WHOM SHOULD WE HONOR IN THE MAY FORENSIC?

With 40 to 45 pictures of first place winners and an equal number of second and third place winners in debating, oratory and extemporaneous speaking before us from which we may select a limited number as most worthy of special honour in the pages of our May Forensic, what should be the basis of selection?

We can think of no satisfactory basis of selection—satisfactory even to ourselves. We presume that any basis of selection regardless of how satisfactory it might seem to the editor or anyone not more personally concerned, may seem quite illogical and unsatisfactory to the individual coach or contestant who does not have at hand the information concerning winners of other schools. We are giving you credit for being more interested in your school than in any other. We believe that is quite natural and therefore normal.

As editor our safest way is that of absolute impartiality. That should be easy, since we have not been personally concerned about any coach or any contestant of any school in any province. We have in mind the division of honors and representation both for men and women in all provinces.

One means of selection which we hope will be acceptable is that we shall include for the most part only seniors, particularly if those seniors have been quite continuously active in forensics throughout their college life. Since this is the last chance seniors will have, we believe space is more particularly due them.

Another basis of selection and elimination is the consideration of successful participation in more than one event. Of course, it is impossible to determine accurately, or perhaps fairly on this matter. We are bothered with such questions as this, for example: “How successful should a senior be in two events
before he might be considered fairly to rate above some senior who has been successful in only one?” Or say, some student has been particularly active during the last year or two, while another whose achievement is quite as good, has been less active from the point of success this year, but more active over three or four years.

There are other troubling considerations. In some cases the information as to whether a student has participated in more than one event or as to his class rank in college is not available. Some chapter representatives or speech instructors sending in their information have reported more in detail. In a few cases, we have been able to supply additional information by ferreting through college papers. This adds to our work without, in some cases, adding to the value of a report.

A further basis of elimination rests in the fact that we are postponing the story of the orators for special mention in the October Forensic. We are doing this because it was entirely impossible to get a decision on the “National Oratorical-Essay Contest” in time for the May number. As this issue goes to press we do not yet have copies of all of the orations. After orations are received we have the further problem of getting them judged. We hope to have that matter settled in time for the first issue next year. There are, if you will note, pictures of some orators in this issue, however, only in case these orators have been successful in one or more other activities.

There is another basis of elimination that is entirely outside our own decision. We have not received any pictures or report from some of the provinces. Governors have had to wait on coaches or contestants.

The October Forensic will give additional information on the province tournaments, not only on oratory, purposely reserved, but also on debating and extempore speaking

* * * * *

WE ARE PEEVED!

Our editorial vanity has been snubbed. We are peevled! We had expected that after the March Forensic should reach the “brotherhood” there would be a concerted scramble on the part of the 28 culprit chapters to fling themselves forward on penitent knee in an effort to get right with us.

There has been no such scramble. Altho a few have reacted with the appropriate response, an equal few have fallen. The result is a tie. February and March each have 28 “in the morgue.” (See Forensic, Series 16, No. 4, p. 210.)
We note that the Alpha chapters are particularly delinquent. More than one-third of the delinquency is in Alpha chapters. Alpha and Beta chapters constitute more than half of those who are “in the morgue.”

What does this mean? Are the older chapters getting tired?

* * * * *

ARE YOU ENGAGED?

That is, are you engaged for the summer? No, we do not want you to sell aluminum ware or take subscriptions for magazines in order to finance next year’s education. O. K. if you want to do that, or those, but we are not seeking “alert, aggressive, intelligent salesmen who can easily make $100 per week and up.” Rather we want to put you in print. Perhaps you are going to enjoy some unique experience before we meet you in debate next fall. You may plan to canoe from source to mouth of the Mississippi as does another of whom we know. You may expect to stowaway in a trans-oceanic air flight on that anticipated European tour. If you should have such experience, write us about it and we will tell the folks (Forensic folks) and we will all ask you further about it at Tulsa.

* * * * *

AGAIN WE THANK YOU

If we should attempt to express our full appreciation to the various province governors, heads of speech departments, and other members of Pi Kappa Delta for the help and encouragement they have given the editor, we would have to claim a larger share of this issue than is available.

We could fill a few pages quoting from those who have taken time out of their busy programs to comment about this and that article or suggestion; to assure us of their desire to be of service in the various provinces and so forth, and so forth.

We will omit such quotations for fear some one might think that we considered such comment as being complimentary to the editor.

We prefer here merely to express our appreciation for your expressed appreciation and for your real help to us. Please accept this statement as being our personal response to you.

* * *

“Pi Kappa Delta is exerting a tremendous influence in the field of debating and public speaking.”—Prof. H. L. Ewbank, Dept. of Speech, University of Wisconsin.
A TRIBUTE

Almost every issue of most of the college papers of the country, patricially during the football season, gives some comment by way of tribute to the local director of athletics.

So much of this is done that it might seem, from the standpoint of the newspaper men, to cease to have value as "news." In like manner, from the point of view of the newspaper editor, any news concerning a tribute paid to a director of forensics should be considered a "scoop."

Following this sort of reasoning, we feel justified, particularly in a magazine such as ours, in giving space to a tribute which appeared editorially recently in the campus paper of Gustavus-Adolphus College, the home of the Minnesota Gamma chapter. That tribute follows.

"Scholarship is something more than learning of facts and principles. It implies application of genius, a spark of personality and initiative, a sort of holy zeal for the discovery of truth. These qualities are rare even in a college group. We think we see something of it, however, in the work of the forensic department. During the last two years the debate teams and orators have won signal honors. Since the one loss at the Wichita battles, the department has scored nothing but wins in all its decision contests. Sixteen successive victories in forensics argue, not that the law of averages has been broken, but that we are no longer dealing with averages. Doubtless the secret of these successes lies in the unusual scholarly approach and intense research with which the debaters have attacked their work. Professor Anderson wisely allows his debaters to work out their own cases and use their own initiative. Two decisions were won by coed teams, the first two victories in women's debate. To Professors Anderson and Bergstrand must go the credit for such remarkable achievements, together with the men and women who have put their whole-hearted effort into debate. Leland Stark and Harold LeVander, especially, as well as the state orator, should receive the applause of all Gustavians who honor scholarly forensic work."

Professor Anderson and his successful forensic students are not satisfied to rest on past laurels. Reading in another issue of the paper, we note that they will again be host to a debate team from Oxford University, England, the first week in November.

