

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1981

Verifiability and Veracity of Evidence at the South Dakota State High School Debate Tournament

Andrew J. Rist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Rist, Andrew J., "Verifiability and Veracity of Evidence at the South Dakota State High School Debate Tournament" (1981). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4052.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/4052>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

VERIFIABILITY AND VERACITY OF EVIDENCE AT THE
SOUTH DAKOTA STATE HIGH SCHOOL
DEBATE TOURNAMENT

BY

ANDREW J. RIST

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Arts, Major in
Speech, South Dakota
State University

1981

VERIFIABILITY AND VERACITY OF EVIDENCE AT THE
SOUTH DAKOTA STATE HIGH SCHOOL
DEBATE TOURNAMENT

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the degree, Master of Arts, and is acceptable for meeting the thesis requirements for this degree. Acceptance of this thesis does not imply that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

Wayne E. Hoogestraat
Thesis Adviser

Date

Judith Zivanovic
Head, Department of Speech

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Wayne Hoogestraat for his patient guidance through my undergraduate and graduate studies and my thesis work.

My loving parents, Paul and Virginia Rist, deserve special recognition for their twenty-four years of continued support.

I thank Dr. Michael Schliessmann and Dr. Harold Widvey for their support and aid in my thesis. Also, they have made the past six years rewarding both academically and personally.

I also thank the faculty of the Department of Speech for their continued guidance and direction.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank Ila Amsus who has always been supportive and helpful.

AJR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Origin and Justification	1
Procedures	3
Endnotes	11
II. VERIFIABILITY	12
Debate One	13
Debate Two	20
Debate Three	25
Debate Four	29
Debate Five	35
Debate Six	38
Debate Seven	42
Debate Eight	45
Analysis	49
III. VERACITY	55
Debate One	56
Debate Two	61
Debate Three	63
Debate Four	65
Debate Five	68
Debate Six	69
Debate Seven	73
Debate Eight	77
Analysis	78
Endnotes	82
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	84
Summary	84
Conclusions	87
Recommendations for Further Study	88
APPENDIX	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine the veracity and verifiability of evidence cited or alluded to in the 1980 South Dakota State High School Championship Debate Tournament. More specifically, this study represents an attempt to find answers to the following questions:

1. Can the researcher identify the specific sources of and allusions to evidence as presented?
2. How complete is the oral documentation for each of the identified citations or allusions to evidence?
3. How accurate is the documentation for each of the citations and/or allusions?
4. How accurate is the reported content of each of the citations and allusions in those instances where documentation is complete?

Origin and Justification

Gerald H. Sanders, the Director of Forensics at Wooster College, has noted that the research demands of current competitive debate are much greater than they

were twenty years ago.¹ With this increased proliferation of the use of evidence, questions have arisen concerning the veracity of evidence.

Throughout nine years of personal experience in competitive debate both as a competitor and as a judge, allegations of the misuse of evidence have been witnessed. Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede have addressed this misuse of evidence. They wrote that "Deliberate falsification not only violates the principles of critical deliberation but constitutes dishonesty of the worst sort."² They have indicated that the implications for the debater using such evidence are that the discovery of misused evidence ". . . casts suspicion . . . on the integrity of the debater."³ This study is designed to analyze the pervasiveness of this practice within a selected sample.

In 1964, William R. Dresser conducted a study which viewed evidence practices in collegiate debate.⁴ James Benson later conducted a similar study dealing with collegiate debate. His study was completed in 1969 at Purdue University.⁵ This current study differs from both Dresser's and Benson's studies in that (1) it is an evaluation of the practices of high school debate and (2) it covers an event which occurred at a later date. Therefore, no possible duplication exists.

The current study is intended to provide insights concerning the present practices in the use of evidence in South Dakota High School debate. By noting the verifiability and veracity of quoted material or implied evidence, coaches and students alike may become more aware of the ethical and utilitarian considerations in the use of evidence. Thirty years ago, Henry Lee Ewbank, and J. Jeffrey Auer noted the importance of guaranteeing the veracity of evidence:

Properly conducted refutation and rebuttal subject each important argument to searching scrutiny and result in a judgment based on a fair consideration of available evidence.⁶

Procedures

The following procedures were undertaken in an attempt to answer the questions raised under the statement of purpose.

