

PRE-CONVENTION PROGRAM
PI KAPPA DELTA CONFERENCE ON
FORENSICS, DEBATE, AND ARGUMENTATION
April 1, 1981, 12:00 Noon, River Terrace Motel
Gatlinburg, Tennessee

Conference Coordinator Larry Richardson has designed a pre-convention program which provides for scholarly presentations in three areas, a workshop in parliamentary debate, and a seminar on Cross Examination Debate Association debate.

CALL FOR PAPERS:

Faculty members and other members of PKD are invited to submit papers in one or more of three areas:

1. Submitted papers in Argumentation and Debate.
2. Submitted papers in Individual Contest Speaking and Non-Traditional Debate.
3. Submitted papers in the Teaching of Speech Activities and/or the Administration of Speech Activities.

Papers should be submitted by March 1, 1981, to:

Larry S. Richardson, Conference Coordinator
Department of Speech
Western Washington University
Bellingham, Washington 98225

Richardson has formed a committee to evaluate the papers. Papers of sound quality will be accepted for presentation. If the number of quality papers is larger than will permit presentation of all of them, those whose papers are not presented will be invited to distribute copies. All papers submitted must follow the Modern Language Association style requirements.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE:

Any student member of Pi Kappa Delta present for the Convention may participate in the Workshop in Parliamentary Debate. Complete details will be made available at the workshop. The basic pattern includes these functions:

1. The topic for consideration will be announced when the session opens and will be selected from an area of current concern.
2. Students will be organized into interest groups.
3. Groups will caucus to develop positions and establish speaking orders.
4. The parliamentary session will be called to order and debate will begin.

SEMINAR ON CEDA DEBATE:

A group of experts active in the Cross Examination Debate Association will present a two-hour program and forum. They will identify the unique features of CEDA debate.

A PROGRAM WITH COMPLETE DETAILS WILL BE AVAILABLE AT CONVENTION REGISTRATION.

Points of View . . .

A Response to a Voice Crying in the Wilderness

In response to a barrage of hostile criticism against his administration Harry S. Truman responded, "If you can't stand the heat get out of the kitchen." In light of the ever increasing amount of UNSOLICITED criticism against NDT debate and debaters, supporters and participants of NDT should adopt Truman's statement as their rallying point for the 1980's. What we previously thought were the growing pains of a wayward adolescent attempting to reach maturity has turned out to be a serious attempt by "them" to draw our attention to our own shortcomings. We had hoped that "taking their ball and going home" would have placated these well intentioned critics, but as Cheryl Smith's article in the Fall issue of THE FORENSIC indicates they seem to be far less than satisfied not only with NDT debate, but with their own self-styled alternative as well. In our opinion NDT supporters are tired of "taking it on the chin." We have turned the other cheek so many times that academic whiplash seems a real possibility. We think a response to our critics "crying in the wilderness" is long over-

Editor's note: Two of the "Points of View" presented in this issue respond to Cheryl Smith's statement from the Fall 1980 issue of **The Forensic**. The other is an article critical of practices seen by the author in collegiate debate. We do wish to provide "equal time" to anyone interested in this issue.

The Spring issue will focus on research. We would welcome your points of view on research in debate and individual speech events. Some of you may also wish to provide ideas on tournament and convention practices of Pi Kappa Delta. One area of concern is the possible use of trophies at the PKD National Convention-Tournament. These are suggestions. We will consider your points of view on any issue of concern to the forensic community.

due and herein attempt to rectify the situation.

We do not intend for this response to be a personal attack against Ms. Smith. We do however intend to respond to her comments, criticisms, and suggestions, all of which are representative of the current hostility directed towards NDT debate. We further recognize that such "debates about debate" are intrinsically valuable if the activity as a whole is to grow in both quality and quantity. And finally we recognize and acknowledge that "their" comments, no matter how misguided they may be, are well intended, for they come from a sincere commitment to see the activity of debate remain a viable academic exercise.

If such "debates about debate" are to occur we suggest a few rules for the contest. RULE ONE: If you don't play the game you don't make the rules or it is better to give criticism than to receive it. Throughout history it has been fashionable for exiles to criticize their native land. We find a remarkable parallel to CEDA proponents. Even though they are exiles by choice they seem to derive a sadistic pleasure from criticizing NDT debate and debaters. One sees little in print criticizing CEDA, perhaps because no one is quite sure whether CEDA is animal, vegetable, or mineral. It is one thing for proponents and participants of NDT to criticize the activity; quite another for "outsiders" to do so. By the very nature of their choice CEDA advocates have chosen an alternative to NDT debate. We are amazed that for some reasons they are not content with their version of the activity, but persist with evangelical fervor to

show us the way. The most rational approach to reform rests with allowing those who participate in an activity to improve it. One would not give much credence to advocates of "tag football" drafting or suggesting reforms to the National Football League. If CEDA truly is an alternative to NDT debate it must by its nature be different. Such differences would seem to preclude one from criticizing the other and vice versa.

RULE TWO: You don't compare apples and oranges unless you work in a grocery store. Assuming that CEDA is an alternative to NDT debate we find it difficult to see how people can compare the two. By definition they are different activities which share a common goal, education, but which advocate two practically and philosophically divergent processes for achieving it. The prescription of a uniform set of standards for participation in the activities would destroy any uniqueness each has. It seems more rational to recognize that each activity is unique, that each is an alternative to the other, and more importantly that they are not mutually exclusive. We know of a number of programs that offer students an opportunity to choose between experiences in CEDA, NDT, or CEDA and NDT. In our opinion it is not a question of right or wrong; better or worse; legitimate or illegitimate, but one of personal preference for coaches and students. We suggest that it is healthy to recognize the differences between the two approaches, encourage them, and afford both coaches and debaters a choice. NDT proponents are not preoccupied with reforming CEDA debate. Why should CEDA proponents be so preoccupied with reforming NDT debate? As far as we are concerned such diversity is healthy for the activity. To each his own, but quit try-

ing to take ours away from us!

RULE THREE: People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones or tag you're it. For some unknown reason CEDA proponents are of the opinion that NDT has a monopoly on mediocrity. It is very easy to criticize an activity if one finds the worst practitioners of the activity and then points a self-righteous finger at them. We have had the "pleasure" of judging a number of CEDA debates that rival in mediocrity anything that NDT has to offer. On the other hand we have heard some pretty mediocre NDT debates as well. We used to think that the only thing CEDA was good for was having someone to give the old files to. Fortunately our faith in the activity has been renewed, however infrequently, by hearing a few good CEDA debates. BAD CEDA debaters replace analysis with smiles, plan attacks with indignant denials, evidence with assertions, and engage in all of the behaviors that BAD NDT debaters are accused of. However, the GOOD CEDA debaters do not, just as GOOD NDT debaters do not. Any debater, CEDA or NDT, should be able to draw the distinction between reasonability and insanity. We find it remarkable that our critics cannot do the same. It would seem to us that our standards for judgement ought to be the BEST that each activity has to offer.

Ms. Smith argues that CEDA has two unique "advantages" over NDT in that 1) the CEDA topic doesn't come until late October, and 2) CEDA encouraged the use of lay judges. We suggest that at best they are differences NOT advantages per se, and that Ms. Smith's word choice implies that one is superior to the other. We have dealt with that previously. Although we do agree that CEDA topic does not come out until late October, we would draw Ms. Smith's attention to the fact the CEDA will be

changing their topic in mid-season since many schools have engaged in the terrible practice of acquiring evidence to support what they say. With this reasoning dominating CEDA theorists, we look forward to the day when they change their topics weekly.

She further indicates that this has resulted in "... some decrease in the rate of speaking, less reliance on evidence, and a decrease in the number of separate arguments with increased clarification by debaters..." It seems interesting that this is exactly what we advise our NDT debaters to do. These "results" are not uniquely CEDA in nature, they are unique to good argumentative processes. Whether or not "lay judges" encourage effective delivery style depends on what your definition of effective delivery is. If you mean that argumentation ought to be geared to the "common man" who walks off the streets and into a debate round, yes. If you mean that delivery ought to be geared to the "grandmothers" of debate, yes. If you mean that we ought to discourage audience adaption by requiring debaters to assume that all of their audiences, both in debate and in the real world, are "lay" audiences, yes. However, we are of the opinion that this perspective alone unduly limits the potential of debate as a learning process.