Chapter representatives who go to Tulsa next year will do well to keep in mind as dangerous opponents the speakers from that chapter which last year won first in the men's debate.
SEVERAL THINGS

HELP YOUR BROTHER—HE MAY HELP YOU

Do you want a speech position? Senior members of Pi Kappa Delta who will graduate this spring will doubtless be interested in securing a position as instructor in forensic work for next summer.

Do you know of a vacancy in such a position? If so, you can help some member of Pi Kappa Delta by sending the information concerning the vacancy to Prof. George Finley, our National Secretary, at the State Teachers' College, Greeley, Colorado. Prof. Finley will have the information concerning eligible candidates and can assist in getting the candidate and the position together.

Who knows, it might happen that the individual you help by supplying information of this kind at the present time might later be in a position to help you. Pi Kappa Delta stands for cooperation in useful service.

* * * * *

Are you a subscriber to the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education? If not, you should subscribe or use your influence in having your department of speech make available this magazine. The Quarterly Journal carries many interesting articles concerning research in the field of speech. Add it to your speech library.

* * * * *

National President Pflaum is making arrangements for having a general get-together of all Pi Kappa Delta people who will be in attendance at the next meeting of the National Association of Teachers of Speech in Detroit during the Christmas holidays.
NOTES FROM THE NATIONAL SECRETARY

First as George III (George Finley) I propose to settle this bet between George I (George Pflaum) and George II (George McCarty) about whether or not Pi Kappa Deltans read The Forensic. I have "conclusive evidence" to show that George I wins the bet. Since the March issue appeared I have had numerous letters that ran something like this: "Dear Mr. Secretary: I have read what you said in the March issue about materials for the local chapters. Please send me——," and then follows the list of articles needed. And so that's that! George I, I shall collect my cut out of that bet at Tulsa one year from this time, or thereabouts!

***

The most important thing the local chapters have to do now is to see to it that this year's business is finished up in shipshape fashion. A good many of you will have done just that thing before you read this page. But if your chapter hasn't sent in its new members and ordered their keys yet be sure to do it now. Don't let these things go until summer or fall. If by any chance you didn't get your key orders to me at least three weeks before time for your Commencement be sure to write me and tell me where you want them sent. We sometimes have a good deal of trouble getting keys to their owners after summer vacation begins.

Encourage seniors, especially, to send in advanced standing blanks bringing their records in the national headquarters up to date, even if they do not send in their keys for rejeweling. This will save a lot of trouble in case they ever do want to have the jewels in their keys changed to show their final standing.

***

It strikes me that it is a little irregular to be called upon to prescribe to people who are already in "the morgue." But then, not being a regular doctor anyway, I don't mind being irregular, and so here goes for the prescription. First, though, let "the doctor" diagnose the case. The symptoms indicate quite clearly

(Continued on Page 54)
Why Not a Debate on Debating at the Tulsa Tournament?

By E. R. Nichols, U. of R.

What about an adequate subject for the 1932 debate tournament at Tulsa? Has anybody an idea?

Of course we all realize what a good tournament subject should be. It should be a big subject—a worthwhile subject. We have been particularly fortunate in having had such subjects for the three national tournaments in which we debated child labor, foreign investments, and disarmament. But where is another comparable question?

A subject that is big enough for a tournament doesn’t grow every day. We may be willing to debate subjects for ordinary contests that are not particularly good for a tournament. Such subjects are too limited in scope and argument—their possibilities are too soon exhausted. Everyone debating them must stick too close to the same line of evidence and attack. This makes for monotony and stereotyped work and kills interest. A tournament subject should be big enough so that there are many angles of approach, many possible ways of attacking the problem, many courses open to the negative as well as the affirmative. Then there is a possibility for varied work, for individual and original ways of planning the cases, opportunity for surprises, opportunity to test real debating skill.

If possible the tournament subject should have a wealth of material printed about it. It should afford a fine chance for research and the acquiring of knowledge on an important issue. This is educational in a field beyond the practice of public speaking, and we all realize the value of that. In case we have a subject about which there is little written directly—it must have at least a great deal of indirect material—like the free trade subject for instance—or at least have possibilities of argument which careful thinking will develop even in the absence of direct printed material.
It should be a problem in which we are all more or less interested—one which we want to debate. If possible it should have a direct relationship to good citizenship. Learning about it should make us better citizens, and more intelligent voters. Or, again it should come home to us in an even more direct or personal way—it might have to do with our own problems of education and personal development. If we could find that type of subject it should be at least profitable.

It should be two sided. We should not pick an unbalanced subject with one side excellent out of all proportion to the possibilities of the other side. We are all familiar with subjects on which the affirmative has the greatest difficulty because it has to carry too great a burden—or one in which a negative is handicapped by too great a popular prejudice—or actual lack of good evidence.

My work as editor of "Intercollegiate Debates" obliges me each year to make a survey of the subjects being debated in the various colleges in different sections of the country, and the one thing that has come home to me in the last two or three years is the dearth of really big and profitable debate subjects.

This year the following list is being discussed:

1. Abolish the distinction between amateur and professional athletes where admission is charged.
2. Administration of Government would be better if women controlled.
3. American Culture, the European Indictment of.
4. American Home has broken down.
5. Automobile Liability Insurance.
6. The Baumes Law.
7. Canadian Method of Liquor Control.
8. Capitalism is an Antedated System.
9. Censorship, Abolition of Legal.
10. Chain Store System.*
11. Church has Failed to Meet Needs of Modern Life.
13. Democracy is a Failure.
14. The Development of Machinery.
15. Disarmament (also under title of Military Preparedness.)
16. Dominion Government for India.
17. Department of Education (Federal).
18. Eighteenth Amendment Should be Repealed.
19. Emergence of Women from the Home.
20. Condemnation of the Federal Farm Board Policy.
21. Forty Hour or Five Day Week.
22. Free Trade (International).*
23. Gandhi Has Been a Benefit to India.
25. Intelligence Tests in Tax-supported Schools.
27. Japanese Immigration, Quota Law for.
29. Modern Science is a Menace.
30. Nationalism is an Evil.
31. Patriotism—There Should be Education in.
32. Public Works for the Unemployed.
33. Recognition of Soviet Russia.
34. Second Place defeated candidate for President should be a senator at large for one term.
35. Social Fraternities Should be Abolished.
36. State Medicine.
38. Thrift is Not a Virtue.
39. Unemployment Insurance.*
40. The Junior College System.
41. Volstead Act Should be Modified.
42. Young Plan for Reparations.