1. A specific review of literature related to this particular study was judged inappropriate due to the nature of the inquiry. At the outset, the project involved viewing an event that had yet to take place, therefore excluding the possibility of prior research identical to the present inquiry. However, research may have been conducted dealing with similar events. Therefore, the following guides were surveyed to determine if any related studies had been completed.

Comprehensive Dissertations Index, 1961-79.
Communication and the Arts. Ann Arbor, Michigan:
 Xerox University Press.

Dissertation Abstracts International, XXVIII. Ann
 Arbor, Michigan: Xerox University Microfilms.

Dow, Clyde W. "Abstracts of Theses in the Field of
 Speech." Speech Monographs, 1930-65.

Knower, Franklin H. "Graduate Theses: An Index of
 Graduate Work in Speech." Speech Monographs,
 1930-69.

Mulgrave, Dorothy Irene. Bibliography of Speech and
 Allied Areas, 1950-60. Philadelphia: Chilton Co.,
 Book Division, 1962.

Nelson, Max. "Abstracts of Theses in the Field of
 Speech." Speech Monographs, 1966.

Shearer, Ned A. Bibliographic Annual in Speech
 Communication: 1970-75. New York: Speech
 Communication Association.

The only possible duplications that were found were indicated earlier (See page two). As was previously noted, this study differs from Dresser's and Benson's work. The current study appears to be original in nature and intent and attempts to discover the answers to questions beyond those used by Dresser and Benson.

2. To determine the verifiability and veracity of evidence quoted and alluded to at the South Dakota State Debate Tournament, the following evaluative questions were developed:

A. Are the source citations and evidence allusions presented in a manner which allows accurate identification?

1. Was the author cited?

2. Was the publication cited?

3. Was the date of publication cited?

B. How complete was the quotation of each of the identified items offered as evidence?

1. Was it quoted exactly as written?

2. Was the entire text of the indicated material orally presented?

C. How accurate was the documentation for each of the citations and allusions?

1. Was the author accurately reported?

2. Was the publication accurately reported?

3. Was the date of publication accurately reported?

D. How accurate was the reported content of each of the citations and allusions in those instances in which documentation was complete?

1. Did the reading of the evidence accurately reflect the original source's content?

2. Did the reading of the evidence accurately reflect the original source's intent?

3. The following criteria were developed to aid in determining the answers to questions posed in 2. A.

A. Source citations for books must include both the author and the title of the book to be considered adequately verifiable.

B. Source citations for periodicals must include both the name of the publication and the exact date of the issue to be considered adequately verifiable.

C. Source citations for government documents must include both the name of the publication (i.e., hearing, etc.) and the author (or speaker) or page number to be considered adequately verifiable.

- D. Source citations for pamphlets must include the name of the publication and the origin of the publication to be considered adequately verifiable.
- E. Citations for newspapers must include the name of publication and the exact date of the issue to be considered adequately verifiable.
- F. Citations for other items must include the name of the publication, the origin of the publication, and the date to be considered adequately verifiable.

4. The following criteria were developed to aid in determining the answers to the questions posed in 2. D.

- A. For a quotation or allusion to be considered an accurate representation of the original source's content it must:
 - 1. Report the original material's content without modification;
 - 2. or, in the case of a paraphrase, it must not add any qualifying words that are not found in the original nor delete any qualifying words found in the original content that could change the interpretation of said material.
- B. For a quotation or allusion to be considered an accurate representation of the original source's intent it must:
 - 1. not alter the wording of the material to alter the interpretation of the material;
 - 2. not take individual portions of the work which may be accurate, but do not conform to the intent of the work as a whole;
 - 3. or, in the case of a paraphrase, not add or delete any qualifying words that could alter the original source's intent.

5. A field study was initiated to find the answers to the questions found in the statement of purpose.

The study was conducted at the South Dakota High School Championship Debate Tournament held in Huron, South Dakota, on February 29 and March 1, 1980.

Permission was granted to conduct the study by Ralph Wilkinson, Assistant Executive Secretary of the South Dakota High School Activities Association.

The following materials were used in collecting the samples for the study:

A. