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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Scientific method has proved a most successful means of obtaining practical information regarding evaluation, control and utilization of complex phenomena observed by man on his planet. The impressive success of the methods of scientists is represented in both complex and simple forms among implements designed to cope with an earth seemingly jealous of her secrets. In modern times, the accomplishments of science have produced a significant change of mind concerning man's attitude toward his environment. From the beginning of time, every human sense coming in contact with the material world has produced infinite questions plaguing the mind of man.

For a long time they (men) could do no more than ask questions and indulge in more or less ingenious guesses, but slowly the modern scientific method developed, giving definite and well-founded answers to these questions. The everyday philosopher found himself in a dilemma. If he asked questions, he was a philosopher; if he answered them, he was a scientist.¹

James Harvey Robinson, a philosopher-scientist of modern times, was truly the prophet of present-day thought when he described this challenge as the development of an "unprecedented attitude of mind to cope with unprecedented conditions, and to utilize unprecedented knowledge."² Thus, a modern scientific method, composed of scientist and


-2-

philosopher is attempting to meet this challenge by precise refinement of the mechanics of understanding observations.

One of the most notable achievements in this attempt is to be found in the language of the scientist. Science has been the first to fully recognize that accurate transmission of information demands consistent word-to-fact agreement among persons communicating. This kind of thinking has led scholars of meaning to establish, for purposes of clarity, two separate categories of meaning. These are readily recognized as verbal and non-verbal definitions or intensional and extensional meanings.

The intensional meaning of a word has been described as the definition found in the dictionary. In regard to these definitions, Miller pointed out:

There are no meanings in the dictionary. There are only equivalent verbalizations, other ways of saying almost the same thing. There is a common belief that to define a word is to give its meaning. It is healthier to say that by defining the word we substitute one verbal pattern for another.¹

H. R. Huse stated:

Dictionary meanings of a word or phrase are a list of symbols. In some cases a drawing illustrates the object referred to, but usually all that can be found is a series of synonyms.²

Wendell Johnson, in his People in Quandries, exemplified this:

People who are accustomed to looking in a dictionary for the meanings of words proceed under a great delusion if they suppose that what they find in a dictionary is a word's full meaning. What


they find is that a definition consists of more words. If you follow
the trail of definitions long enough, you find that it is a trail
that goes in a great circle so that finally you make the enlighten-
ing discovery that the words are defined by each other.\textsuperscript{5}

Irving J. Lee differentiated between extensional and intensional
attitudes toward definition as follows:

To be oriented extensionally is to realize the primary impor-
tance of life facts, to emphasize the roles of observation and
investigation, to go to the facts first and to abide by them. To be
oriented intensionally is to order behavior in terms of dictionary
definitions, arguments, verbal proofs and theorizings, essentially
disregarding the existence of verifiable facts.\textsuperscript{6}

The realization that (1) a single word must represent many
"things" and (2) a single word is meaningful to persons in communication
only when the noises or symbols have a similar word-to-fact relationship
among parties communicating is of utmost importance.

Even though the English tongue, for example, contains thousands
of words, and many of these have more than one recognized dictionary
meaning, yet we are far from having one word for each fact.\textsuperscript{6}

Thus, a single word may, among different people in different situations,
represent different things. In regard to this Anatol Rapaport stated:

"Nor can we be sure that two different persons will interpret
the same verbalization in the same way, because retranslation of
words into past experience depends on that experience."\textsuperscript{7}

John Dewey agreed with Rapaport when he said:

In the first place, they (symbols) stand for meanings to any

\textsuperscript{5}Wendell Johnson, \textit{People in Quandries} (New York: Harper and
Brothers, 1946), p. 201.

\textsuperscript{6}Johnson, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{7}Anatol Rapaport, \textit{Science and the Goals of Man} (New York:
individual only when he has had experience of some situation to which these meanings are relevant. Words can preserve a meaning only when the meaning has been first involved in our own direct intercourse with things.\(^5\)

In the words of S. I. Hayakawa:

We learn the meanings of practically all our words not from dictionaries, not from definitions but from hearing these noises as they accompany actual situations in life and learning to associate certain noises with certain situations.\(^9\)

These views and others of this sort seemed to indicate that the extensional meaning of any term is related to speaker and listener experience with things associated with the term. Science has made notable progress in this area.

Science is an attempt to systematise abstraction of experience. Where science has been most successful in systematising experience, there has been the greatest agreement among scientists.\(^10\)

There is a growing awareness, among persons using words for evaluating various phenomena, that although a particular group may have agreed upon an intensional or verbal meaning, the extensional or non-verbal relation of the word-to-fact may exhibit little agreement. An example of this is represented by the following:

In the University of Iowa laboratory, Dr. Curtis Tuthill carried out an investigation in which he found that even among experts the number of agreements in defining stuttering extensionally was only 36 percent of the number that would have been involved in perfect intensional agreement.\(^10\)

If the assumptions, first, that science has perfected its


\(^{9}\) Lee, op. cit., p. 47.

\(^{10}\) Johnson, Wendell, op. cit., p. 201.
language, and second, that such a language has appeared possible in the field of speech was valid, then the task of the scholar of communication is a two-fold one: first, to discover the degree of agreement in the use of terms of evaluation of communication phenomena now in use, and second, to develop terms that will provide maximum agreement among those using them. This investigation is concerned with the first of these problems—namely, terms used in debate evaluation.

Debate is one of the areas of speech practice intended to develop more perfect abilities of communication among participants.

Debate may be defined as a process of presenting to a particular audience both a pro and a con discussion of some specific resolution. The word debate (debaters—to beat off) implies that at least two opponents contend and strive in an attempt to influence the conduct of a particular audience. Debate is, moreover, usually formal in nature in that it is conditioned and limited by definite rules agreed upon by the contestants.11

Debate has long been a favorite of participants of speech activities the world over. Some of the world's most noteworthy thinkers found debate a worthwhile intellectual activity. John Stuart Mill, in his autobiography, says: "I have always dated from these conversations (discussions in a debating society) my own inauguration as an original and independent thinker."

According to William Trufant Foster:

Training in public speaking should be conducted by teachers who aim first, to produce sound thinkers in the straightforward

---

oral expression of their own thoughts.\textsuperscript{12}

With this growth of interest in debating came a parallel growth in problems of perfecting this educational tool. One of the major problems was that of providing adequate evaluation instruments to provide correction and direction for participating debaters. Present evaluational techniques are founded upon certain accepted educational objectives. These objectives are quite numerous, but the more important ones are represented by the student's ability in analysis, use of evidence, argument, refutation and delivery. Kim Giffin found that the above terms were agreed upon as the most important educational objectives gained from debate as utilized by thirty-seven judges in a debate tournament:

The results of this analysis indicate that judges at this tournament gave approximately 97 percent of their consideration in arriving at their decision to criteria which are identifiable with what are considered to be desirable academic goals.\textsuperscript{13}

Although there was some evidence to indicate that certain terms were accepted as representing abilities to be gained from debating, there was no evidence to indicate that judges used these terms in any given debate judging situation with enough inter-judge agreement to provide adequate evaluational reliability; however, the hypothesis of this research is that experienced judges will exhibit higher agreement than inexperienced judges.


The problem, formally stated, is:

The purpose of this study was to discover the Extensional Agreement Index among debate judges using accepted debate judgment terms as shown by a comparison of thirty-seven expert debate judges and thirty-seven lay debate judges making judgment of twelve recorded debates.
CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

An Overview.

Since the hypothesis pertinent to this investigation indicated that experienced judges would exhibit a higher degree of agreement than would inexperienced judges, the operations of this research were designed to discover the Extensional Agreement Index for the terms Analysis, Evidence, Argument, Refutation and Delivery used in debate evaluation by experienced and inexperienced judges confronted with recorded debate speeches.

Debate Judgement Terms.

The terms, analysis, evidence, refutation, argument and delivery, were used on the ballots for speaker evaluation. These terms and verbal definitions of the terms were formulated on the basis of a survey of numerous texts on debate and argumentation and research data relative to the most widely used judging criteria. (The texts used for reference may be found in the Bibliography.)

A second ballot containing the meaningless terms—or terms not in common usage—Belipaki, Karayti, Sitkrey, Relikes, and Figork was formulated. Meaningless definitions were to be found across from these terms and were similar to the above meaningless terms. Instructions pertinent to the procedure of the judging session were similar to those found on the sheet using the terms Analysis, Evidence, Argument,
Refutation and Delivery.

Judges.

Judges used in this research were persons participating in forensics in Montana. Two categories of judges were established comprising experienced and inexperienced persons. The experienced or "Expert" judges were debaters and coaches with a minimum of two years of experience as debate coaches and/or debaters. The inexperienced or "Lay" judges were students taken from two Montana University Education classes (Education 200, Introduction to Education and Education 305, Secondary School Teaching Procedures) who professed to have no debate experience.

Judges in sessions involving expert and lay judges judging on meaningful terms and those judging on meaningless terms were given the following instructions:

You are about to participate in a judging session in conjunction with research sponsored by the Montana State University Speech Department.

You have been given a set of twelve ballots; you are asked to rate on the nine-point scale the degree of excellence of each of six debate speeches. You will regard the scale as the full range of possible ability from poor to excellent.

You are to be told the number and the side of each speaker immediately before each speech. Please mark your judgments for each particular speaker immediately following each speech.

Please do not confer with others in the room.

The debaters are debating the topic, Resolved: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries.

Instructions on the ballot were then read aloud and judges were then reminded not to confer with others in the room.
Debaters.

Debaters selected for this research were students enrolled in speech at Montana State University. Debaters giving speeches were divided into three levels, with four speakers, two affirmative and two negative, in each level. Level number one consisted of debaters having competitive tournament experience in debate and a formal class in debate techniques. Level number two consisted of debaters who had attended a formal class in debate techniques for one quarter. Level number three consisted of students enrolled in Principles of Speech classes at Montana State University with no debate experience. The speakers were debating the topic, Resolved: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries.

All students giving speeches for this research were given the following instructions:

1. You will have approximately seven days to prepare a seven-minute debate speech.

2. You will debate the affirmative (or negative) side of the proposition: Resolved: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries.

3. You are asked when preparing the debate speech not to be late in meeting your appointment, which is (date) at (time).

In addition to the above, those students having no debate experience were told:

1. How to introduce the debate speech.

2. That (if on the affirmative) they were supposed to stand for the resolution and present proof to back up or uphold the resolution; (if on the negative) that they were to stand for the status quo and against the carrying of the resolution.
3. To plan the speech within the time limit.

**Recorded Debate Speeches.**

The debate speeches were recorded on a Magnacord recorder, model PT6-J, with all possible precaution taken to eliminate extraneous sounds. Recordings were done on Scotch plastic recording tape.

Appointments for recording sessions were made to fit the student's schedule.

In an effort to avoid systematic error, speeches were placed in random order.

The sessions were usually one hour in length, with each group of judges hearing six debate speeches. This procedure was carried on until a nearly equal number of judges had heard both groups of six debate speeches. Judges hearing the second group of six speeches listened to affirmative speech number one (1), so they could be aware of the content of the speech the negative was attacking. Affirmative speech number one (1) was not judged at this time.

The number of each speech and the side was announced before each speech was heard, and judges were reminded to mark this information on the ballot for the speech they were about to hear. The technician was instructed to pause until all judges had finished marking ballots. The entire judging session was approximately two (2) hours in length.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The research done in this study was the result of questioning agreement among debate judges using debate judgment terms as tools of evaluation. The study was concerned essentially with similarity of word-to-word associations among debate judges. Judges were asked to exhibit these individual associations by marking on a nine-point scale their opinion of the excellence of the recorded debate speeches used in the research.

Evaluation of the markings made by judges in the judging sessions was accomplished in the following ways:

1. An examination of the number of judgments falling within three (3) scale points for each of twelve speeches and the respective terms of evaluation. A comparison was made here of the EAI of lay and expert judges confronted with accepted debate judgment terms and lay judges confronted with meaningless terms.

2. An examination of the EAI of all three groups of judges in connection with levels of experience of debaters giving recorded debate speeches.

3. Examination of semi-interquartile range values rank ordered from lowest to highest to discover if the total number of low semi-interquartile values attributed to expert judges differ significantly from the total number expected on the basis of chance. This latter form of evaluation is determined on the basis of the number of "runs" found
among the rank ordered, low semi-interquartile range values. A "run" in this data is a change from one group of rank ordered scores to another—(Scores of Expert, Lay\(^1\) and Lay\(^2\)). On the basis of statistical analysis, a given number of "runs" in series of rank ordered semi-interquartile range values represent what is to be expected on the basis of chance. Therefore, in order for any conclusion to be drawn concerning greater or lesser agreement, the number of "runs" within any grouping of twelve semi-interquartile values must be significantly lower than the number expected on the basis of chance.

4. Examination of semi-interquartile range values and median scores of expert and lay judges using meaningful terms and lay judges using meaningless terms.

The results of this study in relation to the above categories are to be found on the following tables.
TABLE I

EXTENSIONAL AGREEMENT INDEX FOR
TERMS USED WITH REFERENCE TO
EXPERT AND LAY JUDGES USING ACCEPTED
DEBATE JUDGMENT TERMS AND LAY JUDGES
USING "MEANINGLESS TERMS."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERMS</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Lay(^1)</th>
<th>Lay(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGUMENT</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUTATION</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE: EAI</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II

OBSERVED "RUNS" USED TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SEMI-INTERQUARTILE RANGE SCORES OF EXPERT VERSUS LAY1 JUDGEMENTS USING ACCEPTED JUDGEMENT TERMS AND COMBINED EXPERT-LAY1 JUDGEMENTS USING ACCEPTED JUDGEMENT TERMS VERSUS LAY2 JUDGEMENTS USING MEANINGLESS JUDGEMENT TERMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERMS</th>
<th>EXPERT VS. LAY1</th>
<th>EXPERT LAY1 VS. LAY2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I    II   III  IV</td>
<td>I     II   III  IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>13   13.48 1.50 1.65</td>
<td>6     17    *4.20 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>12   12.92 1.02 1.65</td>
<td>15    17    .01  1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGUMENT</td>
<td>13   13    0.0   1.65</td>
<td>19    17    .01  1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUTATION</td>
<td>7    **   *   ** 7   *   *   *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
<td>14   13    .42  1.65</td>
<td>14    17    1.14 1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I The number of Observed "Runs".

