means the best rebuttalist should speak last in rebuttal, and his position in the main speeches can be second. If, however, the last main speech is to be given over mainly to rebuttal, he should be made third main speaker.

The first affirmative speaker has no preliminary refutation work. For that reason it is common to put first on the affirmative a good speaker who may be slow in refutation. All he needs to do is to give a "set" speech, word for word, although disguised as to the memorized portions, and to do his best to get the audience looking with favor upon his proposition. Personality counts for much in the first affirmative speech. One who speaks pleasingly and at the same time convincingly ought to take this position.

The rebuttal speaker who is prone to speak fast and make a good many points without organizing them, is the ideal second rebuttal speaker on a three-member team. He starts the offensive for the final spurt and at the same time gains a great deal of ground. His lack of organization is offset by the firm, methodical analysis which should follow him in the last rebuttal speech.

Where there are two boys and a girl on a team, and the girl has equal ability with the boys, it is customary to have the girl speak second in both main speeches and in rebuttal. However, if she has special ability, her position will be governed according to the juncture at which that special ability is best displayed.

3. The Squad.

The squad consists of all those debaters who have gone through the entire preparatory season up to the time of the debates with close attention to the work being done for the actual debates to follow. This squad should be used as the reserve, and every member of the squad assigned some position on the affirmative or negative team of some question being debated. Furthermore the
members assigned to some one position should be ranked as first alternate, second alternate, and so forth. In addition, one alternate of considerable versatility and possessing fair rebuttal ability should be selected, who should be drilled well on all main speeches on one side of the debate. This alternate accompanies the team on long trips where it is not possible to take more than the team and one extra debater.

The selection of the alternates for the various positions, and their rankings, is best determined by a series of try-out debates several weeks before the opening of the debate season. These debates are held on the subjects to be debated, and either outside judges are called in to judge the debaters or the coach himself can be the judge.

The function of the squad does not cease when the debate season starts. The squad should meet regularly apart from the teams, discuss each debate, and be assigned to look up special material which had not hitherto been thought of as essential for the debate. At the same time the squad is the melting pot for ideas thought to be of use to the debaters in later debates. These ideas are threshed out and submitted by the squad secretary to the debaters, who accept or reject the suggestions as they see fit, in their case meetings.

The squad teams should also participate in debates with less well-known teams during the debate season. This not only gives them practice and experience, but serves to bring in new ideas which the regular debates by the first team do not bring in. The wider the field of experience in which a debate group can engage, the more likely it is to get all the ideas on the subject for its own use in its crucial debates. A squad properly managed is a tremendous asset to a team.

4. Selecting the Captains.

Each team should have a captain, even a two-man team. One of the group must take the major responsibility, and although there is not a large number of players to supervise and direct at one time, still to be able to look to one as the authority helps the debater who is indecisive on some point in a debate. The captain should be an experienced debater, or one who has, by his squad training, proved to be resourceful in platform work. Generalship on the platform comprises the most important part of the captain's work, and unless one is capable in platform management he should not be given the captaincy. The choice of captain is better left to the coach to appoint, for he can better judge of the debaters' qualities in the different departments of debate and tell which one is best able to captain a team.

The captain on the platform is a sort of team strategist. He handles the major share of disputed points, and those questions whose answers are difficult to propound. However, he need not
be an all-around debater. Special knack in keeping other debaters in the harness and telling them what to do fits a man for the captaincy. The captain should take his task seriously, and endeavor to think out ahead of each debate, how he will conduct his team’s part of the debate. He is by no means a figurehead; he is the most influential cog in the debate machine that the coach sends to the platform.

The captain should apprise himself well of what material his teammates have prepared. He should know the respective rebuttal qualities of his teammates on each point, so that he can assign, if need be, a certain point to be rebutted to one or another of his colleagues. In addition, it is important that he see before the debate that all necessary reference works are brought to the platform, that they are properly indexed or tabbed, and that in making trips all the necessary paraphernalia is taken along, and at all times kept under the surveillance of at least one of the group.

5. Organize Early.

A team is not a team in the strictest sense of the word until each member knows intimately every other member. The best team is one that eats, works, and sleeps together. Constant association is good for a team; it makes it think as one individual, and the interchange of ideas becomes so constant that judgment on any point is judgment of the entire group. Homogeneity of thought is the product of close association, and to bring this desirable objective about the teams should be selected several weeks before the opening of debate season.

They then talk over mooted points among themselves. It also saves the coach’s time, for instead of bringing a mooted point to the coach the team member takes it to the other members of the team. If they agree it cannot be answered on their meagre knowledge or left to their judgment, it is taken to the coach, who renders final judgment or gives his advice. Thus team selection has a distinct advantage when done early, not only with regard to the teammates themselves, but also with respect to saving the coach’s time.

Then, in addition, there is something akin to brotherly affection in a group after it has been brought together, for the thought of common responsibility and common fate gives each one a stimulus that forces him to do his best in obtaining for all the success they deserve. It is this added guarantee of putting forth the best that is in one that makes early association a strong aid in getting a team to perform to its utmost capacity.

The division of the squad into teams, and the selection of the two first teams should not be postponed later than three weeks before the first
debate. If it can be done more than a month sooner, so much the better. Debating requires considerable brooding over; it cannot be thought out easily when time is pressing, nor can it be forced out. It must come naturally to a person after thorough study. In order to make team selection possible rather early, it is almost essential to begin squad practice at least three months before the first debate, depending, of course, on the amount of time that is devoted each day to debate as well as on the amount of individual responsibility borne by the debaters, and the amount of class recitation work that is expected from the group.

For a thorough analysis of a question by a squad of twelve at least three months’ spare time is required, when the material is not hard to obtain. The preliminary work consists in searching for the material and then bringing it before the squad at squad meetings for discussion. A final line of argument is thus gradually formulated on both sides of the question. From this point, continued individual work is done, until the squad debates boil it down to the finals, where the teams can get a good idea what will be their affirmative and negative cases during the approaching season.

The coach’s part in the preliminary fact gathering consists mostly in helping to analyze the question so that the squad can determine to some extent what material is useful and what is not, also what material is absolutely required, and what is not. The coach should stay well in the background during the preliminary work to test each debater’s initiative in getting material and formulating arguments. Later he can assume a directional capacity prior to his later retirement in favor of the teams’ own original work in the heat of the debate season, at which time his greatest function consists in sitting in on case meetings in a general supervisory capacity.

II. Team Work

1. Off the Platform.

Team work off the platform consists, for the most part, in case-meeting assemblies. A case meeting is a meeting of the team for the purpose of going over the entire case with a view to perfecting it, or suggesting possible courses to pursue in a coming debate. Case meetings should be held several times before a debate. They serve to get the team working as a unit on the next debate. The captain acts as chairman of the group, which may comprise all the alternates and the coach or adviser.

Squad suggestions are here discussed, and either accepted, rejected, or modified and accepted. Possible cases that might be used which did not previously occur to the teammates are discussed
and a general plan of attack laid down for them. Additional research work is allotted to the debaters and alternates, if it is found necessary to do so.

The success or probable strength of the next opponent is given some discussion, so that the team is not entirely taken by surprise in the debate either one way or the other. If no direct information is available, comments are made on the past fortunes of teams from that school, to arrive at some conclusion as to the likelihood of meeting a strong or weak team.

At a case meeting rebuttal is again checked closely, and the captain or coach gives favorable and adverse criticism on the handling of the rebuttal in the last debate, as well as how the debate could have been better mastered. Rebuttal methods that did not "take," which did not come over clearly and quickly, are discarded and new rebuttal methods decided upon. A rebuttal check sheet is in the captain’s hands, from which he can give his critical résumé of all the rebuttal that can be reasonably anticipated. This rebuttal check sheet consists of a paper divided into as many columns as there are debaters on the team. Under each column headed with a debater's name is a list of points that are to be handled exclusively by that debater in the debate, except where repetition is made in summary. The debater holds himself responsible for those various items; he is expected to frame unusually strong answers to every one of the points credited to him on the check sheet. If there has been revision, the captain can call for the teammate to give his rebuttal, at the case meetings, in skeleton form to decide if its weight as rebuttal is sufficient.

The chief function of the case meeting consists in rehabilitating the case itself, if the previous debate suffered because of the weaknesses within it. There is one word of caution that is timely at this point. Do not revise the main speeches just because one of the judges has a certain criticism to make, or believes the speeches are weak in some particular. Even if the debate has been lost, be hesitant of changing the case unless the team's judgment and the coach's judgment coincide with the outsider's criticism. All too often debaters are likely to seize every outside suggestion as so much valuable advice, and accept it as a sensible view. This is not true. Even a judge has not studied the question as a debater, or from the standpoint of a debater. He may have his opinion on the subject, founded on years of prejudicial thought. He wants one of the team to mould his argument to suit his own prejudices. Furthermore, he does not know the difficulties of finding proof on some points. Many a judge wonders why debaters do not play up a certain argument, when the debaters have already
threshed that argument out, and have found that all the evidence in support of it is editorial opinion, an uncertain authority. Therefore, the criticism of issues, when there are other factors which make that criticism unjustifiable, is not to be given an instant’s consideration.

Every remark made by a layman or a judge, or even by the opposite debate team after the debate, should be dissected to find if it is a sound comment on the debate, and whether it is worth following up.

Continual changing of the case after a debate leads to confusion. The debaters are always trying out something new, at a time when it is detrimental to their interests to remain experimentalists. Something definite should be hewn from the raw material before the debate season has progressed very far, something which can be relied on in any debate. Even losing a debate may be due to other factors than a faulty case. It may be due to poor rebuttal, lack of experience, better strategy on the part of opponents, or a dozen other causes.

All suggestions received should be taken up at the case meetings and disposed of there. The coach’s opinion as to the conduct of the team in the previous debate is likely to be by far the sounder, since he is not only skilled at debating, but also knows the particular question. He should take notes during the debate on what he wishes to bring to the attention of his debaters after the debate. Both he and the debaters ought to talk to the judges briefly after the decision is rendered, not in a critical way, but to seek information on the judges’ impression of the whole debate. Judges should not be pestered with questions, or asked to explain their views in a question-answer fashion. Let them state their opinion of the debate, and have done with it. They are not hired, in most cases, to justify their decision. In some cases this is especially hard to do, and, when confronted with a group of debaters, judges who do not know debate technique are at a loss as to how to give them the satisfaction they wish.