It may be that a few of the old stand-by subjects have not been reported such as Cancellation of War Debts, Installment Buying, and the Open or Closed Shop. A few new ones such as Chain Banking, Hydro-Electric Power also have failed to appear.

The main point is: what in that line-up looks good for a debate tournament next year? If nothing does, what else is there to suggest? It seems to me we ought to be racking our brains for something and that we ought to get the list together soon. I do not believe we can decide the matter this spring but we can take the usual test vote and then await developments before the final vote next fall.

I wonder what about a debate on debating? If that subject could be phrased acceptably wouldn’t we have a grand and glor-

*The three main subjects of the season are marked thus.*
(Continued on page 49)
ORGANIZING A SPEECH

By JONATHAN RIGDON, Ph.D., President Emeritus
Central Normal College, Danville, Indiana

We have heard much in recent years from the Behaviorists in the field of speech on the matter of securing attention. While this certainly is an important consideration for anyone who expects to address an audience, we personally feel that too much has been said on this subject to the expense of a needed emphasis on the matter of holding and using attention once it is secured.

Dr. Jonathan Rigdon is one of the most effective platform men we know. He is not a "spell-binder." Instead he holds attention through the presentation of a thought-filled message, through an adequate vocabulary and clear organization, and through a manner that is at once pleasing and at the same time conducive, not only to securing initial attention, but also to holding that attention throughout. Out of it all one gets a clear-cut message that is easy to remember. Dr. Rigdon is the author of a number of books. His latest contribution, "The Art of Speaking," is soon to come from the press. The simplicity and directness of his article below is typical of his style in writing and speaking.—Editor's Note.

If one's purpose does not justify a speech, no speech should be made. In the first place, if I may be allowed so to express it, the purpose of a speech should be not subjective, but objective. That is, no matter whether he is making a long speech or a short one, a sermon or a sentence, an oration or an answer to a question, to be effective he must aim not at something in himself but at something outside himself. He must be all the time thinking and feeling not that he has a message to give, that it is a great message, that he is giving it in an artistic way, that people will admire him for doing it in such a way, and that when he has done it he will himself feel this way or that, and he himself will be such and so. This is all subjective and wrong. Instead he must be all the time thinking and feeling that the persons to whom he speaks need to have a change wrought in them, that they do not see, and his message will help them to see; they do not understand and it will help them to understand; they do not care and his problem is to make them care; they are against his cause, and his task is to make them for it; or they are indifferent to the cause, and his task is to have them do something about it. This is all objective and right. The subjective attitude makes one self-conscious, artificial, awkward, embarrassed and unimpressive; the objective attitude makes
him natural, independent, forceful, graceful and at ease. With all the training in the world one is bound to fail if he goes before an audience of one or a thousand feeling that his object and his aim is a result in his own mind; and with no training he is sure to be listened to if he is intent upon the purpose to produce a change in the minds he addresses.

The first recorded speech ever made was “Let there be light.” This should be the purpose of all speeches. Unless one has at least a suspicion that he is in possession of light, he should not speak. His purpose in speaking is to let that light, not himself, shine. If he has the light and can reveal it, he will speak as an authority and be heard gladly.

It goes without saying that no one can speak well on all subjects, or even on many subjects. The fact that a man is in demand to speak on a certain subject or series of subjects over which he may rightfully claim a degree of mastery is no evidence that we should care to hear him on other subjects that have engaged but little if any of his attention. No one has a right to speak upon a subject unless he has thoughts on that subject. That is important, but even that does not justify one in speaking. It is immensely valuable to have a prolific mind, which turns out thoughts in abundance. This contributes largely to the interest of one’s message. Every speech should be full of thoughts. Every sentence should express one of them. But yet another quality of mind is needed. For a man to be listened to, his mind must be not only prolific, but logical. Just thoughts are not enough. A speaker must be able to think them in order. It is not uncommon to hear speakers whose minds are fertile in turning out a surprising number of thoughts but who nevertheless fail to satisfy us. We admire the wealth of thoughts, we listen with interest for at least a while, but at the end we are disappointed. What is the matter? It is this: We have had many thoughts presented to us for which we are grateful, but at the end we have little if any better understanding of the subject than at the beginning. Now understanding is what we all want. The lack of understanding is the cause of every question that arises in the mind. Understanding should be the purpose of every answer and of every speech. Here we may remember that by high authority we have been told that understanding is the principal thing and have been admonished with all our getting to get understanding. It is a vital mistake to think that anyone having thoughts on a subject is entitled to speak on it. In addi-
tion to thoughts, understanding is necessary. The purpose of all study is understanding. Anyone who speaks is expected to express the result of his study. The speaker himself is supposed to have understanding, and his purpose in speaking is to produce understanding in others. Individual thoughts come with a degree of spontaneity; understanding comes only as a result of study. The speaker must keep constantly in mind that his aim is to produce understanding. Just before one opens his mouth to speak he should hear the command “Let there be light,” and should remember that that light is understanding.

Only the one who himself has an understanding of a subject can speak so that his listeners will have it. We should not underestimate the value of merely having thoughts. It is certainly well worth while. Most of us most of the time are unable to have very many individual thoughts. And then without the individual thoughts there is nothing to organize, and so understanding is impossible. We must remember, however, that understanding is the speaker’s ultimate aim as well as the listeners’ most earnest wish.

Now what of individual thoughts? What must be added to them to make understanding? The answer is organization. What is organization? It is order. To organize thoughts is to order them, that is, to put them in order. In this respect, minds are not all exactly alike. Some seem to care much for individual thoughts, but hardly at all for organization. Others want only the minimum of organization. Still others demand complete organization. Everything must be in its place. This third class is the one the speaker should strive to satisfy in his presentation of a subject. If he pleases this group he will please all, for listeners that are not orderly in their own thinking admire it in others. The organization of any subject-matter consists in putting in order the thoughts pertaining to it. This order is by no means an arbitrary one. It is fixed by the sequence in which the normal mind puts its inquiries. In this respect all normal minds are so nearly alike that organization for one is organization for all. If this were not true, it would be futile to speak at all. Our problem is merely to find out the order in which a normal mind makes its inquiries, the order in which it wants its questions answered. If we can but hit upon that order, our presentation will result in light, understanding; if we miss it the result is mental darkness, confusion.