II The number of "Runs" expected on the basis of chance.

III Difference between observed and expected "Runs".

IV Significance at 5% Level.

* The single significant difference of semi-interquartile range score from that expected on the basis of chance.

** Due to a lower "N" (18) a different analysis indicates no significant difference if observed runs exceed five (5).
## TABLE III

Means of median and semi-interquartile range scores for accepted debate judgment terms and meaningless terms as used by expert and lay judges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERMS</th>
<th>EXPERT</th>
<th>LAY(^1)</th>
<th>LAY(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGUMENT</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUTATION</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 4.6 1.2 5.4 1.0 4.4 1.4
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Educators have placed much confidence in debate as an effective educational tool; however, the challenge of perfecting the competitive speech process must be faced by all persons interested in increasing that effectiveness. The purpose of the debate ballot was not only to provide a win-loss decision, but also to provide direction for participants by grading the abilities exhibited by debaters in actual debate competition. No attempt was made to change the debate process but only to test the instrument used in judging the excellence of debaters in mastering the skills represented by the terms, analysis, evidence, argument, refutation and delivery. On the basis of the findings of this study, as described in Chapter III the following analysis is suggested.

The Extensional Agreement Index as developed by Wendell Johnson represents a percentage of judgements falling within three (3) scale points. The formula for the Extensional Agreement Index is:

\[
EAI = \frac{x}{y}
\]

in which \(x\) represents the number of obtained agreements and \(y\) the maximum possible number of agreements. For this particular study, "obtained agreements" was operationally defined as the greatest number of judgements in each sample falling within three (3) scale points. Data of Table I, concerned with comparison of all three groups of judges, indicates no difference between average EAI of Expert and Lay Judges using meaningful terms—each of these have an EAI of 69. At this point, it
seemed possible to conclude that the score of the expert judges was a
low one since it did not differ significantly from so-called non-experts;
however, the similar scores could have been due to the fact that the
terms of the ballot were of such a high degree of common usage that both
expert and lay would be expected to achieve a similar score.

With this thought in mind, it became imperative to discover if
the terms used by the lay judges were meaningful terms or if their
scores were representative of what could be expected with terms not
potentially meaningful in judgement. The scores, then, under the head-
ing Lay² represent the results of lay judges (Freshman Principles of
Speech Students) evaluating the selected debate speeches on the basis
of five (5) terms of judgement that were supposed to be completely
meaningless. (Belipski, Karayti, etc.) (See Appendix B.) The scores
of Lay² differ from the Expert and Lay¹ judges by nine (9) percentage
points or an EAI of 60.

Since there seemed to be little difference in EAI among the
three groups of judges, it was suggested that the scores may be similar
to those expected on the basis of chance. As explained in Chapter III,
data was arranged from the lowest SQR values (representing highest
agreement) to the highest SQR values (representing lowest agreement).
The scores were then analyzed for the number of changes or "runs" to be
expected on the basis of chance and those actually exhibited by research
data. In one instance the number of actual "runs" differed signifi-
cantly from those expected on the basis of chance. (See Table II).
This significant difference occurred between the combined scores of
Expert and Lay\(^1\) judges using the meaningful term *Analysis* and the Lay\(^2\) judges using the meaningless term Belipaksi with the meaningful term *Analysis* receiving the higher EAI. The lack of significant difference between Expert and Lay\(^1\) judges using the meaningful term *Analysis* indicates the term *Analysis* was not used within the context of debate evaluation; however, it may be suggested that the term *Analysis* was in such common usage that a greater degree of agreement was to be expected. The low EAI for the term Belipaksi may suggest that this term had less word-fact agreement than other meaningless terms having a greater EAI. The evidence presented here, then, would seem to indicate that judges reacting to the selected debate speeches achieved a score of agreement no greater than would be expected on the basis of chance.

Table III indicates the median scores of the three groups of judges—both median and semi-interquartile values. In regards to the medians of the median scores, judges in all groups tended to utilize the middle of the scale of judgement. This may be due to one of the following reasons:

1. The nine-point scale may carry with it this kind of defect; that is, persons faced with a scale of any type may select the middle point. However, it is well to remember that precaution was taken to select three distinct levels of ability to promote utilization of the entire scale. If the assumption that people tend to mark near the center of any scale is valid, then the nine-point scale used in this research would bias the report in favor of higher agreement indexes. Let it be said, at this point, that all conclusions made on the basis of
these results will be made on the assumption that the nine-point scale
selected in the planning of this research is valid for the purposes of
the study.

(2) The three debate speech categories may not differ enough
for recognition by the judges. But this, of course, is at the very core
of the problem. If the varied degrees of excellence in the abilities
of debate are not recognisable by judges and/or evidenced by evaluation-
ial instrument, then the validity of the instrument of judgement may be
open to question.

The SCR values among the three sets of judges using all five
judgement terms differ to no significant degree (with the exception men-
tioned above) as evidenced by the analysis of data for significant
departure from chance.

In summary, then, the results of this research indicates that

(1) Experienced judges, as defined in this research, did not
use the terms of evaluation, analysis, evidence, argument, refutation
and delivery with sufficient agreement to warrant the use of the terms
as valid evaluational measures.

(2) No significant difference in the degrees of agreement,
among inexperienced and experienced judges, using meaningful terms of
evaluation, was evidenced, and

(3) With the exception of the meaningful term Analysis and the
meaningless term Belipski, no significant difference was noted among
experienced judges using meaningful terms and those using "meaningless"
terms, other than that expected on the basis of chance.
Inquiries into the effectiveness of speech judgment techniques gave birth to this research. Persons interested in providing the most educationally perfect forms of competitive speech felt the need for a scientific appraisal of present judging instruments. Instructors and students have exemplified their belief in the importance of speech participation by the effort they expend each year to promote this activity. Since the speech ballot acts as an instrument of direction for students of speaking, no doubt as to its accuracy can be allowed. If the debate ballot does not correct ineffective speech habits, a new kind of appraisal instrument must be developed.

The debate ballot developed for this research was created with the express intention of testing the degree of reliability of utilizing terms for evaluation of speaking ability. The original hypothesis of this research was that expert judges would show a higher degree of agreement in the use of debate judgment terms than would "lay" judges. The results of this study evidence no significant difference between the expert and lay groups of judges; therefore, the hypothesis must be rejected. However, it remained important to discover the degree of agreement that could be expected from "expert" judges. It was found that scores made by expert judges are the scores one could expect on the basis of chance.

The results of this research based on the operational
particulars thereby established suggest the following conclusions:

1. There is some evidence to indicate that the validity of present methods of debate judgement, similar to that used in this research, is questionable.

2. Evidence of this kind exhibits a need for further study of instruments that employ verbal criteria of evaluation.

3. That an appraisal of other such instruments may be needed with the view of establishing more accurate methods of evaluation.
APPENDIX A

BALLOT OF ACCEPTED JUDGMENT TERMS
Instructions: Rate this speaker according to his degree of excellence in each of the abilities listed. Rate each speaker independently, not comparatively. Encircle one of the numbers on the scale. Regard the scale as the full range of possible skill in each element of debating ability.

ANALYSIS: The process of discovering the basic issues and points of controversy to allow systematic treatment of the proposition.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

USE OF EVIDENCE: The process of selecting those facts (examples, statistics, and authorities) which are most pertinent to the debate.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

ARGUMENT: The process of drawing inferences from proof materials (assumptions, evidence, and logical reasoning) in support of a particular contention in the debate.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

REFUTATION: The process of attacking, weakening, tearing down, or destroying the argument of an opponent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

DELIVERY: Voice quality, vocal variety, articulation, pronunciation, and bodily behavior effectively implemented in debate presentation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent
APPENDIX B

BALLOT OF "MEANINGLESS"

JUDGEMENT TERMS
Instructions: Rate this speaker according to his degree of excellence in each of the abilities listed. Rate each speaker independently, not comparatively. Encircle one of the numbers on the scale. Regard the scale as the full range of possible skill in each element of debating ability.

Pelipki
Frolicset kansik rahlep yekrean key fillik grun flip.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

Kerayti
Belik oock Fank sait Rapicksuris fel panysciop.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

Sitkay
Belin sitrek fan zootkiarel paleontary say kren stan fil aron.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

Reliskz
Malozans Krans letsti fil oran poglichip kid san filmore.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent

Pigork
Rapicure depicutix felix eti progo setreti flitch.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Poor Excellent
APPENDIX C

RECORDED DEBATE SPEECHES
Speaker #1 Affirmative - Level 1

We of the Affirmative are happy to be here this afternoon to debate the resolution: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries. At this time we of the Affirmative feel it is apropos to define our terms. By United States we mean the states, including Alaska and Hawaii, which form the fifty-state Union. By direct economic aid we mean money or goods extended to a foreign country other than for the direct use of its military forces, which includes everything from jet planes to shoelaces, for the direct use of its military forces. This excludes, of course, technical aid in the form of knowledge, techniques, and general American know-how, and the necessary equipment to demonstrate such. By foreign countries we mean all countries other than the United States.

We see there are several main contentions which establish this need. The point has been reached where direct economic aid is just no longer necessary. Let's take a look at the free nations of Europe. It has been stated in the New York Times, May 13, 1956, in an article entitled, "The Marshall Plan Empties the Coffers": "At the peak month personnel-wise of the Marshall Plan, there were 2658 employees for the U.S. government in Europe. That was in August in 1951. By the end of this year, 1956, by current plans, there will be 150 aid program employees in Europe." Going to John H. Alder in "World Economic Growth" as reviewed in Economics and Statistics of August, 1956, "By 1951 the overall European dollar gap that many thought chronic and permanent, was closed and remained closed in the face of a decline in American exports during the 1953-54 recession." We see, therefore, there really isn't any need to keep pouring money into the free nations of Europe if they are discontinuing their economic aid. It is imperative at this time that we recognize this. To back this up once more, Edwin H. Dale, speaking in the New York Times, November, 1956, states: "European currencies, including sterling, had imperceptibly become so hard that these nations could as readily buy for dollars as well as currency." In other words, in plain ordinary English, their buying power in their own currency is almost equal to that of the United States dollar. So much for the nations of Europe.

At this time, let's look at the free nations of the Far East, which, like our European friends, no longer need direct economic aid. Speaking in the Queen's Quarterly, in an article entitled, "Whither India?" it states: "The first India Five Year Plan has been very successfully implemented, particularly in the sectors of agriculture and social welfare. The production of food increased from fifty million tons in 1950-51 to sixty-eight and eight-tenths million tons in the 54-55 year, exceeding the plant target for 55-56 by about four and two-tenths million tons. In fact, India is now offering a small quantity of rice for exports." This would show that a supposedly overpopulated
area is taking care of itself on its own inherent producing potential.

Let's go down south to our Latin American friends. John Alder again in American Economic Growth states, for the countries of Latin America as a whole: "The last year was probably the most prosperous period of their recorded history. The advances during this time and that of those made during the war almost doubled the real income of the area." In other words, they are not too dependent on economic aid.

Now the question of communism advancement arises. We see that there is little to fear of further spread of communism if our direct economic aid is discontinued. This is our second contention under our need arguments. This is readily seen as quoted in U.S. News, December, 1956, "The Blow that Will Crack an Empire": "Youth is not buying Communism. Red indoctrination of Youth has failed. Since Hungary's revolt began, students have rioted in Poland, Bulgaria and Romania. In Moscow itself, hundreds of students have been jailed for asking questions about Hungary." If Youth is suspicious, certainly the adults should be suspicious. Direct Economic Aid is both futile and damaging in attempting to raise the standards of the world.

We see that first of all the free nations of the world no longer need direct economic aid. We see there is little danger of further spread of communism. We also see that direct economic aid is both futile and damaging in attempting to raise the standards of the world. My colleague will present our plan to show how we think aid, if any, should be given to these programs.

Speaker #2 Negative - Level 3

Friends of debate: The Affirmative believes that the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries. They say this aid is no longer necessary. I believe that there is a very great necessity for direct economic aid. Direct aid enables us to help satellites. Poland needs aid. Newsweek, March 19, 1957: "What we should seek is a world's widest possible contact of world cultural relations." This effort should include economic aid. Poland needs it. If some of it will not come from the West, the Polish regime will completely depend on Moscow. Nation, Jan. 7, 1957: "Unless United States grants long-term financial aid to Poland, soon the new regime will have to renew and extend major existing trade agreements with the Soviet Union." This shows that continued aid is needed to continue relations with our satellites.

Direct aid also gives us greater bargaining power. It enables us to bargain for military reasons, airways, air rights, army bases in foreign countries where they are needed. It also enables us to develop essential raw materials. President's Political Commission, 1954: "This
country consumes about \( \frac{3}{4} \) of the raw materials of the world. It is the major single importer of most materials."

Direct foreign aid also enables us to dispose of most of our surpluses. We give surplus food to foreign countries and they can sell it in their own country for their own national currency. Direct foreign aid benefits American industries. The majority of the money that we loan or give to foreign countries is spent in America for American goods.

The Affirmative has said that youths in Russia are suspicious. The United States must spend money for propaganda. To continue giving news to youths to tell them the truth is important. I believe that the United States should continue direct economic aid for these reasons.

Speaker #3 Negative - Level 2

Friends of debate: The Affirmative has stated that we should discontinue foreign aid. I, of the Negative, believe we should not discontinue foreign aid. To begin, I would like to ask the Affirmative to restate their definition of aid in general. We are uncertain of their statement concerning military aid. They said that in India, where they have increased their rice production, that they are doing better with just American fertilizer and seeds. I believe that this is a direct form of aid. The direct economical aid is both damaging and futile, the affirmative said. I believe this is not exactly right. This know-how that we have been giving, has been a help for these countries to up their production. I believe that we have a great investment already. We must maintain this, practically at all costs. According to David Lawrence, U.S. News, May 29, 1957, "Should We Surrender Our Strongholds in Western Europe and Let the Communists Take Over?": Nato is a military alliance. United States troops are in Germany and the military supply is in France. We have the use of air bases in Italy and North America." This illustrates that we must keep on the good side of these nations or we will not be able to have these countries surrounding Russia as we have now. This, I believe, is very important to our National Defense.