Ms. Smith is upset because she feels that NDT debate represents a loss of "human to human persuasion" and is therefore unrealistic in that it is not real world debate. Thank God! Debate offers students the opportunity to participate in an activity where mistakes are not punished as they are in the real world. Besides, why should the "not real world" argument bother educators in the first place? Tests (a relatively accepted academic tool)

are also "non real world" both in the way they challenge a person and in the material they use for the challenge. The point is that both NDT debate and testing put the student under pressure to carefully scrutinize his/her position and ideas. We believe that the benefits of this scrutiny are reaped before and even without success in the actual event—test or round of debate.

In addition, "real world persuasion" is not necessarily something to be encouraged in an academic environment. Real world persuasion involves mass audience with a variety of views and needs. (Even CEDA uses a single judge. Ah, the sin of specialized intent!). This results in politicians who use ambiguity and emotional appeals as persuasive tools at the expense of a well-reasoned, evidenced, and logical approach. Why can't NDT debate encourage participants to focus on perfecting tools like analysis, critical thought, performance under pressure, concise wording and in-depth research? It remains to be demonstrated that "real world" persuasive skills are not formed using this format but even if they are not, why is that an indictment of the NDT system?

Further, if "real world" is to be our standard we should compare NDT and CEDA by scanning the entirety of both processes. Remember, it is only the end step of the process that is the actual delivery of material in a round. Any public advocate will admit that "hours" of preparation are required for "moments" of successful presentation. On complex issues (foreign policy, the economy, consumer safety and rights) the more time spent in background work the better the chances of developing a workable and correct policy. Do we discourage careful and

complete preparation on the part of our public policy makers when they are dealing with the issues that affect us all? Do we "spring" the topic for debate on them at the last possible minute and then threaten to change it as soon as a reasonable level of knowledge and competence is demonstrated?

Ms. Smith claims that the preparation results in analysis that is merely "pointless jest." Does this mean that arguments and ideas should be discouraged (and even prejudged) because they are not in the mainstream of opinion? The example she provides of melting icecaps is a case in point. Why cannot the possibility, which was suggested by experts in the field based on their research, be explored and evaluated? If it is silly, it is voted against; but we cannot know it is silly before we hear the evidence. Exploring possibilities that are reasonable or seemingly unreasonable is a function of being human. Why discourage it in NDT debate?

Finally, we wish to address the issue of skills transfer. Do NDT debaters gain from their experience? Reason tells us that research skills and critical thought preceeding rounds, concise phrasing and ability to respond under pressure during the rounds, and self/position scrutiny after rounds will all transfer their respective effects to later life. In addition, observations show that event the persuasive delivery skills transfer. Contrary to Ms. Smith's statement (NDT debate only trains future coaches and judges) there is not an excess of past debaters floating idly in unemployment lines. Rather, every NDT school has its own list of debaters currently pursuing successful and diverse careers. The implicit assumption that NDT debaters can only speak at high speed in heavi-

ly jargoned phrases is empirically denied by this. How do "machines with voice boxes shouting into a dictaphone" (see Smith's article) ever get such positions of responsibility and authority? The answer is simple—persuasive skills are learned that do not readily meet the eye.

In the final analysis we hope the CEDA proponents will bury their hatchets once and for all in something other than NDT debate. We are convinced that if they would spend as much time improving their activity, as they do in criticizing ours, that debate as an academic exercise would be greatly improved. Such UNSOLICITED criticism, although well intended, does more disservice to the activity than it does service. It assumes that one is better than the other, and places them at competing ends of a continuum. We suggest that CEDA is different, not better or worse. It is an alternative to NDT debate, nothing more or less. Unfortunately we are not likely to hear less from our "opponents" but more; for like Banquo's ghost they will not down.

John S. Bourhis

John O. Burtis

Concordia College at Moorhead, MN

Down with Motor-Mouth and Spread

I am sure that I am not the first to voice this ardent opposition to current debating style, nor shall I be last to do so. But since I have moved from the high school to the college debate circuit I find the situation swiftly declining. I refer specifically to the disgusting situation that allows, nay, even promotes incom-

prehensible speed and incoherent super substructure. I want to go on record along with what I believe to be a large silent majority of seething and disgusted coaches who oppose this insanity. I oppose this style of absurdity for several reasons.