2. On the Platform.

It is customary for the captain to sit between his colleagues, if there are three debaters on a side, so he can talk with both of them without causing any discomfort or bending clear across the table.

Platform teamwork sums up the secret of successful debating. In the heat of debate the team that can keep its activities co-ordinated all the way through and never lose its calm, in spite of what the other team does, will fare well in the majority of debates. There is some kind of stress, both mental and physical, while a debate is in progress. The time flies by very quickly, and
events transpire rapidly. One's turn to speak is just a few moments off. Yet he must get ready for it, as well as take advice from teammates while writing notes of what he will say in addition to his main speech.

There can be little talking on the platform. Again and again debaters make the mistake of thinking they can get up on the platform, sit at the table, and when something important comes up, get their heads together and figure out what they will say to it. They go into a "huddle." While they are in the huddle, however, the other team is still sowing arguments of dissent, and all of these go by with equal force and yet the huddlers do not hear a word of them. The huddle in debate differs from the huddle in football, inasmuch as it comes when there is no cessation of hostilities as in football. Once a debate begins there is no "time out." Therefore talking on the stage means so much loss of argument that one should meet. That is why it is urged that most of the planning be done beforehand, at least sufficiently so that the captain by employing one or two check sheets laid out before him on the table can direct the whole course of attack without uttering a single word. When it is absolutely essential to speak to one another, where there are three debaters on a side, one should pay attention to what the opponent is saying while the other two converse. Later he can be informed of what has transpired, and so none of the opposing case is missed in the interim. Of the two evils, missing out on some of the opposite case, and not having a chance to confer, the former is the greater, and should be avoided in some way.

It is not until the first speech of the opposition is made that the team has any teamwork to do on the platform. When the first opposing speech is being made the next man to speak should be "all ears." The first speech is always important to all debaters on the other side, for it indicates generally on what foundation the opposite plan rests. If that foundation is weak or faulty, all debaters can attack it with propriety, for their allotment of part of the case to meet is built on that same foundation, and hence is a part of their share of attack as well. While the first speech is coming over, the captain looks at such diagrams as the team has seen fit to prepare, and places in view of the others the one that indicates what course the opposition will take, and how in a general way his own team has planned to meet it. With this sheet before him, he need do little conversing with his colleagues. The plan can be dispensed with entirely, of course, but it is a handy instrument to use in any debate, especially where there are inexperienced debaters, or debaters who are easily taken by surprise.

New points in rebuttal may be handled one or more times. A point of a pencil by the cap-
tain to this or that colleague, with a replying nod, is usually sufficient to assign rebuttal to a certain teammate.

A few minutes before the opposing speaker has finished, the next speaker should not be disturbed; he must get a general idea of what he is going to say, and what material he has to take to the rostrum with him. Besides he wants to get the last remarks of his preceding opponent that he may answer them, if need be. If one is rushed taking orders and advice from teammates up to the last minute he is likely to go to the stand confused; he may forget part of his notes, or leave a reference book at the table in the rush of gathering up his written matter. Likewise in rebuttal the last rebuttal speaker should be given nearly all the time of the last speaker on the other side to himself. He has a tremendous responsibility of making a final impression that will carry conviction, and he should be permitted to sit back and follow the "drift" of his opponent’s preceding talk. He will have had plenty of time to gather together rebuttal material, but it is strategic if he can make a direct reply to the preceding speaker’s very last remarks. It is at this time in the debate that his colleagues become overzealous to help him; they have completed their part in the debate and ideas passed by occur to them now. These they want to give to their last speaker to strengthen his rebuttal or add to it, when in fact he probably already has many times more rebuttal material than his time will allow him to deliver. "Let him alone" is good advice to give to the teammates when only one speaker remains.

It sometimes happens that one rebuttal speaker will be called to stop long before he has exhausted his supply or rebuttal material. Should it be discarded then? No, it is better to pass it on to the next rebuttal speaker on resuming the seat at the table, or put it before him to look over. This situation often arises in a debate, and brings out the fact that each debater should be familiar with the rebuttal capacities of his colleagues, and also what they have to answer with. Then when an exchange of material is made, as here indicated, the next rebuttal speaker can use it with familiarity, and will not mumble inarticulately in delivering it.

In some localities the practice is prevalent of passing notes back and forth between debaters on a team. This has only one drawback: it takes considerable time to write the notes and read them. The better rule is to leave all suggestions unwritten and unsaid, unless their need for delivery to another colleague is highly urgent.

Throughout the debate, to show that there has been cooperation in presenting their case and tearing down that of the adversaries, debaters should refer to the work of their colleagues.
There should be a running adaptation of one speech to another, and passing references as to what other colleagues have done and are going to do. This gives the appearance of unity to the case, and indicates that the team has worked together in trying to establish certain tenets by means of the debate. Especially is this valuable when the team is made up of debaters who differ markedly in outward appearance, in stature and build.

CHAPTER VI

PLATFORM CONDUCT

Platform conduct should not be left to the winds of chance. A debate team that is schooled in debating does not have its forensic education complete until it knows how to behave on the platform. Not all debaters know how to conduct themselves. Unless they have witnessed first class debates by experienced teams they are likely to have different concepts of what is proper and what is not. For that reason this chapter finds a ready place in a treatise of this kind, which stresses the practical side of debating.

1. Conduct at the Table.

When the debate begins the debaters should be seated at their tables, busily assembling and arranging the materials for the debate. Nothing should be piled on the floor. It is never necessary to take so many books and pamphlets to the platform that the table will not hold them, for one team could not possibly use so many books in a debate. The material from the books might as well be put on cards or papers, for there is little gained in reading direct from the books. True,
it seems more realistic, but in fact it is not. It is not the book that you are using, but the material that is in it; and this can be presented in any form, as long as it is presented truthfully.

While at the table, each debater should try to keep busy. He should not stare around at the audience or the other debaters. He should be concerned only with the debate and his colleagues especially. He should not put his legs into an unnatural position or assume an unnatural pose. He should not yawn or give the appearance that he is sleepy or worn out. All this has its psychological effect upon those who see him. Likewise he should not comb his hair, adjust his necktie unduly, or arrange his sartorial accoutrements. He is expected to come to the platform immaculate, and groomed for the contest. Any undue gestures in this direction give the impression that he has hurriedly prepared.

When there is nothing to do, as when a team opens the debate, the colleagues should be the picture of attentiveness. They may whisper to one another, but not in such a manner as to attract attention; there should not be any loud talking, for it disturbs the speaker and the audience. If debaters do not care to listen to their colleague open the debate, they should either pretend to be listening to him, or else looking over their own debate work; they should act like debaters throughout the debate. When one of the opposition has spoken then the debaters have no excuse for sitting at the table with hands folded. There is something to do; even if it does not consume all the time, one can again go over the work prepared for one's speech or watch one's colleagues and see that they are following the debate and finding proper material. Nothing is so disconcerting and depressing to a judge as to see some of the debaters with nothing to do on the platform. What are they up there for? Having nothing to keep busy with, they must have all their part of the debate "canned." This is a likely inference, and a none too healthy one for a wide-awake debate team. They are going to lose credit for good preparation, if they do not assume the proper conduct at the table.

When something worth laughing at is said debaters should act natural and laugh too. However, they should never laugh in ridicule. An opponent may make a slip of the tongue, or flounder in meeting an issue, but this is no occasion for cynical smiles or grimaces. Treat the opponents as gentlemen and ladies at all times, and have sympathy for them in their extremities rather than harsh manners and an unbecoming attitude. Debaters should feel their opponents are worthy. The only way to do this is to treat them with respect, in what they do and say.

It is the highest breach of etiquette to interrupt a speaker in the course of the debate, either
indirectly or directly. If he says something that is not true, or falsely accuses his opponents, the time to make the correction is in the next speech. Only in case there is a false accusation in the last affirmative speech can there be any license for such interruption, and even there the gentlemanly team will keep silent, relying on the sense and grace of the judge to catch the erroneous statement and check it against the speaker.

Recognition of certain people in the audience, waving at them or winking at them, even smiling at them, is out of place. The debater should be oblivious of the audience while at the table. He is not on parade in a debate, and should not acknowledge any greetings which may come to him in this belated way from his sympathizers in the audience.

After each speech of the opposition the other debaters should applaud, not extremely, but as decorum and the worthiness of the speech dictate. Acknowledgment of the work of the other team in any ordinary manner is always proper. The debaters should never be unaware of the fact that their opponents are deserving credit at any time for their efforts put forth in making the debate a real contest.

When the debate decision is read by the chairman, or the debate is decided some way, the losing team should cross the platform, and shake hands and congratulate the winning team. Even if the decision seems unfair this formality should be carried out. Sportsmanship requires nothing less than an acknowledgment of this sort. Nothing need be said except to exchange wishes for success during coming debates. Sometimes judges are disposed to come to the platform and congratulate the debaters on their work and comment on their performance. They should be received with urbanity, and their remarks heard patiently. Alternates should come to the platform after the debate and gather up the material of their team and pack it away or at least watch it to see that no one disturbs it. Often members of the audience become inquisitive and wish to find what method debaters employ in the debate. Such inquisitiveness should be met with the civil remark that debate material is not for distribution or inspection.

2. Conduct at the Stand.

The debater should respond to the chairman’s introduction promptly. He should have had his material assembled before the chairman rises to introduce him. Delay in going to the stand makes the audience feel uneasy, and irritates the other team, who see their opponent gaining a minute additional time.

Also, the debater should quit when the last warning is given. Speaking overtime is unfair and there is hardly an excuse for it, since a de-
bater can make his own choice of warning. The fact that a colleague has not used up all his time makes no difference; he should have used up his time. Time not exhausted by one speaker cannot be transferred to the credit of another speaker who may find plenty of use for it. In a similar fashion, it is indecorous to take much time resorting notes at the rostrum after one has finished speaking. He should gather up all his material, and do the sorting at his place at the table, even if it does restrict his time for rebuttal preparation (in case it is done after a main speech). He should do all such arranging of material on his own time, not on the time of the debate which should proceed with clocklike precision and promptness.