The Marshall Plan in the past has been very effective. The countries the Marshall Plan has benefited have not lost their freedom or lost even a bit of land to other countries since 1947, when they took over. In this day and age we cannot be isolationists. We cannot live alone and not be observant of other countries. It will have a very direct effect on our country and our well-being. We are becoming a trading nation more and more. Communism could slowly take over countries surrounding the United States, such as South America. I think as it is being proposed now, a Marshall Plan for South America would be a very good idea. It would help South America ward off infiltration from
stronger countries.

For these very definite reasons, I believe that financial aid to foreign countries should not be discontinued.

**Speaker #4, Negative - Level 1**

Ladies and gentlemen, we are also very glad to be here to debate this all-important topic which is of primary importance to all of us in the world today. We would first like to take issue with their definitions of terms as they have appeared in the resolution. We will first consider the term "direct economic aid." By this, the Affirmative means money or goods. They further contend, however, that this is money or goods other than military. Then they tell us that by military money or goods they mean anything from jet planes to shoelaces. They tell us, further, that as a definition for direct economic aid, they would exclude knowledge and equipment that is necessary for technical aid. But, if we were to contend that there were a need for different kinds of technical aid, they would refer to their term that they meant other than military and they would relegate everything pertaining to direct economic aid to the term military aid. It is quite obvious that the members are willing to submit some economic aid, direct and otherwise, to foreign countries. However, they refuse to put it under this title. They instead would like to call it military aid. Well, regardless of nomenclature, we must consider that economic aid, whether called military or any other title, is still economic aid.

However, in the face of this defining, the members of the Affirmative say they have two contentions. Their first contention is that it is no longer necessary. They go on to give us countless statistics, telling about the Marshall Plan, how in 1951 they had 2000 government employees involved in the Economic Aid Department, and how in 1956 we have about 150. This, they contend, is evidence that we no longer need economic aid to foreign countries. Then they further go on by telling us that the buying power of these free European nations equals the buying power of the United States. This would indicate to the Negative, however, that our economic aid has been somewhat successful. That we have been able to put the foreign nations on their feet once again. This does not mean, however, that they no longer need foreign aid. For it is obvious that it is only possible that they would be at a standstill and continuing in the inadequacies that they have already. They would have a tendency to decline, due to the increase in the world’s population today.

From Harold C. Stassen, in "The Progress of the Mutual Security Program and a Look Ahead," we have this following quote: "Many of the underdeveloped areas still lack the resources to finance the expansion
necessary even to keep up with normal population increases. As a result, they not only fail to move upward; they may decline. To preclude these developments, which would have adverse consequences on free world security, our government should continue to supplement technical assistance with capital investment for basic development and industrial expansion.

After World War I, the U.S. began sending aid to European nations and they reciprocated by buying United States products and supplies in demand. However, after a few years we have lost sight of our aims. We have continued not only to slack off our assistance and refuse to grant any loans to foreign nations, but also we have put the destroyed German nations on a razor’s edge. We soon began to realize the United States was plunging into a depression, but it was too late to stop. It only took four long years to overcome it. We were not the only nation to suffer. We could have prevented this suffering due to the U.S. supplies and due to the fact that if we have the ability and know-how, that we should extend our hand as good neighbors. In this way we should be able to keep American citizens in America to enjoy American prosperity, and at the same time assure our allies and the neutrals a more prosperous and a more gainful future.

Speaker #5 Affirmative - Level 2

Friends of debate, honorable judge, worthy opponents: We of the Affirmative are here to debate the timely topic: Resolved: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries. At this point in the debate we find it is fitting to define our terms. United States, by which is meant the people of the United States and all its territories. Should, by which is meant ought to, and not necessarily can or will. Discontinue, by which is meant to stop direct economic aid, and direct economic aid, by which is meant money and goods given as gifts or loans other than for military forces or a foreign country. This excludes knowledge or equipment to demonstrate it.

There is a need, and under this need we have three main contentions. One, the other nations of the world no longer need direct economic assistance from the United States. As evidence, I would like to quote Fortune, Vol. 54, p. 57, November, 1956: "World Industrial production in 1956 is running at a rate double its prewar peak, and according to a latest study, almost all countries shared in the increase. In the more advanced countries, including Canada, United States, Australia, West Europe, Japan, and the Union of South Africa, commodity output rose 75% between 1934 and 58. Production in the less developed areas, including Latin America and the Middle East and most of Africa, also went up by some 40%." Granted, the industrial nations were making faster progress, the figures indicate that both rich and poor were both
moving ahead.

For additional references, *Wall Street Journal*, October 19, 1956, the *Medical Science Quarterly*, Sept. 1956 mean, in essence, that production and standards of living were up to prewar days and surpasses them in some countries. Today Europe has a greater dollar balance with which to buy our own goods.

Our second contention is that there will be further spread of communism if our direct economic aid is discontinued. As evidence, I would like to quote *United States News*, Vol. 41, p. 25, Dec. 21, 1956: "The Revolt that Will Crack a Nation": "World War III, Russian style, for years appears to be going the Soviet way without check. Subversive infiltration, revolution, theft by Soviet intrigue, Soviet arms, Soviet example were sweeping through large areas of the world. Arab states of the strategic Middle East were the latest to buy the Soviet formula. Today all has changed, largely because of the example of Hungary. It is in Hungary that communist leaders of the Soviet Union dropped all pretense and used brute force to show the true face of their regime. That sudden return to brute force sent shock waves all over the world. The Kremlin has been forced to show its hand."

Our third contention is that the discontinuance of economic aid would be advantageous to America's domestic policy. As evidence, I would like to quote David Lawrence, "United States Unlikely to Give No-string-attached Loans," *New York Herald Tribune*, May 1, 1956: "It is a curious paradox, the very persons here and abroad that are advocating that America give away her money without strings are laying down specific conditions by telling the American taxpayer that he must grant funds and expect nothing in return." Also, I would like to quote Clyde Moore, "Quotable Quotes," *Reader's Digest*, Vol. 69, p. 209, December, 1956: "We hope the scientists discover Mars is not inhabited. This country can't afford to stretch foreign aid any further!" Be of the Affirmative say Amen to that.

Since we of the Affirmative have shown a need and supported by our three contentions: (1) The countries of the world no longer need economic assistance from the United States, (2) There is little danger of the further spread of communism if our direct economic aid is discontinued, (3) The discontinuing of direct economic aid would be an advantageous American domestic policy.

For a workable plan we of the Affirmative would like taxes to start going down, instead of up, and our National debt to do the same; therefore, we stand resolved that the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries.
Friends of debate: My colleague and I are pleased to be with you to debate the proposition, Resolved: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries.

There are certain terms in the proposition which need to be defined. They are: United States, by which is meant the federal government; direct, by which is meant in the absence of any intervening influence; and finally, economic aid, by which is meant money or goods given to a country other than for the direct use of its military forces.