It has already been made clear that thought that is to lead to understanding must be organized. Now let us try to see a
little more definitely what is meant by the organization of thought. We are not now concerned with thought in the abstract; we are now caring only about thought on some specific subject, for when one speaks he is supposed to speak on a subject. As it seems to me, one's thought on any particular subject may be said to be organized when he has in order the answers to eight questions on that subject. And when as a speaker he is able to give these answers in order, his presentation will lead to an understanding of the subject. If any reader prefers other questions, he is at liberty to substitute them for mine. Or if he thinks they should come in a different order, he will change that also. After considerable attention to the matter I submit the following as, to me, the most suitable questions to ask about a subject if one wishes to arrive at organized thought on that subject.

I. What is the subject? Sometimes one will be helped greatly in answering this question by asking, What is it not? Anyway, we must first be able to grasp it, see it as a whole. It is good to sit down in a quiet place and think about it. Turn it over and over in the mind many times. One must define his subject, that is, he must think its boundaries around it so that he may know where it begins, where it ends, and what it includes. Whether or not one begins his speech by expressing his definition is a matter of individual preference; but one must certainly have it in his own mind. That is, he must know what he is talking about. And very early in his speech he must let his hearers know what he is talking about. One gets this conception of his subject by thinking about it and continuing to think about it till it begins to look not altogether unfamiliar. Many times a subject that at first is as black as midnight becomes infinitely significant after a period of real study. Of course, if one cannot by thinking get any conception of his subject, then he must read about it; but it is always better to read after a period of thinking, and it is absolutely essential to think after a period of reading. In the process of getting hold of a subject, finding out what it is, thought must be both first and last. One cannot present clearly what is hazy in his own mind. Clearness comes only from thinking, and then more thinking.

II. What does it belong under? What is it a part of? What brought it about, or what caused it? Of what larger subject is it a part? Out of what condition or conditions did it arise? What
are its antecedents? How has it come to be? Here I prefer to list several questions, because in some investigations one question, and in other investigations another question, will best bring out the relation wanted; and yet in other investigations perhaps all the questions listed, and possibly others would be in place in this second step.

III. What other subjects belong under the same head? That is, what subjects are coordinate with the one under consideration? What other subjects are in the same class with it?

IV. What is the relation of each of these coordinate subjects to the subject in hand?

V. What is the specific relation (or relations) of the subject in hand to the broader subject under which it belongs?

VI. What subjects or parts are included under the subject in hand?

VII. How are these divisions related to one another; and particularly, how is each related to the subject in hand?

VIII. What is the bearing of the whole discussion upon the conclusion to be established?

Now, valuable as I think this scheme or formula may be to a speaker who has not yet mastered the art of thinking, it would be better for him to throw it all away at the very beginning than to think that it must be followed slavishly in every case without modification. Subjects may come before us in the explanation of which one or more of these eight steps seem superfluous. In such cases it would be foolish to strain ourselves and weary our audience by an effort to follow the formula. And if any student, after a careful examination of it,—I am sure it is worth that,—decides that he can think better without it, I am here and now releasing him from all obligation to use it. But for the many who realize the importance of order and have not yet learned how to organize their thought, I commend very strongly this outline or something similar to it.

AN APPLICATION

Suppose for illustration that the subject under consideration is Literature:

I. Tell what literature is, what it is in a broad or general sense, and what it is in a more restricted sense. In which of these senses is it one of the fine arts? If this is the way in which one wishes to discuss it, then?

II. Fine arts is the answer to number II.
III. The answer to number III is given by naming the other fine arts, architecture, sculpture, painting, music.

IV. Here one has an opportunity to show how Literature is related to, that is, how it influences and is influenced by each of the other fine arts. Or if one wishes to consider Literature as one of the branches of education, then one would have an opportunity to show how it influences and is influenced by each of the other branches of study as well as by life, religion and industry. Here also one would show how Literature has helped to mold or give setting to individual lives, and how on the other hand the peculiar mold or setting of individual lives has made their expression in literary form inevitable. Here illustrations would be in place and exceedingly interesting.

Under V one would want to show that the elements indispensable in all Art,—thought-content, form, emotion,—are always present in Literature. Some thinkers, owing to their particular attitude or inclination, would regard Literature as the greatest of the Arts. They would then be expected to give their reasons for this view.

VI. The answer to VI might be Poetry and Prose, which would be further subdivided into Drama, Novel, Short Story, Letter, Oration, etc.

VII. Number VII would be answered by comparing these different forms of Literature and showing their relative values.

VIII. The answer to question VIII will depend upon the purpose of the discussion. If, for illustration, it is to show the value of Literature for life, then all the points bearing on this conclusion will be marshalled toward this end.

The same series of questions, or similar ones, might well be answered in the discussion of Hamlet, The Tariff, The Constitution of the United States, The Democratic Party, the Mediterranean Sea, Evolution, The Kellogg-Briand Treaty or almost any other topic.

It must be kept in mind that the formula is proposed only as a help to those who need it in organizing their thought on some subject. Experienced thinkers are not expected to make any change in any scheme of organization that has proved satisfactory. And even beginners are not expected to subject any topic to undue strain to make it conform to the formula. The author does believe, however, that the order of investigation suggested by these eight questions will be found helpful to most students

(Continued on page 49)
The March number of The Gavel, the official publication of Delta Sigma Rho, Honorary Forensic Society, is designated as the Silver Jubilee Number. This number carries the story of the founding of Delta Sigma Rho and also contains interesting articles on the history, traditions and policy of the organization.

We believe Pi Kappa Delta should and will be interested in the following abbreviated story taken from the Silver Jubilee Number of The Gavel.

The Foundation of Delta Sigma Rho

PROFESSOR THOMAS C. TRUEBLOOD, University of Michigan

Delta Sigma Rho had a double origin. It sprang from the brains of two college professors. Whether mental telepathy can reach over many hundred miles and take form in the minds of kindred spirits and set them to writing to each other simultaneously is matter for the cogitation of psychologists. But the fact is that Professor H. E. Gordon of the University of Iowa and Professor E. E. McDermott of Minnesota sat down at their desks at the same moment, and each in a letter to the other proposed a national honor fraternity for men and women who represent their colleges in authorized intercollegiate debates and oratorical contests. These letters passed on the way, and to the amazement of their authors contained almost identical propositions. Their desires and enthusiasm were conveyed to heads of speech departments of several others of the leading western universities, and it was agreed by eight of them to meet in the spring of 1906 to effect an organization.