It becomes necessary at times to take books and papers to the rostrum for use as references. These should be taken up at the time the speaker goes to the stand. He should not ascend the stand, deliver some remarks, and then go to his table and get the references and quote from them there. His point of delivery is the stand, and when he gets to it, he is expected to be completely equipped to make his speech. If he is not, there is nothing to do but go to the table and get what he has forgotten; but the situation is an awkward one and detracts from the effectiveness of his speech.

Some debaters delight in “waving the red flag

in the bull’s face” by taking a certain reference, pamphlet, or list of questions to the other group’s table, putting it on the table, and then issuing a peremptory challenge to the effect that the next speaker should explain or account for that reference, or whatever it may be. This practice smacks of absurdity. It may disconcert the opposition, who are thus affronted, but only to the extent that it is a wholly unprecedented and impolite gesture. The audience also resents such affronts. There is no need to make debating look like a “chip on the shoulder” contest. Yet such is the effect of challenges made by throwing references upon the other table. There is one exception to this practice: One team presents a complicated plan, which they have written out, to help the opposition, in order that there may be no mistake as to what that plan includes. The originators retain a copy of the plan for their own use. There is need for expedience in this case, but that is entirely absent in the other cases where the debaters can grasp the point their opponent is trying to make without the aid of written matter placed on their table as much bait to be grabbed and swallowed.

The cards or sheets of paper used as a guide when one is delivering a main speech should be placed on the rostrum if possible, and as little referred to as possible. By no means should the audience be attracted to speech aids. Better that
they be out of sight on the rostrum, and that the speaker glance at them now and then with appropriate pauses rather than that he have them before him as a shield to hide behind. Small cards of the three-by-five size or less, can be conveniently placed in the hand without distracting anyone's attention, and a little practice will help one to gain the facility of turning them over so that there is no perceptible pause either in the speech or the expression. Any larger size, however, cannot be conveniently concealed in the palm. To have a speech which is written out on typewriter-size paper taken to the rostrum and picked up in the hands and read from for brief periods is a disconcerting method of delivery. The speech should be put on small pieces of paper, no larger than half a sheet of standard typewriter paper, about $6 \times 8$, if it is necessary that it be written or outlined. However, the card method is much more convenient and compact than the slips-of-paper method.

Whenever the debater must hesitate to recall a point, or to find a reference which he has brought with him, but which he has temporarily displaced, or in some manner causes a delay, it is entirely unnecessary for him to beg the pardon of his listeners, although that is the instinctive urge that he has. To say “I beg your pardon” only serves to call their attention to his bewilderment, which is the very thing which he would like best not to do. A delay of a few seconds always appears to the debater monstrously long, while to the audience it seems to be just what it is, a very brief pause. Therefore it is better that the debater err by not calling their attention to his slight discomfiture than by delaying the debate to their distraction by saying, “I beg your pardon.” After all, the time is his own, and if he sees fit to consume it in pausing between breaths, that is his own concern.

Debaters are likely to think they must be saying something all the time they are at the stand, while orators and great public speakers realize the value of pauses. They serve to allow what has been said to soak in, to be grasped by the audience, which is feverishly trying to get all that is being said, and put it in order. If the debater must pause for some reason or other, he should look at it as natural, collect himself so that he can go on, and do so without any remark concerning it. Young folks are not expected to be perfect speakers, and almost any audience will pardon a slight delay without any request from the platform.

In delivering his speech from the stand a debater must make it a point to face his entire audience and not part of it. If the audience is not directly in front of him, but is spread out over a wide area, he should turn to one part or another now and then so that he reaches the entire mass.
All great speakers attempt to make themselves equally audible to all those before them. It cannot be done perfectly, but some care on the part of the speaker will enable him to reach all of his audience some of the time; furthermore, he will be showing everyone consideration.

A word of warning is necessary where a debater has a question to propound to the opposing team or a challenge to deliver to them. Should he turn around and face them, whether they are behind him or to his side, and thus disregard, for the moment, part of his audience? By no means. Every question asked, every challenge delivered, should be delivered straight to the audience, even when the opposition is directly addressed. The opponents are expected to know it is delivered to them without it being necessary to look at them in doing so. Theirs is the duty of hearing without any special care on the part of opponents that they do hear. If the audience can hear, surely the debaters on the platform will hear. It is exceedingly discomforting to an audience and especially to the judges to find a debater turn around and speak to his adversaries and deliver an important question, when the judges are eagerly straining to hear that same question so that they can see whether later it is sidestepped, misstated or handled deliberately. The speaker should of course have consideration for his opponents, but this does not mean that he must speak directly to them in order to make his questions and challenges appear to be delivered for their use in the debate. If they overlook what he says it is their loss, not his.

In standing at the rostrum delivering his speech the debater should be careful of his posture. He should not slouch, lean on one leg, or spread them apart as if bracing himself. He need not stand still on the platform; in fact, it is better that he shift his position naturally from time to time to avoid monotonous pose. Once he has gone to the front of the platform he should be careful never to retreat in delivering a strong point in his case. Retreat, backing up a step, always gives the impression of lack of force. If he wants to make his arguments stand for all they are worth he should move forward when making them, rather than retreat. If he finds it necessary to retreat, he should do so between arguments and when he is getting ready to deliver another part of his speech. Never should it be done while he is earnestly trying to establish a major issue in the debate.

A rather informal style of stance is becoming the vogue with preachers, lecturers, and public speakers in general. They put one hand or both hands in their pockets, lean against any support handy, leave their coats unbuttoned, and in other respects act informally. There is some license for this, but what if the judge is meticulous in
such matters, being of an older school? It will discredit that debater. On the other hand, if he is formal it will hardly offend anyone. So it is perhaps better to err on the side of being fastidious in matters of this kind rather than careless. Putting one’s hands in the pockets, drawing them out to use in adjusting written matter for the convenience of the eyes, and putting them back again is distracting to say the least, and does not fit in well with speaking. The hands, if they are not to be used, should rest naturally beside the hips, or be concealed behind the back. They need not be put into an unnatural position or wrung together.

Leaning against the stand gives one the appearance of being tired or lazy. Why do it? If debaters would own up to the practice, they would admit that they do it for fear they look unduly rigid when standing up beside it and not resting upon it, or that they are nervous and must have support to keep them from falling over. The best place to stand is beside the rostrum, without touching it; one should act as if there were no need for any prop. One hand resting lightly upon it, for convenient access to material placed there, is in good taste, but the stand should not be used as a support. Another position that does not commend itself to the debater is to hide behind the rostrum, either with both hands firmly bracing the shoulders by grasping the edges of the rostrum or by simply standing concealed behind it. This is never good form. There is no suggestion of aggressiveness or fighting spirit in getting behind an obstacle in a debate. On the contrary, get in front of the stand. Even sitting upon the rostrum gives a more aggressive appearance than standing behind it. One is at least where he can be looked at, and the audience never loses interest in looking at a debater.

Any suggestion of fidgetiness or slouchiness is to be avoided. Fumbling with a watch chain, buttoning and unbuttoning a favorite button on the vest or coat, fingering the lapel, rubbing the chin with the palm or using the hands about the face or hair in any way, is annoying to everyone present. Having pencils or pens sticking from an upper coat pocket or resting over the ear, numerous society pins conspicuously placed, extreme dress, is all to be shunned as adversive and repugnant to good taste.
There is no opportunity of fitting the speech to the occasion, unless one departs from the speech. Then his whole attitude changes, and the audience must adjust itself again and again to the change from one attitude to another. There is never any adaptation in such a speech. The debater who has prepared the speech tries to do this by inserting such expressions as “Perhaps the opposition will argue,” or “Our opponents may say,” hoping that his friends of the opposition will do what he wants them to. Invariably they do not, and his set speech and its listless delivery accomplishes nothing of worth to be set down to his credit on the judge’s balance sheet.

The only justification for reading in a debate is when one is using a quotation or reference of some kind. Then reading is appropriate and insures accuracy where absolute accuracy is required.

(b) The memoriter delivery.—Since the whole set main speech is to be given when the occasion calls for it, why not memorize it word for word? This is invariably the tendency, and in some respects memorizing a speech that one knows will fit the occasion, as memorized, is an advantage. Accuracy of course is obtained if memorizing is done perfectly. Striking phraseology is not left to chance in the memoriter method. Furthermore, time can be given to the external aspects of delivery as well as to the effect of the delivery upon the audience. One can deliver a memorized speech without much concentration, once his memorizing is accomplished. But in these advantages there is a great drawback.

What will the debater do when he finds that he has prepared his speech for an occasion that does not arise quite as he anticipated? This is what often happens, for no one can foresee accurately what the status of the debate will be when he arises to deliver his memorized speech. He cannot ignore all that has gone before; yet the one who has a memorized speech must do this, or abandon the speech and substitute an extemporized one. Not having practiced extemporizing, he is worse off than before.

In addition to the handicap of lacking flexibility the debater with a memorized speech has difficulty putting any life into the speech. He is used to going over it in the same words and same manner, and it becomes a habit with him. Being a habit, he does not make the speech a part of his thought while he is giving it. He does not act it out. He may dramatize, but unless he is very good at dramatization, the audience will catch the deception quickly, and then the speech loses all force. There is no give-and-take discussion with memorized speeches. At most one hears a declamatory contest; nothing one speaker says affects what the other speaker says, either in substance or in feeling. That is not debating at all, for debating
CHAPTER VII
DELIVERY

The debater should come to the debate squad with some training in public speaking. Debating is not a stepping stone to good speaking, so much as speaking is a stepping stone to good debating. As to delivery, the debater cannot expect much help from his colleagues or his instructor when the all-important question is not, How to deliver? but, How to debate? Nevertheless it is amazing how fast one can train himself in public speaking by actual debate practice. A debater, if he really becomes absorbed in a debate, is so oblivious of the fact that he might be frightened before his audience in trying to sell his ideas, that to become stage-struck is a rarity when one has plenty to say, as, in a debate founded on good preparation. Good delivery is fundamental to good debating.

1. Forms of Delivery.

There are three recognized forms of delivery in debating: (a) the reading or recitative, (b) the memoriter, and (c) the extemporaneous. Of these three, the last is the most common and by far the most powerful.