The first issue of this debate is that there is a need to discontinue direct economic assistance to foreign countries. Our first argument under the issue of need is that such assistance as is now needed is calling for action other than for direct economic aid. What is our evidence to back up this statement? Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, in a report to a special committee to study the foreign aid program, studied in March 1957, has this to say: "Technical aid is the cheapest form of aid for us and will in the long run do more for us to further India's economic and social progress. India's resources and manpower are very great. Her development will ultimately depend upon science and technology for their utilization." A further piece of evidence from Robert W. Hillbrouner in Public Affairs Pamphlet, published in July, 1956, "Consider for a moment the very essentials of development, illiteracy for example. How is one to run a complex industrial plant if the workers cannot read the bulletin board? Yet illiteracy commonly runs as high as 80% in an underdeveloped nation."

Under the issue of need, the second issue, is that economic aid is both a futile and damaging policy as a means of raising the living standards of the underdeveloped countries. George A. Nolan, Congressional Record, June 19, 1955, gives us this piece of evidence: "Recorded history goes back 2000 years in the case of some countries and for 5000 years in the case of others. Many of the countries on which we have been spending our money have not changed their standard of living throughout that time." Now, what does that particular piece of evidence indicate? It indicates just this to us, that money or direct economic aid is not the thing that these underdeveloped nations need at this particular time. A further piece of evidence on this argument states that "The long-continued receipt of aid in the amount determined on the basis of need may make it possible for a government in the aided country to evade the truth about its own predicament and avoid actions to cope with it."

Benjamin Higgins in National Conciliation, in March, 1955, says: These countries want economic development but show little eagerness to accept the hardships attendant upon the first stages of industrial
revolution. On the contrary, they want development, together with a full-fledged welfare state." Now, what does this evidence mean? It means just one thing to us, that is, that direct economic aid is not the thing these countries need now. They are not ready for such a program.

Our third argument under the issue of need is that the policy of direct economic aid is futile and damaging as a means of securing friends and fighting communism. What is our evidence to back that statement? T. Milton Hands, in The Congressional Record of July, 1956, says that "It has been constantly urged that this is a program which is to contain communism. I regret to say that there are far more people under communist control now than when the program started. Indeed, hundreds of millions more! As one pertinent example, there are as many communists in France and as many communists in the French Chamber of Deputies as there were at the beginning of the program." There is what our economic aid is getting us! No change in the status of the communist advance at all! Eugene Staley, in his book, The Future Underdeveloped Countries, published in 1954, quotes J. J. Sane, president of the India League of Nations as saying, after a recent visit to South and South East Asia that he was once more "made aware that one of the main causes of the resentment against the Western Powers was their arrogant assumption that the white fathers know what is good for the backward Asian peoples." You cannot support the world without giving them the idea that you feel that you are better than they are. This means that our program of direct economic aid is not gaining friends for us; it is not containing communism.

Our plan for discontinuing this aid is:

1. To allow present allocations to run out as they are now scheduled.

2. To work through the United Nations technical assistance program.

3. To legislate laws and negotiate treaties to encourage private investment in foreign countries.

We feel that the plan as stated is a realistic point of view.

Speaker #7 Affirmative - Level 2

The proposition for debate tonight is that the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries. We will take the Affirmative side of this proposition. The immediate causes for this discussion include the sudden concern over the economic aid program as it now stands today, and a criticism by prominent men connected
with foreign relations regarding the shortcomings of this system.

During the last fifteen years, during hot and cold war, and troubled peace, the United States has spent more than 110 millions of dollars in grants and loans going to foreign aid. If you wish to go back to World War I period and include the unpaid war debts, forgiven and unforgiven, the total is some ten billion greater.

Terms which we feel need definition include: United States, by which we mean our government at Washington, D.C.; Should, by which we mean ought to, and not necessarily can or will; Discontinue, by which we mean terminate in its present form; Direct Economic Aid, by which we mean any military and economic assistance; Foreign Countries, by which we mean any country other than the U.S. Admitted and waived matter includes the time elements which will be taken to be in the immediate future or within one year.

Issues in the debate shall include: Is there a need for economic aid in any form, and if so, what plan of discontinuance should be adopted? And, is the plan a practicable solution to the problem of foreign aid?

We, the Affirmative, feel that our United States bilateral aid program has failed in many respects. Our program of military aid has done more harm than good. For example, our policy of military aid to NATO countries has not been satisfactory. France, in Algeria, Britain, in Cyprus, and France and Britain, in Egypt has used our aid for purposes we did not intend. Our arms aid policy is also unsatisfactory in the Near East. Our aid to various Arab countries was used to take an aggressive stand against Israel. Paul H. Douglas tells us: "Lying next to Israel as it does, Jordan has an intense hatred towards Israel, and its ruling groups want nothing better to attack Israel and drive its inhabitants into the sea." By maintaining and equipping their armies, we'll be giving them the means of attack. What is King Saud going to do with the army we have paid and equipped and trained? Mr. Dulles implies that he will use them to defend the United States against the Russians. What guarantee is there that he will not use them against Israel? Our giving arms to King Saud may give him the equipment to attack oil-rich Kuwait. When we gave arms to Iraq and refused Egypt aid, we encouraged the latter to turn to Russia. James F. Warbrook tells us: "We should learn from the past that paying off one group benefits not us, but our enemies." A classic example of this is the arming of Iraq and refusing to rearm Egypt. The result was that Egypt turned to Russia for needed supplies.

We, the Affirmative, also feel that bilateral assistance has not proved as a satisfactory method of helping the under-developed countries with their economic problems. The giving of our direct aid has been dominated by unworthy political considerations. This plan of aid-giving
actually promotes the spread of communism. The major qualifications for American aid is an active communist party. Some of the countries, best equipped to make use of American assistance under this plan are denied American help; under the bilateral system we are less susceptible to having inefficient use of aid funds.

I have presented what we, the Affirmative, feel is sufficient evidence to support the need for a change, and sufficient reason for changing the status quo.

Speaker #8 Negative - Level 2

Honorable Judge, Mr. Chairman, Friends of Debate: Tonight we will argue the proposition that the U.S. should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries. My colleague and I contend that we should not discontinue aid to foreign countries. We feel that foreign aid is very necessary for these countries' existence.

I would like to quote Senator Hubert Humphrey, "American Economic Responsibilities in the World Crisis," Congressional Record, 21 February, 1957. "I have never heard a private investor trying to provide for hospitals, malaria control, a teacher training school, the county agent office, or a community development project. We know that these steps are necessary before a private investor can go into an area. Public investment must supply a substantial proportion of the capital, at least in the early years." We draw from this conclusion that Mr. Humphrey states the U.S. is the only one who will be able to supply money for these needed things of hospitals, malaria control, and teacher training. For this reason my colleague and I feel that the U.S. should not discontinue direct economic aid.