First, it simply promotes bad communication. When this attempt for the speed of light is approached by a debator, he cannot communicate with any audience except perhaps a group of auctioneers. People rather than computers cannot keep up with, let alone understand, words at this insane speed. It seems to me that to speak at this rate is merely an attempt by very insecure and unconfident people who are trying to confuse their opponents, forgetting that the judge may also be confused.

Second, by allowing, and worse of all promoting, this style, we do not in any real sense teach practical, realistic abilities and concepts. Except for an auctioneer, there is **no** vocational situation in which excessive speed of near incomprehensibility is found. Lawyers, preachers, teachers, doctors, and businessmen do not use such delivery. Real persuasive communication, using all of the proper techniques that all of us teach in basic speech classes, is what works and is of value to the real world. What happened to debate that used—as the rule not the exception—sound, intelligent, understandable, simply organized, sensible, and believable speeches. They are still there. We just allow them to lose or be passed aside in favor of the other style of slop.

Third, we as coaches **and** as teachers (which some of us may have forgotten intentionally or unintentionally that we are) who allow this excessive speed and substructured organization and logic really teach our students very bad habits.

We allow our students to treat au-

diences as if they were computers with plug-in terminals rather than intelligent thinking humans with ears.

We allow our students to rely upon intimidation rather than rational thinking when through speed and volume they impress upon the audience that failure to understand and to "flow" the arguments results from incompetence or ignorance.

As a time proven rule, fast thinking usually leads to faulty reasoning: there is not adequate time to clearly think out an idea. This usually leads to the dreaded but common disease—foot in mouth.

Too much of each debate becomes reading prepared briefs by both sides that very seldom relate and pertain to each other in any manner. Thus we end up with two teams arguing over two completely unrelated aspects of the resolution with no relevance to each other. No wonder we constantly keep hearing that "they never answered or refuted these attacks."

Lastly we teach very bad speaking habits. Poor posture occurs when debaters lean over the podium in an awkward position to yell at their flow sheet. Because of superspeed and motor mouth, stumbling and slurred articulation occur in most debaters. Monotone pitches prevail. There is none of the pleasant variety which make speech interesting. Gestures are limited and repetitive and there is little eye contact with the audience. When there is eye contact, there appears to be a refusal or inability to react and adapt to audience feedback. And childlike attitudes of sarcasm, ranting and raving, jumping up and down, dancing the two-step and other very pathetic things abound.

By allowing, and in some sad situations promoting, these types of situations and actions, we really teach incomprehensible oral reading

which has no practical, realistic value. We do our students a great injustice and disservice by warping them into a false sense of "victory" that is really just downright gross bad habits and attitudes. I know that there will be some through the country who will disagree with me, perhaps even call me ridiculously old fashioned. True, I don't have a Ph.D. in debate with twenty-five years of number-one debate teams at nationals. I am a person who still believes that we are still first and foremost educators as well as coaches. I am a person who still believes that there is no place for the Vince Lombardi's philosophy of "winning is the only thing" in educational debate contests. Isn't it time for all of us of like mind to stand up and refuse to allow motor mouth and incoherent spread to continue? If you agree with this stance, then please don't flow that point across, or pull that card down. Demand as a judge and coach that we return to the sane days of persuasive communication before it's too late.

Mike McCullars
Southwest Baptist College

Debate: The Game Is Up To Us

Cheryl Smith's point of view as expressed in "Debate: The Game Is Up For Me" is clearly a first affirmative constructive that deserves a first negative response. It is somewhat unclear just whom Smith is referring to when she indicts N.D.T. debaters. If she is referring to all of those who debate the national topic—which we assume she is—then her article is upsetting. We within the N.D.T. camp, whatever that may be, are apparently "inherently corrupt," in-

capable of reform, and deserve to be abandoned. We differ in opinion quite strongly. Our reasons are two-fold. First, Miss Smith attempts to lump together the practices of all N.D.T. debaters. Secondly, Smith is not complete in describing what is—and what has the potential for being—persuasive. Following the accepted practice of many first negatives, we will follow her structure as offered.

One observation should be made. Smith takes the position that persuasion is **the** end of debate in the inter-collegiate arena. While persuasion is important, the fundamental goal of debate is to arrive at probable truth. The distinction here is obvious. Rhetoric, traditionally defined, uses all of the available means of persuasion, and Smith agrees that the goal of debate is found within its rhetorical value. If Smith hopes to find absolute truth, she is bound to be frustrated.