The delegates assembled at the Hotel Victoria on Michigan Avenue in Chicago, two blocks north of the Auditorium Hotel. This hotel has since been torn down,—not, however, on account of our meeting. Most of the universities were represented by heads of departments, others by students with power to act for their institutions. I felt much honored to be asked to preside at this conference. Professors McDermott and Gordon presented their plan in detail which they had worked out; and, as I remember, there were very few changes made. The meeting was most cordial and enthusiastic. The charter members, in alphabetical order, were the following eight universities: Chicago, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Northwestern, and Wisconsin.

The sentiment was very strong at the meeting that only the larger and more influential universities of the United States, which had well-organized courses in public speaking and which belonged to debating and oratorical leagues, should first be approached to become members; first, because it
would encourage the introduction of credit courses in speech in some universities that had been slow to adopt the subject of public speaking in their curricula; and, second, because it would stimulate the organization of debating leagues and oratorical associations throughout the states. Both of these objects have been accomplished, and I believe that the organization of this and other honor societies has had much to do toward these ends, for no other nation is comparable with ours in the development of speech interests.

Among those who extended greetings to Delta Sigma Rho on its twenty-fifth anniversary was our own National President, Geo. R. R. Pflaum. His statement follows:

In behalf of Pi Kappa Delta it gives me great pleasure to extend to Delta Sigma Rho on the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding, hearty congratulations.

Through the cordial cooperation of the forensic organizations, speech activities have been advanced, and it is the sincere hope of Pi Kappa Delta that these congenial relations may always continue and that Delta Sigma Rho may have many more such anniversaries.

---

**ORGANIZING A SPEECH**

(Continued from page 47)

in the organization of their thought on most subjects. It is at least worth a trial. Then it may be dropped when something better appears.

"Some are geniuses and others are just plain people; but certain it is that mediocrity artfully expressed is a larger contribution than genius clumsily concealed."—Dr. Jonathan Rigidon.

---

**WHY NOT A DEBATE ON DEBATING?**

(Continued from page 41)

ious time! What about this decision or non-decision debating? What about this attack on debating as non-educational as now conducted? Could we frame a question that would include both discussions? Also it should allow the bringing in of arguments on all the mooted points about debate. Of course we should have to eliminate any quotations from debate coaches not printed or published and therefore open to all comers. Is it possible to get such a question properly phrased to make a real debate that is a fight? Think it over. This is just a suggestion. My idea is that if we tried out such a question we should all learn a lot and maybe we might clarify our ideas on the real standards of debating. Now let somebody else get up on his hind feet and talk. I am only trying to get a real subject for our next tournament— somebody may have a brilliant idea.
Twelve new members were initiated into the Minnesota Gamma chapter in their local Pi Kappa Delta ceremonies recently. Their campus paper informs us that entrance examinations for the neophytes were held in the afternoon and that in the evening meeting the results of the examinations were considered in determining membership eligibility.

* * * * *

The Missouri Zeta chapter has been particularly active this year. A girls' team recently in competition with McKendree College debaters won a two-to-one decision. This chapter expects to have six or eight new eligibles for membership this year.

* * * * *

A debate team composed of Lyle Brown and Eugene Matthews representing Henderson State Teachers' college recently won the state college debate tournament. This team won three out of four debates in a preliminary and all three debates in the finals. This tournament is an annual affair and this is the second consecutive winning for Henderson.

* * * * *

The California Epsilon chapter has introduced some innovations in their regular monthly luncheons. As a part of their activity, this chapter has sponsored their annual inter-fraternity and inter-sorority oratorical contest, in which 22 organizations participated.

* * * * *

The Tennessee Alpha chapter has just finished another most active season. During the last debate season they have won 18 out of 23 decision debates. This, they state, is a "batting average of .782"—not a bad batting average. They have culminated their achievement with the winning of second place in the province convention. The local chapter points out that credit for their unusual success should go to Professor Verton M. Queener.
A debate held at Eastern Texas State Teachers' college in which the Texas Gamma debated Kansas Beta had an audience of 1000 or more. We have asked Miss Webster, the forensic coach there, to tell us how such an audience can be gathered in to hear a debate.

* * * * *

The Oklahoma College for Women has invited the 1933 Province Convention to Chickasha. Their invitation has been accepted.

* * * * *

Governor Patton of the Province of Oklahoma suggested at their recent Province Convention that that province establish a list of eligible judges to be called upon through a central management, these judges to serve at a uniform fee.

* * * * *

Eastern State Teachers' College of South Dakota has two debaters, George Moeller and Joyce Gregory, who have debated together for seven years thru High and College. During this time they have had as their speech instructor Prof. Karl E. Mundt.

-------

DR. FAUNCE ON COLLEGE

College is absolutely useless unless we bring to it genuine intellectual interests. All of us are born, like kittens, with the eyes shut. Some men come to college with eyes still closed. The greater interests of life have not gripped them. Their existence is not vicious, but hopelessly trivial. Even to discuss a really weighty problem of industry, politics, or religion, as all European students constantly do, is to "queer" oneself irretrievably. Listen to the conversation in the fraternity house, the field house, the boarding house—does it rise above the level of the talk at Coney Island? But the world does not look to the Island for intellectual leadership and it does look—how eagerly!—to the one institution which embodies all its chief hopes and loyalties, the American college.—From "Facing Life" by Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, former president of Brown University.
AMERICAN-ENGLISH DEBATES AGAIN

T was our privilege a while ago to hear a debate between an American team and a team from the English universities. I had read what others had to say of their impressions of such contests. Comments of others had ranked from a very complimentary sort of thing favoring the English to unqualified criticism of their debating. It was interesting, therefore, to me to hear and to jot down some of my own impressions. Without attempting an article on the subject, here are a few random impressions.

First of all, I liked the contest, and I liked the English type of debate, partly because it was different. I liked their attempt to interest their audience, to make of the debate something more than mere statistics and the citation of authority.

In some respects, the American debater excels the English debater, if the contest which I witnessed is a fair sample of English debating. The American team was better organized as individuals and as a team. There was more progress made, less overlapping, more real information given. The English debater is easier to listen to, partly because of the absence of the quantities here listed as advantages to the American debater. He does not seem to feel that the debate is so all-important. After all, Congress or the nations of the world, or even individual citizens are not going to do anything very different because of college debating. The English seem to have this thought somewhere in their consciousness. There was therefore less “straining for a point.”