Also, I wish to quote Paul D. Hoffman, Mutual Security Hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Oct., 1956, page 26: "The original estimates of the cost of the Marshall Plan were approximately 17 billion dollars. It was to be considered a success if European agriculture and production were restored to pre-war levels in a four-year period. Free Europeans, working together as they never worked before, accomplished miracles. In 1947 production in Western Europe was only 25% below the levels existing before World War II. The total cost to the U.S. was not 17 billion, but less than 13 billion." From this we conclude that the U.S. is not spending as much money as people would have you believe. The U.S. money that is spent is very usefully spent. These people do not have enough food, do not have enough clothing to go around. The money that goes into these countries helped the people of these countries and thus promotes good will toward the U.S.

Let's look at the world situation. Russia says that she will dominate the world by force or by any other means. Right now, Russia is putting on an economic push to try to get countries on her side. We
need these countries to defend our country. We need them to defend the free world. We are dependent on foreign bases. To keep these foreign bases we have to give these countries money. This money is in the way of foreign aid. It profits the country receiving the aid, and it profits us to give them the aid. No country is on a par trading level with the United States. The U.S. dollar is worth more than any European money. This deficiency has to be made up somewhere, and foreign aid is the answer to the problem. There is a struggle at the United Nations for the favors of the Afro-Asian block. The U.S. is making headway in this struggle because of foreign aid. In Africa and Asia, these countries are underdeveloped. We helped to bring their standards of living up. It is our job to bring up the African-Asian block. These people need the aid. Russia is willing to give them aid. We feel this aid from Russia will sway this block of countries. They can then veto any bill that tries to go through the U.N.

In conclusion, my partner and I feel direct foreign aid is necessary for preserving United States and the Free World.

Speaker #9 Negative - Level 1

Ladies and gentlemen: I would like to first of all run over what the first Affirmative has stated in today's debate. First of all, looking at their definitions of terms, we will be concerned with their definition of economic aid. By economic aid, they mean food and money. They made the distinct point that they were not including in this resolution the use of military aid. My colleague and I feel this is very wisely done, and we are willing to accept this term. Now, looking at the next definition of term they used was foreign countries. They said this was all countries outside of the U.S. Now, under those circumstances, we would like to take up the debate.

The first contention that the Affirmative brought to the floor was the need to continue aid. Foreign aid has done its job. They say that we should discontinue all aid under this reasoning. We would like to look at this in a very serious light. First of all, we would like to question if it has done the job, then why should the U.S. needlessly throw out the money? Presenting this question has a very definite reason for doing this. Are we intentionally wasting money? Are the government officials intentionally trying to waste the money by continuing to waste the money by handing it out to these foreign countries? This is the opinion that the opposition has tried to place in the mind of the audience. It is a very vague opinion that my colleague and I would like to develop throughout this debate.

First of all, I would like to say, since, as I pointed out, direct foreign aid includes only money, under their definition of the term, and does not include their military standpoint. I'd like to read
to you a quote that was taken from "How Much Trade and How Much Aid?" This is taken from Foreign Policy Bulletin, March 15, 1957. He states the plain fact that "only 1/10 of our foreign aid is economic; the rest is military. Its purpose is to contain the U.S. or, to put it in reverse, to preserve the free world." My colleague and I would like to bear this out. Therefore, we feel that this is a very small price to pay in the revenue that we gain from it. By saying this, the food and money that we have there we still need to make these countries self-sufficient.

Throughout the debate, I would like to remind you that the first Affirmative has continually pointed to countries that are self-sufficient. He has pointed out numerous examples, saving our taking the time to enumerate them. Such countries as India, who through our aid has been able to develop to such an extent that they are now exporting rice. This is very good. My colleague and I are happy that they have benefited from this. Therefore, why should something good be done away with? We have, under the present system, a very flexible policy. We have a policy that we can break off without any obligation. Under this reasoning, my colleague and I would like to point out that when the aid has done its job, we can cut it off.

In looking back to their second contention, the opposition has said that there is little chance for world communism. But communism is a threat wherever the opportunity arises. In fact, as I quoted to you before on my last quotation, I stated specifically that communism will infiltrate in any country. When we do this, we are opposing every policy we have maintained to this point. Therefore, we are doing this aid-giving in a two-fold program. It is beneficial to the U.S., and it is also helpful in securing these countries to be substantially reliant on themselves. My colleague and I feel that to maintain our plan of foreign aid is advisable today.

We are living under a policy nowadays where the U.S. is no longer self-sufficient. It cannot stand by itself and challenge the world. The U.S. must continue this program under the two-fold basis that my colleague and I are contending in today's debate.

Speaker #10 Negative - Level 3

America has spent over 100 billion dollars on foreign aid since 1917. 100 million dollars have also been spent on keeping American peoples, you and I, free. As you can see, each sum is the same as the other. There is, I believe, not too much doubt about the aims of international communism. They are not expanding their armed forces merely because they wish to give jobs to retired drill instructors. They, in the end, wish to conquer the world and then to occupy what is left. They are not stupid enough to do so by armed aggression. It is simpler
just to let countries fall into their hands for economic and political reasons.

In a poor country, communism is very easy to believe. The peasant sees the landlord living in comfort while he and his family are starving to death. Then comes the glorious day! A peasant friend comes to him and suggests, "The landlord is rich, and we are poor. Why not seek a happy medium where everyone is just middle-class? I have some Russian friends down at the village who will agree to help us." Right there is a primary reason for foreign aid, to keep countries on our side and get them there. Our allies need help, and the only help they can give us right now is the willingness to help. They simply don't have the production facilities to build up their own forces. They are still trying to build their country out of the chaos of the last war.

Look at Korea. To exist as a country at all, Korea needs 20 or 30 divisions of troops. This she can afford on her national income? Yes, if everyone goes without eating! So we give aid to Korea, military and economic aid, and it costs money—a lot of money. But Russia can't build missile bases in Seoul because of it.

Then there is Britain. The opponents of foreign aid say, "Why supply Britain? They have their own weapons." Sure, they have weapons: guns, planes, missiles, maybe a few atom bombs, lots of slinghots, pocket knives, and if worse comes to worse, they could even throw rocks at the Russians. And, one Hydrogen Bomb could kill every living thing on that island. If the British are willing to be our allies, to fight with us, why not give them something to fight for? And with?

At present, we can reach every inch of Russian territory by our SAC bases throughout the world. They can't even hit part of Texas, let alone return to their own bases. Can you imagine what would happen if they had bases in Cuba?

We can't afford to lose our bases, for the simple reason that, if we do, we will have no method of retaliation. Giving aid to our allies is just like maintaining armies throughout the world. They may speak Turkish, and perhaps Norwegian, but they carry American weapons and are fighting for American ideals. This, too, is another reason why we cannot afford not to give aid to neutral countries. We know what happens when we find our allies surrounded by communist countries. We cannot afford to have these neutrals communists, if for no other reason than they will imperil our allies and be closer to us. With our program of food and freedom, these neutral countries, if they don't become our allies, will not at least become our enemies. If a country is eating out of our generosity, perhaps they may wonder why we can afford to be so generous. Then, when we ask for their help, they will also afford great generosity. We cannot afford to lose a single one of these countries, and by feeding them food, we may have a chance to feed them America.
Resolved: That the U.S. should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries. Friends of debate: Let's be realists for a moment. Let's suspend our preconceived ideas of what foreign policy ought to be and think of the world situation. I believe our overall goal as Americans should be the prevention of World War III, and that our policies concerning direct economic aid ought to be based on this ideal. Our present attempts at this are ridiculous. We have no comprehensive plan, no systematic idea, no general program for economic development of foreign countries. We can only offer spotty and piecemeal grants of money. What is this money but credit to buy goods in our country?

