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CHAPTER I

The Problem and Definitions of Terms

A. Introduction. The history of self-governing societies has been characterized by one common denominator, the right of every person to be heard in free public debate and discussion.\(^1\) This right to be heard might be called the historical "Technique of Controversy" and represents the deliberation which develops in the process of change and resistance to change.\(^2\) For problem solving to take place, it is necessary for people, without fear of persecution, to be free to admit that there are things wrong, and to be free to consider and advocate various ways to right those wrongs.\(^3\)

Exercise of the art of controversy may be found in literature,\(^4\) in the stories of the development of the political systems,\(^5\) and in clerical and religious heritage of democratic man.\(^6\)

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 377.


\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 64-77.  \(^6\)Ibid., pp. 218-227.
Traditionally, education in a Democracy has included instruction in Rhetoric and in Debate or the art of controversy.\textsuperscript{7} This was so in ancient Greece. Such men as Protagoras, Empedocles, Plato, Aristotle, Corax, and Isocrates developed in their time, concepts of education and Rhetoric that even today are influential.\textsuperscript{8} The Roman Rhetoricians were also influential as educators.\textsuperscript{9} The mock contest in speech as a test of ability to perform is dated from Quintilian. Quintilian was one of the early defenders against those who criticized the practice of free speech. He especially tried to defend the use of the so-called Ciceronian style. To him Cicero was the greatest practitioner of effective debate and oratory.\textsuperscript{10}

G. W. Gray wrote that modern speech education can be traced back in an unbroken line for twenty-four centuries,\textsuperscript{11} and that the oldest known manuscript is a manual which includes the precepts in debating and public address taught to Egyptian youths fifty centuries ago.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{flushleft}
7\textit{Ibid.}, p. 379.  \\
8\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 30-113.  \\
9\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 116-132.  \\
10\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 137-139.  \\
\end{flushleft}
Debating in England dates back to the 14th Century at Oxford University. In America even the earliest colleges engaged in inter-class and inter-collegiate debates. After the turn of this century debating in American schools and colleges became generally extensive. As debate clubs, debate classes, and debating associations grew and flourished, their purposes and practices came under scrutiny from critics in education. By the end of World War I debating in high schools and colleges was undergoing major criticism in American education.

One of the initial attacks on the custom of having a speaker support both sides of the issues in inter-collegiate contests appeared in The Outlook of February 22, 1913.13 "This attack on the morality of debate came from the celebrated pen of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, whose personal prestige gave his views added dignity. Mr. Roosevelt was at this time an Associate Editor and frequent contributor to The Outlook."14

Criticism of speech activities reached a climax on March 22, 1950, when the Commission on Secondary Schools of the North Central Association received the Report of the

14Ibid., p. 265.
Contest Committee of the Association. (See Appendix.) The most specific recommendation in this report with respect to speech was that interscholastic speech contests should be discontinued.\(^\text{15}\) The question raised at that time concerned the usefulness of intercollegiate and interscholastic debate as an instructional activity.

The Speech Association of America's special Speech Activities Committee (composed of Bower Aly, Orville Hitchcock, James H. McBurney, Loren D. Reid and Karl R. Wallace) met to establish objectives for forensic contests which, if attained, would eliminate most cause for criticism.\(^\text{16}\) As a result of their deliberations, a substitute recommendation on the philosophy, function and programs for interscholastic debating was adopted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This action by the North Central Association brought a reaction from both advocates and opponents, and in the next two years—1950 and 1951—there were a number of criticisms of debating as a contest activity in modern education. Since that time the so-called "debate on debating" has continued with numerous writers setting forth their views in the major publications on


\(^{16}\)McBurney, loc. cit.
Speech and Forensics. An awareness of the ongoing controversy about debating led to an interest in analyzing and evaluating the criticisms as a thesis study.

B. Statement of the Problem. The purpose of this study was to analyze and evaluate the criticism of debating in American high schools and colleges as found in certain professional speech journals since 1930.

C. Sources of Materials. The sources of materials in this study were: the publications of the Speech Association of America (The Quarterly Journal of Speech, The Speech Monographs and The Speech Teacher); the publications of the National Honorary Forensic Associations (The Speaker of Tau Kappa Alpha, The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, The Rostrum of the National Forensic League, The Register of the American Forensic Association); and certain contemporary textbooks on debating by Potter, Freeley, Kruger, McBurney, O'Neill and Mills.

---


Ewbank and Auer, Foster, Baird, Ehninger and Brockriede, Newman, Braden and Brandenburg, Behl, Crocker, Fox, Gulley, Hayworth and Capel, Nichols

Pellegrini and Stirling,\(^{33}\) Reeves and Hudson,\(^{34}\) Summers and Whan,\(^{35}\) Thomas,\(^{36}\) and Wagner.\(^{37}\)

D. **Definitions of Terms Used.** The terms requiring definitions were defined in the literature or in the textbooks on debating.

**ANALYSIS:** In this study the term analysis was taken to mean the process of finding the basic issues, fundamental elements or individual aspects of which the total concept (in this case, criticism of debating) is composed. This is a process of definition, comparison, classification, description, contrast, observation, and designation.

**CLASSIFICATION:** In this study the term classification was taken to mean the process of identification and grouping of particular aspects of criticism on the basis of content, similarity of attitude, phraseology or language, or nature of criticism.

---


CRITICISM: Thonnsen and Baird in their opening paragraph in their book, *Speech Criticism*, made the following point in the problem of defining criticism.

Criticism is a much abused word. It has come to mean many things, from discerning appraisal to irresponsible faultfinding. Its locus of meaning probably never will be fixed for, like matters of taste from which it is not wholly disassociated, it often makes excursions into subjectivity, running from honest predisposition to forthright caprice.  

The usage or definitions of various authorities seemed to support this statement. For instance, criticism was defined by Braden as being synonymous with teaching. Robinson defined criticism as a process of revealing diagnosis or evaluation of performance to a student so that he may take steps to improve his work.

The object of criticism, as used in the several selected works, seemed to be the modification, in such a way as to improve upon, the phenomenon being criticized. Some criticisms carried an implication of censure while an impression of approval was given in others.

Allowing that the various writers of the articles of

---


criticism intended to modify in some way the current practices of debating, the following definition of criticism was adopted: an authoritative or reasoned judgment drawn from personal experience, observation or investigation. The phrase "disapproving criticism" was used to designate those criticisms which seemed to censure the activity of debating. The phrase "approving criticism" was used to designate those criticisms which seemed to approve the activity of debating.

DEBATING (ACADEMIC DEBATING): In this study "debating" and "academic debating" were taken to be used interchangeably, and to mean an oral contest in argumentation between two persons or groups of persons on a given proposition, within the framework of a prescribed procedure, for the purpose of presenting both sides of a controversy so that a decision could be made as to which side did the better job of arguing. According to Funk and Wagnall, debating is "a regulated discussion of a given proposition between two matched sides as a test of forensic ability." Windes wrote: "Debating emphasizes the mastering of certain rules and theories pertaining to analysis, case, proof and refutation." Its purpose, according to Kruger, is: "to train the student in the tools of argumentation; to train him how

---

**footnote:**

to construct logical arguments and detect the weaknesses or lapses from logical standards in the arguments of others." Kruger further stated that it helps to produce training in thinking quickly and critically, to provide training in expressing ideas clearly for evaluation, to provide training in organizing many arguments in a coherent presentation, to develop a tolerance for different points of view as a tool for seeking the truth, to motivate the student to learn about current social, economic, and political problems, and to afford the student an opportunity to meet and compete mentally and verbally with interesting people.

EVALUATION: In this study evaluation was taken to mean a determination of the basis on which the author of a criticism seemed to make his criticism, whether unsupported, that is, on the basis of subjective judgment and personal experience (i.e. personal opinion), or supported, that is, on the basis of surveys of other people's opinions.

PRINCIPLES: In this study the term principles was used to designate those assumptions or concepts which were proposed or accepted by the twenty-one textbook authors as fundamentals and presented as instruction on debating. The term

---


43 Kruger, loc. cit.
was not used in the sense of "tested or proved" canons or laws.

E. Limitations of the Study. The study was concerned only with the collection, classification, reporting and evaluation of the criticisms on debating as an intercollegiate and interscholastic activity as recorded in national professional journals in the field of Speech and Forensics. All considerations on debating not covered by the criticisms were not included in this study.

F. Importance of the Study. The immediate worth of the study lies in the information which the study revealed regarding the nature of criticisms on debating. Also, the worth of this study lies partly in the questions which the study raised indicating the need for further investigation. As the criticisms were classified in this study, various problems regarding debating were brought to light for research and experimentation.
CHAPTER II

Survey of the Literature

In surveying the literature on the subject of debating and preparation for debating in American schools and colleges, twenty-one books were examined to establish a representative outline of the principles of instruction by textbook writers on the subject. All twenty-one of the books were written within the past forty years and most of them have been used to some extent as standard textbooks on debating.

In outlining and comparing the content of each of the books with the others, five major areas of consideration occurred repeatedly among most of the texts. These areas or headings were: the philosophy of debating; the bases of debating; the kinds of debating; the ethical code of debating; and the values of debating. Not all of the texts considered these five areas under these five exact headings. Nor did the content of the treatment of each heading in any one text match exactly the treatment of the same heading in any other text. However, enough similarity was observed among the texts to warrant the construction of a composite outline of their content. In the following pages the five headings have been outlined according to the major items which were included by at least a majority of the texts. A number of
quotations from the texts have been presented to show the similarity of treatment of the subject.

The Philosophy of Debating. Under the heading of "the philosophy of debating," A. Craig Baird\textsuperscript{44} pointed to recognition of a problem of human affairs as a prime purpose of debating. McBurney, O'Neill and Mills also expressed this feeling by saying: "Competence in argumentation and debate includes the ability to see and state the issues in a controversy."\textsuperscript{45} Kruger said of debating, "It motivates the student to learn much about current social, political and economic problems..."\textsuperscript{46} Gulley put it this way: "To control and preserve a democratic society, citizens must know how to use these privileges. We must be proficient in studying problems, examining policies and stating convictions. In other words, we must be proficient in discussion and debate."\textsuperscript{47} Pellegrini and Sterling said, "It acquaints students with the vital controversial questions of the day and teaches them how to analyze such questions."\textsuperscript{48} A syn-

\textsuperscript{44}A. Craig Baird, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{45}McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, \textit{op. cit.}, p. v.
\textsuperscript{46}Kruger, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{47}Halbert E. Gulley, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{48}Pellegrini and Stirling, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 81-82.
thesis of these statements resulted in concluding that debating should teach students to recognize and study current problems of human affairs.

In describing the role of debating as a function of democracy, Crocker said, "When speaking in a democracy the debater tries to make his thinking and speaking promote the ends of democracy, for it is only through the philosophy of a democratic government that he has the right to speak."49

Ewbank and Auer in the first paragraph of their text stated specifically, "Discussion and debate are not simply courses in a college curriculum. They are the essential tools of a democratic society. . . . To train students in the intelligent and effective use of these basic tools of democracy is the aim of this book."50 McBurney, O'Neill and Mills in the preface of their text stated approximately the same idea: "Much of the effective deliberation in our society is carried on through argumentation and debate."51 Braden and Brandenburg pointed out that "History verifies the observation that fruitful discussion, effective debate and great oratory thrive in democratic societies and wither into meaningless phrasemaking under totalitarian or authori-

49Crocker, op. cit., p. 7.
50Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., p. 3.
51McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, op. cit., p. v.
A synthesis of the preceding statements resulted in concluding that debating should teach a practical usage of the democratic process in problem solving.

In the concept of advocation, the influencing of belief and behavior is inherent, and Ehninger and Brockriede spoke of the role of the debater: "The ultimate goal of the debater is to use ideas as proofs for influencing the beliefs of listeners or readers." Crocker made a point of the application of this aspect of debating:

Preachers have long recognized the value of training in argumentation and debate. In seeking to arrive at the truth in the realm of probability preachers find the techniques of analysis, tests of evidence, and the methods of presentation invaluable in adapting their truths to the needs of their congregation.

Freeley further specified the role of debate training by suggesting, "It is the task of the advocate to discover the preferences, wants or beliefs of the particular audience that will render the decision." Braden and Brandenburg spoke of the influence of debate upon behavior by their statement of another requisite which "involves the willingness of the audience to abide by the decision of the

---

52 Braden and Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 4.
53 Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., p. viii.
54 Crocker, op. cit., p. 3.
55 Freeley, op. cit., p. 227.
A synthesis of these viewpoints resulted in concluding that debating teaches responsibility in the modification of human belief and behavior.

From these assumptions of the role of debating, the philosophy of debating was taken to include three propositions:

1. Debating teaches students to recognize and study current problems in human affairs.
2. Debating teaches a practical usage of the democratic processes in problem solving.
3. Debating teaches responsibility in the modification of human belief and behavior.

The Bases of Debating. Under the heading of "the bases of debating" a comprehensive report by the contemporary writers was undertaken. A perusal of this area revealed five distinctly different categories of the bases of debating. First mentioned by almost all authors was the need for general background knowledge of debating. The statement of McBurney, O'Neil and Mills about background preparation was significant:

To put the idea positively, thorough investigation is undertaken for the purpose of accumulating a general background of information, finding the available evidence and discovering the specific lines of argument to support an answer to the issues which analyses has revealed.57

56 Braden and Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 372.
57 McBurney, O'Neil and Mills, op. cit., p. 53.
Freeley phrased this point about the same: "He must undertake an organized program of research so that he may explore fully all relevant aspects of the proposition." Behl phrased the concept of research most aptly: "Similarly, the arguer should know how and where to conduct a search for factual material on specific problems." Waldo W. Braden stated the relationship by pointing out:

Many debates are won before the speaking starts; they are won in the library, at a study table, and in a conference with colleagues. They are won because the advocate has a keen insight into the problem, has made a thorough analysis of his case, and has assembled the facts to support his views.

Coverage of this point can be noted in the writing of

Kruger, Ewbank and Auer, Braden and Brandenburg, Thomas, Gulley, Nichols, Reeves and Hudson,

---

58 Freeley, op. cit., p. 38.
59 Behl, op. cit., p. 3.
60 Braden, op. cit., p. 41.
61 Kruger, op. cit., pp. 78-80.
62 Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., pp. 80-83.
63 Braden and Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 58.
64 Thomas, op. cit., p. 3.
66 Nichols, op. cit., p. 31.
67 Reeves and Hudson, op. cit., p. 16.
Crocker,68 Summers and Whan,69 Pellegrini and Stirling,70 and Foster.71 Ehninger and Brockriede went one step further and pointed out the obvious but necessary requirement for a specific type of information: "This factor is a knowledge of debate theory, of the body of principles and procedures that constitute the discipline of argumentation."72

A synthesis of the statements of the textbook writers regarding the importance of background preparation as a basis of debating indicated debaters should have: 1. Knowledge of the subject and area for the debate proposition; and 2. Knowledge of debating technique.

On the subject of analysis as a second basis for debate preparation, all of the writers had a number of definite steps. Foster73 listed seven steps in analysis. Reeves and Hudson74 listed only five as did Ewbank and Auer,75

68 Crocker, op. cit., p. 60.
69 Summers and Whan, op. cit., p. 75.
70 Pellegrini and Stirling, op. cit., p. 13.
71 Foster, op. cit., p. 86.
72 Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., p. 27.
73 Foster, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
75 Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., pp. 94-102.
Potter, et al.,76 Baird,77 and Behl.78 Some of the writers condensed these steps to as few as four. Ehninger and Brockriede wrote that, "To locate the issues is the primary purpose of analyzing the proposition, a process that includes four steps: (a) discovering the immediate causes of the controversy; (b) understanding the historical background; (c) defining the terms of the proposition; and (d) determining the issues."79 McBurney, O'Neill and Mills80 listed the steps in analysis as being concerned with the processes of thinking, studying, excluding and selecting. Kruger81 took the approach that analysis should be studied in terms of common objectives, affirmative approach to need issue, and negative approach to need. Hayworth and Capel,82 similarly, considered only four major steps. Crocker,83 who listed ten steps, and Freeley84 who listed only three, as

76Potter, et al., op. cit., pp. 30-37.
77Baird, op. cit., pp. 57-84.
79Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., p. 211.
80McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, op. cit., p. 51.
81Kruger, op. cit., p. 37.
82Hayworth and Capel, op. cit., p. 76.
83Crocker, op. cit., p. 30.
84Freeley, op. cit., p. 25.
did Thomas,\textsuperscript{85} had either explained the steps of analysis in
detail or attempted to simplify through a process of re-
phrasing.

From a study of these considerations of analysis in
debating, the following five steps were selected to repre-
sent most accurately a composite of what contemporary
authors recommended on this basic preparation for debating:
(1) immediate cause for discussion, (2) definition of terms,
(3) history of the question, (4) admitted and waived mat-
ters, and (5) statement of issues.

An even more extensive presentation was given to a
third basic preparation called the "proof of arguments."
McBurney, O'Neil and Mills devoted eighty-six pages or
about one-fourth of their book to the consideration of evi-
dence, logic and assumption. Baird gave sixty-eight pages
to the subject of evidence and argument. Freeley took
seventy-five pages, or about one-fifth of his text to ex-
plain the relationship of evidence, argument and assump-
tion. Kruger devoted 105 pages or one-fourth of his book
to this proof of arguments. Crocker took sixty-seven pages
or one-sixth of his book to classify evidence as intrinsic
proof, and logic and assumptions or conclusions as ex-
trinsic proof. Gulley also took one-sixth to discuss the
place of proof, which he referred to as inference, reason

\footnote{\textsuperscript{85}Thomas, op. cit., p. 15.}
and support.

Potter, et al.\textsuperscript{86} used the terms evidence, logic and assertion in defining how argument is supported. Foster\textsuperscript{87} took eighty-three pages or one-fifth of his text, to explain the function of proof. Fox,\textsuperscript{88} in the space of forty-eight pages, or one-sixth of his book, defined proof as the sum of evidence and argument. Summers and Whan,\textsuperscript{89} in the course of forty-two pages, referred to proof as the use of evidence, contentions and reasoning. Pellegrini and Stirling\textsuperscript{90} took 120 pages to cover the role of proof, and spoke of its elements as evidence, inference and argument. A synthesis of the various elements for proving arguments in debating included these three: (1) Assumption, (2) Evidence, and (3) Logic.

The approach of the writers to organization as the fourth basis of debating generally included two ideas. These were: first, how to develop a brief; and second, how to fit or partition the available materials under issues, argument or evidence.

Foster\textsuperscript{91} identified the steps in the construction of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86}Potter, et al., \textit{op. cit.}, p. 90.
\item \textsuperscript{87}Foster, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 86.
\item \textsuperscript{88}Fox, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 39.
\item \textsuperscript{89}Summers and Whan, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{90}Pellegrini and Stirling, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 13.
\item \textsuperscript{91}Foster, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 191, 219.
\end{itemize}
a brief and also told how to develop the brief into a complete written argument (case). Potter et al.\(^{92}\) also explained the concept of briefing. Ewbank and Auer\(^{93}\) assumed a knowledge of the brief and covered the development of the "case". Kruger\(^{94}\) also seemed to assume knowledge of the brief and gave only a statement of its content, then detailed what should be contained within each of the speaker's speeches. Braden and Brandenburg\(^{95}\) considered studying and briefing together and then covered case planning and speech composition together. Baird\(^{96}\) not only explained how briefing is done, but spelled out the justification for briefing as well. Freeley\(^{97}\) discussed the use of the brief and the steps of its construction and then explained how the brief in turn is enlarged into a total case, what is generally included, and what is included in the affirmative case and in the negative case. Nichols,\(^{98}\) Hayworth and Capel,\(^{99}\)

\(^{92}\) Potter, et al., op. cit., p. 61.

\(^{93}\) Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., p. 405.

\(^{94}\) Kruger, op. cit., p. 87.

\(^{95}\) Braden and Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 403.

\(^{96}\) Baird, op. cit., p. 87.

\(^{97}\) Freeley, op. cit., p. 151.

\(^{98}\) Nichols, op. cit., p. 126.

\(^{99}\) Hayworth and Capel, op. cit., p. 383.
Reeves and Hudson, Pellegrini and Stirling, Thomas, Summers and Whan, Crocker, Gulley, and Behl discussed the nature of, construction of and need for general organization in debating. A synthesis of the various recommendations on organization in debating revealed that a debate brief generally should be constructed into three parts, namely: (1) Introduction, which included the five steps of analysis; (2) Arguments and Proof (sometimes called the body of the debate brief); and (3) Conclusion. Within the arguments and proof (Body) the authors generally recommended that a partitioning of the materials used would take the following form:

I. Issue

A. Argument
   1. Proof, including:
      Assumptions
      Evidence
      Logic

In discussing strategy as a fifth area of the basis

100 Reeves and Hudson, op. cit., p. 41.
101 Pellegrini and Stirling, op. cit., p. 110.
102 Thomas, op. cit., p. 19.
103 Summers and Whan, op. cit., p. 310.
104 Crocker, op. cit., p. 233.
105 Gulley, op. cit., p. 102.
of debating, the various authors showed more divergence in their recommendations than in treating the other four bases. Freeley introduced his coverage of strategy in debating by pointing out:

Debate does not take place in a vacuum, but in the presence of opposition. The debater is always confronted with the necessity of overcoming objections that are raised by his opponent. The process of overcoming these objections is known as refutation... The term rebuttal, strictly interpreted, means to overcome opposing evidence and reasoning by introducing other evidence and reasoning that will destroy its effect. Freeley also pointed out that strategy in debating includes an awareness of what each participant is responsible for presenting. Braden and Brandenburg also referred to the obligations of the speakers as being an inherent part of the strategy aspect. Kruger covered the same material, although he classified the teaching of strategy as from an indirect and then a direct attack. Baird included analysis of the audience and the complexity of the case as a part of strategy.

McBurney, O'Neill and Mills pointed out the importance of the "narrow-case" as compared to a "complete-

\[^{107}\text{Freeley, op. cit., p. 195.}^{108}\text{Ibid., pp. 195 ff.}\]
\[^{109}\text{Braden and Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 448.}\]
\[^{110}\text{Kruger, op. cit., p. 238.}\]
\[^{111}\text{Baird, op. cit., p. 240.}\]
\[^{112}\text{McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, op. cit., p. 233.}\]
case" and the techniques of answering opposing arguments. Potter et al.\textsuperscript{113} presented a step-by-step methods conception of debate strategy. Ehninger and Brockriede\textsuperscript{114} considered strategy in debating as a matter of attack and defense with the responsibilities of each speaker quite clearly delineated.

Ewbank and Auer\textsuperscript{115} took note of what each speaker is supposed to do and in addition, spelled out some of the common errors committed under the name of strategy. Foster covered the mechanics of strategy\textsuperscript{116} and the organization of strategy.\textsuperscript{117} Crocker\textsuperscript{118} narrowed his coverage and took up refutation and rebuttal and the methods by which each is accomplished. Reeves and Hudson\textsuperscript{119} presented only the strategy of refutation. Hayworth and Capel,\textsuperscript{120} in addition to treating the general methods of strategy ("who does what and when"), specifically treated types of strategy, special devices, special cases, and how to prepare for negative counter proposals.

\textsuperscript{113}Potter et al., op. cit., p. 125.
\textsuperscript{114}Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., p. 252.
\textsuperscript{115}Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., p. 441.
\textsuperscript{116}Foster, op. cit., p. 170.
\textsuperscript{117}Ibid., p. 260. \textsuperscript{118}Crocker, op. cit., p. 138.
\textsuperscript{119}Reeves and Hudson, op. cit., p. 99.
\textsuperscript{120}Hayworth and Capel, op. cit., pp. 193-245.
A synthesis of the various recommendations on strategy in debating revealed that the following five considerations should be given attention: (1) The use of refutation in debating; (2) The use of rebuttal in debating; (3) The responsibilities of the affirmative and of the negative; (4) The responsibilities of the individual speakers; and (5) The uses of the "complete" versus the "narrow" case.

From the foregoing considerations of the bases of debating, the following summary may be gathered:

1. Background information for debating includes:
   a. Knowledge of the subject area
   b. Knowledge of debating techniques

2. Analysis of the debate topic in debating includes:
   a. Immediate cause for consideration
   b. Definition of terms
   c. History of the question
   d. Admitted and waived matters
   e. Statements of relevant issues

3. Proof of arguments in debating includes:
   a. Assumption
   b. Evidence
   c. Logic

4. Organization in debating includes:
   a. Structuring the Brief into:
      (1) Introduction
      (2) Arguments and proof
      (3) Conclusion
   b. Partitioning of Materials into:
      (1) Issues
      (2) Arguments
      (3) Evidence

5. Strategy in debating includes:
   a. The use of refutation in debating
   b. The use of rebuttal in debating
   c. Responsibilities of the affirmative and the negative
   d. Responsibilities of speakers
   e. The uses of the "complete" versus the "narrow" case
The Kinds of Debating. A third major area of treatment of debating was referred to by the writers as the kinds of debating participated in by high school and college students.

Baird\textsuperscript{121} presented the comparison of judged or decision debates and non-decision debates, listing five special types of debating experience and the procedures by which they can be decision or non-decision. Kruger,\textsuperscript{122} similarly, considered decision versus non-decision debating. He listed fourteen "other debate forms" which he commented were, "desirable as an occasional departure from the regimen of formal debating, they also provide the debater with exercises in argumentation and persuasion that more closely approximate real life situations. . ."\textsuperscript{123}

Freeley\textsuperscript{124} made the basic comparison of substantive debate (where decisions are binding on participants) and educational. He then made a comparison between standard type of debating and special types of debating with eight special types listed. Freeley included in this grouping non-decision debating, which he stated, "may be used in all debates except direct clash, appellate, parliamentary, or English debates."\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{121} Baird, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 333.
\textsuperscript{122} Kruger, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 393.
\textsuperscript{124} Freeley, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 313.
Freeley\textsuperscript{126} made reference to two comparisons by referring first, to the audience and non-audience debating as well as this relationship to tournament debating. Then Freeley considered an additional comparison by stressing the importance of the critiqued versus the non-critiqued:

The decision, as a part of the educational process of debate, must be reported in a manner that will contribute to the further educational attainment of the students. This may be done through the medium of an oral critique or by the use of a carefully prepared ballot, or by a combination of these methods.\textsuperscript{127}

Ehninger and Brockriede\textsuperscript{128} described the college debating program in terms of five general patterns: traditional, cross-examination, direct-clash, legislative, and multilateral. The practice of these they grouped into five categories: tournament debates, on-campus debates, speaker's bureau, mock assembly, and radio and television debates. Crocker\textsuperscript{129} classified debating in terms of the procedures or the occasions by which the debate is conducted. Hayworth and Capel\textsuperscript{130} discussed debating in terms of whether there is a criticism or not and whether it is "The Typical Debate" or "Split-team" or "Open Forum" or " Heckling" or "Oregon Plan" or "Limited Preparation" or a "Direct Clash

\textsuperscript{126}Ibid., p. 317. \textsuperscript{127}Ibid., p. 285. \\
\textsuperscript{128}Ehninger and Brockriede, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 318. \\
\textsuperscript{129}Crocker, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 208. \\
\textsuperscript{130}Hayworth and Capel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 347.
Debate." Hayworth and Capel\textsuperscript{131} also made note of the methods of preparation as a consideration: independent study, classroom preparation, squad preparation, or team system of preparation.

Behl\textsuperscript{132} listed eight types of debate which he said are: traditional, cross-question, jury, direct-clash, problem-solving, parliamentary, and radio-television debates along with a comparatively new form, legislative session debates. Ewbank and Auer\textsuperscript{133} described eight types of debate but discussed debate as either "an educational method, as a legislative procedure, or as a judicial process." McBurney, O'Neill and Mills\textsuperscript{134} spoke of debate in terms of its usage: legislative, judicial, political and academic. Potter, et al.,\textsuperscript{135} spoke of debates with audiences, debates without audiences, and debates broadcast over radio-television. The debating referred to as "tournament debating" was appraised by Potter\textsuperscript{136} in terms of audience, critiques, role of the coach, role of judge and the influence of decisions. Wagner

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{131} Ibid., p. 353.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Behl, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 258.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Ewbank and Auer, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 392.
\item \textsuperscript{134} McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, \emph{op. cit.}, p. 260.
\item \textsuperscript{135} Potter, et al., \emph{op. cit.}, p. 370.
\item \textsuperscript{136} Ibid., p. 380.
\end{itemize}
pointed out that,

The method of debating varies with the emphasis on decisions and the kinds of decisions. These in turn depend on the aims and purposes of academic debate. If the object is to stimulate college spirit, or, in the classroom, to add the incentive of winning, then a decision is necessary. The most satisfactory type of decision is that of an expert or board of experts--those well acquainted with the principles of argumentation; a valuable part of the decision is the criticism given by the expert judge.\(^{137}\)

From these descriptions of the kinds of debating, the experiences which the debater may receive may be classified into the following classes or areas:

1. Decision and non-decision debating
2. Critiqued and non-critiqued debating
3. Audience and non-audience debating
4. Tournament and non-tournament debating
5. Special debating

In general, the textbook authors recommended that the kind of debate experience used should fit the demands of each special audience.

The Ethical Code of Debating. On the topic of debating ethics, ethical practices and ethical conduct, nearly all of the authors were compelled to make a number of adamant comments. Potter, et al., stated the situation in a number of ways:

If the negative intends to introduce a counterplan, it can be introduced by either the first or second speaker. However, good sportsmanship would indicate

that the counterplan be introduced by the first
speaker.\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 138} (\ldots) Realizing that the negative rebuttal
has no chance to answer, often the second affirmative
rebuttalalist will make sweeping generalizations, falsely
accuse the opposition of failing to meet the affirmative
case, mis-quote the negative and in general, take unfair
advantage of his position as closing speaker. Such be-
havior is unpardonable and displays the poorest type of
sportsmanship. The audience is quick to recognize such
unfair tactics and will rightly penalize the speaker for
this breach of debate ethics.\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 139}

Be fair to your opponent. (\ldots) Any attempt to
twist into an argument or read into it any inference
that your opponent did not intend should be avoided.
Especially in debate, the use of foul play will tend
to defeat the person who uses it.\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 140}

A debater, who reveals an unworthy character by
overstepping the bounds of fair play sacrifices auto-
matically all the sound reasoning and debate strategy
that he may have developed.\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 141}

Etiquette means more than superficial good manners.
It is more than decorum or politeness. In this section
the word is taken to mean the outward observable signs
of mental attitudes of tact, fairness, and consideration
of others.\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 142}

Crocker did not come out and use the term ethics;
however, he said, "Be fair in your quotations. Do not ex-
cerpt only that which is useful to your case. Suppressing
an unfavorable phrase or sentence is dishonest."\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 143}

McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, in talking about attitudes in
debate, noted that ways have been outlined in some books to
unethically, sophisticatedly "take advantage" of an opponent.

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 138}Potter, \textit{et al.}, \textit{op. cit}., p. 76.
\item\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 139}Ibid., p. 78.
\item\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 140}Ibid., p. 167.
\item\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 141}Ibid., p. 185.
\item\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 142}Ibid., p. 239.
\item\textsuperscript{\textcopyright 143}Crocker, \textit{op. cit}., p. 92.
\end{itemize}
In describing what is a more desirable procedure they said:

> The behavior of debaters toward each other should be fair, courteous, considerate and honest. Any evidence of poor sportsmanship turns an audience against a speaker.  

Kruger did not cover the matter of ethics per se, but pointed out that,

> Since a debater depends upon secondary sources—newspapers, speeches, periodicals, reference works, etc.—for his evidence, he sometimes records the wrong data, overlooks significant data, ignores fine distinctions, or makes unwarranted assumptions about the evidence. Thus his evidence may be inaccurate or false.

Nichols identified one action which he considered of questionable or definitely unethical nature, when he said:

> Scouting of the debates of a future opponent on the same question to be debated later, or the use of other means of securing information as to the argument to be used by opponents in future debates, is to be considered unsportsmanlike. (. . .) Probably on account of the difficulty of enforcement, this rule has been generally relaxed in tournaments. But the rules of the national conclave in Pi Kappa Delta in 1940 provided: "A word about scouting: We want listeners. We encourage those not participating in debates to attend and listen. We discourage pre-meditated and deliberate scouting, especially note-taking. Debaters appreciate listeners, but not stenographers."

Ehninger and Brockriede listed eight unethical methods of misrepresenting evidence: suppressing data, failing to name sources, quoting out of context, failing to

---

144 McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, op. cit., p. 277.
145 Kruger, op. cit., p. 135.
146 Nichols, op. cit., p. 110.
date, deliberately falsifying or emotionalizing evidence, delaying its presentation until it is impossible for opponents to respond. They further made the point that:

Faculty advisers must share a part of the responsibility for inculcating in students a lively sense of social and ethical concern. They can promote high ethical standards by making clear to students the code of ethics they should follow and by scrupulously exemplifying such standards themselves. Neither opposing debaters nor judges nor faculty advisers, however, can guarantee ethical practices. Proper conduct ultimately depends on the debaters.

Foster expressed the idea that debaters should watch their attitude toward opponents, ridicule and satire, use of invectives and epithets, and in general should demonstrate honor in their debating. Gulley cautioned the debater:

You must reject unethical methods even when they can win for you an immediate victory. It is obvious that fabrication of evidence, inventing sources, and deliberate misquoting are dishonest. Some other violations of ethical standards are not so obvious. Sometimes it is difficult to tell when an authority has been quoted out of context or a source unfairly identified. To prove dishonesty, it would be necessary to prove intent.

Ewbank and Auer suggested that judges watch for

\[147\] Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., p. 116.
\[148\] Ehninger and Brockriede, loc. cit.
\[149\] Foster, op. cit., p. 269.
\[150\] Gulley, op. cit., p. 138.
\[151\] Ewbank and Auer, op. cit., p. 486.
misquoting of opponents, attacking the opponent instead of their argument and misquoting of authority. Braden and Brandenburg\textsuperscript{152} discussed ethics in terms of the goals of the persuader. Fox made a point that such things as he called "surprise witnesses" and delaying the presentation of the plan until the end of the constructive speech are representative of poor sportsmanship. He said, "Running the team 'from the bench' or coaching from the audience by signs and various signals is taboo. The time for the coach to do his work is before and after, not during the debate."\textsuperscript{153}

From these expressions about debater relationships, an ethical code of debating has been identified which assumes:

1. Courtesy and good manners toward opponents
2. Honesty and integrity in selection and use of materials
3. Divided responsibilities of students and instructors
4. Usage of language adapted to the audience and occasion
5. Style of delivery adapted to the audience and occasion

\textbf{Values of Debating.} On what is called the values of debating, the various writers seemed to reach a general agreement.

In describing the values of debating Kruger

\textsuperscript{152}Braden and Brandenburg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 510.
\textsuperscript{153}Fox, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 116.
indicated that:

The paramount goal of academic debate is to train the student in the tools of argumentation, to train him how to construct logical arguments and detect weaknesses or lapses from logical standards in the arguments of others. (. . .) In academic debate, logic is not studied in a vacuum but in relation to current social, political and economic problems. Debate arguments and the application of logical principles are more realistic.154

Ehninger and Brockriede suggested about the same idea:

College debate directors recognize three general objectives for their programs: (1) to achieve competitive success; (2) to develop specific skills and attitudes; and (3) to train students to speak effectively in situations that approximate conditions of actual debates in the adult world.155

They also suggested certain values to be assessed from debating which they expressed in six premises:

1. Enter contrasting beliefs into full and fair competition, so their relative worth may be assessed.
2. Let such competition consist of two phases. First, set forth each belief in its own right together with the arguments that support it. Second, test each belief by seeing how well it withstands the attacks of an informed opponent.
3. Delay decisions until both views have been presented and defended.
4. Let the decision be rendered, not by the contending parties to the dispute, but by an outside judging agency.
5. Let the judging agency act as an arbitrator, and instead of merely recording the competing arguments, weigh and consider them so as to produce a decision reflectively.
6. Let the debaters agree as to abiding by the decision which the judging agency awards.156

---

154Kruger, op. cit., p. 5.
155Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., p. 304.
156Ibid., p. 15.
Behl\textsuperscript{157} said that debate develops the ability to analyze, develops the ability to organize, develops an appreciation for preparedness, develops the ability to influence human conduct, and prepares the student to meet real situations. McBurney, O'Neill and Mills listed the values of debating as: provides excellent training in argumentation, improves skill in extemporaneous speaking, develops ability in the analysis and investigation of public questions, develops skill in critical thinking, prepares for policy determining debate in courtroom, legislature and life, provides training in public speaking and is a good teaching device for social studies.\textsuperscript{158} Baird, in describing the educational importance of argumentation, indicated that debate provokes original and constructive thought, that it develops broadmindedness, provides practice in speaking, and concerns itself with important problems of the time—economic, political and social, that it generates a search for truth and teaches techniques of social control.\textsuperscript{159} He said the objectives of a course in argumentation or debate are to develop:

1. ability to select, frame properly and analyze a subject
2. ability to gather and organize materials
3. ability to develop and test arguments and evidence

\textsuperscript{157}Behl, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 242 ff.
\textsuperscript{158}McBurney, O'Neill and Mills, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 264.
\textsuperscript{159}Baird, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 12.
4. ability to refute effectively
5. ability to express arguments in effective language
6. ability to deliver a speech effectively
7. ability to use persuasive methods

From the many generalizations by authorities of the benefits to be derived from debating, the values of debating may be classified into three areas:

1. For the student:
   a) Satisfying the need to be recognized
   b) Developing reflective thinking
   c) Stimulating inquiry in vital issues
   d) Developing judgment and evaluation
   e) Contributing to personal development

2. For the school:
   a) Stimulating interest in human problems and development
   b) Integrating the learning process
   c) Relating the school to society and society's problems

3. For society:
   a) Preparing youth for useful participation in life
   b) Fostering the ideals of democracy
   c) Attaining improvement of human welfare

From the writings of the contemporary authorities on debating the following composite categories of the principles of debating were drawn:

A. The philosophy of debating includes:

1. Student recognition and study of current problems in human affairs

2. Practical usage of the democratic processes in problem solving

\[160\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 14}\]
3. Responsibility for modification of human belief and behavior

B. The bases of debating include:

1. Background information
   a) Knowledge of the subject area
   b) Knowledge of debating techniques

2. Analysis of the debate topic
   a) Immediate cause for consideration
   b) Definition of terms
   c) History of the question
   d) Admitted and waived matters
   e) Statements of relevant issues

3. Proof of arguments
   a) Assumptions
   b) Evidence
   c) Logic

4. Organization of the debate case
   a) Structuring the Brief
      1) Introduction
      2) Arguments and proof
      3) Conclusion
   b) Partitioning of materials
      1) Issues
      2) Arguments
      3) Proof (Including: assumptions, evidence and logic)
5. Strategy in using arguments
   a) Refutation
   b) Rebuttal
   c) Responsibilities of sides
   d) Responsibilities of speakers
   e) Complete or Narrow case?

C. The kinds of debating include:
   1. Decision and non-decision debating
   2. Critiqued and non-critiqued debating
   3. Audience and non-audience debating
   4. Tournament and non-tournament debating
   5. Special debating

D. The ethical code of debating includes:
   1. Courtesy and good manners toward others
   2. Honesty and integrity in selection and use of materials
   3. Divided responsibilities of students and instructors
   4. Usage of language adapted to the audience and occasion
   5. Style of delivery adapted to the audience and occasion

E. The values of debating include:
   1. For the student:
      a) Satisfying the need to be recognized
      b) Developing reflective thinking
      c) Stimulating inquiry in vital issues
d) Developing judgment and evaluation

e) Contributing to personal development

2. For the school:

   a) Stimulating interest in human problems and development

   b) Integrating the learning process

   c) Relating the school to society and society's problems

3. For society:

   a) Preparing youth for useful participation in life

   b) Fostering the ideals of democracy

   c) Attaining improvement in human welfare
CHAPTER III

Method of Procedure

A. Overview of Study. A preliminary examination of the criticisms on debating seemed to reveal a lack of organization, system and order. In an attempt to visualize the fundamental aspects of the activity being criticized, twenty-one major contemporary textbooks on debate principles were examined. The principles which were presented in these textbooks were assimilated to establish a set of principles of debating.

The journals of speech and forensics were examined for articles of criticism of the activity of debating. The specific points of criticism were analyzed in terms of the body of principles established from the textbooks. The results of this analysis were then evaluated, enumerated and reported.