Persuasion of uninformed audiences is not the debater's sole purpose. Debate is geared to discovering the best decision in viewing the resolution. One value of debate can be found in assessing the probable truth of a particular resolution. Let us view argument as one important element in the available means of persuasion. Let us further hold that the rhetorical value of debate is in persuading those who are present to accept the probable truth or falsehood of the resolution. These considerations provide an interesting contrast to Smith's view of debate as persuasion. An argument, properly tested, which results in the best decision in a debate can easily become the property of those who shared in the decision. After being tested in a debate, the argument may become the basis for persuasion in the larger public. We submit that the goal of debate is not persuasion

alone, but also a thorough analysis of arguments centered on the resolution. The "best" logical argument in a debate may not be the one that wins elections, sells cars, or sways juries. We would not feel qualified to dispute the Christianity example.

This overview should clarify our position that debate, properly viewed, is geared to the best decision, based on adequate argument. Ideally, though impractically, this is an all-win situation. The best decision is a win, knowledge on the part of the opposing team is a win, and knowledge on the part of the critic is a win. Since this overview offers an immodest view of debate, we will now address the specific contention structure.

In contention one, we are told that the delivery found in N.D.T. debate is reprehensible. Apparently, it is Smith's contention that the speed employed by many debaters makes them incomprehensible. We would argue two separate things at this point. First, speed may or may not be linked to incomprehensibility. Samovar and Mills provide evidence that we speak at an average of 125-130 words per minute and that our minds are able to cope with approximately 400 words per minute.¹ This figure is important. Even if, for example, a good, fast debater can speak at 300 words per minute, a normal auditor could comprehend if speed were the only offending variable. Secondly, incomprehensibility can result despite the level of speed. A slow, halting, inarticulate delivery with improper pronunciation will be incomprehensible, as will delivery with the same problems which is excessively fast. Neither is particularly persuasive, and by muddling the content of an argument, a best decision is difficult. Thus we would conclude that listening to a debater who speaks rapidly is not a

barrier in and of itself. To make such a claim denies common sense. In addition, other delivery affectations mentioned by Smith seem to be those things which surround the utterances themselves and perhaps can be effectively ignored by a listener concentrating on the content of the message in order to test the argument.

In her second contention, Miss Smith asserts that the reasoning ability may be scared out of an opponent by tactics involving filing systems. We will simply assert that the arguer who is adversely affected by such nonsense is unprepared to reason well under any circumstances. We refuse to apologize for our past behavior of lugging "five catalog cases, 14 file boxes, two briefcases, etc." It is the ultimate goal of this research to provide a more reasoned and informed discourse—and we assert that it does. This tendency hardly deserves ridicule. Deserving of ridicule are those who argue from ignorance and claim that it is the researched ones who are detracting from the goals of debate. We will make one further comment. Miss Smith is apparently concerned with what constitutes "real" evidence. In her opinion there is only enough to fill two vest pockets. True, perhaps, if one is speaking of rather large pockets. The last time that we checked our library, however, there seemed to be a plethora of information relating to this year's debate topic. Some of us would appreciate an attempt by Miss Smith to define her terms. Ambiguity provides a nice cover, but hardly a substantive argument.

Contention number three bemoans the loss of reason in debate for the use of blurb quotes from "quasi-qualified" sources. First, Miss Smith grossly mislabels this contention style. For someone so interested

in rhetoric, we would remind her that style concerns language use. Perhaps she could refresh her memory on what constitutes style by re-reading George Campbell's **The Philosophy of Rhetoric**. Regardless, Miss Smith seems to find reasoning and the use of evidence exclusive in practice. We have already mentioned our disdain for those who argue from ignorance and will not repeat the argument here. However, the claim that the evidence is procured from quasi-qualified sources is without merit. Somehow, the various sources that are being used for this year's topic—e.g., Pentagon studies, C.I.A. studies, the North Atlantic Council, the London Institute for International Studies, etc.—do not strike us as quasi-qualified. The blurbs that she refers to are generally used by those who rely excessively on handbook material rather than initiating original research. These folks probably deserve a scolding. However, we have witnessed few final rounds being won by people using the type of evidence that Miss Smith claims is prevalent. Regardless, the assumption that logical proof can be attained without evidence, or that somehow reasoning and evidence are exclusive of each other, is incredibly ill-thought. If we are preparing our debaters for what Smith calls the "real world," then we tremble in fear at the thought of debaters turned congressmen proposing legislation without having done their research. As Toulmin would most likely note, if we interpret reasoning as drawing conclusions, evidence and reasoning are inseparable. To reason a claim, an argumentative conclusion, one must base the claim on some data or information.² Thus, in summary, the information is part of the claim—arguing the merits of evidence is another avenue of

testing the argument, but at this point Miss Smith ignores that possibility.