In the matter of humor it seems to me the English excel. I believe this is due essentially to the different types of humor used. The humor of the English debater is, for the most part, one of phraseology; that of the American debater is apt to be more of a humor of incident, a “that-reminds-me” sort of thing. It therefore is more likely to seem dragged in by the ears. The humor of phraseology, being the higher type of humor, if well done, places the American speaker at a disadvantage. It assumes a more excellent vocabulary, and if one has the vocabulary, such humor is more adaptable to the discussion in hand. The Amer-
ican "tacking-on" type of illustration is apt to make his humor more isolated and more difficult of transition and application.

Perhaps the English debater has an advantage over the American debater in that he has more opportunity for "polished" humor since in debating many schools on the same question he can use cleverly arranged phraseology in his later efforts. The fact remains, however, that the types of humor used are for the most part different.

Perhaps also, there is an advantage in being away from home. Someone has defined an authority as "one who is far from home." The local speaker is more or less handicapped perhaps from the start because he is rated inferior by his own people. He is not an "authority" under the definition given above. His audience already knows, perhaps, too much about him. He has no opportunity to put on airs. Whether the audience rates the local speaker low, he may expect to be so rated and therefore the result for him is the same.

It is the opinion of more than one teacher of speech who has known of English debating over a period of years that American. English debates have been good for both groups. A well-known speech authority said recently in our hearing that it was his opinion that the English had improved their debating by putting into it more of content, and that the American debater has improved his work by introducing more of the humor element. It was his belief therefore that international debating for these reasons as well as for others is of great value.

It was my own impression as I listened to the contest that all the debaters failed as most college debaters do in the very important matter of personal conviction. The question debated was one in which every speaker might have had or developed real personal interest and conviction. Yet there was a dead-level lukewarmness about it that prevented its getting over to the audience as being anything very vital. There were a few "flare-ups" on the part of the American debaters, but it seemed to me to come from the fact that their opponents had disagreed with them in their case rather than that they were concerned about the cause under discussion. After all, in debating, one of the goals is persuasion. We not only want to get something said, we want to convince somebody. We should want to convince not only to the point of academic agreement, but, if possible, to create opinion, to influence conduct or action. Let both American and English debaters keep uppermost this goal, avoid-
ing the one-two-three-ness so common in American debate briefs, and the overstressed humor of the English debater. Both are good and necessary, but the speaker must be careful to guard against their becoming dominant.

* * *

FOUR EUROPEAN DEBATE TEAMS IN U. S. NEXT FALL

There will be four debating teams from Europe engaging in verbal combat with the orators of American colleges and universities during the fall of 1931. For the first time in the history of international debating the National Student Federation of America will present a Turkish team. A team from Holland will also make its debut in American forensics.

The federation will again sponsor and direct teams for two groups of English students. December 20, 1930, concluded the series of international debates conducted under the auspices of the National Student federation. Teams from England, Germany, and Scotland engaged a total of 110 debates with colleges located in every state in the union.

* * *

NOTES FROM THE NATIONAL SECRETARY

(Continued from Page 38)

an advanced case of "collegiate irresponsibilititus." Fortunately there is a sure cure. Let every chapter elect as local chapter officers students who know how to accept responsibility. If you'll do this, "the morgue" will have to go out of business this next year.

* * * * *

Last Membership Number—10223, issued to Robert Wilson, Kansas Gamma.

* * * * *

Last Key Number—7695, issued to Minna Tigges, Colorado Beta.
QUALIFICATIONS FOR A GOOD TEACHER

By GLENN FRANK
President of the University of Wisconsin

(During his undergraduate days Glenn Frank won first place in the Annual Contest of the Northern Oratorical League.)

The other day I spoke of three things we will have to do before we can expect to have an adequate supply of great teachers.

Today, I want to speak of three things that mark a great teacher.

First, the great teacher never stops studying his subject. He does not lecture year after year from the same dog-earred and yellow notes.

He is in the best sense of the word a research man, which does not mean, by the way, that he is forever publishing monographs and books in his field. Frankly, when I have an appointment to make I am not at all impressed by a long list of research publications by the candidate. I want to see the man and get the feel of his mind, for some of the liveliest minds in the world of scholarship are not forever rushing into print. I am convinced that infinite harm has been done to our universities by the over-emphasis we have put on publication by the teachers we appoint. We need men of wide and deep knowledge, and many teachers would be broader and wiser men if they studied and thought more and wrote less.

Second, the great teacher keeps his mind fresh and free. He must be given the chance every so often to get away from the routine schedule of his work so that he can have time to examine himself, his mind and his methods. He must have time for travel, for leisurely reading. He must have time to peer into all the corners of his field so that he will not become a too narrow specialist. He must have time to dip into some related but different activities. He must have the chance to become wise as well as learned.

Third, the great teacher establishes a personal as well as professional relation with his students.

I confess that I lose interest in a teacher when I discover that he never sees his students save in his class-rooms and in his

(Continued on page 59)
QUOTING MAYOR WALKER—
“SPEECH PREPARATION IS UNNECESSARY”

WTHIN the last year we have heard, in and out of speech classes, references to the advice of “Jimmie” Walker, mayor of New York City. Such references dated back to a magazine article which appeared a year ago this month, in which Mr. Walker was quoted as having stated that preparation for public address not only does not help, but actually hinders a speaker.

The interviewer who gives us the story states that Mr. Walker advises: “No matter how inadequate you may feel, no matter how uneasy it may make you, never prepare a speech. When the time comes, simply get on your feet, say whatever is in your head... You’ll be a better speaker in the long run if you’ll force yourself at whatever cost to speak extemporaneously... Begin thinking about your speech while the preceding speakers are talking—not before... Some word of a previous speaker usually gives me a cue for an opening.”

We presume, of course, that Mr. Walker is here talking about after-dinner speaking. On an occasion of this kind, of course, it is often true that there are a number of speakers. One wonders what would happen to Mr. Walker if he were the only one on the program. Or supposing there were others on the program, but that he were called on first. In such instances there would be no “cues.”