B. Specific Description of the Study. The study was undertaken in the following steps:

1. Twenty-one textbooks on debating by the contemporary writers were consulted for their positions on what should be taught about debating.

2. From these expressions about debating, five major categories of the various aspects of the principles
of debating and its practice were developed.

3. Journals of speech and forensics were examined for articles and statements of criticism on debating.

4. The various criticisms were collected and classified according to the categories of principles established from the summary of the literature on debating.

5. The foregoing materials were then evaluated according to the type of verification on which the criticisms were made.

6. A general summary of the whole problem was presented and recommendations for further study were made.

C. Development of Categories. The categories used in this study were developed by:

1. Outlining the main points of instruction presented in the twenty-one textbooks of the contemporary writers on debating.

2. Assimilating those main points to develop a general comprehensive outline of five major categories of instruction on the principles of debate and debating.

3. Expanding each of the five categories of principles into as many sub-divisions as necessary in order to allow for a full enumeration of all of the principles upon which contemporary criticisms have been made.

D. Kinds of Materials Examined. Sources of the
criticisms on debating examined in this study were:

1. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, (national collegiate honorary forensics fraternity), beginning with Series 43, No. 1 (October, 1957) to Series 47, No. 4 (May, 1962), previous copies unavailable.

2. The Speaker of Tau Kappa Alpha, (national collegiate honorary forensics fraternity), beginning with Volume XXIX, No. 4 (May, 1947) to Volume XLIV, No. 4 (May, 1962), previous copies unavailable.


E. Kinds of Observations Made. The kinds of observations on the contemporary criticisms of debating, as reported in this study, were:

1. Criticisms of debating as those criticisms were
expressed in the writings which were examined.

2. Evaluations of those criticisms whenever such evaluations accompanied the criticisms in the articles examined.

3. Verification of those criticisms whenever such verification was expressed in the materials examined.

F. Treatment of the Criticisms Examined. The criticisms on debating were treated by:

1. Grouping the criticisms according to the five categories and the particular principle of debating considered within each category.

2. Classifying the criticisms according to the approval or disapproval expressed by the author and in relation to established principles of debating.

3. Evaluating the criticisms in terms of the type of verification, investigation or value judgment.

G. Organization of the Remainder of the Study.

1. Chapter IV undertook the following functions:

a) The criticisms on debating were reported according to:

   (1) The five categories of principles of debating as established in Chapter II.

   (2) The approving and disapproving nature of the criticisms reported.

b) The criticisms were evaluated according to their verification, investigation or value judgment.
2. Chapter V presented a discussion of the materials revealed in Chapter IV.

3. Chapter VI undertook the following functions:
   a) The findings of the study were summarized and reported.
   b) Recommendations for further study were made.

H. Reliability of the Method. The method of treatment of the criticisms was checked for reliability in the following manner. A high school debate coach whose education was received from different schools from those of the writer was asked to examine fifteen articles selected at random from all of those articles treated in the study. This individual was asked to decide whether the author in the article seemed to favor or oppose debating and whether the article was applicable to the master outline. This individual was further asked to decide to which specific principle the relevant articles should be applied. The categorization of the articles by this individual agreed with that of the writer on every article.
CHAPTER IV

Report of the Findings of the Study

Method of Reporting. In the following pages the criticisms on debating were reported according to the following format:

1. The criticisms were treated according to their relationship to the five major categories of principles of debating as established in Chapter II.

2. The criticisms were presented in the following order:
   a) the criticisms which tended to indicate approval of the established principles and their practice.
   b) the criticisms which tended to indicate disapproval of the established principles of debating and their practice.

3. An evaluation was presented according to the type of verification used by the critic quoted.

A. Philosophy of Debating. In this general category of principles of debating, the following principles were alluded to by the manner indicated.

Principle #1. Debating teaches students to recognize and study current problems in human affairs.

a) Approving Criticisms:
   (1) According to James M. Ridgway:
Debaters are challenged to think on terms of broad social policies. Credit for this should go in part to the Committee on Materials and Inter-state Cooperation of the National University Extension Association. By aiding in the selection of topics which are closely related to the general welfare, the committee has done much to stimulate thinking that is social in its outlook. 161

(2) According to Kim Giffin, Chairman, Department of Speech, University of Kansas, and Will Linkugel, Professor of Speech, University of Kansas, this principle is supported in this manner:

In recent years numerous educational committees have released reports of what they considered to be sound educational objectives. For example, the Harvard Committee Report: General Education in a Free Society set up the following characteristics and abilities:

1. To speak well; that is, to have better "delivery," including good voice usage, appropriate bodily action, and a communicative attitude.

2. To analyze a topic-area as a whole, selecting a group of related issues.

3. To select logically defensible arguments which are related to a proposition.

4. To support these arguments with facts and authority.

5. To phrase these arguments and facts in clear and concise language.

6. To organize ideas in a clear and logical fashion, including those selected for refutation.

7. To perceive and to point out irrational, fallacious, or irrelevant arguments advanced by another speaker.

8. To develop the ability to think under "pressure." While the opponent is speaking, the debater has to analyze what is being said and to determine quickly what he is going to say in reply. Also when the debater delivers his reply, he is under pressure to "think on his feet." Although he may have prepared a rough plan of what he is going to say, he still needs to do considerable thinking on the platform.

9. To analyze the audience and the debate situation and to adapt his arguments and style of debating accordingly.

10. To encourage interest and discrimination in problems involving civic responsibility. The problems debaters usually consider are of wide social and political significance.

It is our opinion that the above objectives can best be fulfilled through a well-balanced program of tournament and audience debating.\(^{162}\)

**Type of Verification for Approving Criticisms.** Both of the critics supporting this principle offered their subjective appraisals based upon a number of years of experience. There were no references to supporting studies given in their statements.

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**

None.

**Principle # 2.** Debating teaches practical usage of the democratic processes in problem solving.

---

a) Approving Criticisms:

(1) According to Abraham Tauber, Dean of Bronx Community College:

Here is where debating can make its essential contribution to the democratic process. Concentrate on the audience— and arm them with an instrument to winnow the wheat from the chaff. Let them learn to discern bombast and fustian, to seek facts, to recognize the commoner methods of calling a thing a name and hence relegating it to limbo. Work on the audience until they understand why authorities... disagree; why it is important to search for the source of a quotation; why definitions are all important.

Let this audience learn to scrutinize every statement that is made. Cause them to discover for themselves what their basic drives to action are—and how these are manipulated by unscrupulous appellants.\(^{163}\)

(2) According to James F. Hardy, Jr.:

I am especially pleased to write on this subject because through the years I have come to appreciate that college debating is not only the best, but very often the only training the lawyer may receive for trial court argumentation. More and more, the law school curriculum is becoming so crowded with essential "bread and butter" courses, Torts, Contracts, Taxation, Evidence, etc., that there is no room for the polishing courses which the young lawyer would like to have.\(^{164}\)

(3) According to William S. Smith, Professor of Speech, Auburn University:

The formality of college debate must not mislead us into thinking that debate takes place only when two speakers oppose two others on a predetermined proposition. The formality of college debate is only a


manner of organizing debate training into an effective learning process. Debate, broadly defined, is dynamic persuasion restricted to the situation where two or more points of view are expressed, where a decision to accept one is paramount, and where the decision reached will affect those who do not suggest it. Debate, as here defined takes place constantly between political opponents, between our policy makers, between prosecution and defense attorneys, and between ministers of various religions and churches, and between other people in all walks of life.

The place of debate in a democratic society is to provide one of the important methods by which the society functions and even survives.

(4) According to Paul D. Brandes, Associate Professor of Speech, Ohio University:

The place of debate in a democratic society is analogous to the place of two sides of a coat. Just having the front or back of a coat, no matter how well-made that one piece may be, does not protect the body and stimulate its growth. Debate, by forcing two sides to be heard, covers all phases of the problem and stimulates the growth of compromise between the two extremes.

(5) According to Lionel Crocker, Chairman of Speech Department, Denison University:

Debating teaches the technique of argument for a democratic society. A few of the concepts the debater learns that are of value to him in his general education are such fundamentals as the following: The debater learns to know what he is talking about. He insists on definition. He knows that the history and origin of a question are important in yielding the issues. The debater is taught to ferret out the issues. The debater


knows that he who proposes a change in the status quo must accept the burden of proof. The debater knows the weaknesses of testimony; he knows how to question "facts". The debater knows that the negative can take one of several lines of attack: the negative can simply refute; they can maintain the status quo; they can offer a counter plan. Where else in the curriculum does he learn these and similar techniques? And in addition the student learns how to think on his feet. His mind after much training acts in trigger-like fashion in mustering support for his assertions. The debater learns how to use his voice and body in getting across his meaning. Instead of being a hindrance, his physical self aids him in his argument.¹⁶⁷

Further along in the same article, Dr. Crocker commented:

Let us never forget that debate is not an end in itself. Debate training is for the purpose of making the individual an articulate member of a democratic society. A college community is part of our American democratic society. The debater does not have to wait until he graduates to make his influence felt. In student government, in the classroom, in committee meetings, in the fraternity, in bull sessions, the debater can use the splendid training he has received.¹⁶⁸

(6) According to Annabel D. Hagood, National President of Tau Kappa Alpha:

Much has been written and said about the role of the problem solving technique in a democracy. When one considers the committee structure of our government and legislative process whereby bills are enacted, there can be little question that discussion and debate are integral phases of an effectively functioning democracy.

But have we paused to ask ourselves the question: Does the debate tournament reflect the active functioning of the democratic processes? There are varying opinions regarding the precise function of a debate


¹⁶⁸Crocker, op. cit., p. 25.
tournament but let us assume that it is a competitive event in which students match knowledge and skill for the purpose of determining a winner. This definition should not imply that educational purposes are not present in debate tournaments: it merely attempts to establish the precise function of the tournament itself.

Certainly most people will agree that audience debates are the most desirable type of debate experience. Since, however, the opportunity for audience debating is limited, one must turn for additional debate experience to the debate tournament. (. . .)

In terms of these characteristics of a democracy, one may conclude that a debate tournament reflects the things we believe and practice in a democracy. It does reflect the active functioning of the democratic processes.169

(7) According to Waldo W. Braden, Chairman of Speech Department, Louisiana State University:

Many prominent men of today were intercollegiate debaters. In the field of politics there are Vice President Nixon, Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Henry Jackson, and Senator George Smathers. On the Supreme Court is William O. Douglas. In the ministry are Ralph Sockman, Bromley Oxnam, Fulton J. Sheen, and James Pike. On the radio are Mel Allen, Chet Huntley, Lowell Thomas, H. V. Kaltenborn and Edward R. Murrow. Who's Who in America lists many other persons who debated in college.

Former students are most enthusiastic in endorsing the activity. They advise persons entering their professions to participate. They say that it helped them in their careers and that it aided them in taking a prominent place in civic life.

What elements in debating seem to contribute to the careers of successful people?

At the outset it should be pointed out that training in debate is only one of the many factors involved in an education. Some of the elements of intercollegiate debating which seem to explain its influence on persons in business, law, government and other lines of endeavor

are the following:
1. Intercollegiate debating attracts students with superior intelligence.
2. It develops an intense interest in public affairs.
3. It creates a great desire to improve.
4. It throws the participant into competition with other bright students.
5. It teaches the student how to analyze, to think critically, and to listen.
6. It develops the ability to extemporize, to express thoughts clearly and fluently under pressure.

Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. All seven of the critics propounding on this principle were expressing viewpoints on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from their respective years of experience. No one of the seven mentioned any substantiation relative to this principle.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:
None.

Principle # 3. Debating teaches responsibility for modification of human belief and behavior.

a) Approving Criticisms:
(1) According to W. Scott Nobles and Herman Cohen, Professors of Speech, University of Oregon:

Earlier it was noted that student speakers for whom public audiences are not provided tend to ignore such

important elements as attention, interest, and motivation. Conversely, speakers often tend to over-emphasize these elements when all their efforts are directed toward popular audiences. Short cuts to audience favor often substitute for the careful research, adequate evidence, and well-reasoned lines of argument upon which most tournament judges place heaviest emphasis. Competitive speaking, particularly debate, before trained rhetoricians encourages the student speaker toward more emphasis upon research, evidence and logic. At the same time it discourages over-reliance upon rhetorical devices and emotional appeals. Thus the tournament, sometimes censored on ethical grounds, can make a substantial contribution to the training of socially responsible speakers who have been taught to concentrate first upon the integrity of ideas and second upon adapting the presentation of those ideas to audience and occasions.171

(2) According to Charles T. Brown, Professor of Speech, Western Michigan University:

Debate is the laboratory where we test an idea before we put it into action. Debate is intellectual competition; it is speech designed for the world of controversy. (. . .)

Debate training brings out the best in a person. Debate can teach a person how to hold his temper when he is under fire. It can teach him how to retain cohesiveness, to think and to speak straight when under pressure. It can teach him how to listen to the fellow who threatens his own point of view, how to disagree without contempt, how to admit the best data of the opposition, how to reject specious argument on both sides and how to weigh the good against the better.

We perceive—and debate—as our drives force us to see, and education exists to teach people how to change, how to see differently. The debate coach teaches. He changes people. He capitalizes on the most dangerous or the most desirable drives of the human personality.

Debate is the test of ideas before they are sent to

---

the proving ground, but debate is the proving ground for personality.\footnote{172}

Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. The two critics who expressed themselves on this principle did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from their years of experience. There was no mention of substantiation for the statements offered.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

None.

B. Bases of Debating. Under this general category, which assumes certain bases of preparation, the following principles were mentioned or referred to in the criticisms.

Principle # 1. Debating requires background information consisting of knowledge of the subject area and knowledge of debating techniques.

a) Approving Criticisms:

(1) According to Leroy Lewis, National Education Director, American Institute of Banking:

It is well to admit in the beginning that many worthwhile objectives are reached in good high school debating programs. I have in mind such virtues as acquiring skill in research techniques, learning to

organize and arrange materials, learning to reason
logically, acquiring skill in speaking, overcoming fear
and acquiring poise, and many others.

(2) According to Walter E. Simonson, Associate Pro-
fessor of Speech, and Bennett Strange, Assistant Debate
Coach, at Mississippi Southern College:

Characteristically, debaters do analyze debates on
the "content" basis. If the judging decisions are then
rendered on the same basis, the decisions will be better
understood by the student. Though debaters will proba-
bly always continue to contest certain decisions, it is
certainly far easier to explain to a debater why he lost
a given debate by pointing at a certain argument that
was left standing than to tell him that his organization
was poorer than the other team's. Other phrases embody
even greater ambiguity. Such improvements in judging
and debating we feel cannot help but lead to a better
educational experience for the student.

Type of Verification for Approving Criticisms. The
critics supporting this principle did so on the basis of
subjective judgment drawn from their experience.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

None.

Principle #2. Debating requires an analysis of the debate
topic in which the immediate cause for consideration is ex-

^173 Leroy Lewis, "The Effect of High School Debating
on College Speech Training," The Quarterly Journal of

^174 Walter E. Simonson and Bennett Strange, "A Re-
consideration of Debate Judging," The Forensic, Series 46,
Examined, the terms are defined, the history of the question is considered, certain matters are admitted to or waived from consideration, and a statement of relevant issues is made.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**
   None.

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**
   None.

**Principle # 3.** Debating requires proof of arguments based on assumptions, evidence and logic.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**
   None.

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**
   None.

**Principle # 4.** Debating requires organization, in structuring the brief and in partitioning materials.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**
   None.

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**
   None.

**Principle # 5.** Debating requires strategy in refutation,
in rebuttal, in meeting responsibilities of affirmative or negative position, in meeting responsibilities of individual speakers, and in the presentation of the case to include all relevant issues (not just one or two "tricky" issues).

a) Approving Criticisms:
   None.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:
   None.

C. Kinds of Debating. Under this general category, which assumes different classifications of experience, the following specific principles were mentioned or alluded to in the criticisms.

Principle #1. Debating should be judged and a decision given.

a) Approving Criticisms:
   (1) According to Richard A. Hildreth, Associate Professor of Speech, Kansas State Teachers College:

   Supreme Court judges frequently have split their decisions mainly because of the lack of fine enough instruments, reliable measures, or Euclidean analysis. A study of the American judicial system, a part of the sociological environment in which a debater must learn to live, reveals that in a majority of cases a single judge, ill equipped with "fine" instruments, must make a decision to determine which of two lawyers, of two teams of lawyers, who have prepared and presented arguments, is deserving of the "championship." The opposing
lawyers, in this contest for the judge's decision, are subjected to pressures to win which can lead to mis-
representation or falsification of information.175

Type of Verification for Approving Criticism. The critic who expressed himself referred to a study of the American judicial system but did not identify the study any further.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

(1) According to Fred Goodwin:

Far too many people are insisting that after we identify the superior forensic participants, we continue to apply our wandering micrometers to decide which of the best is best.
I suggest that after we isolate the superior speakers in debate, oratory, discussion, and extemporaneous speaking, our measuring instruments are and always will be, too crude to separate them further with any degree of meaning.176

(2) According to Kenneth Scott Wood:

The fact that decisions are rendered after debates contributes to the poor quality of contests. Speeches are often so carefully prepared in advance, that affirma-
tive and negative arguments do not meet.177

(3) According to Donald L. Graham:

My point is simply this: a reasonable adult, though

---


177 Kenneth S. Wood, "Is the Decision Element a Detri-
not possessed of expert knowledge of procedures and
techniques of debate, can recognize superior skill in
the debate situation precisely because the coach has
trained the debater for that exact purpose. (...) 
Incidentally, those who bemoan the lack of public
interest in debate might lie in the spectacle of an
activity that is so isolated from public knowledge, so
specialized in its nature, that only an expert can
assess its merits. Evidently this idea has been estab-
lished with some success—the most common excuse I re-
ceive from members of our faculty is, "0, I can't judge
a debate—I'm not qualified!" Perhaps academic debate
has become too academic?

My definition of a qualified judge will not meet any
discernable set of objective criteria, but "tis enough,
'twill serve." A qualified judge is an American citi-
zen, possessed of a mind, two ears (one of which must
be functioning), a good night's sleep (if possible),
patience, and a ballot.178

Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. The
critics who expressed themselves in opposition to decisions
did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from
personal experience.

Principle # 2. Debating should be critiqued.

a) Approving Criticisms:

(1) According to Gerald M. Phillips, Director of
Debate, Washington State College:

The faculty of the college in general helps us to
provide audiences for our programs, and they also serve
as judges in the three tournaments we sponsor annually.
I concede that when tournament debate is well judged

178Donald L. Graham, "Private Debate vs. Public
Speaking," The Forensic, Series 45, No. 1 (Oct., 1959),
pp. 11-12.
and the teams honestly coached, there is both educational value and pleasure to be derived. There are few tournaments, however, that fit these criteria. We found, for example, in a survey conducted by one of our graduate students, that 60% of the tournaments conducted nationally make extensive use of student judges. The use of students cannot be condoned if intelligent critiques are desired. Mr. Windes says it is an insult to a coach to infer that he cannot judge objectively. I agree.179

(2) According to Kenneth Scott Wood:

The opinion of debate judges as to who wins does not contribute to the training of the student. The judge's criticism might, but not his verdict. While one judge would declare the affirmative the winner in a debate, another equally competent judge would give the decision to the negative. This happens over and over as many of the 2-1 decisions show who actually does win. It is clear that it depends mostly upon the backgrounds, beliefs, prejudices and philosophies of the judges themselves.180

(3) According to Jack Howe, Director of Forensics, University of Arizona:

So, I would still like for my debaters to know why they won or lost debates even though the judges do not happen to be trained in the field of debate. If there are no criticisms given after a debate, if the teams leave the tournament not knowing what they did well that enabled them to win, or what they did wrong that caused them to lose, then the value of that debate is relatively slight.181


According to Donald L. Graham, Assistant Professor of Speech, Northwestern State College, Louisiana:

If the tournament is the testing ground of decision-influencing skills, skills which are developed under expert guidance, then the more skillful team should win the decisions—other factors being equal—whether the judge is an expert in the art of debate or not. The coach of debate has, presumably, ample opportunity to guide the development of his debaters through individual sessions, practice debates, and postmortems following tournaments. The coach seldom has the opportunity to hear all his debaters under tournament conditions; throughout the season, however, the coach and the debater receive expert help from other coaches, for at least some of the judges in almost every tournament are coaches. When, in addition to this supplementary guidance of other coaches, the debater can test his development and skill before non-coaches, he is speaking under conditions which closely approximate the ultimate, and lifelong, professional and public speaking situations he will meet after he graduates from college and from tournaments. I believe that the variety of judging is rather to be sought than avoided, if for no other reason than to give the coach a check on his coaching, for if a team consistently loses decisions before non-expert judges, it is suggestive that the coaching is not helping the student much in terms of the ultimate applications of that training.