(a) The reading or recitative delivery.—There is little strength or persuasiveness in a speech that is read to an audience. Prominent men of affairs who have never spoken before audiences use this method because any other is impossible for them; however, the radio has now hidden the speaker from his audience so that he can well resort to reading his speeches. It at least insures accuracy of statement, and the speaker can check any misquoting. But in a debate, what of the audience? Are they expected to listen and believe when the debater glues his eyes to a paper, seldom looking at his hearers, and deadening the words by their mechanical utterance? Surely no self-respecting audience will have any belief in his statements, or will applaud that debater as they will one who gets up before them, faces them, and talks to them as if he meant what he said. The reader never seems to mean what he says; he is not saying the words because he believes in them, but apparently because they are in black and white before him, and because he has the duty of delivering them. Usually that is his attitude also. Moreover, the read speech is prepared to be read; it is full of bookish phrases and expressions that “give away” the whole speech as a stereotyped, limpid bit of argumentative composition. There is no conversational quality in such a speech, no variety, no life, no force. It cannot be called debating in the true sense of the word.
connotes contentiousness, and contentiousness connotes extemporary replication, which is impossible in memoriter delivery.

There is one place for some memorizing in a speech, and that is in learning the transitional passages in an extemporary speech. The reason is that unless a young speaker memorizes such passages he will not quickly bridge over from one point to another and carry his audience with him. The transitions in a speech are very important. It is also important that the speaker know the outline of his speech from memory. By learning the transitions he saves himself the embarrassment of floundering when he wants to go from one part of his speech to another. Here memorization of the exact words of the speech is justifiable.

(c) The extemporaneous delivery.—Let the debater learn first that this type of delivery, by far the best for real debating, does not constitute the antithesis of preparation. There is nothing accidental or impromptu in an extemporaneous speech. The speech is prepared thoroughly, only it is not committed on paper to the precise words that it will have when given. It is outlined, briefed from beginning to end, practiced upon as with a written speech; but the words are left to the occasion. Quotations may be used, and these are read direct from cards. No extemporization at all is used with them except to fit them into the rest of the main speech or rebuttal speech. Written notes or an outline are used by the speaker to help him in following the prepared speech, although one with a good memory can dispense with such written aids.

The extemporaneous method allows the greatest flexibility in adapting the speech to the previous part of the debate, both to what the colleagues have said and what the opponents have said. The speaker is not hampered by words prepared in advance; he can make room for anything recently contrived by him as better than what he planned. In a nip-and-tuck debate flexibility in delivery is imperative; there can be no strong head-on argument without it. Besides adapting his speech to what has previously been said in the debate, the extemporaneous speaker can watch his audience closely and see whether they are getting what he says. If he sees they do not grasp a certain point, he may repeat it. If he finds them slumping in interest and attention, he knows that he must put forth greater efforts to keep them keyed up to his part of the debate.

Lastly, the speaker has no fears that he will lose his place in his speech, that he will forget the next phrase, or become confused in what he has prepared for delivery. He has utmost freedom of action both mentally and physically. He has poise with no show of nervousness. He can "suit the action to the word" faultlessly. There are no
mechanized motions to summon in aid of the words uttered; there is the highest synchronization of words, thought, and action that can be obtained by any kind of platform speaking. The conversational style delivery, so effective when properly applied to the occasion, is only possible by extempoare address. There is no talking at an audience; instead there is talking to and conversing with an audience. The intimacy of conversation is at all times present in the extempoare method of delivery. It is ideal; let the debater cultivate it as soon as he can.

There are certain drawbacks to extempoare delivery not present in the other types. One who speaks extempoareously is not always accurate in his choice of words; unless he is accustomed to much public speaking he is not likely to be discriminating at every phrase. Yet he must be, to speak with accuracy. However, the extempoareous method has the possibility of correction taken care of, for one can always acknowledge a mistaken expression and correct it.

If extempoare delivery is sought right in the heat of debate season, forced extempoare work will result in a slovenliness of expression. Omnibus words and trite phrases will creep into speeches. This the debater must foresee and try to avoid. Originality and freshness in forming sentences make a speech vivid. Slower speaking may be necessary, but under such circumstances one can sacrifice “how much” he will say for “how well” he will say it.

2. The Manner of Delivery.

(a) The voice.—The voice of each speaker should be adjusted to the room in which he is to speak. It is offensive to hear a speaker use his voice loudly when he could be heard more distinctly if he spoke softly or moderately. Before the debate the speaker should try out his voice in the room where the debate is to be held by having someone go to the rear of the room and listen to him. If he can be heard distinctly with his voice softer than usual, he can depend upon it to be approximately right in a filled room when a slightly stronger voice is used. The speaker should adjust his voice to the room in which the debate is to be held. It is hard to accomplish the adjustment with accuracy during the debate, and to have someone in the back of the auditorium signal by some prearranged device whether the speaker should speak louder or softer is an annoying way to make the adjustment.

The debater who does not enunciate properly and who mouths his words should gain access to a book on public speaking early in the debate season and do individual work on his voice. Distinctness in utterance helps to make the soft voice audible when an indistinct loud voice conveys the thought no better. Faulty articulation and poor
voice quality cannot be cured by calling attention to them. Usually they are the effect of long indulgence in wrong speech habits, and their correction is not accomplished except by breaking down the old habits and forming new ones. Habit formation requires time, and he who has speech defects of this nature should assume the responsibility of correcting them on his own initiative, and start early.

Rapid speaking on an argumentative subject spells its own doom, if done at length. No person can follow a speech made up almost wholly of argument and fine analysis, if delivered rapidly. The mind of one unaccustomed to thinking on the subject must have some time to absorb the many ideas that the debaters have thought out long before the debate. Public speakers have a certain amount of padding in their important speeches to lay audiences. The padding consists in repetition of their ideas in other words and phrases. This padding insures that no ideas will be gone over so rapidly that no one will catch their significance. The debater should keep the same thing in mind. Especially in rebuttal work, when the stand is laden with a multitude of replies and a quantity of material that would fill three times the amount of speaking time in delivery, does the debater feel he must hurry or he will lose out in delivering some of his material. Here some rapid-fire work is justifiable, but not for an entire rebuttal period. The debater must have consideration for the state of mind of his listeners, especially the judges. They must grasp the importance of everything he says; just the general impression that he has done a lot of rebuttal work will not do. His audience judges him by what they remember of what he has said, instead of by what he has done in a general way in hitting back at his opponents.

(b) Action.—The schools of eloquence, by artificial stimulation of platform action, almost put action into the shade forever. Gestures nearly disappeared in platform speaking less than a decade ago, mainly because a new influence had come into schools where speaking was taught seriously; the teachers had become so serious in trying to obtain results that they tried to reduce platform action to a science and took out of it all naturalness.

There is nothing unnatural about a real gesture. It is natural to move the arms and the body to help the voice. A child when speaking uses all he has in conveying his meaning, and what he lacks in words is conveyed by gestures. A dog has no voice, yet by his action he can communicate his ideas much better than some people can by use of their native language.

As one author puts it, one need be "neither a phonograph nor a windmill." One can act naturally not only in saying what one thinks, but in
acting what one thinks. Dramatists do nothing less; they try to convey their thoughts to an audience sometimes as much by action as by words, and they are successful at it. Moreover, no one looks at it as distasteful. It is only in solo speaking that the anathema of moving the corpus and its appendages an inch out of line has attached itself. But not for long. Speech experts have come round again to the point of trying to make the student emulate the actions of a natural-born speaker: to act naturally.

Debaters fail to comprehend the true significance of that phrase. They acquire the idea that all people naturally act alike, a rash inference indeed. The fact that a man of Webster's build can swing his giant frame and shake his head in consonance with his powerful words does not mean that a man of Slim Jim's build can do the same. The former resembles a giant steam engine in motion; the latter would resemble a grasshopper bothered with some kind of gastrointestinal ailment. On the other hand a man of athletic build, straight in form and without excess fat, may be able to make his words tell with nothing but a pointed finger as a gesture, while a man built on the John Bull pattern would not be able to convince an intimate friend in that style.

Action, then, is to be suited not only to the words, as Shakespeare advises, but is to be suited also to the speaker's general make-up. The wiry individual can come to the rostrum, shake his pointed finger in this direction and that, can prance around like a race horse straining under leash, and convince, not by his words alone, but by his natural actions on the platform. Such a person is likely to talk fairly rapidly, and walk rapidly. He will not address the chairman slowly, nor go to the stand slowly. His action starts not with his first word to the audience, but with the first movement at the table in response to the chairman's call.

On the other hand, the man who is built like Abraham Lincoln, who moves slowly from his place at the table to the stand, is not expected to act like his fox-terrier type of colleague. He will speak methodically and with no apparent hurry. His action will consist in slow movements about the stand, now and then a raised voice and sweeping gesture; then a subsidence till he again meets with some thought which he emphasizes with large motions and a strong voice. To be natural, his actions cannot be at all like those of the individual described above.

What kind of action is suited to this particular debater? That must be determined by the debater's self-analysis, and the criticism he can secure from others who see him in action. There are as many kinds of platform action as there are kinds of speakers. However, most of them can be classed roughly into the three groups men-
tioned in this chapter: (1) the wiry, lightweight type of speaker; (2) the athletic, mediumweight type of speaker; and (3) the large, heavyweight type. The last class again roughly divides itself into (1) the short-man type, rotund in proportions like the familiar caricature of John Bull, and (2) the large-built man of angular proportions like Abraham Lincoln. The kind of action suited to the wiry type individual and the tall, angular man has been touched upon. The athletic speaker will not be prone to adopt windmill tactics, but he will find it natural to use his head as a third gesticulating organ, and will use his hands naturally one at a time rather than two at a time. He will not move about the stage much while talking, depending upon a vigorous voice and timely action of his arms for his power in delivery. The short man of the John Bull type uses his body as the third gesticulating organ. His arms are used close to his body. He depends more upon his swinging corpus and his voice for effect, than upon his arms.

If one would like to know whether his action is natural or forced, let him deliver a speech before a small group of friends. Ask them to comment after he is through on his speech and manner. If he finds they have forgotten his gestures and can only comment on the effectiveness with which he delivered the speech, it is likely his action was natural. Only an unnatural gesture will stand out in a person's memory. Natural gestures do not attract the eye, and if one is criticizing the contents of a speech, paying attention to the words and what meaning is given to them by the speaker's action, natural gestures will not be noticed at all.