Concerning our foreign countries, I'd like to quote C. Wright Mills, Sociologist, author of The Causes of World War III, The White Collar, and The Power Elite. This sociologist says, "The doctrine of violence and inapt opportunism, based on violence, are substitutes for political and economic programs. That doctrine is the basis and is the fundamental basis of U.S. foreign policy. And U.S. policy is now bankrupt." Why should this be an argument for the discontinuance of direct foreign aid? Well, our present system of direct economic aid is not doing the job. It is not a realistic approach for preventing World War III. It is now used as a part of the game of power politics.

We must replace our political policies for real economic programs. Programs which will help build the industrialism of underdeveloped foreign countries. At present we are only exploiting these countries. We are exploiting them as markets to keep our own industrial system at full pace. If we consider peace something worthwhile, then the idea that our foreign policy has gone awry is not so hard to see.

If I were Nostradamus, I would surely be a prophet of doom. The old ideas of power politics are firmly embedded in our great American way. The power of propaganda, education, call it what you will, enhances the leaders of war preparation and the criers for short-sighted economic policies. Therefore, I believe that direct economic aid should be discontinued and heavy-duty programs installed in its place. But I realize that this will not happen. My idea is good but not practical, because of the complexities of many factors, factors such as the church, the school, the propaganda of our free press, factors of conservatism and self-appointed protectors of the status quo. We citizens of the world are planning out the role so vividly prophesied by Franz Kafka in his short story, "The Metamorphosis." We are the Gregor Samsas, fated to accept the inevitable end. We are the followers of Nietzsche's Supermen. The Supermen in our society are the short-sighted Celts, the
power-elite. Sadder still is our complacent attitude in the face of anthropology and social psychology. We cannot use determinism. We cannot say it is inevitable that this will happen. Where are we left? What are we to think?

I have only offered an idea—an idea of a plan. My colleague will offer a plan. The plan is practically utopian, considering the weight of counter-forces. But the utopian, the naive, the new are all we have left. We must deal in ideas or follow the fate of Gregor Samsa. The potentialities are great, but the challenge now facing us must be recognized, or we will never realize these potentialities.

To sum up, I have said that our foreign policy is bankrupt; secondly, that our foreign aid is a part of this bankrupt policy, and that shortsighted, selfish motives cannot be an effective basis for dealing with foreign countries.

Speaker #12 Affirmative - Level 3

At the present, the United States Bilateral Foreign Aid program has failed. It has actually done more harm than good. The military policy hasn't been satisfactory at all, such as France in Algeria, Britain in Cyprus, and France and Britain in Egypt. They do not use arms as planned by the United States. Arms aid has also been unsatisfactory in the Near East. Arms to Iraq and not to Egypt has encouraged Egypt to turn to Russia. This aid also has been equally unsatisfactory in South East Asia, by rearming Pakistan. India spent money for arms which could have been spent for economic purposes. Nor has this aid been practical for the Far East. American gifts and tanks sent to China has proved they could not keep out communism.

Bilateral foreign aid programs have proved unsatisfactory for underdeveloped countries with economic problems. One reason is because the funds are not equally divided among the countries needing it. Today 2/3 of the aid goes to six small countries: the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China, Vietnam, Turkey, Pakistan, and Iraq. These six countries contain 170 million people, while the remainder of the aid goes to 109 million people. Some countries best equipped for this aid are left out.

Unsatisfactory use of economic aid has caused a lot of trouble, too, such as equipment sent to countries that were not equipped to use it, and a new building that these countries could not use because of lack of education. Sending aid without conditions often means that their countries would squander it. When we did send conditions, these countries immediately resented it.

Weaknesses with no strings attached. Some of these weaknesses are bad planning, bad construction, and bad operations. Also, these
countries lose respect for the United States. This Bilateral Aid Program produced hard feelings, which is envy over the United States' wealth. And if some countries have been left out, they have resented this. Also, many countries have resented us lending money to neighboring lands. The present program has spent more than is necessary or wise. They have also spent too much on gifts and loans.

How could we have a more satisfactory foreign aid program? The most advantageous way to meet this foreign aid program is with multi-lateral foreign aid, administered by the United States and not by the United States. This would remove unworthy political considerations. The United States would not lose by having no credit for this, nor would Russia gain anything by this. United States funds would not aid Russian satellites. Communist countries would not want United Nations officials inside their boundaries. Complete multi-lateral aid would end hard feelings. The United States would not be blamed when one country receives more aid than another.

Multi-lateral programs are important and advantageous. Other nations would be more likely to pay their share. The United States now shoulders nearly all of this aid. United States funds would move other nations more strongly into this program. The general idea of multi-lateral aid is sound and practical. The cost is within the reach of most of the nations, as most of the nations are fully recovered from World War II. NATO now holds millions of dollars of gold and short-term assets. This program would cut tension in the world. These countries could gain, because there would be a military cross-cut. They would not have to spend near as much for keeping up their military arms. Also, the United States would only spend one-third to one-half, instead of paying all of it like they are at the present.
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TABLE SHOWING MEDIAN AND SEMI-INTERQUARTILE RANGE SCORES OF EXPERT, LAY1, AND LAY2 JUDGES JUDGING RECORDED DEBATE SPECIMENS USING THE TERM ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>EXPERT Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>EXPERT Q Value</th>
<th>LAY1 Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>LAY1 Q Value</th>
<th>LAY2 Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>LAY2 Q Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M min: 4.7  M q: 1.3  M min: 5.9  M q: 1.2  M min: 4.9  M q: 1.9
### Table Showing Median and Semi-Interquartile Range Scores of Expert, Lay^1, and Lay^2 Judges Judging Recorded Debate Specimens Using the Term Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Median Scale Value</th>
<th>$\sigma$ Value</th>
<th>Median Scale Value</th>
<th>$\sigma$ Value</th>
<th>Median Scale Value</th>
<th>$\sigma$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Min} 4.4, \text{Q1} 1.3, \text{Min} 4.9, \text{Q1} .99, \text{Min} 4.4, \text{Q1} 1.2$
### Table Showing Median and Semi-Interquartile Range Scores of Expert, Lay1, and Lay2 Judges Judging Recorded Debate Specimens Using the Turn Argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Lay1</th>
<th>Lay2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specimen</td>
<td>Median Scale Val.</td>
<td>S Value</td>
<td>Median Scale Val.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 4.7  IQR 1.2  Median 5.4  IQR 1.1  Median 4.1  IQR 1.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>EXPERT Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>EXPERT Q Value</th>
<th>LAY1 Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>LAY1 Q Value</th>
<th>LAY2 Median Scale Value</th>
<th>LAY2 Q Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These were affirmative speeches to which the term REPUTATION would not apply.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
<th>Median Scale Val.</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M adn 5.0  M q 1.1  M adn 5.5  M q .92  M adn 4.3  M q 1.5
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