Are the non-expert judges in reality less accurate than the experts? In seven years of operating tournaments, and twelve years of attending them, I have found that the layman tends to acknowledge the superior teams with about the same regularity as do coaches; and in elimination rounds, at my tournaments, I find as many coaches as laymen splitting on decisions. Frequently, to mention but one other advantage of having layman judges, the layman actually gives a better analysis of his decision than the coach who has become too familiar with the arguments and evidence to be relatively, as objective about a particular debate.182

According to Ben Padrow:

Some thirty-five contestants had entered in the same round, and judges rushed to make decisions and found no time to make critical evaluations of the speakers. The net results of the tournament seemed to be a very tired and unhappy group of contestants and judges and no discernible educational merit.

The situation seemed so appalling that a number of the coaches brought the matter up during the meeting of the national organization. They suggested holding fewer events, that there be limitations on the number of events a student might enter, and that there be more time for critical evaluations by the judges. In the end, the members tabled these suggestions because the majority of the coaches seemed to feel that it would be valueless to bring students long distances unless they could compete in as many events as possible. (...)

If this is the attitude of debate coaches everywhere, the time has come to stop deceiving ourselves and our administrators about the educational value of forensics. 183

According to Walter E. Simonson and Bennett Strange:

In recent years considerable attention has been paid to standardizing debate judging. In discussions of which approach to debate judging should be used, there has evolved a dichotomy between "who won the debate" and "who did the better debating." Examining these discussions it has become readily evident to the authors that this is a dichotomy in terminology only, for the first of these categories, "who won the debate," has come to be used as a blanket category to cover at least three different approaches to debate judging. These are: first of all, judging on the assumed persuasive effectiveness of the team; secondly, a judgment of general effectiveness; and thirdly, a decision rendered on an objective analysis of the content of the debate. The approach towards deciding who did the better debating consists generally of identifying those skills which it is felt the debater ought to develop. 184

---


184 Simonson and Strange, op. cit., p. 10.
Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. The six critics who considered the problem of critiques did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from personal experience and observation. Surveys of verification were not mentioned in connection with their expressions.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

(1) According to Hyman Kupperstein:

It was a case of utter confusion for the Rutgers teams who had been instructed that debating involved, essentially, reasoned discourse and not sophistic trickery.

Some judges knew how to criticize constructively, but they were in the minority. Prejudiced judges, those with "unbeatable plans" and outmoded ideas, and some completely ignorant of debate procedure were what the Rutgers men frequently came up against.

Men and women from other schools had similar complaints. Debaters seldom knew until after a contest that the judges would adhere upon forensic rules. Only when it was too late did they realize the Critics had improvised their own standards which often were years outmoded.185

(2) According to Charles R. Tayton:

As long as the present situation remains in which some debaters, debate directors and judges think that one goal or group of aims is the objective of good debating, while others look to a very different purpose and end product, of no standards other than those associated with general impression and momentary appeal, we shall not have more uniformity in judging.186

---


Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. The two critics who commented on the problem of critiques in debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from personal experience or observation.

Principle #3. Debating should take place before an audience.

a) Approving Criticisms:
None.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:
(1) According to J. D. Thomas, Head, Department of Speech, Freed-Hardeman College:

Today, it is sterile, neither audience nor speakers caring a rap for the validity of the arguments or having the slightest notion of acting in any practical way upon the so-called decision. 187

(2) According to Robert S. Cathcart:

All too often our otherwise effective debaters are at a loss when it comes to winning an audience rather than a debate, and they make only feeble attempts to reach the audience; or worse, they plunge ahead as though every member of the audience were a well informed critic judge. 188

Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. The


critics who commented on this principle did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from personal observation.

Principle #4. Debating should include tournament experience.

a) Approving Criticisms:

(1) According to Robert G. Turner:

I have gone into some detail to show a very extensive high school program that has grown largely because of the impetus of contest work. This small school, competing with schools three or four times its size, has won the state sweepstakes tournament three out of the last five years and has made a creditable showing in national tournaments. The students are vitally interested in speech work, push each other for the first team positions, and generally keep the whole program moving. 189

(2) According to Frederick C. Harrington:

Some local leagues have determined their championships on this basis, while others are for the avowed purpose of giving students a chance to practice before entering league contests. Regardless of the purpose, in most cases a tournament has increased the opportunity for students to meet more students from other schools and increase their ability through the practice they receive. 190

(3) According to Scott Nobles and Herman Cohen, Professors of Speech at the University of Oregon:


The tournament, however, possesses some advantages peculiar to it as a laboratory for speech training. It is generally conceded, for example, that in terms of providing a maximum number of speaking experiences in minimum administrative cost, the tournament is an extremely practical activity. The frequent lack of audiences and the possible overdependence upon competition as motivation often make this experience far short of ideal. There is some virtue in experience, however, and the necessities created by demands upon student time and administrative budgets tend to add to this virtue.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the very absence of a public audience may suggest a second virtue of the speech tournament. To the inexperienced speaker, lacking especially in confidence and poise, the tournament offers an opportunity to secure experience and assistance before facing a public audience. It should be added that many forensic directors, and many school administrators, would prefer to provide "laboratory training" for their students before allowing them to represent their institution before a public audience. Unless extra-curricular forensics is to be limited to students with extensive classroom training, the kind of laboratory program which the tournament provides is necessary.\footnote{W. Scott Nobles and Herman Cohen, "The Disjunctive Premise About Forensics," The Speech Teacher, Vol. VIII, No. 4 (Nov., 1959), pp. 317-318.}

\footnote{According to Wayne C. Eubank, Chairman, Department of Speech, University of New Mexico:}

During the early thirties most debate budgets were visited by famine. Debate directors were no longer able to launch several squads on various sectional loops hitherto traversed. The tournament idea afforded a financial solution. Many schools could meet at a relatively near center and much debating could be done in a very short time. Thus a variety of schools, representing many states and even regions, were able to touch shoulders and enjoy a variety of contacts and friendships hitherto unknown. Certainly the cosmopolitanism present in tournaments has done much to foster and strengthen wholesome associations and respect on a state and sectional level. Furthermore, many debate tournaments offer a variety of individual speaking contests,
for instance, oratory, after dinner speaking, extemporaneous speaking, radio speaking, and interpretation. Thus the debater has an excellent opportunity to participate in types of speaking other than debate. This participation in a variety of speaking situations is most desirable.¹⁹²

(5) According to the Directors of Forensics at the Universities of: Chicago, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue and Wisconsin:

The educational values of tournament debating seem to amount to the following three:

1. Tournament debating is an efficient way of giving a reasonable number of college students in all degrees of speech proficiency sustained, repeated practice in oral argument. This practice occurs under circumstances which tend to motivate these students toward maximum use of their abilities. It has been our observation that this sustained repeated practice is essential in the skills of oral argument. Moreover, American colleges and universities at present have no other highly developed speech activity or method of organizing a speech activity, which is pointed as specifically as tournament debating toward providing a reasonable number of students with repeated, motivated practice in argumentation.

2. The significant audience of the tournament debater is likely to be one "expert" judge. In general this judge will seek to apply rigorous standards for the use of evidence and reasoning to the argument which he criticizes. The student's capacity to use evidence and reasoning is thus apt to be more important in tournament debating than in the generality of other speaking situations. By placing such specific emphasis upon the use of skills of reasoned discourse, tournament debating may contribute uniquely to the development of these skills.

3. Democratic society has need for informed leaders who are also skillful in oral argument, and American

colleges and universities have the responsibility of helping to develop such informed, skillful leaders. Thus it is that tournament debating, which cultivates skill in oral argument, may make a significant contribution to the purposes of American higher education.

(6) According to Donald E. Hargis, Associate Professor of Speech, University of California, Los Angeles:

The reactions to the values of debate were many and varied, but all were favorable to contest debating. The most universally expressed reaction was that debate gave the individual self-confidence and assurance, that it gave the debater poise, and that it dissipated stage fright. Many comments were made on the effects of debating on the thinking and mental processes. The point of these comments was that the individual secured training in logic and the use of logic in active thought and so was able to use the mind more readily than would have been possible otherwise. The third emphasis was on the development, through debate experience, of personal proficiency and poise in speaking. A fourth value listed was the fact that debating aroused interest in questions of public concern. And the last value stated was that debate stimulated habits of thorough investigation and seeking after truth. All of the comments can be summarized under these headings, and the commentators were enthusiastic in their statements of the values.

(7) According to Wayne C. Eubank, Chairman, Department of Speech, University of New Mexico:

Certainly the judging problem needs careful attention. Normally, the debate director is the best judge


and some tournaments are conducted with directors only, as judges. Experience will prove that these tournaments are far more satisfactory than those employing various types of judges such as doctors, lawyers, ministers, and politicians. The West Point National Debate Tournament is an excellent example of a fairly large tournament (34 teams) conducted with debate directors only, as judges. A majority of the directors present at the 1948 tournament were interviewed in an attempt to evaluate their opinion of the quality of judging. Without exception every director stated that the judging at West Point was the best of any tournament in which his squad had participated during the year. 195

(8) According to Jack H. Howe, Director of Forensics, University of Arizona:

The premise on which this article is based is one on which there can surely be no disagreement: the forensic tournament is part of the learning experience.

What, then, might be advanced as the values of the debate tournament, over and above the rather petty one of proving that your school's debate team is better than any other team in the vicinity?

First, one of the obvious advantages is that the debaters are obliged to speak before strangers, and this calls forth greater poise and obliges them to master nervousness better than could possibly be the case in a practice debate before their own coach.

Second, not only is the audience strange, but so are the surroundings. The debaters will be forced to adapt themselves to different speaking conditions than those to which they are accustomed, and in the course of most tournaments, they will be compelled to re-adapt themselves with every new round.

Yet, when all is said and done, these same students in future years will not be able to pick and choose the conditions under which they will be obliged to speak. A speaker must learn to adapt to his environment as well as to his audience, and the varied conditions found at a tournament are training in this adaptability.

Third, in debating one should be seeking different points of view. After a few weeks of intra-squad debating, the ideas are rather well raked over and subsequent debates become somewhat stereotyped.

195 Eubank, op. cit. p. 3.
Encountering, then, the teams from another school in a tournament provides far more of a challenge to the debaters and causes them to think far more skillfully than when they are meeting members of their own squad with a case already familiar.

My fourth point is: the debaters at a tournament are under an emotional and intellectual strain which in itself is a valuable experience to them. They learn to keep calm even though there is every temptation to be otherwise.

It is a fifth point of value in tournament debating about which I would like to make a particular suggestion, however. This is the chance for my teams to be judged by fellow debate coaches and to be criticized by them. Personally, I place a high value on giving my teams a chance to debate before debate coaches from other schools so that my debaters may have the benefit of their advice and suggestions.

**Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms.** Of the eight critics who expressed themselves on the positive aspects of tournament debating, only two indicated that a study or survey had been made to warrant the statements made. Hargis referred to a study of the opinions of former champion debaters. Eubank interviewed the directors of forensics at the 1948 West Point National Debate Tournament. The other five expressions were made on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from personal experience and observations.

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**

(1) According to William D. Brooks, Director of Debate, Garden City Junior College:

196Howe, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8
What is the nature of the charges against tournament debating? It seems to the author that they might be placed in two categories. One type would include those charges having to do with the undesirable effects produced by debating and the physical problems in the tournament situation. Some of these charges are: dishonest coaching, poor quality in judging, excessive competition in winning, an over stress on argumentative attitude, and the encouragement of faulty reasoning.

A second category would include those attacks on the results which debate alleges to provide but does not. Some of these alleged values are: develops research ability, improves the effectiveness of one's participation in a democratic society, develops one's ability to make rational decisions, develops leadership, sincerity, honesty, self-confidence, effective delivery and social maturity. Charges have been made that debate fails to meet these goals.197

(2) According to Wayne C. Eubank:

At best the tournament debater is, in the main, engaging in an artificial situation. Undoubtedly it is artificial insofar as it correlates with the functions of a citizen in a republic. As was noted by Brooks Quimby, such exercise may be beneficial in the training of lawyers. However, it should be remembered that although juries are judges, they usually behave like audiences and are just laymen chosen by lot. This artificiality, which is now being associated with the tournament idea, may be one reason why discussion is again being heralded by many as far more valuable to the student as an exercise in the use of the tools traditional to democratic procedures.198

(3) According to James M. Ridgway:

In the nature of things, debate tends to be aristocratic, even snobbish. Only two or three people can represent a school in any one debate. The national high school debate questions are pretty steep for all but the

---


198 Eubank, op. cit., p. 2.
cream of high school intellects. The questions usually discussed appeal only to a minority of high school students.

We can safely say that in many cases the speaking in high school debate contests is not in accord with this principle. It is my belief that high school debate tends to degenerate into discussions by embryonic experts in subject matter, who use a particular technique and jargon. In so far as debate so degenerates, in such measure it tends to fail to meet the current best standard in speaking. 199

(4) According to William K. Clark, Chairman, Department of Speech, McMurray College:

At this point, at the risk of losing what Aristotle termed the most effective means of persuasion, ethical proof, I should like to state (in the accepted Congressional and TV style) that I am not now, nor have I ever been, an authority on debate. I only know what I like to hear in a debate—and I didn't hear it during those ten days. And the reason, I believe, is this: I heard students who had been taught dialectic and debate, not argumentation and persuasion. One of my own debaters reminds me of the people I heard, a science major whose speeches are typical of the scientific approach: cold logic, hard facts, accurate analysis—but with no attempt at all to convince me that I should accept those facts, that logic, that analysis. And I was reminded of another man who is a good debater, but who made a poor showing as a speaker in an oratorical contest. I listened carefully during the preliminary tryouts for the debate squad to the fellow. He was logical, he was analytical—but he was no public speaker! He was skilled as a dialectician, but not as a speaker.

Webster defines dialectic as: "Disputation or debate in conformity with the laws of logic"—and that is what the science major does: he disputes in conformity with the laws of logic, but there is no resemblance between his disputation and public speaking! ( . . . )

I have stated that the reason for the poor speaking I heard was that the students were not taught persuasion and argumentation, but dialectic and debate. The type of debate I meant is debate in the sense in which

---

199Ridgway, op. cit., pp. 542-543.
Webster defines it: "A regulated discussion of a given proposition between two matched sides as a test of forensic ability." When students are taught to engage in debate as a "test of forensic ability" they are being taught debate for debate's sake, and that is wrong. The result is what I heard during every debate tournament this year.  

(5) According to Donald L. Graham:

Every tournament yields its tales concerning experiences with judges—those judges who are prejudiced on the question (including some coaches who discount arguments and cases not in use in their particular section of the country); those who have never heard a contest debate; those who vote against a team which did not answer the judge's unspoken objections, or did not employ the judge's unspoken refutation (which was much better than that used by the debaters); judges who sleep through the debate (perhaps with good reason), ad infinitum, ad tedium. Such criticisms are heard with sufficient frequency as to cause some twentieth century Mark Anthonys to cry, "Oh judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason!"

Strangely, very few criticisms are heard concerning the judges' lack of expert status on the subject matter debated.

It seems to be a relatively simple matter to label certain judges as unqualified. So far no one, in my experience, has been able to describe, in terms unmistakably clear, just what constitutes a qualified judge, to tell how and where he may be discovered, and to determine who shall pass the judgment concerning the judge's qualifications.

Upon what bases can we say that the judgment of any particular individual is not competent? The answer to this question depends, in large part, upon what we assign as the purpose of tournament debating.

If a debate tournament is conceived as a test of expertise in the technical formulation of a case, a test of whether debaters are familiar with the processes of organization, analysis, discovery and evaluation of evidence and argument, and of skill in speaking and in

the Latin fallacies—then, of course, only someone similarly trained would be capable of judging the relative attainments of the debaters. Under such conditions, with experts judging the degree of expertness of students, the tournament becomes, in almost absolute terms, the anathema of public speaking.201

(6) According to James M. Ridgway:

Debaters often do not realize what they are saying. They give the same speeches so often that they can set their mouths going and shut off their minds. You may have observed the practice some teams have in tournament debating of placing a card before them which states the side of the question they are discussing in that particular debate.202

(7) According to Wayne C. Eubank:

At the end of two days of judging debates the director is likely to be harassed by the question: "Is there real educational value in this kind of procedure or is it a type of intellectual marathon which aims at picking a champion?" If the debate director is not confronted with this query at the end of the first tournament in the fall, wait until he attends four or five tournaments and finds many of the same debaters at all tournaments. It must be recognized that tournaments emphasize winning and there is a strong tendency for the director to take those debaters he thinks will have the best chance of bringing honors to his school. We could mention one team (two men) who participated in some twelve tournaments last year and won the majority of them. That's great guns, especially for the two men. However, a two-man debate squad is carrying specialization to its extreme.203

(8) According to N. Edd Miller, Director of Forensics, University of Michigan:

\[201\text{Graham, op. cit., p. 9.}
\[202\text{Ridgway, op. cit., p. 543.}
\[203\text{Eubank, op. cit., p. 2.}
Let us consider, first of all, some of the more important weaknesses in present contest debating.

1. There is too much emphasis on winning. (. . .) No one would object to a debate team's effort to win a debate, but when other worthwhile objectives in debating are lost sight of because of the overemphasis on winning, then a clearly unhealthy situation exists. As Abernathy has pointed out, where there is too much desire to win, "the debater is changed from a sincere student of speech into a 'debate bum', trained in the tricks, fair or unfair, of winning, rather than in the honest techniques of persuasive speaking."

2. There is too great a tendency to use the single, national debate topic. (. . .) The debater loses much by not getting a variety of topics on which to prepare and speak, and audiences lose interest in debating out of sheer boredom with a single topic.

3. Many coaches are too rigid in adhering to the standard, orthodox type of debate. (. . .)

4. There are too few audiences in most present day forensics programs. (. . .) Debate training is incomplete unless the debater has many experiences speaking before audiences. (. . .)

5. Tournaments tend to exemplify all these evils of present day contest debating. Too frequently, it is in tournaments—with the accompanying superficial motivations of awards, decisions, and publicity—that the overemphasis on winning has its genesis; tournaments, almost by necessity, encourage the use of a single debate proposition; tournaments nearly always expect the use of the orthodox style of debating; and there are almost never audiences present at tournament debates.20

Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. The eight critics who expressed unfavorable criticisms on tournament debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from their years of personal experience and observation. No one of the critics indicated any attempt to

support his criticisms.

**Principle # 5.** Debating should generally take place between two man teams who debate on both sides and on one topic annually.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**

(1) According to Scott Nobles and Herman Cohen:

Obviously the students who prepare only one debate proposition for the entire year face a less demanding task than those who must also prepare to discuss symposium topics.\(^{205}\)

(2) According to Donald E. Sikkink, Associate Professor of Speech, South Dakota State College:

Let us now try to apply this study to two of the issues in the both sides controversy: Murphy argues that it is unnecessary to debate both sides in order to understand fully both since

"The Debater can brief the other side. He can explore the other side and read about it. In actual debate, one can listen to the other side if he will but open his ears and his mind."

The data presented here on the attitude shift for the affirmative group do not support Mr. Murphy's position. These affirmative debaters undoubtedly explored the other side, some of them probably briefed it, and they all debated; yet their shift in attitude appears to be quite different from those who verbalized both sides of the proposition. It may be that one has to take the other side verbally in order to appreciate its actual strength.

A second issue is the belief that many debaters at the beginning of a season do not know enough about the topic to take a stand. This study supports that belief, for at least 46% of the students were undecided at the beginning of the season. If we would make the assumption that only the positions of Strongly Agree and

\(^{205}\) Nobles and Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 319.
Strongly Disagree represent real conviction, then we could assert that 83% of this student group did not initially take an intensive stand on this topic.206

(3) According to Nicholas M. Cripe:

However, the fact that interschool debating (and thus debating both sides of a proposition) differs in purpose from other forms of debate does not by itself mean that it is more or less ethical than these other types. So now we come to the heart of the controversy. Is it "immoral" for a school debater to debate both sides?