(c) Attitude toward the audience.—Often a speaker gives little care to the audience. Unless he speaks familiarly before large audiences his occasional sally will be accompanied with no attempt to assume the proper attitude toward his listeners. He comes before them feeling he has something to say and they have something to hear; that sums up his entire mental attitude. Yet the attitude of a speaker toward an audience has a telling effect on the reception that is given his speech.

With what attention does he watch the visible effect of his own words? No speaker can neglect to watch the effect of what he says on his hearers. The tyro slays with words; he scatters them hither and yon regardless of the repulsiveness they may have. One idea follows another with ruthless abandon of the feeling his audience has for them. He does not change his speech to suit the audience. Instead he seems to desire to force them to swallow what he gives them. This practice will never convince them; it will tend to turn them away from him and what he has to say. They will never believe a man who treads on their sen-
sitive feelings recklessly. A speaker must coddle his audiences. Do they seem pleased with a homely illustration? Give them another one. Do they like gentle ridicule of another? Give them more. Do they frown at his mention of the political issue? Let it alone. Do what they want you to do; not what you want to do.

An audience is not to be bought, begged, or bullied. It is to be treated humanely and fairly. There is no obligation one way or the other; if there is any obligation, it is mutual. The speaker, then, must consider himself on the same plane with his hearers and speak to them as if he were sitting beside them and engaging in ordinary conversation with them. He would not speak like an overseer to them in that position; neither would he speak without regard for their opinions on the same matter. When one is speaking to an audience, the audience has no chance to reply.

The speaker must make up for this deficiency by pretending they have said something in reply. Such a pretension calls for adjustment. This adjustment is what is meant by watching the visible effects of one's words and matching later thoughts to suit the effect one wishes to produce. The debater who ignores this element in his delivery loses the force he wishes his words to have.

The debater must actually want to convince and persuade his hearers. He cannot pretend to do it, for the pretense will be revealed in his manner of speaking. It takes effort, honestly put forth, to achieve this aim. One may be immensely pleased with his own opinions on the subject, but will that convince an audience? Certainly it will not! It carries no weight that one person thinks thus and so. To make that thought worthy of deliberation, to a large audience, it must be presented in a spirit of willingness to stand behind it and show to the most critical that it is not specious or faulty. To convey to the hearers the desire that they be convinced calls for more than aggressiveness. Aggressiveness tells the listener that one is in earnest, but does not tell him the speaker wants his cooperation. The speaker who consciously feels that the biggest thing for him to do is to show he has the better part of the argument will not put much credence into his words. His words will betray his motive in spite of him. He must feel in his marrow that he wants the people to believe as he does, and try to make that possible by the way in which he talks to them. No audience can be convinced against its will; and its will flows from its attitude toward the speaker; and that in turn flows indirectly from the attitude of the speaker toward the audience.

The attitude of the debater toward his auditors should be pregnant with friendliness. He cannot appear to them as one of disputatious and meddlesome disposition. He cannot expect to carry his audience with him if he looks at them as one immense gut to be stuffed. There must be ready
sitive feelings recklessly. A speaker must coddle his audiences. Do they seem pleased with a homely illustration? Give them another one. Do they like gentle ridicule of another? Give them more. Do they frown at his mention of the political issue? Let it alone. Do what they want you to do; not what you want to do.

An audience is not to be bought, begged, or bullied. It is to be treated humanely and fairly. There is no obligation one way or the other; if there is any obligation, it is mutual. The speaker, then, must consider himself on the same plane with his hearers and speak to them as if he were sitting beside them and engaging in ordinary conversation with them. He would not speak like an overseer to them in that position; neither would he speak without regard for their opinions on the same matter. When one is speaking to an audience, the audience has no chance to reply.

The speaker must make up for this deficiency by pretending they have said something in reply. Such a pretension calls for adjustment. This adjustment is what is meant by watching the visible effects of one's words and matching later thoughts to suit the effect one wishes to produce. The debater who ignores this element in his delivery loses the force he wishes his words to have.

The debater must actually want to convince and persuade his hearers. He cannot pretend to do it, for the pretense will be revealed in his manner of speaking. It takes effort, honestly put

forth, to achieve this aim. One may be immensely pleased with his own opinions on the subject, but will that convince an audience? Certainly it will not! It carries no weight that one person thinks thus and so. To make that thought worthy of deliberation, to a large audience, it must be presented in a spirit of willingness to stand behind it and show to the most critical that it is not specious or faulty. To convey to the hearers the desire that they be convinced calls for more than aggressiveness. Aggressiveness tells the listener that one is in earnest, but does not tell him the speaker wants his cooperation. The speaker who consciously feels that the biggest thing for him to do is to show he has the better part of the argument will not put much credence into his words. His words will betray his motive in spite of him. He must feel in his marrow that he wants the people to believe as he does, and try to make that possible by the way in which he talks to them. No audience can be convinced against its will; and its will flows from its attitude toward the speaker; and that in turn flows indirectly from the attitude of the speaker toward the audience.

The attitude of the debater toward his auditors should be pregnant with friendliness. He cannot appear to them as one of disputatious and meddlesome disposition. He cannot expect to carry his audience with him if he looks at them as one immense gut to be stuffed. There must be ready
assimilation, or mental indigestion will characterize the state of mind of his listeners. As stated above, an audience must be coddled; it cannot be coerced. There can be no intimidation. An audience will not be deluded or coerced into a speaker's embrace by a hostile attitude at its lack of receptivity toward an indifferent or quarrelsome solicitor. Once an audience becomes antagonized against the speaker, he is hopelessly at sea in attempting to regain their former good will. He has erected an insuperable obstacle.

To prevent any such calamity the speaker should cultivate beforehand the habit of looking at his audiences as his brother co-operatives. He should nurture the feeling that they are there to receive him in their good grace if he shows the proper spirit toward them. He must think of them as his friends, willing to go more than halfway with him, and in fact to help him, if he approaches them in the spirit of friendliness and good will. Never mind the opponents; they are confronted with the same task. There will be no prejudice against anyone unless he himself creates it. If he debates in the enemy's camp, he might suspect such a prejudice but he cannot be sure of it. Often an audience will favor a visiting team for its cavalierlike attitude, its gentlemanliness, its urbancy, its lack of apparent confidence. "Treat the audience right, and it will treat you right" is more than a spirit booster; it is a fact.

Chapter VIII

THE FORM, ETHICS, AND STAGING
OF DEBATE

I. Debate Form

1. The Composition.

It is never good debate form to use the first person conspicuously, either in the singular or plural number. The singular number is especially to be left out at all hazards. To hear a debater say,

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I will prove to you . . . I have here the statement of . . ., who says, as I first pointed out, that . . . We do not say, as the opposition would have you believe . . . nor do I accept their proposition, and so forth.

makes one feel that the debater is exceeding egotistical and partisan. Strict parliamentary usage requires the almost total abolition of the personal pronouns in referring to the debaters. In Congress, for instance, a member does not speak of one who has just spoken as "he." Instead he calls him "the gentleman from Ohio," or "the previous speaker," always avoiding the use of pronouns. In debate even referring to the
other debaters as "they" is not the best form. "We," "our," and "us," is condoned, if not overused; but "I," "my," "me," finds little sanction anywhere, for the reason given above.

In referring to the opposition call them "the opposition," "the negative" or "affirmative," "the visitors" (if they are visiting the home college or school), "the first (second, or third) opponent." Sometimes debaters forget on which side of the debate they are on temporarily, and get the terms "negative" and "affirmative" confused, referring to their negative opponents as the "affirmative," and vice versa. Anyone who has this fault should speak of them as the "opponents," or "opposition," until that usage gets to be habitual. (Some debaters continually stumble over the word "statistics." Why not say "figures"? It has nearly the same meaning.)

When definitions are given, debaters must beware of the faulty "is when" and "is where" form. A definition consists of the genus and differentia; for example, an automobile is a vehicle (genus) which is propelled by gasoline power and meant to run on a common road (differentia). A faulty definition is one like this: A battle is when two different armies meet and fight it out.

Tautological expressions, such as "this here," "where at," "repeat again," "good benefits," "necessary requisites," "total effect of all this," "free gratis," "same ilk," "over and above," "each and everyone," "you can see it with your own eyes," and "many in number" are bad form in any composition, but especially in oral work such as debating.

In the same class are grouped such trite expressions as "along these lines," "the weaker sex," "a long-felt want," "last but not least," "a goodly number," "more easily imagined than described," "herculean efforts," "checkered career," "in the last analysis," and "it goes without saying," which are boring now that they have passed their once current usefulness.

Idiomatic expressions are often confusing to a debater. Notice the following list of correct idioms and their incorrect use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Faulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>different from</td>
<td>different than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remember</td>
<td>remember of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the year 1928</td>
<td>in the year of 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the city of Memphis</td>
<td>in the city Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a half hour, or</td>
<td>in a half an hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Rev. Mr. Jones</td>
<td>the Rev. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have to, or must</td>
<td>have got to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is no doubt that</td>
<td>there is no doubt but that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slang and exaggeration come within the same scope as the misuses of composition mentioned above. Exaggeration in debate is not so prevalent, owing to the need of authority for all important statements. But slang is common be-
cause of slovenly speech habits. Common slang expressions like "swell," "enthus," "dope," "get by with it," "can you beat that," "talking through his hat," "got pinched," and "stunning" are the fitting counterpart of street-corner altercation, but not formal debate.

Sometimes a debater's zeal to emulate great orators leads him into such indiscretions as saying, "The hand of fate making footprints on the sands of time," "English-speaking ear," "the hand that rocked the cradle kicked the bucket," or "one who has a spark of genius should water it." Imagination will produce such contortions if it is not checked by reading one's speech after it is written, or by speaking with attention to one's every word.

2. Pronunciation.

When a debater finds that there are several prominent men whose names he must quote in the debate but which he cannot pronounce, he should either write directly to the men themselves, if living, or try to find out from some other source the correct pronunciation of their names. It is easily noticeable that a debater is committing an error when he pronounces a proper noun in a different manner from his comrades. Some one is wrong. If the proper noun is of foreign origin its spelling will not very frequently elicit its correct pronunciation; to make sure of its pronunciation the debater should make inquiries. Guessing is never safe. If correct pronunciation is unascertainable, at least the debate team should agree as to the pronunciation that is to be given to the name.