But “Jimmie” is different. He is quite generally, we presume, placed at a more dramatic position on the program. In such a case he may well follow his own advice, at least in some respects. We seriously doubt, however, that even he goes as unprepared as he here suggests. As a matter of fact the reporter of the interview adds the amendment that what Mr. Walker really means by his advice, “Don’t prepare your speech” is, “Know your subject.” But how can one know his subject without preparation? This writer further explains that “although Mr. Walker’s talk is not prepared, his mind is.” By which we suppose he means that Mr. Walker has a fund of information on which he can draw for a great variety of occasions. How did he get that way? Whence this fund of information? How did his mind be-
come prepared? We are sorry that we do not have available the information as to Mr. Walker’s early efforts in public address. In the absence of such evidence we are going to believe that somewhere along the way, through his study in or out of books, of facts and folks, he has constantly accumulated usable material. He has prepared.

If we may be privileged to have an opinion on the matter we would guess that Mr. Walker either did not mean what he said or that before saying it he did not stop to analyze his thought. We believe that he did not consider several matters. Among them he forgets or ignores the fact that few speakers have had or will ever have the varied opportunity for speech experience before public audiences that he has had. Without such opportunity one can not develop such effective oral expressions; cannot build up an adequate vocabulary; would not have the desire to speak. Also, of course, most of us do not have the prestige that Mr. Walker has in his official position. That must help a lot. Most of us do not even have the clothes, and we believe in spite of Abraham Lincoln and his success, that clothes, particularly when connected with officialdom, as in the case of Mr. Walker, help on first impressions and serve to lend confidence to the speaker.

Is Mayor Walker’s advice safe for the beginning speaker even assuming that Mr. Walker’s ability as a speaker has been entirely developed under the system which he advocates? What do other successful speakers say? There is not space here to attempt to answer this question. One reference to which there might be added many, by way of refutation to Mr. Walker’s advice, is that of the great “God-like” Webster, who stated on one occasion “There is no such thing as extemporaneous acquisition.”
HOW TO BECOME A POLITICAL ORATOR
FORMULA OF TWO BOSTON MAYORS
(Reprinted from the Emerson Quarterly.)

Two of Boston’s outstanding public speakers, Mayor James M. Curley and former Mayor John F. Fitzgerald, prescribed a formula for those who may wish to become great political orators in this day and age. They present somewhat varying opinions.

Mayor Curley says he owes his accomplishment to hard work and lifelong preparation, while ex-Mayor Fitzgerald gives all the credit to “the Irish in him.”

Says Mayor Curley: “The ability to address an audience is not a natural endowment but an acquisition that requires conscientious and strenuous self-training. To be an orator necessitates fortifying the mind with an inexhaustible fund of information, cultivating a retentive memory; it requires constant reading as well as the proper voice training. It is extremely difficult. Cardinal O’Connell, Dr. Cadman and Dr. James J. Walsh, three of the most renowned public speakers in this country today, are veritable store-houses of information, and owe it all to hard work.”

According to the Mayor, addressing an audience is comparable to acting behind the foot-lights, and requires an equal amount of training and preparation. Create the right atmosphere and you get the right reaction, is his belief.

“From observations,” he adds, “it has been coming to my attention that the day of face-to-face public speaking is quickly passing, and the medium of the radio is taking its place. During the past campaign, it was only with the most outstanding roster of speakers that a comfortable-sized audience could be assembled. About 80 percent of the people prefer to remain by their firesides and listen in on rallies and addresses. Soon there will be only radio orators.”

Another new development that he emphasized is the demand for shorter, more concise and less detailed discourses.

“A Webster would have a great deal of difficulty in holding an audience today for more than an hour,” he asserts. “Lin-
coln’s Gettysburg address is a perfect example of the 1931 public speech.”

“Speakers, too,” he concludes, “will be required to make more careful preparation, watch diction and enunciation. Gone are the days of impromptu and extemporaneous speeches. The introduction of the radio has revolutionized all public speaking.”

The two mayors agreed that the old-fashioned oratorical displays with prepared gesticulations and histrionics would never return, but the ex-Mayor, prominent for ability to vocalize, especially where a particular song is concerned, says he owes his individual ability to inheritance.

“It’s the Irish in me,” he says. “Italians, French, Jews and Poles are all wonderful orators, especially the Irish. Englishmen and Scotchmen are too repressed and self-centered to feel the call of a great question, and lack the fire and pep that gives a speaker his charm.

“No, I never studied for public speaking, but just respond with the whole of me when the urge comes to arouse the people, and let them see what is going on around them.

“With women doubling the number of votes, and their desire to see the candidates in action, there is going to be a lot more local public speaking, and better speakers, too. The introduction of the radio has given a start to many men who otherwise would not have the courage to face the public.

“Oratory is the salvation of society, and can have more effect than any other medium, including the newspaper. The human voice is the most powerful thing in the world, and can bring the right things into life, help humanity and act as a savior to society.”

QUALIFICATIONS FOR A GOOD TEACHER

(Continued from page 55)

office at stated office hours. The great teacher is willing to have his private life broken into by eager students who come into his home at odd hours for informal and unofficial intellectual wrestling bouts. All this is taxing enterprise. But whoever said that the life of the great teacher is an easy life?
THE word *strategy* should probably not appear in the title of this article because of its doubtful associations. We sometimes use it, when we have been defeated, to explain our opponent’s tactics to ourselves and to anyone else who may care to listen. Then, usually, the inference is that we are surprised that the gentlemen of the opposition would “stoop to such methods.” Thus it comes about that the word *strategy* often carries some notion of taking an unfair advantage, of intentional misquotation, of deliberate misrepresentation, of doing the things that one admits to be wrong for the sake of winning a point.

So, since we have persisted in using the word, in spite of its doubtful connotation, a definition seems clearly indicated. And, because any one-sentence definition that comes to mind is about as unsatisfactory as such definitions usually are, we will explain what we mean in the light of a typical situation, a debate on prohibition, between two distinguished men who hold almost opposite points of view.

This public debate is not, from the point of view of the debaters at the moment of the meeting, a search for truth. Each speaker, we can assume, has made a study of the evidence and believes that he has already found the truth. To each it seems unthinkable that an intelligent person should read the same evidence and arrive at the opposite point of view. Yet what seemed incredible has come to pass, and an audience has gathered to hear the two distinguished men defend opposite sides of the highly controversial question. On the platform are the two speakers, each confident that he is right and that the other is *ipso facto* wrong, each fearful lest he be discredited in the eyes of the audience, each anxious to win converts to his cause and ready to use all legitimate means to accomplish that end.

Society has outlawed certain means of discrediting an opponent on the public platform. Violations of the codes of courtesy and common honesty are just as reprehensible in debate as
anywhere else and, of course, are not included in our definition of strategy.