It would seem for every authority quoted by the opposition, proponents of debating both sides can also quote somebody of equal merit to uphold their contention. This being the case, who is right?

If a debater at any tournament presents the arguments he honestly believes to be the best possible arguments that can be presented in behalf of his side of the proposition, it would seem to be ethical debating, and that to condemn him is either to misunderstand or to misconstrue his purpose in speaking. Where only honesty and sincerity are present, where any intent to betray or deceive is absent, it is hard to find reason to condemn such public speaking as unethical.

Upon this argument, then rests the case for debating both sides of a proposition, that the purpose of the speaker determines the ethics by which he is to be judged, that the school debater cannot correctly be judged unethical by the same rule of thumb that might be used to evaluate the ethics of the pulpit or campaign speaker. The purpose in speaking differs; therefore, what might be "right" for the one may very well be "wrong" for the other, though they both say the same words. It seems impossible to most debate coaches that anyone should condemn as a "public liar" the school debater who presents the best possible case for his proposition within the limits of the facts as he knows or believes them to be. Yet those who condemn college debaters' speaking on both sides of a proposition do just that. They are wrong.207


207 Nicholas M. Cripe, "Debating Both Sides in Tournaments is Ethical," The Speech Teacher, Vol. VI, No. 3 (Sept., 1957), pp. 211-212.
Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. Two of the criticisms offered were made on the basis of subjective judgment. Sikkink's criticism was based on an experimental study.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

(1) According to Nicholas M. Cripe, Head of Speech Department, Butler University:

When the real implication of this contention against debating both sides of a proposition is considered, it becomes evident that this question involves more than some philosophical hairsplitting; it involves the future of intercollegiate debating. For if it is not ethical, then so-called "two-man debating" should be stopped, and when the topic is one such as was used this past year, a great many schools could not debate unless some means could be found so that the few ethical affirmative or negative teams in the country would not be overworked. It seems to me that Murphy never attempts to solve this problem in his article. Rather, he confines himself to supporting the argument that it is not ethical for any debater to speak on the side of the proposition he believes to be the "wrong" side. Nor is any distinction made between school debaters and those in public life. And that is probably the basic error in the reasoning of those who condemn speaking on both sides in school debate tournaments, that is, their failure to make a distinction between tournament debating and other forms of public argumentative speaking. It is my contention that interscholastic debating is a different form of public speaking from debate that we hear the legislator or the lawyer use.208

(2) According to J. D. Thomas: "No debater should be required to defend both sides of a proposition."209

---

209 Thomas, op. cit., p. 4.
According to Richard Murphy, Professor of Speech, University of Illinois:

In reply to these simple arguments, the debate-both-sides proponents have many answers. One of the sets of answers can be classified as philosophical. The most frequent of these arguments is the necessity of a free and open platform, with no silencing of unpopular sides. (. . .) There is no contesting the usefulness of the debate form, in which unpopular sides may be presented because the popular side is presented to counterbalance and correct. Any valid action to keep inquiry free, to assert the essential debatability of disputed questions, is a contribution to our freedom of expression. But it is not clear that one team's debating both sides has any connection with such a policy. (. . .) A second philosophical argument is that it is necessary to understand both sides of an argument, and debating both sides helps one to understand both sides. (. . .) If there were no way of seeing many views than debating for them, the practice might have to be tolerated on this count alone. But there are so many ways of seeing other views. The debater can brief the other side and read about it. In actual debate, one can listen to the other side if he will but open his ears and mind. The position of the other side can be accurately stated for purposes of refutation where it seems in error, or for purposes of admission where it seems to be correct. To argue that the way to discover an idea is to get up on the platform and advocate it is rather unusual pedagogy. (. . .) A third philosophical argument is that it is never clear on what side the truth lies; hence all positions can be maintained with equal intensity. (. . .) That is why we argue a matter: there is a case on each side. But this is only the beginning. The end is to discover where the truth lies. (. . .) To argue in contemporary times that a speaker who has read and discussed his question shall not bring to the deliberation any personal conviction, but shall leave it to an audience which may never have heard the matter deliberated before, is to resign the moral responsibility of the speaker.

A fourth philosophical argument is that debaters themselves do not know what they believe. "My debaters," says one coach, "didn't know at the end of the season what side they were on." Their uncertainty is understandable. If one argues at nine o'clock that he and his colleague are firmly convinced of one side of an
issue, and at ten that he is convinced of its opposite, and keeps up this shifting of advocacy for a season, it would be remarkable indeed if he really knew what to believe.

A fifth philosophical argument is that the debaters are too young to take a position on questions of public affairs. (...) If students are debating questions over their heads, then the subjects need to be simplified. But if the debater is incompetent to take one position, he is certainly all the more incompetent to take two. (...)

A sixth philosophical argument is that it is the function of neither the school or the debate coach to turn out persons "with ardent convictions on the side of right." It is sufficient to train them to think logically, and to see both sides. But the school and the teacher must have some responsibility for inducing conviction on such matters as the freedom of speech, democracy, and the integrity of ideas. (...)

A seventh philosophical argument is that debating both sides, through disassociating the student from belief, teaches him the essentials of rigorous, logical thinking. It gives him skill in using facts and inferences, and in thinking accurately. If he waives belief, he may be able to think purely, his mind unclouded by prejudice and predisposition. And if he demonstrates that he is so well informed and so superior to conviction that he can debate either side on the call of the chairman, he has reached the nirvana of scientific method. Now training in logical methods is not to be disparaged, but is not the end result the discovery of what truth the logical inferences seem to illuminate, and what position one can most validly maintain under the circumstances? Why stop the logical process before the final goal has been reached?

An eighth philosophical argument is that "lawyers do it." Even Theodore Roosevelt allowed that lawyers may have to take an assigned proposition and argue it without relation to conviction. The debaters are advocates, the explanation goes, presenting arguments now for, now against, a proposition, that an audience may see the truth. It is not quite clear, in this argument, why an audience would gain more from hearing a question debated by persons not necessarily believing their sides, than by hearing debaters of deep conviction.

A ninth philosophical argument is that debating is not public speaking, and hence not subject to the ethics of the platform, but is "educational forensics." This terminology has lead to many quips, such as "It may be
forensic, but is it educational?" But to state the argument fairly, it goes something like this: The method of disputing a question on both sides is an old educational device, used in ancient, medieval, and modern times. No man can say that he is equipped to defend a position until he has demonstrated he can defend the opposite. Furthermore, in life one frequently has to present a case for, or at other times, a case against, a proposition. So practice in disputation makes the ready man.

Exercises which train a student to analyze, study lines of argument, or to comprehend and resolve or decide disputed matters may have their place in the educational process. (. . .) The methods used in a closed debating society or in a classroom may be judged by pedagogical, rather than ethical, standards. But since the development of Whatly's "natural method," that one learns to talk best by saying what one means and by meaning what one says, there has been a decline in the use of artificial devices. The tendency has been to make the club and classroom speaking situation an actual one, rather than make-believe.

But modern debating is something other than a medieval exercise in dialectic. It is geared to public platform and to rhetorical, rather than dialectical, principles. The questions are not speculative or universal, but specific and timely, concerning practical public policy. The debater relies heavily on the use of authority and opinion, whereas in logical disputation an argument is taken on its merits. The debater uses ethos, a rhetorical element: "So my colleague and I ask you to agree with us." And the modern debater makes an appeal for judgment by his audience or his critic. The contemporary debater is often ill-equipped to carry on a logical disputation; he may not know one mode of the syllogism from another; but he does know certain forms of rhetoric. (. . .)

But what are the ethics of debating both sides? If one conceives of debating as a closed club activity in which a rhetorical-dialectical exercise is used for some purpose, then perhaps the method can be judged in terms of pedagogy, rather than of ethics. But insofar as debating is a method of the platform, it will have to submit to the contemporary ethic, which is that a public utterance is a public commitment. Nor, if the view presented in this survey is correct, can the practice be justified as realistic training for the practice of the law. Debate would be in a stronger position if it were
freed from the anachronistic practice of multiple positions. 210

Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. All three of the critics propounding unfavorably on this principle did so from the basis of subjective judgment drawn from personal experience and observation.

D. Ethical Code of Debating. Under this general category of principles of debating, the following specific principles were alluded to by the criticisms.

Principle # 1. Debating develops courtesy and good manners toward others.

a) Approving Criticisms:
   None.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:
   None.

Principle # 2. Debating develops honesty and integrity in the use of materials.

a) Approving Criticisms:
   None.


b) Disapproving Criticisms:

(1) According to G. Bernard Cohn:

A debate can too often be won by twisting facts, distorting quotations, using wrongly drawn implications and other unethical methods. But no one actually wins by this; all parties lose, including the institution of debate.

A debater who consistently wins by these methods can have his entire concept of values distorted by the reward of misplaced labor. ( . . . )

Debaters, I think you will come up with the right answer. 211

(2) According to J. Robert Hamlin, Director of Forensics, Bethany College:

Debate is basically an anti-intellectual affair. The process of debate is alien to the spirit of free inquiry, to the scientific method, and, it would seem, to one's own conscience. Two parties come together, lock horns, haggle, and purposely distort and deceive until a third party is at last convinced that one or the other can better be trusted to twist any given issue to his own advantage. It is essential that the individual participating divorce himself from the "truth-value" of his argument as determined by his own conscience. The only ethic of debate is to win. ( . . . )

In a conversation or a discussion, the parties involved have more of a choice than dogmatic self-assertion. A vast multitude of possible compromises lie open as a result of their interchange. In debate only two results are possible and both are extremes.

A neutral listener can gain little concrete knowledge from a debate. His first natural instinct is to doubt the validity of anything he hears; the sources are so prejudiced. Quotations and statistics are always given out of context and it is impossible to determine if they reflect what they are purported to reflect. 212


Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms.

Both of the critics commenting on this principle of debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from personal experience and observation.

Principle #3. Debating develops divided responsibilities of the students and the instructors.

a) Approving Criticisms:

(1) According to Edward Rogge, Director of Forensics, University of Missouri:

Given the function of evaluating a speaker's ethics, the critic must change an ethical system into a moral system. He must agree with Jeremy Bentham that "the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the measure of right and wrong," but he must then apply that principle to specific situations. The critic is not accorded the luxury of philosophical detachment from worldly affairs that an English philosopher, visiting and lecturing in the United States, thought he merited. When students listened to lectures and then sought him out for practical advice, the astonished scholar explained that he was an ethicist, not a moralist. The teacher of public speaking must be an ethicist; the critic must be a moralist.

Much of the writing on ethics of speechmaking is intended to guide the teacher. To try to apply the principles in criticism presents frequent difficulties. Hence this attempt to suggest an ethical (or moral) approach for the critic. Since speakers are studied not only to evaluate their role in history, but to clarify and define rhetorical principles of effectiveness for use in teaching, perhaps standards of "rightness" and "goodness" developed by the critic will also be useful to the teacher.213

Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. The critic propounding on this principle did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from his years of personal experience.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

(1) According to Professor James L. Robinson of Oklahoma University, Executive-Secretary Oklahoma High School Speech League:

An increasing trend toward artificiality and what even may be called "shysteristic" practices is being recognized by more and more debate people--friends of the activity--as well as more and more school administrators, many of whom are long-time enemies of the activity. To prevent this increasing criticism from crystalizing into another protest movement like that of a decade ago, it is important that we re-examine our current practices, and most important, urge coaches to start doing something about it. (. . . .) The Oklahoma High School Speech League has made an attempt to focus attention on those excesses that might be condemned "shysteristic" by including on its evaluation sheets an item called "ethics". The purpose is to remind debaters that ethics is important. Of course we have not eliminated such practices in our state, but we have made a beginning. We hope articles like this, reminders by state league and NFL directors in their respective publications, and a discussion of this in the various classes, workshops, and clinics might get the ball rolling in the proper direction. We had better start cleaning house from the inside or the "outsiders" might outlaw our activity again.214

(2) According to Gary L. Peterson:

Ever since Plato firmly established the moral bases

---

of rhetoric, the ethical nature of communication situations has been deemed important. In our day ethical evaluations were frequently made of television's Great Debates in the 1960 presidential campaign, as witnessed by the adverse criticisms about what was said and how it was presented in the debate situation. In our realm of competitive academic debating there have also been numerous statements about ethics in the discipline. Objectionable practices do occur, and the debater may have no personal awareness of ethical implications of those practices. Problems may exist because the debater has not learned moral and ethical values, particularly as these values are associated with the peculiar nature of academic debate.

One important source of a debater's training is the argumentation and debate textbook. However, few textbooks contain specific sections dealing with ethical conduct. Indeed, many popular and useful texts pay only token homage to debate ethics. McLaughlin properly reports that comments in textbooks usually "urge the debater scrupulously to avoid any deliberate, unintentional, or inadvertent violation of implicit and explicit criteria of morality in contest debating." One or two objectionable practices are generally cited along with these admonitions to be honest and fair. Some textbooks, of course, do provide more explicit instruction on ethical matters in debate. Ewbank and Auer, Foster, Chenoweth, and the Tau Kappa Alpha sponsored Argumentation and Debate provide more extensive coverage of ethics in formal debate.

Two significant findings are revealed by an examination of ethical considerations in argumentation and debate texts. First, although nearly every author of a debate text advised debaters to follow strictly a code of fair play, very few of these authors included items which might compose a code. This view on the part of writers suggests that they felt such a "Code" already existed in the minds of students of debating. Secondly, many of the specific items which were mentioned, and regarded by some writers as unethical practices, were listed by others as merely constituting the conventions of debating. Such a disagreement on the practices constituting unethical conduct contained some interesting implications for those who believe that an implicit code is already in operation.

Some interesting innovations were reported by state organizations--usually by those groups with well-defined and explicit ethical standards. In Kansas debate clinics include sections for rules and good sportsmanship in
debating. Indiana awards a sportsmanship trophy at the state finals, covering coaches' and speakers' conduct for the entire year. Michigan distributes ethical instructions to coaches, debaters, and judges. Oklahoma stresses the elimination of poor teaching which allows malpractices. These departures from the traditional handling of debate indicate an effort to regulate debate conduct and to correct what they feel are shortcomings in their respective areas.

This study maintains that due to inadequate instruction from textbooks, forensic organizations and debate coaches, the practicing debater lacks a well-developed ethical philosophy to guide his conduct.

(This conclusion was arrived at after 39 forensic organizations responded to a specific question concerning whether the organizations had or did not have definite rules or codes pertaining to ethical conduct. [Eight college organizations and 31 high school forensic groups] According to the author, "The generally expressed view was that debaters already knew the rules, that attempts to compile codes would not be effective nor would such codes be enforceable."215

(3) According to James M. Ridgway:

This principle calls for more activity and originality on the part of individual debaters and less on the part of coaches. You are doubtless familiar with the phrase current in educational literature—"purposeful student activity." In connection with this concept we might well borrow a slogan from the field of intercollegiate football. This slogan is, "Give the game back to the boys." A premium should be placed on student effort in debate.

I believe common consensus has it that coaches do far too much of the work. They spend too much time in getting their charges to parrot a speech effectively and too little on teaching them to think through the problems involved to such an extent that the debaters can make effective adaptations under fire.216


216Ridgway, op. cit., p. 545.
According to Robert L. Scott, University of Minnesota:

There are, I know, those engaged in directing forensic activities who think that primarily they are engaged in an educational enterprise and that a part of the value of that enterprise consists in weighing material, selecting evidence, and building for oneself a debate case. In short, research is not irrelevant to what a debater ought properly spend his time doing.

It might be argued that the better job a debate handbook does in collecting and synthesizing material, the more assiduously we ought strive to keep such handbooks away from our debaters since these debaters will be prevented from doing much of their own work and, hence, probably from the most fruitful learning. (There are those who maintain that handbooks are so poorly done that debaters ought to be kept away from them for that reason. Take your choice.)

I count myself among those who think that we ought not purchase such handbooks. As a matter of fact, it would be a credit to the activity in which we engage and to our organization if the AFA were to go on record as discouraging the use of the sorts of material referred to. I say discourage. We cannot, in my opinion, prohibit such use; nor should we, if we could.

Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. Of the four critics considering this principle of debating one, Gary L. Peterson, indicated his criticism was based on a survey. The three other criticisms were based on subjective judgment drawn from experience and observation.

Principle #4. Debating develops a usage of language adapted to the audience and occasion.

---

a) Approving Criticisms:
None.

b) Disapproving Criticisms:

(1) According to Don K. Wright:

Dear Beginning Debater,

I have recently traversed the 3-ring circus of a high school debate institute. This was an extremely fruitful experience and was enjoyed by all. I must admit, though, that while much good technique was demonstrated, there was not a little allusion to certain stereotyped procedures which left a bitter taste in my forensic mouth.

Wearing as I am today the cloak of the pedagogue, I cannot be untrue to my calling nor to my inclination by failing to "set you straight" on certain issues that are certainly more than unimportant, but perhaps a little less than essential. Nevertheless, I am the custodian of at least one clear observation--the following ten commandments, plus five, cannot be ignored by the forensic neophyte. (. . .)

If you follow these 15 suggestions to the letter, then you can be assured of a modicum of success equal to that of debaters of similar intent.

MUSTS FOR THE MAD MUTILATORS OF THE FORENSIC ART

or

HOW TO SHOW IRREVOCABLY THAT YOUR REASONING HASN'T REACHED THE BOILING POINT

1. Be "sweetly" gracious in your salutory remarks.
2. Make a big issue by defining obvious portions of the proposition.
3. Use certain cliches--a few of which are the following:
   a. "Our most worthy opponents"
   b. "Because of the irrefutable evidence we have presented" (You had four quotes--all of which were opinionated and not evidentiary.)
   c. "I think" or "I strongly believe" (well--good for you)
4. Have a plan to meet your needs that is untenable, childish, and not worthy of mature utterance.
5. Use analogies whose comparisons do not include adequate similarities.
6. Be so unorganized that it is a toss-up who is the
most confused about your case—you, your opponents, or the judge.

7. Try to meet by adamant refutation every word, syllable, and grunt offered by the opposition.

8. Ridicule your opponents instead of meeting their issues.

9. Be sadistically sarcastic (even to the point of sneers, smirks, "knowing glances" to your colleague, and audible sighs).

10. Take one or more writing implements to the stand with you in case of mental emergencies.

11. Talk to your colleague through a shuffle of materials while your opponents are on the floor.

12. Forget logical reasoning and depend on "authoritative" quotes for corroboration of contentions.

13. Talk at a rapid rate in order to confuse your opponents.

14. Use "heavy" gestures that clearly identify you as "a debater-in-the-know."

15. By all means have at least two debate manuals within easy reach in every contest in order to prove to your opposition and judges alike that you are up on the latest materials. 218

Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms. The criticism of this principle of debating was made from the basis of subjective judgment drawn from his personal experience.

Principle # 5. Debating develops a style of delivery adapted to the audience and the occasion.

a) Approving Criticisms:

None.

---

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**

(1) According to Charles Van Riper:

And it would not be hard to recommend that the incredible ritual of American debate be modified into something more like human communication. The Cambridge debaters do not seem to need a captive audience. As for public address, perhaps a soap box in front of the student union would be a better rostrum than the classroom platform.

None of these suggestions are worth a tinker's damn, of course, but that does not negate the criticism that there is too much display and not enough real communication in your student training. Somehow, someway, you must find communicative experiences for your students that are real, not artificial. The messages must be important to their listeners and the listeners representative of the society in which we live.219

(2) According to Charles T. Brown:

In the course of the hundreds of debates, orations, and extemporaneous speeches to which I have subjected my ears, they have been painfully impressed by an all too general accent upon fluency, rapidity, glibness, barbed sophistication, and the sensational juggling of statistics, authorities, and testimonials. In keeping, the speech is usually delivered after the best traditions of the patent medicine show. The tendency to emphasize speech gymnastics at the expense of speech education is the gravest weakness in the present forensic program.220

**Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms.**

Both of the critics expounding on this principle of debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment.


E. Values of Debating. Under this general category of principles of debating, the following specific principles were alluded to by the criticisms.

**Principle #1.** Debating holds values for the student which include: satisfying the need to be recognized; developing reflective thinking; stimulating inquiry into vital issues; developing judgment and evaluation; and contributing to personal development.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**

(1) According to Lionel Crocker, Chairman, Speech Department, Denison University:

The fundamental purpose of independent study is motivation. One of the big problems in liberal education is interest. The average student in a liberal education set-up does not have the zest for learning that administrators would like him to have. Professional students, it seems, go at their work in earnest and do their best. While the debater, regardless of course of study, is motivated because he knows that he must get the answers to puzzling questions or be made a fool of in the next debate.\(^{221}\)

(2) According to Wayne E. Hoogestraat, Assistant Professor of Speech, South Dakota State College:

"Debate is often contrary to the convictions of the debaters and consequently undesirable." The apparent weakness of the above argument is the implication that consistency of convictions is the mark of intelligence. Open-mindedness, rather than unwavering conviction is the prime pre-requisite to learning, and learning is

\(^{221}\) Crocker, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
the goal of all intellectual pursuits. The writer agrees with the above argument that "debate is often contrary to convictions (tentative convictions)," but sharp issue is taken with that portion which holds this to be undesirable. The debater by exploring theories contrary to his present convictions often finds himself refining his convictions. He is submitting his theories to a test—the test of evidence and logic supporting other theories. If this is undesirable then the bulk of present day critical thinking should be discouraged.\(^222\)

(3) According to Abraham Tauber, Dean, Bronx Community College:

The essence of teaching debate should be to train the audience to listen critically and analyze the array of arguments hurled at them in an emotionally surcharged barrage of words.\(^223\)

(4) According to Henry Lee Ewbank, Associate Professor of Speech, Purdue University:

Courses in argumentation, properly taught and contest debating, properly conducted provide valuable training for leadership in our society. This is supported, he says, by: "Capel measured the effect of listening to a debate on the attitude of high school students; ( . . . ) Howell studied the effects of a season's high school debating on the debater's ability to evaluate arguments, detect errors in reasoning and draw valid conclusions from evidence. ( . . . ) Brembeck, using the same battery of tests measured the effects of a college course in argumentation on critical thinking ability."\(^224\)


(5) According to A. E. Rupp:

I think that good teachers of debate have also been good teachers of speech. They believe in speech training because it is a skill that is valuable in various lines of endeavor. I have talked with many former high school debaters who are doing little public speaking as adults. These same persons have said that their speech training was the most important subject in their high school course. When I asked the reasons for such a statement I invariably received one of the following replies:

I learned to evaluate properly various sources of information.
I learned to organize materials and reassemble this information into a well-organized brief.
For the first time in my school experience I learned to use our library.
I became open-minded and attempted to understand the other fellow's viewpoint.
I developed a questioning attitude that has stirred my interest in many new fields.
I learned to scan newspaper and magazine articles and to get the material out of them in a minimum of time.
All of these statements and other similar expressions have been heard from time to time. They testify to the value of debate training by capable and inspiring teachers. 225

(6) According to the editorial staff of The Forensic:

The practical objections seem to concern what debate can accomplish. The aim of tournament debate is not to accomplish; it is a competitive situation, and does not seek to find solutions. It is an instrument for the development of reason and logic in the debater. A debater must be ready to change his whole outlook on a problem in a matter of minutes. This is not a matter of conscience, but a means of developing the power of objective thought. Debate, then, through the speech skills,

seeks to develop the abilities of reason, logic, and objectivity.

(7) According to Bert E. Bradley, Jr.:

Various reasons, some invalid, are given for rejecting debate activity, but this article is not concerned with discussing these. Rather it is the purpose of this article to focus the attention on seven values of debating which speech teachers can advance to justify debate as a program for superior students in the non-sciences.

In the first place, working with a debate proposition develops and improves the student's ability to do research.

Debate activity, secondly, develops and improves thinking ability. Confronted with the debate topic at the beginning of the year, the student is obliged to make a thorough analysis of the proposition and the problem.

Participating in debate is valuable, thirdly, in creating an understanding for and appreciation of orderly change. As is well known, society must constantly be searching out new methods and rejecting outmoded methods if progress is to be made.

Fourthly, taking part in educational debate programs helps to create tolerance for other points of view. Not tolerance for the sake of tolerance, but tolerance for the other point of view because of respect for the logical, substantiated arguments upholding that viewpoint.

A fifth value of debate is that it teaches emotional control. The debater soon learns that most trained judges listen with disapproval to obviously emotional arguments and to highly emotionalized presentations.

Debate activity is valuable, in the sixth place, because it prepares the student for the democratic society in which we live.

For those who insist that an activity have economic rewards for its participants, there is a seventh value of debate. One researcher, for example, studying executives in the business world discovered "a clear and consistent trend for people with 'substantial' college extracurricular achievement to receive more of the higher salaries and for people with no college extra-

---

curricular achievement to receive more of the lower salaries.  

**Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms.** Six of the critics considering this principle of debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from their years of experience and observation. The seventh critic based his criticism on the responses of former debaters.

b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**

(1) According to Douglas Ehninger:

Readers of this journal, I assume, are familiar with the criticisms commonly leveled against debate as a method for settling differences and arriving at shared beliefs and decisions. Prominent among them are these: (1) Debate, unlike other available modes of deliberation, does not result in a reflective or critical judgment because it does not employ a critical method. (2) Debate, instead of being a technique of investigation— a means of discovering and testing ideas—is a technique of persuasion, suitable only for propagating ideas and impressing them on others. (3) Debate, instead of implementing the desirable attitudes and processes of cooperation, emphasizes the undesirable attitudes and processes of conflict.

(2) According to Alice Donaldson:

Another difficulty in the present plan is the missing of school time by the debaters. The students suffer

---


academically when the same classes are missed repeatedly.229

**Type of Verification of Disapproving Criticisms.**
Both of the critics expressing criticisms pertinent to this principle of debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment drawn from their years of experience.

**Principle # 2.** Debating holds certain values for the school including: stimulating interest in human problems and development; integrating the learning process; and relating the school to society and society's problems.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**

(1) According to Robert G. Turner:

Now let us examine the second challenge that forensics take too much time. An orator or debater in preparing for speech activities is working on Oral English, written composition, social science, mathematics, and (in Illinois where charts are still used) art work. Can you find another activity where so many subjects are correlated to get a common result? Many a parent has expressed to me his sincere appreciation for giving a pupil enough work in an activity that he likes to keep him interested and off the streets.230

(2) According to Donald E. Hargis:

These comments indicate that high school principals considered the championship debater to be outstanding

---


in every respect: in scholarship, leadership, personality, activities, and professional success after high school. Many comments were made upon the distinctive personalities of these debaters and the leadership which they demonstrated both in and outside of the classroom. Without exception, the students were evaluated as scholastic leaders, with many of them receiving university scholarships upon graduation from high school. The superior intelligence of the group was universally acknowledged. While it is impossible to indicate all of the specific comments in this summary, it is apparent that school administrators consider the championship debaters to have been the distinguished citizens in their schools.231

Hargis further stated:

In scholastic standing 84% of the debaters were in the upper 20% of their graduating classes and 66% in the upper 10%, while only 6% were considered average. No debater was reported as below average. 52% had an average letter grade of A or A-, and 90% a record of B- or better. All of the debaters were graduated from high school. Hence it seems obvious that nearly all of the championship debaters had excellent records and were scholastic leaders in their classes.

On the question, "Was the debater considered a leader in high school?" 82% answered yes, 11% answered no, and 7% of the questionnaires had no answer. All of the principals indicated that the students had taken part in at least one extra-curricular activity beyond debate and many in two or three and up to eleven.232

Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. One of the critics writing on this principle of debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment. The other indicated his statements were based on a survey of championship debaters.


232Hargis, op. cit., p. 57.
b) **Disapproving Criticisms:**  
None.

**Principle #3.** Debating holds values for society including: preparing youth for useful participation in life; fostering the ideals of democracy; and attaining the improvement of human welfare.

a) **Approving Criticisms:**

(1) According to Robert G. Turner:

You probably have heard the statement that this business of getting decisions is not a "life situation"—that when you get down, for example, to the final sixteen teams in the state they are all about equal and that often the wrong team wins. But isn't life like that?\(^{233}\)

(2) According to Richard A. Hildreth:

This is the environment into which a forensics student must step. If we accept the premise that forensics is an educative process and thus a training device for the student in his post-school life, and if we acknowledge that the American sociological environment is based on competition in which a few become "champions," then Mr. Goodwin's contention that we eliminate "championship" competition is obviated because forensics would be sterile if removed from its practical function.

This writer would like to submit that a more realistic answer lies in greater emphasis on ethics in forensic programs and that possibly greater deterrents to unethical practices might be devised—as is done in the nonclassroom competitive life.\(^{234}\)

\(^{233}\) Turner, *op. cit.*., p. 553.

(3) According to Hargis Westerfield:

Besides practical values that go with the development of debating as an art, there are also deeper values in contest debating that pertain to the safety of our democracy and to our knowledge of the world. Decisions help keep alive the element of struggle so necessary for survival in a hostile environment, and decisions help prepare youth for the irrationality of humanity. (. . . )

Now another merit of decision debates is that the democratic flabbiness has no place here. Absoluteness is their essence; a speaker wins outright, or he loses outright. There are no imponderable shades between, and the boy who dodges the issue by saying he lost by "just one point" finds he is wasting his breath. He has been carried beyond our relative passing system, with its grade of sixty, below which number lies failure, and above which stands success, whether he knows anything or not. He has projected into a hard, adult, business-like world of struggle, wherein decisions are clear-cut, wherein a man either holds his job definitely or loses it definitely, or wherein a product is sold or rejected.235

Westerfield further stated:

Another major advantage of the decision debate is that it gives the youth himself a pragmatic philosophy of human nature. Contact with twenty to fifty different varieties of more-or-less able judges in a year, is sure to give him a matter-of-fact outlook on the world he has to live in. Even the judges in the most benighted stages of ignorance, will afford him important lessons. He may realize that men are, in too many cases, not ruled by reason, even though they ought to be. For better or worse, he must learn to accept the irrationality of the human race. It is a part of his education for him to comprehend that he can be correct in his logic, and excellent in his delivery; to discover that he can be altogether right and yet be defeated by a verdict that seems grievously unjust to him. Whether he intends to take the reformer's or the realist's view of the world, he needs to recognize that

---

stone wall of opposition so often found among human beings.

He has to become tolerant of the failings of human judges. He must get acquainted with the tired business man who nods throughout the entire series of arguments, and then props himself up to maintain an utterly unforeseen judgment.236

(4) According to Carney C. Smith:

Some people say that decisions are unfair because they are decided on prejudice. The judge may be a friend of the other coach or may be sympathetic with the other school because it had been the underdog. Perhaps the judge or judges are interested financially in one side or other of the question, or they may not know anything about debate.

But let us say the judge is prejudiced. Now we do not want a judge of this kind, but if we are unfortunate enough to draw one, is not that a life-like situation. Each of us has tried many times to sell a person an idea, an article, or ourselves and has been defeated by prejudice.237

(5) According to Harold A. Brack:

Ministerial students who have participated in forensic activities in their college days, usually fare quite well during a busy week in their church. This is true because their participation in forensic activities has given them training for, and experience in fulfilling demanding schedules of speech activities. In this respect the forensic tournament, conference or festival more nearly approximates the real life speech experience of the minister than does the speech class.

Theological schools have no significant counterpart to the extra-curricular forensics programs of colleges and universities where ministerial students can receive this vital training and experience in speaking with scheduled frequency, under critical scrutiny, and with


the feeling that one has an important responsibility to fulfill.238

(6) According to Carney C. Smith

We should remember that we in debate are training the future leaders of our country. In their respective communities and in the nation, they are sure to suffer many reverses. If we can train them to be true sportsmen and sportswomen, we shall not only make for a more harmonious community, but shall give them one of the prime requisites of a successful life.239

Type of Verification of Approving Criticisms. All six of the critics who commented relative to this principle of debating did so on the basis of subjective judgment.

b) Disapproving Criticisms.

None.

Previous Studies Relative to Debating. In the search through the literature sixteen studies on debating were found to have been reported. These studies were listed here; first, because they were not presented as criticisms and second, they identified those areas or principles which have been studied.

238 Harold A. Brack, "Pre-Ministerial Students Need Forensic Training," The Forensic, Series 43, No. 2 (Jan., 1958), p. 35.

Sikkink\textsuperscript{240} studied the practice of having students debate on both sides as an influence on shift of attitude toward a proposition. Capel\textsuperscript{241} investigated the effectiveness of debate as an informative and persuasive medium of attitude change. Giffin\textsuperscript{242} investigated the degree to which the judges believe they use certain judging criteria. Winters\textsuperscript{243} experimented with the use of accepted debate judging criteria. Schug\textsuperscript{244} studied attitudes of various groups toward debate and forensics activity. Schmidt\textsuperscript{245} did an analytical study of the writings of Ellen Boothroyd Brogue to determine what she felt were the objections of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.


Barber conducted an opinion study of former debaters from schools in the North Central Association. Halstead made a study of debate decisions in terms of attitudes of judges. Giffin and McKee made an analysis of the use of evidence in support of arguments in debate. Vasilew studied the attitudes of debaters toward debate. James studied the judging standards for judging refutation. Howell investigated the influence of high school debating on critical thinking. Brembeck similarly, checked the influence of


a college course of argumentation on critical thinking. Cripe\textsuperscript{253} conducted a survey of debate programs in 246 American colleges and universities. Patton\textsuperscript{254} studied successful high school debaters.


CHAPTER V

Discussion of the Findings

The following chart listed the principles and enumerated the criticisms made on supported judgment and subjective judgment. (For definitions, see page 10.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Debating:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Philosophy of Debating regarding:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognition of Problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Democratic Processes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speaker's Responsibilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Bases of Debating including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Informational Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proof</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strategy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Kinds of Debating as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critiqued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Audience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tournaments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conventional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ethical Code of Debating involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Manners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Division of Responsibilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delivery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Values of Debating to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column A. . Number of approving criticisms--supported.
Column B. . Number of approving criticisms--subjective.
Column C. . Total number of approving criticisms.
Column D. . Number of disapproving criticisms--supported.
Column E. . Number of disapproving criticisms--subjective.
Column F. . Total number of disapproving criticisms.
Column G. . Total number of criticisms of this principle.
From the report of the findings of the study, a number of observations were made regarding the nature of the criticisms which have been written about debating. These observations were as follows:

1. Of the forty-seven approving criticisms,
   a. Eleven criticisms (23.4 per cent) were concerned with the philosophical concepts of debating. Seven of the eleven criticisms defended the position that debating promotes a development of the democratic process. Two criticisms claimed that debating fostered student recognition of public problems in a democracy, and two other criticisms asserted that debating develops a sense of responsibility for modification of human belief and behavior.
   b. Two criticisms (4.25 per cent) were concerned with the bases of debating. Both of these criticisms dealt with the value of debating in developing background information and general knowledge of the subject area. Principles of analysis, proof, organization and strategy were not treated. One explanation of this condition might be that the proponents of debating felt that these bases were so well founded that they did not require further establishment.
   c. Eighteen criticisms (38.3 per cent) approved or defended the kinds of debate experience which debaters
now receive. The large number of approving criticisms defending the kinds of debate experience stemmed mainly from the large number of disapproving criticisms on this same area. In many cases the approving criticisms were direct answers to the disapproving criticisms.

d. One criticism (2.12 per cent) concurred with the concept that debating develops an appreciation of ethical practices. This critic pointed out that debating helps the teacher to be an ethicist as well as a moralist in the learning situation. The shortage of approving criticisms seemed to stem from the position that student actions subjected to disapproving criticisms are not accountable to debating alone.

e. Fifteen criticisms (31.9 per cent) listed the values received from debating, with seven listing the benefits for the student, six considering the values for society, and two specifying values to the school. In many cases the approving criticisms were written to answer certain disapproving criticisms on the values of debating.

2. Of the twenty-nine disapproving criticisms,

   a. No criticisms were found which disputed the philosophy of debating. An explanation of this might be that even the critics of debating found no fault in the
principles of debating dealing with the philosophy of debate.

b. No criticisms were found which disapproved of the bases of instruction of debating. This again seemed to indicate acceptance by the critics of the principles dealing with informational research, analysis, proof, organization, and strategy as the bases of debating.

c. Eighteen criticisms (62 per cent) were found which were concerned with the kinds of experience in debating. Particularly, the critics objected to the way debates are judged, the lack of understandable critiques, the lack of audiences, the conditions that prevail at tournaments, and failure to employ fresh new methods or styles of debate. Thirteen of the disapproving criticisms were related, dealing with tournaments, decisions and critiques. In this general area of the kinds of debating, the total number of disapproving criticisms equaled the number of approving criticisms. In some cases the disapproving criticisms in this area were prompted by claims and allegations made by the advocates of debating.

d. Nine criticisms (31 per cent) were found which decried the unsavory actions or conduct that indicated a lack of ethics on the part of debaters and coaches. Four
of the nine disapproving criticisms charged that coaches did too much of the work for the students; two complained about the value of some of the materials used by debaters, one objected to the choice of language by some debaters, and two found fault with the delivery of speakers in contest debating. However, these criticisms were all made about the abuses of debating and did not dispute the intended purposes of debating. In almost all cases these disapproving criticisms recommended improvements in the ethics of debating. They did not go so far as to recommend the complete abolishment of debating.

6. Two criticisms (6.89 per cent) expressed the opinion that debating did not produce the values which advocates of debating claim. Both of the disapproving criticisms focused doubt upon the value of debating for the student, claiming that it produced undesirable attitudes in the debaters and that it took an unnecessary amount of time away from other studies.

3. Of the forty-seven approving criticisms and twenty-nine disapproving criticisms (totaling seventy-six),

a. Eleven criticisms (14.5 per cent) dealt with the philosophy of debating. All eleven were approving criticisms. Significantly, no disapproving criticisms were found on this principle of debating.
b. Two criticisms (2.6 per cent) made reference to the bases of debating. Of particular significance to coaches is the apparent acceptance by the critics of the bases of debating, which, as advanced generally in the textbooks on debating, were not under attack. An inference that might be drawn from this condition is that the bases of debating have become generally accepted and established academically. Accordingly, no disapproving criticisms and only two approving criticisms were made by the critics.

c. Thirty-six criticisms (47.4 per cent) were related to the kinds of experience which debaters receive or to which they are subjected. This number was equally divided between eighteen approving criticisms and eighteen disapproving criticisms. Although the total of thirty-six criticisms represented the largest number of criticisms on any of the general principles of debating, the importance of the number seemed to be diminished by the nature of the criticisms. Many of the criticisms, in the estimation of this writer, were inconsequential and petty. Haggling over different styles and forms of debate presentation seemed relatively unimportant in comparison to other criticisms which dealt with the problems of decisions in debating, the desirability and use of a critique, and the
problem of debating both sides of the proposition.

d. Ten criticisms (13.2 per cent) were directed at the ethical code of debating. Of the ten, only one was an approving criticisms while nine were disapproving criticisms. The wide difference in the numbers of approving criticisms and disapproving criticisms seemed to indicate that the ethical code of debating included specific principles of ethics which were rather frequently attacked and not readily defended.

At the same time, the advocates of debating generally have contended that the abuses of the ethics of debating have not been basically different from the abuses of the ethics of interscholastic athletics, music festivals, journalistic contests, and other forms of interscholastic competitions. On this basis the attacks on the ethics of debating might not appear as significant as at first considered.

e. Seventeen criticisms (22.4 per cent) were expressed in consideration of the values received from debating. Fifteen of the seventeen were approving criticisms, which generally praised the value of debating to the student, the school and society. Often these praises of debating, while seemingly justified in part from personal experience, were, in the opinion of the writer, cases of shifting ground when defense could
not be offered for disapproving criticisms on the ethics of debating. Whereas fifteen approving criticisms of the values of debating were found, only two disapproving criticisms were discovered on this general principle. This condition seemed to indicate that the critics of debating were not generally disapproving of the values of debating.

\( f \). That aspect of debating (dealing with kinds of debating) that received the greatest total number of criticisms (thirty-six) was the aspect to which the textbook writers devoted the least consideration (in number of pages) and held the least amount of agreement. Conversely, that aspect of debating (the bases of debating) that received the least total number of criticisms (two) was the aspect to which the textbook writers devoted the greatest consideration (in number of pages) and held the greatest amount of agreement. This condition suggested to the writer that much study and evaluation needs to be given to those aspects of debating that are under widespread disapproving criticism. On this basis the writer was prompted to consider phrasing specific recommendations for further study regarding the kinds of debating and the ethical codes for conducting interscholastic debates.

\( 4 \). Concerning the type of verification of the forty-seven
approving criticisms,

a. Six criticisms (12.8 per cent) indicated some attempt to substantiate the criticism offered. This writer was impressed by the fact that so few approving criticisms (six out of forty-seven) were based upon study and investigation.

b. Forty-one criticisms (87.2 per cent) seemingly were expressed on the bases of personal observation, indirect experience or a number of years of personal experience. This writer was further impressed that so many of the approving criticisms (forty-one out of forty-seven) were accepted as authoritative articles in the professional journals when the contents of the criticisms were based only upon personal experience and subjective judgment.

c. The rather low percentage of supported approving criticisms offered would seem somewhat enigmatic considering the concept of "he who asserts must prove" generally accepted by debaters. This condition once again prompted the writer to structure certain questions for further study and investigation.

5. Concerning the type of verification of the twenty-nine disapproving criticisms,

a. Only one criticism (3.1 per cent) indicated that it was substantiated by investigation.
b. Twenty-eight criticisms were made on the bases of personal observation, indirect experience, or a number of years of personal experience. Once again, the writer was astonished to find that so many critics had published articles in the professional journals when the contents of their disapproving criticisms were based only upon personal experience and subjective judgment. This condition once more prompted the writer to phrase questions for study based upon the controversial aspects of debating.

c. The small number (one) and percentage (3.1) of disapproving criticisms which were supported might in some degree be attributable to persons both within and outside of the field of Speech and Forensics who were unaccustomed to supporting their contentions with empirical data.
CHAPTER VI

Summary and Recommendations for Further Study

Summary

Textbooks. In surveying the literature on the subject of debating and preparation for debating in American schools and colleges, twenty-one textbooks were examined to establish a representative outline of the principles of instruction on debating. All twenty-one of the books were written within the past forty years and most of them have been used to some extent as standard textbooks on debating.

In outlining and comparing the content of each of the books with the others, five major areas of principles occurred repeatedly among most of the texts. These areas were: the philosophy of debating; the bases of debating; the kinds of debating; the ethical code of debating; and the values of debating. Not all of the texts considered these five areas under these five exact headings. The content of the treatment of each heading in any one text did not match exactly the treatment of the same heading in any other text. However, enough similarity was observed among the texts to warrant the construction of a composite outline of their content.

A. On the Philosophy of Debating, the following
principles were recognized:

1. Debating teaches students to recognize and study current problems in human affairs.
2. Debating teaches practical usage of the democratic processes in problem solving.
3. Debating teaches responsibility for modification of human belief and behavior.

B. On the Bases of Debating, the following principles were recognized:

1. Debating requires background information consisting of knowledge of the subject area and knowledge of debating technique.
2. Debating requires an analysis of the debate topic in which the immediate cause for consideration is examined, the terms are defined, the history of the question is considered, certain matters are admitted to or waived from consideration, and a statement of relevant issues is made.
3. Debating requires proof of arguments based on assumptions, evidence and logic.
4. Debating requires organization, in structuring the brief and in partitioning the materials.
5. Debating requires strategy in refutation, in rebuttal, in meeting responsibilities of affirmative or negative positions, in meeting responsibilities
of individual speakers, and in the presentation of the case to include all relevant issues (not just one or two "tricky" issues).

C. On the Kinds of Debating, the following principles were recognized:

1. Debating should be judged and a decision given.
2. Debating should be critiqued.
3. Debating should take place before an audience.
4. Debating should include tournament experience.
5. Debating should generally take place between two man teams who debate or have researched both sides of the topic, and on one topic annually.

D. On the Ethical Code of Debating, the following principles were recognized:

1. Debating develops courtesy and good manners toward others.
2. Debating develops honesty and integrity in the use of materials.
3. Debating develops divided responsibilities of the students and the instructors.
4. Debating develops a usage of language adapted to the audience and occasion.
5. Debating develops a style of delivery adapted to the audience and occasion.

E. On the Values of Debating, the following principles
were recognized:

1. Debating holds values for the student including: satisfying the need to be recognized; developing reflective thinking; stimulating inquiry into vital issues; developing judgment and evaluation; and contributing to personal development.

2. Debating holds values for the school which include: stimulating interest in human problems and development; integrating the learning processes; and relating the school to society and society's problems.

3. Debating holds values for society which include: preparing youth for useful participation in life; fostering the ideals of democracy; and attaining the improvement of human welfare.

Professional Journals and Periodicals. From the selected contemporary professional Speech and Forensics journals a total of seventy-six criticisms were collected, analyzed and classified according to the composite outline structured from the textbooks on debating.
Nature of the Criticisms. As analyzed and classified, the criticisms numerically presented the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of principles</th>
<th>Approving</th>
<th>Disapproving</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Philosophy of Debating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving criticisms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproving criticisms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Bases of Debating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving criticisms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproving criticisms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Kinds of Debating</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving criticisms</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproving criticisms</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ethical Code of Debating</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving criticisms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproving criticisms</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Values of Debating</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving criticisms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproving criticisms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That aspect of debating (dealing with kinds of debating) that received the greatest total number of criticisms (thirty-six) was the aspect to which the textbook writers devoted the least consideration (in number of pages) and held the least amount of agreement. Conversely, that aspect of debating (the bases of debating) that received the least total number of criticisms (two) was the aspect to which the textbook writers devoted the greatest consideration (in number of pages) and held the greatest amount of agreement. This condition suggested to the writer that much study and evaluation needs to be given to those aspects of debating that are under widespread disapproving criticism. On this basis the writer was prompted to phrase specific recommendations for further study regarding the kinds of debating and the ethical codes for conducting interscholastic debate.

Forty-one criticisms, out of forty-seven approving criticisms, seemingly were expressed on the bases of personal observation, indirect experience or a number of years of personal experience. (This writer was impressed that so many of these approving criticisms were accepted as authoritative articles in the professional journals when the contents of the criticisms were based only upon personal experience and subjective judgment.)

Twenty-eight disapproving criticisms, out of twenty-nine, were made on the bases of personal observation,
indirect experience, or a number of years of personal experience. Once again, the writer was astonished to find that so many critics had published articles in the professional journals when the contents of their disapproving criticisms were based only upon personal experience and subjective judgment. This condition prompted the writer to phrase questions for study based upon the controversial aspects of debating.

Recommendations for Further Study

From the previously noted points of summation, there seemed to emerge three new classifications of principles which warrant further study. The principles on debating, as listed previously, seemed to fall into the following three arbitrary groupings, which did not necessarily constitute an order of preference for further study.

1. Principles which received both approving and disapproving criticisms:

   This group was listed first because it contained those principles toward which most approving and disapproving criticisms were directed, and about which most disagreement seemed to center, indicating some doubt regarding these principles. Stated in the form of questions for further study, they include:

   a. Does tournament debating more fully accomplish the
educational and philosophical aims of debating than non-tournament debating? If so, to what extent?

b. Does debating both sides of a proposition more fully accomplish the educational and philosophical aims of debating than debating only one side? If so, to what extent?

c. Does a critiqued debate more fully accomplish the educational and philosophical aims of debating than a non-critiqued debate? If so, to what extent?

d. Does a judged debate more fully accomplish the educational and philosophical aims of debating than a non-decision debate? If so, to what extent?

e. Does debating promote desirable educational relationships between teacher and student? If so, to what extent?

f. Does debating develop student judgment and critical evaluation in problems of human behavior? If so, to what extent?

g. Which kind of debating attains the greatest degree of achievement in relation to the philosophical aims of debating?

2. Principles which received only approving criticism or only disapproving criticism:

The second group of principles which attracted attention included those principles toward which either approving or disapproving criticism was directed, but about which no
disagreement seemed to center. Those principles were expressed as possible questions or topics for further study in the following manner:

a. Does debating promote student recognition, study, and understanding of current problems in human affairs? If so, to what extent?

b. Does debating promote student usage of the democratic processes in the solving of problems in the social sciences? If so, to what extent?

c. Does debating promote a student sense of responsibility for the modification of human belief and behavior? If so, to what extent?

d. Does debating promote student motivation for acquiring background information on problems in the social sciences? If so, to what extent?

e. Does debating before an audience more fully accomplish the educational and philosophical aims of debating than non-audience debating? If so, to what extent?

f. Does debating develop honesty and integrity in the use of argumentative materials? If so, to what extent?

g. Does debating promote vocabulary development in debaters? If so, to what extent?

h. Does debating develop effective speaking by debaters? If so, to what extent?

i. Does debating promote desirable values to the
school? If so, to what extent?

j. Does debating promote desirable values for society? If so, to what extent?

3. Principles which received neither approving nor disapproving criticisms:

The third group of principles included those principles toward which no approving or disapproving criticisms were directed, and which seemingly were accepted by the critics. Those principles were expressed as possible questions or topics for further study, as follows:

a. Does debating satisfy the student's need for recognition? If so, to what extent?

b. Does debating promote student use of reflective thinking? If so, to what extent?

c. Does debating contribute to student personal development in interpersonal relationships? If so, to what extent?

d. Does debating foster an attitude of attaining improvement in human behavior? If so, to what extent?

e. Does debating promote student analysis of problems in the social sciences prior to formulating judgments and behavior? If so, to what extent?

f. Does debating promote student use of proof prior to formulating judgments and behavior? If so, to what extent?
g. Does debating promote organization in structuring the materials of argumentative discourse? If so, to what extent?

h. Does debating promote commendable strategy in argumentative discourse? If so, to what extent?

i. Does debating develop courtesy and good manners toward others? If so, to what extent?

For the writer, this study was a very satisfying and worthwhile experience. First, it required a survey of all of the leading authoritative books on debating. This survey led to constructing a composite set of principles of debating based upon the collective judgment of all of the textbook authors. The construction of this composite set of principles on debating had not previously been done by any other researcher on debating.

Second, this study required an analysis and classification and evaluation of the collected contemporary criticisms on debating in the journals according to the classifications of principles drawn from the textbooks. No previous researcher had pursued this task. Accordingly, the findings of this study represented new information which should become of importance to teachers and coaches of debate. Of special interest was the information that twenty-eight out of the total of twenty-nine disapproving criticisms, and forty-one out of forty-seven approving criticisms were based
only upon subjective judgment and personal experience. Of equal interest was the information that only one out of twenty-nine disapproving criticisms and only six out of forty-seven approving criticisms were based upon some form of academic support.

In the third place, the writer was prompted to structure certain questions for further study about debating. These questions were phrased around the principles of debating that had been drawn from the survey of the textbooks and which had come under varying degrees of approving and disapproving criticism by the writers in the current journals on Speech and debating. This writer will be interested himself in pursuing answers to some of these questions. But this writer will be interested also in helping to motivate other persons interested in debating to help find the answers to the questions.

Out of this study grew a strong impression by this writer that debating is a valuable, important and even a necessary part of American education. To learn more about debating, and to stimulate others to help answer many of the unsolved problems of debating, will be, for this writer, a worthwhile and unending goal.
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C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS


To Members and Affiliates
Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation
National University Extension Association
Gentlemen:

This bulletin is a report of recent relations of your Committee with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Members of the Committee on Debate Materials were gravely concerned to read the report of the Contest Committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools adopted at the meeting of the North Central Association held in Chicago in March, 1950. If you have not been previously informed of this report the following excerpt from it will indicate the reason why the committee was concerned.


3. Speech. It is rather commonly felt that the success of a democratic form of life is dependent to a great extent upon the intelligent study and exchange of ideas of persons within groups. It is also recognized that the solution of common problems in the democracy is not best arrived at through dramatic, eloquent, emotional speeches. On the contrary, deliberations on a highly intellectual plane should be more prevalent than they are in the solution of community, national, and international problems. Intellectual provincialism can be greatly reduced by encouraging students to seek solutions to recognized problems not only between schools and states, but between nations. Very little place in our democratic life is left for the long over-used dramatics and emotions in speech making. Nor is there much purpose in a democracy for formalized debates wherein parties resolve to win through eloquent presentations of a side with little, if any, regard to examination of the facts involved in a problem. The
purpose of debate is to win a point, not necessarily to arrive at a solution to a problem.

The Committee can see very little real good to be derived educationally from speech contests as most of them now are organized and conducted. It is recommended, therefore, that the emphasis in secondary education be placed upon the ability to conduct oneself intelligently in group discussions. Emphasis should also be placed in teaching pupils to be able to convey verbally their thoughts in a group or before an audience, but not to win a point or attain an emotionalized victory. Interscholastic speech contests should be discontinued.

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS, Wednesday, March 22, 1950."

Professor Lowell B. Fisher of the University of Illinois, Chairman of the Contest Committee, sent a copy of the report containing the foregoing excerpt to the Executive Secretary of the Committee on Debate Materials and requested comment and advice. The report of the Contest Committee was considered at the meeting of the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation held in Excelsior Springs, Missouri, on April 30, 1950. At this meeting the Executive Secretary of the Committee on Debate Materials was instructed to get in touch with Professor Fisher and to represent the point of view of our Committee, in the hope of being able to inform the North Central Association of the true aims and purposes of debating in the secondary schools.

The Executive Secretary initiated a correspondence with Professor Fisher. In the course of this correspondence, he invited Professor Fisher to attend a meeting of the Committee on Debate Materials to be held in New York City, on December 27, 28, and 29, 1950. The Executive Secretary also solicited the advice and assistance of leaders in the Speech Association of America and arranged for Professor Fisher to meet them during the New York Convention.

Professor Fisher attended the meetings of the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation held in New York and participated in a number of conferences and conversations concerning our program of activities.

As a result of these meetings, Professor Fisher agreed to confer with a committee appointed by the Executive Council of the Speech Association of America, and such a com-
mittee was appointed with the following members: James H. McBurney, Chairman of the committee, Dean of the School of Speech, Northwestern University, Evanston; Bower Aly, Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Speech and Professor of Speech, University of Missouri, Columbia; Orville Hitchcock, Executive Secretary Elect of the Speech Association of America, and Professor of Speech, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Loren D. Reid, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, and Professor of Speech, University of Missouri, Columbia; and Karl R. Wallace, Head of the Department of Speech, University of Illinois, Urbana. This committee held a number of meetings in Columbia, Missouri, the meetings being attended by Professor Fisher, who took an active part in the deliberations. The members of the committee obtained advice from many sources but the principal consultants were: Hale Aarnes, Chairman, Department of Radio Education, Stephens College; Henry L. Ewbank, Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin; Grant Fairbanks, Editor, Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, Professor of Speech, University of Illinois; Barnard Hewitt, Editor, American Educational Theatre Journal, Professor of Speech and Theatre, University of Illinois; and Wesley Swanson, Professor of Speech and Theatre, University of Illinois.

The committee, headed by Dean McBurney, came to the view that the proper task was to write a program for speech education that would incorporate current responsible opinion concerning the place of forensic activities in the schools. Since Professor Fisher participated constantly in the deliberations of the Committee, the final committee report represented a consensus in which all concurred. Professor Fisher recommended to the Contest Committee that the report be submitted to the North Central Association. It was submitted by Dean McBurney and Professor Wallace at the meeting of the North Central Association held at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago on March 28, 1951, and was unanimously approved by the North Central Association.

We can readily understand that not every one of our members and affiliates would approve every item in the enclosed report, but we believe that all will agree that it represents a substantial improvement over the North Central statement of March, 1950, which it replaces in toto.

Respectfully submitted,

Bower Aly, Executive Secretary
Committee on Debate Materials
and Interstate Cooperation
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONTEST COMMITTEE
OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
WITH RESPECT TO SPEECH

As Prepared and Submitted to the

CONTEST COMMITTEE
by the

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
A PROGRAM OF SPEECH EDUCATION*

PART ONE: POINT OF VIEW

A speech teacher of ancient Rome once observed that God had distinguished man from all other creatures by no other means so powerfully as by the gift of speech. A modern novelist has declared that all life comes back to the question of our speech, the means by which we communicate with one another. If the observation of the ancient teacher and the modern novelist are sound—and most thoughtful persons agree that they are--then education for the effective use of speech is paramount for the individual and for his culture.

Speech education is determined by fundamental facts representing some of the contributions made by students of psychology, linguistics, sociology, political science, and communication, as well as by speech scientists. The basic facts are few; taken together they support a philosophy of

*In presenting this statement concerning speech education, the Speech Association of America is aware that in part the statement applies also to written communication. Taken as a whole, however, the statement stands for the special values that speech education can make to the personal and social development of youth in a democratic society whose vocational, professional, civic, and cultural values are realized in everyday communication through speaking and listening.
speech education.

II. The Basic Facts of Speech

1. Speech is learned, not inherited: Speech becomes so much second nature that men sometimes regard it as a physical inheritance like eyes or hands or feet. But every member of the human race has to acquire his speech; he brings none of it with him. A significant part of this tremendous feat of learning is accomplished by most people before the age of six, i.e., before school age.

2. Speech is complicated: Considering the hindrances to the creation and communication of a single thought, human beings may marvel that they understand each other even as well as they do. One reason for the complexity of speech is that no single organ of speech exists. The eye sees, the ear hears. What organ speaks? Not the tongue, for all the poet's metaphor. Not the lungs alone, nor the larynx, nor the brain, though all are involved. Speech is a secondary function of many organs, each of which has a more pressing vital function: the throat is used in speaking, but its chief function is swallowing; the lungs supply the column of air for speaking, but only as an incident to maintaining the breath of life; the ear has an important function in speech, but its primary obligation is to hear. In a sense, the whole human body is involved in every act of speech.
Language behavior is virtually equivalent to thinking behavior. Although language may be of different kinds—such as the language of mathematics and of music—the language of words is universal. Accordingly, whatever improves the use of language improves the individual's ability to think. Education is always interested in the development of thinking. One way to develop thinking is to develop speech. Through planned experience in speaking comes growth in thought and speech.

3. The act of speech is unified: Whereas the human being has certain senses for inward impression—such as sight, taste, touch, smell, and hearing—he has, in an overwhelming number of life situations, the single means of speech for outward expression.

The human being is most human when using language. Unlike other animals, man can use speech to point to objects and events not immediately present to him and to others; he can talk and reason about his past and plan for his future, and for such purposes he has developed a grammar, a rhetoric, and a logic. Education is always deeply concerned with humanity and with personal adjustments peculiar and proper to the human being. In seeking to develop effective use of speech, education is meeting man on his most human level, for speech and thought are so interdependent that no one is likely ever to make a clear distinction between them.
In the human and social sense the mind is made of language; and for nearly everyone the major language is the speech learned in childhood.

The requirements of speech vary in differing cultures: In the simple culture of rural America in 1850, personal anomalies of speech created relatively simple problems. The Illinois farmer in 1850, for example, probably did not require ten per cent as much speaking as most citizens of Chicago do today. If the farmer chanced to have an impediment in his speech, personal consequences might or might not have been unfortunate; but the social and vocational results were not highly significant. The geometric progression of complexities in modern life has magnified the importance of ready speech for every active member of our society and at the same time has placed heavy stresses upon the channels of communication. In a complex urban culture, the man who cannot speak well is often handicapped just as surely as the man who cannot hear well: often they are the same person. In a great city, a man who is ill in his speech may be just as unemployable as one who is deficient in vision.

Realizing all that is involved in the creation and communication of thought in our increasingly complex culture, responsible Americans should consider means of helping those persons whose physical basis for speech is inadequate
but perhaps remediable. In an era when every man counts, effectual measures should be taken to redeem the speech handicapped.

III. Speech and the Citizen

What of the great body of people whose speech is acceptable? What do they require of speech, and what is required of them?

The stresses of the times and the need for easy communication are present for those of normal speech just as they are for the handicapped. The grouping of people in cities, the developments in the technology of communication, the impact of the moving picture, radio, and television on American culture, and the necessities of modern production merely suggest the ways in which speech problems have multiplied. The problems of communication have not merely increased in number; they have developed to unprecedented intensity. With the coming of radio and television language has entered into a new age: speech has been given a fourth dimension whose potential can hardly be estimated. Apparently more people must talk and more must listen today than ever before, not only because there are more people but also because they have more problems—and because they live closer together. In the union hall, in the board meeting, and in the council chamber; in consultation, in conference,
and in negotiation; from the pulpit, from the platform, and from the radio and the television set talking goes on to one listener or a million. Arguments are developed, appeals are made, propaganda is insinuated into the minds and spirits of the people. How do they respond?