Many common nouns, also, are frequently mispronounced. Below is a list of words frequently called into use in debates. Look up the correct pronunciation of these words. The debater who does it will have several surprises awaiting him:

| research | genuine |
| resource | illustrate |
| detail | inquiry |
| defense | irreparable |
| (notice the accent on these four words) | long-lived |
| status | lyceum |
| data | maintenance |
| errata | mischievous |
| (all these Latin derivatives take the same vowel sound. What is it?) | precedent, as adjective |
| drama | precedent, as noun |
| route | travail |
| finance (notice accent) | vehement |
| irrelevant | alternate, as adjective |
| wounded | and as noun |
| alias | apparatus |
| advertisement | bureaucracy |
| column | proved (there is no such word as "proven" now.) |
| deficit | It is obsolete |
| despicable | cocaine |
| obligatory | acclimate |
3. Address and Close.

Is it "Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen," "Mr. Chairman, friends," or "Mr. Chairman, worthy opponents, fellow students, friends, ladies and gentlemen"? This would make a pretty argument, and one that has been argued pro and con by coaches and their students during many decades. Invariably debaters think more attention is paid to the address than is necessary. It is only a formality to make an address, but it should never be omitted. Let the people know to whom you are talking. The chairman by all means should be addressed, and that before the debater leaves his position at the table. He should wait for the chairman's nod or acknowledgment before stating the rest of his address.

"Ladies and gentlemen" is an age-old address, but it is one of those expressions which years have not made trite. "Honorable judges" is inserted by a majority of teams, where special judges are secured. Should they be singled out for attention from the rest of the audience? Are the debaters addressing remarks directly to them, or to them as ladies or gentlemen? "Friends" is a Quakerish sort of address that is popular, and in good standing. People like to be called friends whether they are friends or not. The opponents are the least of those present to whom remarks are addressed. The remarks are not addressed to them; they merely overhear them. The remarks are addressed to those "down front." Of those present the opponents are the least to be noticed in the address. It is best that no separate mention be made of them.

That it makes little practical difference what address is made, so long as it is not too long, is apparent, when debaters are warned not to use the same kind of an address throughout the debate, and colleagues not to follow the same style. In rebuttal, debaters fall into the habit of rising without making address. The entire address should be repeated; not only should the chairman be included, but the audience as well. The fact that they have been addressed once does not mean that the debater may rise and take for granted that the same group feels itself incumbent to listen to him.

During the course of a speech it is better to appeal to the audience directly as "ladies and gentlemen," or "friends," or by some other title, so that the speech has the effect of being a direct solicitation of their attention. Again, in this practice, the debater should beware of monotony.

At the close of the speech "I thank you" should be omitted. For what does the debater have to thank the audience? Attention? Hardly. He has not asked them to listen. The use of this expression at the end of speeches is rapidly becoming passé for the reason that the audience
should be thanking the speaker rather than the speaker thanking the audience. The practice grew up where the speaker was unduly solicitous of his hearers and had to beg for a chance to say something. In a debate this is not true. A nod of the head acknowledging that the time has expired, or a gathering of papers brought to the stand signifies sufficiently that the speaker is done.

In referring to other debaters, the team should also avoid monotony. Everyone should not say “the speaker who has just left the floor,” or “my colleague.” Vary the form. Refer to the “preceding speaker” or “the first negative speaker,” or “the one who has just addressed you,” or “the opposition.” One’s colleagues may be called “the affirmative” (or “negative”), “my colleagues,” “this team,” “we who favor this bill.”

II. Debate Ethics

Throughout this book the author has stressed the value of sportsmanship and fairness in debate. There is no place for muckraking in forensic practice, and base trickery is hardly worthy of the high ideals for which debate has its aim. A fair use of strategy is entirely commendable, but meanness is anathema. An example of unwarranted trickery is the taking of a quotation of a prominent authority and only quoting that part of it which is favorable to one’s cause, or the cause he espouses. This is unjustified falsifying. Also, it is trickery of the basest kind to take part of a senator’s speech and incorporate it into a debate speech without acknowledging it in any part. This practice can be condemned by the debater whose reading has been thorough, for he can discredit the user of such tricks by simply reading from that same senator’s speech out of an original source or legitimate copy, and then calling to the attention of the audience that the opposition borrowed part of the senator’s speech and incorporated it without telling anyone about it. He need not belittle the opponents for what they have done. His audience will see the exposure, and the judges will take full cognizance of it.

Another instance of such unethical conduct is in deliberately misquoting an opponent to the effect that he said something unfavorable to his own side. To misconstrue an opponent’s remarks is highly unethical and no debater should stoop so low as to employ this plan of gaining the upper hand. Sometimes debaters run across arguments which they would like to use, if only they were arguments of some authority which the audience would recognize and accept. It is best not to use such arguments at all, rather than slander some person and commit perjury.

Another bit of malfeasance is that of dragging into debates a political, religious, or fraternal
issue. A national organization like the Masonic order may be fostering a national movement. To play up this fact before a Masonic audience is unethical. Likewise is it unethical to present before the same kind of an audience the fact that the Catholic orders are fostering a measure which the team is denouncing before the audience. The religious and fraternal factor may have some influence, but it is unfair influence. It is not debating the question upon the merits, but by an insidious form of argument “ad populum.” In the same category comes the debating of a question by bringing in the fact that a certain political party favors the proposal, appealing to the political sympathies of the audience.

The selection of judges with the same object in view is likewise unethical. “Juggling judges” in any kind of debate work is to be disparaged. A debate should be won by the debating, not before the debating begins.

Some debate society constitutions rule out the use of personal correspondence and personal experience because they give an unfair advantage to a team. This is undoubtedly true. Writing to the President of the United States, or sending him a telegram may add force to the effectiveness of an argument, but again it is not fair, for both sides may not succeed in getting a response. Personal experiences vary, also; therefore they should not be brought in as evidence to help a certain side, since both sides have not had equal opportunity to secure the evidence, and in rebuttal the side not using them is taken by surprise, and cannot answer directly upon any ground. It becomes a victim of circumstance, instead of a victim of better debating.

There is nothing “sweet” about the debating game. One should not hesitate, therefore, in stating his achievements positively. “The affirmative has proved,” “Thus it is established beyond a doubt,” are proper statements to make and more forceful and pleasing than “The affirmative thinks it has proved to you,” or “it is our opinion, and we hope you see it the same way, that we have the better of the argument.” There should be no equivocation or doubt in what one says in a debate; he must know what he has done. He either has proved or has not proved, and no half-way statements help along either cause an iota. Debate ethics do not draw the line on being optimistic at what one has done.

Charts and plans should not be used unless the teams agree to their use. To use any device in aiding a team which the other team could not have anticipated or reasonably expected is unethical. Charts are desirable adjuncts to debates involving, to a great extent, the use of statistics, or on such questions as the tariff. But an agreement should be reached on their use before they are brought in to aid the debaters. One team
may find use for them and another may not; one team may not care to make charts, while the other may want to use them extensively. The teams always ought to agree on the use of such auxiliaries before they are actually relied upon.

III. STAGING THE DEBATE

1. The Plan.

In the center of the platform should be the speaker's rostrum. On opposite sides of it and at an appropriate distance in the background should be the tables and chairs for the debaters. Pitchers of water, and glasses should be provided. Behind the rostrum in line with the tables is the chairman's chair.

The affirmative team should sit at the right of the platform, or at the audience's left. This is the natural position for the affirmative in any debate. The first affirmative speaker advances on the chairman's left side.

Judges should be seated somewhere in the audience, and if they are to render their decisions individually they should be seated apart in different sections of the auditorium. Before the debate begins, the chairman should ask the judges to rise so that the debaters can see where they are seated. The judges are supplied with paper and pencil to make notes, and a ballot and envelope.

2. The Chairman.

The chairman may be anyone who knows how to conduct himself on the platform during the conduct of the debate. One of the squad debaters or a school official may be chairman. He acts as the interlocutor up to the time of and during the reading of the ballots. He announces the subject for debate, the amount of time for main speeches and rebuttal speeches, which team has the affirmative, who the judges are, who the timekeepers are, and what kind of a decision is to be rendered. He may also make fitting comments to the effect that both teams are to be treated with equal courtesy. Sometimes it is possible to get judges from some distance and to keep them unaware throughout the debate as to which team represents the home school. This can be done if the chairman makes no mention until after the debate which school's team upholds the affirmative or negative.

The chairman introduces the debaters. He may do this by reading their names, one by one, and having them stand to acknowledge, and then announce that they will follow one another in the order named; or he may introduce each one just before the individual is ready to speak. The latter method is the more formal and pleasing to an audience and to the debaters. To introduce performers en masse always calls for considerable recollection by the audience. No audience can
remember four or six names of debaters, nor should it be asked to do so. It is much better that the chairman introduce the first affirmative speaker, and after he has finished speaking, introduce the first negative speaker by name. Thus he proceeds in introducing each succeeding speaker. When the rebuttal period is to begin, he should announce any change in speaking order, and again introduce each debater in turn. Some chairmen take the half-way position of introducing each debater separately in the main speeches, and then allowing them to alternate without further introduction in the rebuttal. This expedites the debate, but again, it is not as pleasing as to repeat the names of the debaters, at least by naming the next speaker.

After the last rebuttal speaker has finished, the chairman asks the judges to prepare their ballots and requests one of the timekeepers to collect them. On bringing them to the platform, he may either request the captains of the two teams to witness the reading of the ballots, or do it without such witnessing. The ballots are presented to the captain of the winning team as the “spoils of victory.”

3. Timing the Debate.

The timing of the speeches and the warnings to be given should be arranged to suit the convenience and taste of the debaters. The signal may be by any of a number of tried methods. A bell may be rung, the timekeeper may stand as a signal, or time cards may be used. The bell is disconcerting to some debaters who prefer to have the timekeepers stand, one standing for the warning and then sitting again, and both standing and remaining in position at the expiration of the period. Time cards consist of cards with large numbers that can be seen from the stage, about $14 \times 16$ in size; they are numbered 1, 2, 3, etc., and as each minute of speaking time is past the next minute card is displayed. If the speaking time is ten minutes, the cards may be displayed from ten down to one, or vice versa, the displayed card in the former order telling the number of unexpired minutes, and the card displayed in the latter order telling the number of expired minutes. No warning need be given with time cards.