Having examined the "rules" of the game, and having attempted to clearly illuminate what a proper but not completely refutative interpretation of the rules might be, we would like to examine other portions of Smith's case. Smith asserts that debate has been the target "of more attacks than any other area within the speech field." Our response is simple: being a target is not necessarily bad. By being the target of attacks, debate can be allowed to progress in both theory and practice. In fact, it is as a target that debate would change within the plan offered by Smith. We hold, however, that a significant good has emerged from these attacks. Even the most cursory glance at the **Journal of the American Forensic Association** will demonstrate that the academic community is attempting to define and redefine the scope of academic debate in both a theoretical and practical perspective. **JAF**A has presented debates on judging models, various case structures, and issues such as inherency. This type of academic debate, made public, provides the discipline with a method to keep an old art new—to ensure that vigor is present in the thinking of those who practice. The various case structures used by affirmatives, for instance, provide a means by which to view the "real" world. The real world is reflected in such structures and debate makes reality a practical experience for those who advocate in a policy realm. These are argumentative structures to be sure, but an able adaptation to persuasion is obvious. Thus, we feel that "attacks" have led the discipline to modify the wheel while still maintaining the goal of providing for best-decision

argumentation.

Before presenting the plan, Smith indicts debate for its emphasis on evidence and for its apparent inability to train for life. We would like to examine these issues as one because we feel that in a complex modern society such as ours, the emphasis on evidence is one which adequately is translated to the real world. For instance, one can point to the introduction of the studies counterplan. Here the negative is arguing that the best decisions in a real-world policy-making arena are reached only through exhaustive research. The implications outside a debate round should be obvious. As has been mentioned, the validity of evidence is a debate issue, just as is the conclusion which is drawn from the evidence. We humbly suggest that debate which follows an argumentative framework—one which examines evidence both qualitatively and quantitatively, and which then thoroughly analyzes the conclusion and reasoning behind it—is a framework superior to the persuasive model. Best-decision models, based on argumentation, may logically and temporally precede a persuasive framework. The available means of persuasion may make a complex, argumentative conclusion palatable to the public. Thus, the emphasis of current debate on evidence is justified because our society and our world community are too complex to exist without evidence upon which to base conclusions. Perhaps Miss Smith would feel more comfortable living in the time before George Campbell. Clearly, Campbell strove to demonstrate that outside information can be artistic and relevant, as opposed to those who confined artistic proof to that which comes from within. We are not claiming that in all rounds all NDT debaters use evidence properly and

ethically. We would agree quite clearly that misuse of evidence does not prepare one to function usefully in his or her society. However, it is crucial to emphasize that these are indictments of particular individuals, not of the discipline or of the activity. Skilled persuaders can also be detrimental to a society.

Smith asserts that debate fails to train students about decision-making in the real world. We would offer two responses. First, the policy-making model generally accepted in debate rounds adequately reflects the real world. Policy is debated, passed, implemented, enforced, and redebated **ad nauseum** in the real world. The resultant policies affect each one of us in nearly everything we do. For the sake of convenience, debate resolutions generally examine federal policy. The carryover of training to the real world cannot be ignored. More important, however, is our view that policy debating **is** the real world. We cannot envision a student more prepared for real-world experiences than one who has been exposed through debate to the problems of adverse drug reactions or the mechanics of the LEAA, who has argued the viability of air bags, or who has sought solutions to the problems of scarce world resources. We would quite seriously suggest that the student who is aware that certain environmental changes, influenced by mankind and policy-makers, may melt the polar icecaps is a student who can grasp more mundane problems such as foreign military commitments. Solar space stations may appear at the surface to be inane, but they may work, be cost-beneficial, and solve our energy problems. Debate is not of pointless jests. That which is, does not deserve the name "debate."

As a concluding gesture, to keep