Communication makes possible group living; and speech, as the chief means of communication, is the universal instrument of social cooperation and coordination. From the most ordinary conversation to the most complex political discussion, speech is used more often and more widely than any other means of communication. The world of today is for most persons a speaking and listening world. It is a world, furthermore, that the great majority of youth must learn to live in without the privilege of higher education. Youth, then, must have mouths that speak and ears that hear. "Without speech I can exist," said the sage, "but I cannot live."

Speech appropriate to group living is characteristic of the individual who gets along well with others. Personality traits and attitudes seem to be most often revealed in speech, and significant development in speech is usually accompanied by significant gains in personality. Successful communication depends upon the understanding, respect, tolerance, and sympathy which speaker and hearer have for each other. Accordingly, certain attitudes should become inti-
mately associated with speech and speaking situations. They are the attitudes of helpfulness, cooperation, tolerance, inquiry, concession, admission, self-reliance, honesty, and conviction. Although some of these may appear more sharply in one speaking experience than in another, they are the attitudinal bases of informal speech and group discussion, of dramatics and the oral interpretation of literature, and of public speaking and debate. In speaking, as in any other learning experiences, such attitudes should be rewarded and reenforced, and anti-social attitudes, such as belligerence and egotism, should go unrewarded.

In a free society, the welfare of all the citizens depends ultimately upon public opinion. If they do not have the ability to form wise judgments on the basis of information and arguments presented to them, then the wise and the unwise will suffer together the consequences of their mutual failure to present and to comprehend wise courses of action. That men should be able rightly to conceive policies, effectively to communicate them, and readily to understand them is a matter of first importance.

If we are not to be deluded by the fraud that government by decree is safer than government by discussion and debate, then all our people must be made increasingly able to participate effectively in public affairs—in the union, in the church, in the corporation, in the legislative assem-
bly, and in the Congress. A citizenry able to differentiate between sound and fallacious reasoning, to distinguish between acceptable and shoddy evidence, to tell an honest speaker from a verbal swindler—this is the minimum essential for the survival of a free and responsible society in a chaotic world.

IV. Speech and the Leader

In The American Commonwealth Lord Bryce set forth the ideal that every citizen in a free country should be able to formulate his opinions on public policies and to defend those opinions with arguments. Bryce readily admitted that in practice perhaps not more than one voter in twenty is so ideally equipped. The nineteen lack the ability or the information to deal with the issues of the day; or they have become so engrossed with private affairs that they have no time for public business. But if the twentieth man has the time, the energy, and the ability to state the right propositions in the right way, the nineteen may be able to reach the right conclusions.

What is the usefulness of speech to the twentieth man, the leader in the enterprises of labor, industry, and government? The leader in any group not dependent immediately on force must employ the twin arts of discourse: discussion and debate. Discussion, chiefly a method of inquiry, is a way groups of people learn: it is a means of
discovering alternatives. Debate, chiefly a method of advocacy, is a way groups of people develop alternatives. As experience demonstrates, when the arts of discourse are corrupted, when the channels of communication are clogged, men resort to violence as the final arbiter. Doubtless that is one reason why the founders of the American Republic set so many safeguards around the right to speak and the correlative right to listen. For the right to make inquiry (i.e., to discuss) and the right to advocate one's convictions (i.e., to debate) are firmly fixed in the Constitution of the United States. The right to be heard by a jury is even older than the Constitution. At the heart of true citizenship in any organization--social, economic, or political--lies the right and obligation to utter in the most effective possible way what one believes to be true.

The twentieth man, the leader, must perforce accept the obligation with special care and purpose. Upon his ability to explain, to clarify, and advocate his judgments rests the welfare of his group and, in the long run, of his nation and his culture.

V. Speech and Schools

The functions of the arts of speech in a democracy have been set forth because their state is critical. A generation ago John Dewey declared the essential need of the day to be "the improvement of the methods and conditions of
debate, discussion, and persuasion." The situation has not changed for the better. Systematic instruction in speech is one of the oldest and most significant of the tasks entrusted by the American people to the schools. Indeed the relation between the schools and instruction in discussion, debate, and persuasion is much older even than America. The earliest schools known to the Occident dealt with a problem essentially similar to the one current today: How can we make boys and girls more useful when they talk? The consequences of the neglect of speech education can be observed in the lack of social intelligence. Unless we heed Dewey's injunction to improve the methods and conditions of debate, discussion, and persuasion, we may find ourselves lacking the basis for a tecnhoalogical or any other culture. We have long lived without atomic science. Whether we can live with it in the dignity of freedom depends in large measure on our ability to solve our problems through the intelligent use of the spoken word.

Discussion and debate serve democracy, and in turn democracy preserves and fosters personal integrity that springs from freedom of speech. The interaction of discussion and freedom of speech preserves personal integrity--personal conviction. In our society any speaker is free to declare, in effect, "I am saying what I believe in the way that I think best for the good of all who hear me." In a
tyrannical society, he must say, in effect, "I am saying what I am told to say in a way approved by the Dictator for his benefit." The difference between these two statements marks the difference between personal integrity and the lack of it. To encourage and preserve discussion and debate as we know them is to preserve freedom of speech. To preserve freedom of speech is to preserve integrity in all social relationships in which communication makes a difference.

PART TWO: SPEECH AND GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS

In keeping with the values and goals of speech education expressed above, school programs should give all pupils opportunities to improve their speech through guided experience. The essential speech activities are part of a common learnings program. They are the universal means through which basic information is acquired and social adjustments made both in and beyond the school. Through them personal relationships are facilitated or hindered; through them individuals and groups seek understanding, decision, and action.

I. Tests of Speech and Hearing

1. Speaking: Since difficulties in voice and articulation impede communication and are sometimes associated with social maladjustment, every pupil should know whether his voice and articulation are adequate.
If his speech does not meet minimum standards, he is entitled to counsel and aid.

Although judgments and informal tests can be made by any teacher of speech, diagnosis and training in remedial speech should be undertaken by or under the guidance of a qualified speech correctionist. In cooperation with medical and counseling services available in the school and community, the correctionist can undertake adequate diagnosis and prescribe proper therapy. The correctionist can often help pupils individually, and can sometimes aid other teachers to facilitate speech improvement in group situations. An increasing number of states have standards of certification for speech correction teachers. In addition, the American Speech and Hearing Association certifies the clinical competence of its members and carries on studies designed to improve the standards and education of speech clinicians.

2. Hearing: Since the ear guides the act of speaking, every student should know whether his hearing is normal; one who has a hearing loss damaging to the perception of his speech and that of others is entitled to appropriate help. Such diagnosis and help should require the cooperative services of medical and speech specialists. Simple hearing tests, such as large-
scale screening tests required in many states, can locate pupils who need the attention and treatment of specialists. In many schools hearing is tested during the regular physical examination.

II. Speech and Learning Situations

1. General Observations: Speech is learned, not instinctive, behavior. Acquiring speech through trial-and-error and imitative methods in early life, most young people upon entrance to high school can communicate well enough to "get along" with their fellows. But if their speech is to develop appreciably beyond the minimum level, the guidance of good teachers is essential.

In the general curriculum the method of teaching may consist chiefly of planned experiences in which the practical speaking is emphasized and the knowledge of principles is subordinated, though not omitted.

Speaking experiences should be planned (a) to meet the needs of the pupil who may never have the opportunity to take a formal course in speech, and (b) to meet the social, political, and economic needs of the individual in a democratic society.

Experiences may be developed effectively within a core curriculum; invariably they should be adapted to
the plan of general education in the school. Workable and progressive patterns of speaking experiences have proved valuable in general courses devoted to written and oral communication, general science, social science and the language arts. Successful integration of speaking and listening with such courses requires the knowledge of a person trained in speech, who may function as a counselor and planner and often as participating teacher.

2. Kinds of Experience in Speech: The kinds of experiences recommended can best be suggested by reference to their immediate ends: (a) to make inquiry and to disclose information; (b) to ascertain the truth and advocate it; (c) to understand literature and interpret it; (d) to know the drama and participate in it; (e) to evaluate the dynamic powers of radio, television, and the motion picture, and to respond intelligently to them.

For each of the speaking experiences a correlative listening experience exists which is not less important than speaking. The student who would obtain and disclose information must be willing to hear it. Anyone who would advocate should also listen. Whoever would interpret literature should be able to enjoy its presentation by others. Those who would really know
the drama must be able to observe as well as act. Meaningful radio and television programs require the cooperation of the listener.

(a) To make inquiry and disclose information: Experiences in making inquiry and disclosing information can be found in interviews; introductions; reports; explanations of basic concepts (such as occur in economics, civics, science, literature, history); explanation of processes (how something is done or made, how a simple mechanism works, how a society or club operates, how bodily processes function, etc.); explanation of the causes of a social movement or phenomenon; conferences; biographic sketches; reading aloud of informative materials; job and vocational requirements.

Such endeavors in the school program encourage the gathering of information from persons, reading and observation; habits of clear organization and presentation; building of a functional vocabulary; the experience of direct, two-way communication with an audience of one's peers; the satisfaction of making useful contributions to others; listening with accuracy.

(b) To ascertain the truth and advocate it: Experi-
ence in discussion can be designed (1) to examine problems that spring out of general education materials and processes, and (2) to produce, express, explain, and support opinions, to develop a feeling for the attitudes necessary to making admissions, concessions, and compromises in order to reach group agreement, and to provide experiences as participants and as leaders. Such discussion should help to build the attitudes essential for effective participation in democratic processes, to afford training in how to take part in and conduct meetings, to follow the path of give-and-take talk, to arrive at the issues of a problem and to clarify them, to evaluate on-the-spot evidence and facts, and to develop respect for straight argument and logical reasoning.

Experiences in advocacy can be found in the organization and management of clubs, in the practice of parliamentary law, in the discussion of controversial issues, in the debating of live propositions, and in the extemporaneous, persuasive speech prompted by the problems growing out of general education courses and out of a speaker's conviction that he has a position to recommend to his hearers for acceptance.
Persuasive speaking holds certain personal and social values not directly associated with informative speaking: sense of public responsibility for one's views on controversial questions; personal integrity and confidence that springs from conviction and the successful presentation of the grounds of conviction.

(c) To understand literature and interpret it: Experiences in understanding literature and interpreting it can be provided only through good literature whose full meaning requires oral expression. The reading of prose and poetry aloud encourages full mental and emotional responsiveness to written symbols. Close and accurate observation of printed matter enlarges the spoken vocabulary and illustrates the satisfaction derived from communication which gives pleasure to others.

(d) To know the drama and interpret it: Experiences can consist of original dramatizations of significant events dealt with in the general curriculum and of productions of standard plays which in whole or in part are adapted to the content and activities of the general curriculum. Creating and playing roles develops insight into human
emotional and aesthetic values; the foundation is laid for the appreciation of the cultural contributions of the theater and dramatic literature.

(e) To evaluate the dynamic powers of radio, television, and the motion picture, and to respond intelligently to them: Experiences in radio listening and in evaluating of program content can be provided in almost any classroom; many classrooms can provide experiences in television. As a motivating force in a speech program and as a means of providing further insight into radio and television, programs can be developed; if other facilities are not available, a room-to-room or public address system broadcast can be used. Although few schools can afford to make motion pictures, many schools use educational films. These, and the professional entertainment films, can be employed to study the film, as an art and a means of mass communication, with attention to production methods and social effects.

PART THREE: SPEECH IN SPECIALIZED EDUCATION

Beyond the learnings in speech essential to all students, schools should provide additional opportunities to challenge those who may have special interests and aptitudes,
to train those who may take leadership roles, and to serve
those who realize that speech is essential to their voca-
tional and professional activities.

In specialized education instruction in speech be-
comes more systematic and intensive than is possible in gen-
eral education. Teaching, therefore, centers on two main
purposes: (a) understanding of the principles, causes and
conditions which promote success in speaking effectively,
and (b) guided experience marked by direct application of
principles to practice. These purposes are achieved both by
courses in speech in the school curriculum and through high
level experience in school activities outside the classroom.

I. In the School Curriculum

The diversity of educational activities and the resources
of schools determine the kind and extent of instruction.
Nevertheless, the essentials of a sound minimum program
may be suggested in the following central topics:

1. Fundamentals: How speech sounds are made, care and
   improvement of the voice, the essentials of distinct
   utterance and acceptable pronunciation, poise and
   self-management, personality and speech.

2. Reading Aloud: The application of principles to a
   variety of materials and activities, including choral
   and group reading.

3. Discussion: Its values, aims, and chief forms, in-
cluding procedure adapted to the conference and committee.

4. Debate: Its aims, methods, and practices, including its relation to discussion, to parliamentary law, and to the functioning of our society.

5. Public Speaking: Its aims, methods, and chief forms.

6. Drama and Theater: The qualities of a good play, the conditions and requirements for producing the play, the social and personal values of play participation, acting and role-playing, representative plays, and the creation of one's own play.

7. Radio, Television, and Motion Picture: The qualities of an effective broadcast, the differences between radio and television, the demands of radio and television on the speaker and listener, and the functioning of radio and television in our culture; the purposes, chief production methods and techniques, and the social effects of the motion picture.

The requirements of the radio medium can be met by the adaptation of the materials and experiences included within each topic.

In practice the seven topics appear in high school courses in various combinations:

(a) A two-semester course, frequently called Fundamentals of Speech or Oral Communication, during
the Junior year and dealing with all seven topics.

(b) A two-semester course devoted to fundamentals, discussion, debate and public speaking, and a semester course devoted to reading aloud and drama and theater.

(c) A semester course centering on fundamentals and reading aloud, a semester course on discussion, debate and public speaking, and a semester course on drama and theater.

(d) A semester course dealing with discussion, debate and public speaking, with some attention to fundamentals and reading aloud.

(e) A semester course dealing with the personal and social implications of radio, television, and the moving picture.

The number and character of the special courses must extend and complement the experiences in speech provided in the general education offerings of the school.

The educational record of the teacher who develops and participates in the speech program should disclose specialized college or university training in the seven topics above. If speech is the major teaching subject the teacher may have emphasized (1) oral reading, theater and drama, or (2) public speaking, discussion and debate, or (3) radio and television; nevertheless, the teacher will have
had supporting courses in all areas of speech. In semester hours the record will show 20-26. If speech is the second teaching subject, the teacher will have had at least one course in each area of speech; in terms of semester hours the teacher's record will show 16-20.

Equipment and Supplies. For the proper testing of speech and hearing an audiometer is essential; a machine for recording speech is standard equipment. The speech correction teacher requires tests and materials for examination and retraining procedures.

Play production is most readily carried on with modern theater facilities, but where a stage and auditorium are not available much can be accomplished with adequate space and seating arrangements and with minimum materials for scene construction and lighting. Adequate time and space for rehearsal and for scene construction are the great essentials.

The classroom ordinarily affords satisfactory surroundings for most experiences in discussion and speech-making. Arranging seats to permit face-to-face talk facilitates discussion.

An adequate debate program is absolutely dependent on ready access to a good library or to the latest books or articles on the proposition debated.

A good program in radio, television, and the mass
media requires a motion picture projector, a tape recorder, a microphone, a radio, and (when practical) a TV receiver. Much can be done with radio speaking if a public address system is available and if acoustics are reasonably good. The large school may desire a radio studio to permit preparation for occasional broadcast programs. If programs are to be transcribed for later presentation, recording equipment of good quality should be available.

II. In Extra-curricular Activities

The chief educational goal of extra-class and interscholastic activities in speech must be clearly comprehended. Such activities give the pupil of special aptitude an opportunity for more intensive and extended experience than is possible either in formal courses or in the general education program. In the small school they provide the only training in speech.

Principals and teachers therefore should treat the interscholastic speech activities as having educational values identical with those that govern classroom instruction in speech. Accordingly, these recommendations are offered:

1. That extra-class events be regarded as the counterpart of the curricular instruction.
2. That extra-class events be integrated as closely as possible with class instruction.
3. That extra-class speech activities be taught by a person whose qualifications are in every sense equal to those of persons teaching speech in courses.

4. That the person teaching speech activities be given every right and privilege of other teachers, including the right to have the extra-class teaching counted in the teacher load.

Standards in extra-class instruction in speech cannot be maintained unless teachers and administrators conscientiously observe these recommendations. Even the most highly qualified teacher of speech activities requires time and energy for them. Speech events guided by a teacher of inadequate and narrow preparation or by one whose burden of duties permits only superficial last-minute preparation cannot well be expected to develop or continue an adequate speech program.

The wise principal and the qualified teacher, furthermore, should be mindful of the standards, forms, and regulations in speech activities which are determined and administered by state or national associations. The North Central Association and the Speech Association of America recommend that all groups which sponsor and administer speech contests keep in close touch with each other; that they seek advice and counsel of teachers of speech through their state and national organizations with a view to
constant improvement of the speech events they administer. Such associations are concerned with the number and kinds of activities, the length of the season in each event, the encouragement of broad local participation, the educational goals of activities, criteria for the evaluation of events, the choice of qualified critic judges and observers, and the schedules. The responsible agencies do not seek to legislate uniformity in these matters; rather they make it possible and convenient that students and teachers, meeting together on an interscholastic basis, may gain much from mutual observation, evaluation, and comment on common enterprises in speech.

Recognizing that interscholastic speech contests tend to become institutionalized and slow to change to meet modern social conditions, and believing that schools and teachers everywhere would be helped in their efforts to improve contests, the NCA and the SAA join in making the following recommendations:

1. Keeping the educational values of speech in today's society in mind, teachers and administrators should evaluate the aims, methods, and procedures of speech activities as they now exist. Although the names and forms of activities vary considerably, the following titles are widely used: public speaking, oratory, radio speaking, debate, dramatics, oratorical decla-
mation, humorous reading, dramatic declamation, prose reading, verse speaking, choral reading. Are all these events as appropriate today as they may have been 20 years ago? Does declamation (the memorized reading), for example, find a place among communicative situations today?

2. In events devoted to the oral reading of prose and poetry for appreciation and pleasure, reading from the page rather than speaking from memory should be encouraged. Some experiences in sight reading should be offered.

3. An event devoted to and emphasizing group discussion would appear to be highly desirable. Such an event should be genuinely motivated toward the acquiring of understanding and technique in committee and conference procedures as well as in discussion as an enterprise in group learning.

4. The teaching of debating should be extended to include in addition to the traditional forms, other procedures, especially those of the legislative type. The Moot Court, the Debaters Assembly, and the Student Congress all provide useful and possibly interesting variants from standard forms and all seem well designed to meet the essential purpose of scholastic debate, i.e., the teaching of advocacy. In all school
debates greater emphasis should be placed on the speakers' talking to an audience. Possibly desirable or necessary as an exercise or as a rehearsal, tournament debating in an empty room can not be justified as an end in itself. Does not every student of debating have the right to speak before a genuine audience at least as often as he speaks in a tournament rehearsal?

5. Events concerned with public speaking should emphasize extemporaneous speaking, i.e., the original speech which is carefully prepared but whose language is not memorized word-for-word. An event might be the panel-forum and any event could well require questions from the audience.

6. Activities planned to provide experiences in radio and television should include speaking, acting, writing, and producing, as well as listening. The planning and management of broadcasts are useful not only as a method of mastering of techniques but also as a motivating factor in learning essential principles of speech and as a means of developing intelligent listening.

7. In dramatic contests, good plays should be chosen to meet the needs of students, school, and community. The stock contest piece is too often undertaken merely because it has been a "winner."
8. The types of awards, the method of awarding them, and the manner of presenting them should be carefully examined with a view to their educational and psychological implications. To encourage the proper response, interscholastic meetings might well be called festivals or conferences rather than contests. The students' work may well be evaluated by the use of general categories such as superior, good, average. Contestants should have the opportunity to learn the bases of the judge's or critic's evaluation of their work. Interscholastic meetings will attain their greatest value when participants and teachers ask first, "How can we improve?" not "Who won?"

Extra-class occasions for speaking should be as real and as meaningful as possible. In speaking, discussion, and debate, subjects and problems can often be in tune with the interests of the school and the community. Opportunities are afforded by the school assembly, clubs, the school council, class meetings, and the like; civic groups often welcome students who are prepared to offer them something of interest. Plays, and scenes from plays, can be chosen not only for their entertainment values but for their insight into basic human problems, character, and behavior.