An alternate from one team should act as timekeeper for his side in conjunction with the alternate from the other team, the two sitting together in the front part of the audience, where they can easily be seen by the speakers. If a debater becomes confused as to the amount of time left, he should not hesitate to ask the timekeepers directly and feel no embarrassment in doing so. Sometimes, in his attention to his speaking, he fails to see or hear a warning signal, and it is perfectly proper for him to make his inquiries direct to the timekeepers if he becomes confused.
Timekeepers should not try to make any adjustment to suit the speaker's remarks. They should keep time with a stop watch or good pocket watch, and at the warnings or closing time arise promptly. The speaker then will make the adjustment of his remarks to the time, and try to end his speech with a hurried closing sentence, if he finds he is speaking beyond the time limit. In case a speaker fails to heed the timekeepers, it is the duty of the chairman to tell him, rather than for the timekeepers by gestures, or loud whispers to try to call his attention to the lapse of time.
APPENDIX I

First and Second Affirmative Speeches in a debate on the proposition, Resolved, that Congress should submit to the several states a new child labor amendment.

(Briefs at end of Chapter VII, Part I)

First Affirmative.

Mr. Chairman, honorable judges, ladies and gentlemen: You have already been told that we are debating the question, Resolved, that Congress should submit to the several states a new child labor amendment. Though the question seems clear enough, it is still the right and duty of the affirmative to explain just what is involved in that proposition, so that we will be debating the same thing.

What is a "new" child labor amendment? When we use the word "new" we mean an amendment that will differ in some marked way from the amendment which Congress submitted to the states two years ago. Obviously, it would be useless to submit the same amendment, since the states already have shown their dissatisfaction with that amendment by refusing to ratify it. The amendment which was defeated gave to Congress the right to regulate the labor of persons up to the age of eighteen. That meant that Congress would have the power to prohibit child labor, and the labor of all persons up to eighteen years of age. That
she would use that power is highly improbable, inasmuch as Congress only regulated child labor up to the age of sixteen in the first two child labor laws which she passed, and doubtless would have reenacted one of these laws, had the amendment been passed. An amendment, we must remember, is only a general grant of power; it is not legislation.

It was in this respect, then, that the last amendment was radically at fault, for it provided specifically for the regulation of child labor, whereas it should have given a general grant of power. Therefore, when we say "new" amendment we mean an amendment which shall read as follows:

Congress is hereby given the power to regulate child labor. Such an amendment only serves the purposes that a constitutional principle should serve; namely, as a guide to future legislation.

We have only one more question to raise with respect to the proposition we are debating; namely, What is child labor? Child-labor laws of thirty-four states provide for the regulation of certain kinds of child labor up to the age of sixteen. The former two child-labor laws passed by Congress did the same. It is our intention that Congress enact a law that will regulate the labor of children up to the age of sixteen.

We are now confronted with the problem itself. Why should Congress submit a new amendment? The affirmative will answer that question for you, ladies and gentlemen, and our first reason is that under present-day conditions such an amendment is absolutely necessary.

Our first reason for declaring such action necessary is that child labor has become a national menace that needs regulation. To prove that it is a national menace, let us first look into conditions in one of the northern states. Bulletin 115 of the Children's Bureau tells us that in Michigan alone there are 13,000 children working in beet fields, and 43% of these are below the age of ten. Consider just what a child laborer has to do in a beet field. He goes to work at five in the morning and works till seven at night. He doesn't do a man's work; he does more than a man's work, and he knows no eight-hour day. The work consists in getting down on hands and knees beside a row of beets, pulling them out of the hard soil, until the child is ready to lie down from exhaustion. When the sun is at its height this boy, whose bones are not yet hardened, has to lift these beets from the ground and throw them into a wagon. This is the hardest kind of manual labor; and it is not for eight hours a day, ladies and gentlemen, but for ten and twelve hours a day. At night he goes home, not to a happy, cozy home, but to a tin shed, where as many as fourteen have been found sleeping in a single room. In the morning, the same grind begins over again.

But this boy in Michigan is not alone, my friends, we find his companions in the canneries of the south, in the tenement factories of New York, in the steel mills of Pennsylvania, in the cranberry bogs of New Jersey, in the mines of the west, and the beet fields of our own state; in fact, according to Bulletin 93 of the Children's Bureau we find that there is not a single state free from the menace of child labor, some states having as many as 25% of their children working the year round. It is the nation-wide prevalence of this evil that makes us declare to you that it is a national menace. In the Civil War, we were fighting against black slavery, but the present battle is a battle against child slavery.

But, my friends, it is not only the nation-wide pres-
ence of child labor that makes us declare it is a national menace, but also the large numbers involved. According to the 1920 census there were 1,060,858 child laborers in the United States. And mind you, ladies and gentlemen, this was true in spite of the fact that there were forty-eight child-labor laws in effect by the states at that time, forbidding the labor of these children.

Furthermore, we consider at this time that child labor is rapidly increasing, and again in spite of state laws. However, the census figure of 1,000,000 child laborers is far too conservative a figure, first, because that census was taken in January and did not include the laborers in beet fields, canneries, and other industries not carried on in the winter extensively, second, it did not include children below the age of ten, third, it was taken at a time of business depression, and fourth, it was taken when a Federal child-labor law discouraged the employment of children.

It is for these four reasons that Miss Grace Abbott, head of the Children’s Bureau, declares that there are in the country over two million child laborers today. One out of every ten is doing manual labor that should be done only by men. And this, in spite of forty-eight child-labor laws.

Besides the fact that the evil is nationwide and involves so many children, we declare that it is a national menace because it is on the increase.

The last census was taken in 1920 and not another will be taken until 1930. Therefore, there are no government figures available to show the number of children working in the whole country. However, the National Child Labor Committee has carried on investigations in industrial cities in over half the states, and this investigation, taken in 1925, shows a steady increase in child-labor work permits, ranging from 20% in half the states, to 50% in seven states, and in some states so high as 100% in the course of the last five years. Remember, also, that these figures showing increases, represent only those children lawfully employed; they do not include the thousands who may be working contrary to state laws. The World Almanac for 1926 says, “If the census were taken up to the present time it would doubtless show a notably larger number employed than in January, 1920.”

Can you blame us for calling it a national menace when the National Child Labor Committee found, under unhealthy conditions, children working in Massachusetts who for five years had performed but two operations with their hands while in a cramped, humpbacked position?

But we have another reason for declaring an amendment necessary; namely, that the present policy has failed. Let us again point out that every state has a child-labor law, but how effective are they? Bulletin 93 of the Department of Labor shows that in these forty-eight child-labor laws there are no less than eighty-eight exemption clauses that nullify and weaken the effect of the laws. Thirty-seven states allow children to work without a common grade school education; and eleven states have no educational requirement of any kind. Eighteen states allow children physically unfit to obtain employment, thirty-six states allow children to work on railroads, on scaffolding, and in otherwise dangerous occupations. Twenty-four states allow children to run elevators, twenty-five states allow children to work more than eight hours a day, five states have actually no minimum age for child labor. These facts are gathered from the state laws themselves.

Actually there are forty-eight state laws, my friends, but they are no more effective than a rope of
sand. This is an indisputable fact when you consider that with these forty-eight laws we still have over two million children employed. These facts lead us to the conclusion that state laws are inadequate to meet the situation.

Besides being inadequate, we condemn state laws because they are not enforced. This glaring indifference on the part of the state is shown in Mississippi. Mr. Pringle of the _New York World_ was sent to that state to investigate child-labor conditions. He reported: "In Mississippi there is but one labor inspector getting $5500 a year—they spend ten times that amount on cattle inspection. The law forbids the work of children but the lone inspector admits his task is hopeless." That it is hopeless is not to be denied; according to the latest census one child in every four in Mississippi was employed.

We further condemn the present policy because there is no hope that it will improve. Let us first bear in mind that for ninety years this state legislation has gone on, and yet to-day the evil is greater than ever. The states do not appear to be serious in their feeble efforts to get rid of child labor. Such states as Tennessee, Arkansas, Alabama, Delaware, Iowa, Louisiana, and Texas, in the hearings before the United States Senate in 1924, positively admitted that the previous child-labor law did good, but when it was declared unconstitutional forty-three legislatures met and only eight made any improvement in their laws, showing the remote possibility of relying on the states.

In the third place, there is no hope for improvement in continuing the present policy, for there are barriers in the way that are hard to remove. The Judiciary committee in _Report 395_ to the House of Representatives in 1924 said: "In some states a single industry was so powerful as to prevent the passage of a reasonable child-labor law." Can there be any hope for better legislation in such a state of affairs?

Ladies and gentlemen, I have taken my time to prove to you that a new amendment is necessary; first, because child labor is a national menace that needs regulation, since it is nation-wide, involves such large numbers, and is on the increase; secondly, this amendment is necessary because state regulation has failed. This, the affirmative have proved to you by showing that state laws are inadequate, are not enforced, and that there is no hope for improvement under this policy. These reasons we declare to be sufficient to prove that this amendment is necessary for the welfare of our country.

_Second Affirmative._

The affirmative have thus far proved that an amendment is necessary; first, by pointing out to you that child labor is a national menace that needs regulation; and second, that the present policy has failed.

But the question we are debating is whether or not Congress should be given the power to regulate child labor under the amendment we propose. It is therefore my province to prove to you that an amendment giving Congress the power is the only satisfactory way of handling the problem.

The affirmative declare Congress should be given this power because there are some problems which Congress alone can handle. One of these problems is that cited in the hearings on the child-labor amendment before the House of Representatives in 1924. An investigation in New Jersey disclosed the fact that children in that state were doing sweatshop work for New York manufacturers who shipped the raw material across the Hudson river. Now the New York law
forbids child labor for such work; but the officials of New York can do nothing because the work is done in New Jersey. On the other hand the New Jersey officials cannot prosecute the manufacturers because they live in New York. Here, my friends, is an interstate problem which came up at the hearings held at Washington, and being an interstate problem it still remains outside the scope of any legislation that has thus far been enacted. A state law never extends beyond the boundaries of that state. Now and then a governor of a state can be petitioned to aid a state in tracking down a criminal, but that is only a moral obligation; and even that remedy could not be applied to thousands of children. Here is an actual case that the states are powerless to handle, because it is a problem that extends beyond state lines.