But to be effective each speaker must do more than state what he conceives to be the facts. Much depends on his skill in relating his arguments to the experiences of his hearers, in appealing to attitudes and antagonisms already existing in their minds, and on his success in directing their attention toward the strong points in his own arguments and the weaknesses in those of his opponent. It is to this skill in presentation, this “learning to put one's best foot foremost,” that we apply the term “strategy.”

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

A debate speech is not a thing to be judged by fixed rules, regardless of the effect it has produced on the audience. The debater is using voice and action as stimuli in the hope that he can get his hearers to respond as he wishes them to respond. The members of the audience react to the speaker's words in terms of their own past experiences. In real life situations, then, the effectiveness of the argumentative speech is judged in terms of the reactions which it provokes. A speech may observe all rules of grammar and fulfill the general requirements of unity, coherence, and emphasis, and rank low on the basis of this test.

The first principle of effective strategy is to make a careful analysis of the audience that will hear you speak. The two most important points to be considered for our purposes are (a) the amount of information about the question which your hearers already possess, and (b) their general attitude towards the proposition.

(a) If your hearers know little or nothing about the question, your speeches must supply the information essential to an understanding of the controversy. It is often necessary to inform before beginning the process of persuasion. But if the history of the question is a matter of common knowledge, the same explanation that was so desirable in the other case would be a waste of time.

(b) On the basis of their general attitude towards the question audiences may be classified as favorable, hostile, or indifferent. Oftentimes, representatives of all three groups will be found in the same audience.

How can such an analysis be made? Here are two plans that have been worked successfully: (a) Have as many students
as possible write down their reactions to the question, why they favor or oppose the proposition, what questions they would have to have answered before they would change their opinions, etc.

(b) After the debaters have studied the question for some time and are about to prepare their final speeches, have them talk with as many townspeople as possible about their attitude on the proposition.

Have the debaters study the answers given by both students and townspeople. If a great many mention some argument, it must be dealt with, no matter how trivial it may seem to the debaters who have studied the question for some time. If the results show the audience will have little information of any sort about the question it must be supplied. If a general favorite attitude towards the affirmative proposal is revealed the affirmative should capitalize on this advantage in the first speech, and the first negative speaker must deal with this before his hearers will be willing to pay attention to his other arguments. If, on the other hand, one finds the audience hostile to the affirmative proposal, the reasons for this hostility must be dealt with in some manner before much progress can be made.

An outline that would suit one audience might be quite ineffective with another. Study your audience as thoroughly as possible and build your case to fit it. Custom-built cases are much better than the ready-made ones.

Many words are more than names of qualities or attributes, or things; they arouse in us feelings of approval or disapproval; they are "yes-response" or "no-response" words. We learn about new things, and tend to accept or reject them, as they are compared with things that we already approve, or likened to others that we learned to disapprove. The attitude of approval or disapproval does not even depend on a knowledge of what the words mean; it may come from the manner in which the words are uttered. Thus, we may approve of justice, or liberalism, and disapprove of radicals and traitors, without being able to give a satisfactory definition of the terms.

The wise debater uses "yes-response" words in connection with his proposal and "no-response" words to describe the position taken by his opponent. The following introductory sen-
tences from Henry Van Dyke’s speech “For Freedom of Con-
sience” are filled with loaded words.

This is not a political speech. I am no politician—nothing but
a private citizen with progressive principles and conservative tastes,
an old Presbyterian parson, an independent writer, and a son of lib-
erty in the eighth generation of native-born Americans. I welcome
the opportunity of speaking by radio to many thousands of unseen
friends and neighbors, Protestants, Jews, Catholics, and member of
no visible church, about a subject which is very dear to my heart:
Freedom of Conscience in these United States.

For an excellent example of the application of “no-response”
words to the opposition, read Claude G. Bowers keynote speech
at the Democratic national convention in 1928. The following
sentences are taken from his introduction as printed in the daily
papers on June 27 of that year.

The American Democracy has mobilized today to wage a war
of extermination against privilege and pillage. We prime our guns
against autocracy and bureaucracy. We march against the central-
ization which threatens the liberties of the people. We fight for
the republic of the fathers and for the recovery of the covenant
from the keeping of a caste and class. We battle for the honor of
the nation, besmirched and bedraggled by the most brazen and
shameless carnival of corruption that ever blackened the reputation
of a decent and self-respecting people.

The advice to use loaded words is not to be construed as ad-
vice against the use of evidence. But unless the evidence is con-
nected with the experiences of the audience by means of these
words the speech will tend to be “dry” and the skillful choice of
these words and phrases constitutes one of the most subtle forms
of strategy.

A FEW SPECIFIC TECHNIQUES

Of the many devices that may be used, we have space to
mention only a few.

(a) Ask questions to be answered by your opponents. Choose
the question that, more than any other, is troublesome for your
opponents to answer. Ask it early in the debate after showing
the audience why they need to know the answer in order to un-
derstand the position of the opposing team. Each member of
your team must be ready to follow up the question by being pre-
pared to deal with any answer that may be made, or by showing
the significance of the failure of the opposition to attempt an
answer.
A few don’ts to be observed in connection with this device:

Don’t ask a question unless you are sure that it will be difficult for your opponent to answer it.

Don’t ask a question without showing your hearers why you are asking it and why it is important that they should know the answer.

Don’t ask a question at the end of your speech and demand that the next speaker answer it, without time for reflection.

Don’t ask more than one or two questions of this sort.

(b) Ask questions to be answered silently by the audience. This type of question usually suggests the answer that is expected but, if it is skillfully done, the listener feels that he has thought of the proper reply himself. This method has all the advantages of the “putting-it-up-to-you” technique. Consult almost any classic debate for examples of this device.

(c) Use a few pieces of the most significant evidence and take time to explain their significance. You will have much more evidence than you can present. Instead of trying to say as much of it as possible, select a limited number of pieces of evidence which will appeal, especially to your hearers and make the most of them.

(d) Attempt to prove only what is necessary to establish your side of the case. A reform need not be perfect in order to make its adoption worth while. Do not claim too much for your proposal. You will find it easier to present evidence in support of a moderate position, and the opposition will, in consequence, find the attack more difficult.

(e) Show that the affirmative proposal should be opposed because of what it will lead to. Thus the opponent of the child labor amendment argued that the amendment should be defeated because it was a step towards state socialism. The administrator refuses a request on the grounds that if it were granted many more would come in which would be much more difficult to refuse.