But there are other situations of like nature. The Judiciary committee in Report 394 points out that children go from northern states to southern states to work in canneries and mills. In 1924, thirty-five hundred went from Baltimore. The report says “Communities where they lived and worked temporarily did not regard themselves as responsible for the protection of out-of-state children. Local control is difficult or impossible.”

Still another case is that cited in Bulletin 115 of the Children’s Bureau. Beet workers are shipped to certain states, and enticed to sign contracts, for it enables them to make money on their children. But when they migrate to other states, where child labor is not allowed, the officials take no steps to curb the labor because the children are not residents of that state. The attitude is: let each state take care of its own children; but as the bulletin says, no thought is given to the children who live a nomadic life, without any state protection. The attitude of the states is that of

two men standing on opposite sides of a stream and listening to the frantic calls for help by a child drowning in midstream. Instead of jumping in and helping the child they stand on opposite banks and argue who should jump in first.

These are some of the problems demanding a law that does not stop at a state boundary, but which applies everywhere alike. We ask the negative: How would you handle such problems without an amendment making a Federal law constitutional? We must have a law that applies equally to all states, and it must be enforced by officers who have the interests of the union at heart instead of the interests of one selfish state. Congress alone can make such a law, and Federal officers alone can enforce it without selfish state interest.

We further submit to you, my friends, that if Congress had this power the law would be better enforced. The Bureau of Labor for Arkansas in a statement made in March, 1922, tells the story fully: “When in the enforcement of our state law we discovered a violation, the most common excuse was ‘We did not know what the law said,’ but no sooner had the Federal law been passed than the department was deluged with inquiries concerning the law, many frankly admitting that they did not wish to get in bad with Uncle Sam.” There is a confession on the part of a state itself that a Federal law always commands greater respect and enforcement than a local law. The states represented in the tenth annual convention of government labor officials in 1923, went on record in favor of Federal legislation, positively admitting that a Federal law was always better enforced. If we give Congress this power, then, on the authority of the states themselves we will have better enforcement.

In addition to these two reasons for giving Congress
the power to regulate child labor, we declare it is a logical step because the maintaining of high standards of citizenship is manifestly a matter of national concern. We are one of the great powers of the world. We are the only great power that has no uniform standard of citizenship; we have not one, but forty-eight.

The effect of this policy was shown in the World War. The army officers were filled with consternation when they found that our illiteracy conditions were appalling, the worst of any world power, as they are at the present day, and that there were so many physically defective men who were called and had to be rejected.

It is an old story, for England was confronted with a similar problem before the Boer War, and had to lower her army standards to fill her ranks. But England profited by the experience, saw where the difficulty lay, enacted a child labor law, and in 1914 the English soldier was a normal citizen again. Our experience in the World War showed we could not rely on the states, for there, confronting us, was the result of 150 years of state control of citizenship.

In support of this contention we submit that it is no radical departure for Congress to carry out a policy of child conservation. Conservation for the future is a settled policy of our government. The government tries to prevent wholesale exploitation of all natural resources. Vast forests are reserved, water power rights rest with Congress, the very soil is protected by a Federal law against exhaustion. No state has ever doubted the wisdom of such a policy or attempted to fight it.

That we cannot rely on the states is shown by the example of the quarantine law that Congress passed several years ago. Congress urged the states to adopt a quarantine law to protect the meat supply. The states put it off, they delayed; the situation finally became so tense that something had to be done. Congress took a hand, enacted a quarantine law, and then the states admitted the wisdom of such an act. Today we do not object to Congress conserving for the future; but what of the future itself? Those who are to enjoy all this result of conservation are not given a vestige of Federal protection to insure the benefit. Ladies and gentlemen, there is no greater anomaly in our government than the fact that a common barnyard hog is important enough to demand Federal protection but that the child is not.

I have proved to you that giving Congress the power is the only way out of the present difficulty; not only because there are some problems which Congress alone can handle and that it will better enforce the law; but also because it is the rightful body to receive such power, especially in view of the fact that we cannot rely on the states. For these reasons the affirmative declares Congress should be given the power to regulate child labor by the submission of a new amendment to the several states for prompt ratification.
APPENDIX II

Sample Constitution for a Debate League.

Article 1—Name.

The name of this organization shall be the Middle Western High School Debate League.

Article 2—Object.

The object of this league shall be the promotion of the science of argumentation and debate contests among the students of the schools in the midwest district.

Article 3—Membership.

The membership of this league shall consist of such schools which are fully accredited by some state university. The annual membership fee to be paid to the league secretary by each school shall be five dollars.

Article 4—Debates.

All debates shall be held between the period March 1 and April 30 of each year.

Article 5—Debaters.

Selection of Teams.—The members of a team (three speakers) shall be selected as the debating authority of each school shall direct.

Eligibility.—The members of a team shall be under twenty-one years of age; shall be undergraduates of the school they represent; shall not be matriculated
as freshmen in any college; shall be carrying at least fifteen hours of school work for the semester in which debating is done. They shall have passed in the same amount of work the preceding semester.

Article 6—Time and Order of Speakers.
Each speaker shall have ten minutes main speaking and five minutes rebuttal speaking, except the last two rebuttal speakers, who shall have eight minutes rebuttal speaking. The negative shall lead in rebuttal. The order of speakers may be changed in rebuttal. Warning shall be given as the students direct. Time shall be kept by a representative from each school.

Article 7—Admission of Sides.
The entertaining school shall maintain the affirmative unless the schools make other arrangements. The league does not advocate that all home debates be on the same side of the question for the home team. As many negative as affirmative debates should be engaged for each floor.

Article 8—Conduct of Debates.
Private correspondence is not to be used in any debate as material for proof.
It shall be considered dishonorable for a school to procure the arguments of a debater or team with whom it may compete that year. Proof that this has been done will bar that team from further debates within the league that year, and it shall forfeit all previous debates.

Article 9—Expense.
The entertaining school shall pay the expense of staging the debate, and securing judges. The visiting school shall pay the expenses of its team, including transportation and living expenses.

Article 10—Questions.
The question for each season shall be determined by a vote of the coaches of the league schools. The secretary will ask for suggested questions, after which a referendum vote will be taken, first to determine the two most popular questions, and then a vote on these two.

Article 11—Judges.
Each debate shall be judged by three competent judges or one expert judge. No person who has been connected with either school, or who is related to the participants, shall be a judge. The coaches of the two teams who are to debate shall agree on the judges. The instructions to the judges shall not be changed from those found on the printed instructions and ballots furnished by the league secretary.
The judges shall sit apart and vote without consultation. Each judge shall sign and seal his vote. The chairman shall open the votes and announce the decision.
APPENDIX III

Sample Judge’s Instructions and Ballot.

MIDDLE WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE LEAGUE
1929–30
TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONTESTS

Question

Resolved, That Congress Shall Have the
Power to Overrule Supreme Court Deci-
sions by a Two-thirds Vote

Instructions to Judges

I. Rules of the League require that the judges render
their decisions on the basis of the selection, ar-
 rangement, and presentation of the arguments.

II. Both thought and form shall be considered by the
judges. If one team excels in substance, thinking,
and handling of material, this team shall be given
the decision over another team that excels merely
in the speaking or delivery.

A. In estimating the substance or thought element,
due attention should be given to: (1) knowledge
of the subject and clear analysis of the relevant
material bearing on it; (2) weighing and inter-
preting the testimonial evidence—especially the
quotations—as to competency and bearing on
the subject of the debate; (3) reasoning—the
drawing of inferences from the material, quo-
tations or general arguments; (4) effectiveness in
 refutation, on which special emphasis should be
laid, with regard to exactness, relevancy, and
fullness.

B. In estimating the form or speaking itself, at-
tention should be given to: (1) correct use of
English; (2) clearness, human interest, and persuasive power of the style; (3) general impression of effectiveness, such as arises from good taste, sincerity, ease, and fluency in speaking. (Reciting verbatim a memorized speech is not good debating. The judges should favor the team which more fully adjusts its arguments to the actual conditions of the debate. A high premium should be placed on knowledge of the question, and on clean-cut refutation, not on mere glibness or ease in speaking. Debaters should not read much from cards or manuscripts, except quotations, which should not be too numerous, and which should be interpreted.)

III. The judges shall sit apart during the debate and shall render their decision without previous consultation, unless both sides agree that they may consult after the debate. Each judge shall sign and seal his ballot in the envelope provided. The presiding officer shall open and read the ballots and announce the decision to the audience.

**BALLOT OF JUDGES**

**MIDDLE WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE LEAGUE**

**Question**

Resolved, That Congress Shall Have the Power to Overrule Supreme Court Decisions by a Two-thirds Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative School</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Negative School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The more effective debating was done, in my judgment by the</td>
<td>Negative or Affirmative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEX**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>335</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracting, 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action in delivery, 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address, 302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hominem argument, 217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad ignorantiam argument, 219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted matter, 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad populum argument, 217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad verecundiam argument, 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative case, outline of, 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims, debate, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alertness, mental, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almanac, World, quoted, 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fallacies of, 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figurative, 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literal, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer, evading direct, 236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony, Mark, 218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A posteriori reasoning, 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final word, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of, 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward audience, 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience, speaking to, 276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptability of, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capability of, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do opponents use same, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequent use of same, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference to, 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance of, 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tests of, 204, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon, Francis, 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballot, sample, 332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballots, preparation of, 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging the question, 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listing in, 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation of, 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samples of, 46, 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using, 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographies, use of, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, reference, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief construction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples of, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how made, 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules of, 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbols, 146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why make a brief, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane, Arthur, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan, W. J., 157, 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden of proof, 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, Edmund, 211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrill, &quot;Treatise on Circumstantial Evidence,&quot; quoted, 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Canned&quot; rebuttal, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Canned&quot; rebuttal, trapping, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain, selecting team, 263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card system rebuttal, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards, samples for index-box, 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards, time, 311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative, 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changing the, 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructing the, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essentials of, 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essentials of, 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinds, 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting the, 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case meetings, 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal relation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause to effect, 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect to cause, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect to effect, 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what it is, 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause to effect relation, fallacies of, 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman, the, 309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charts, use of, 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brief, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speeches, 315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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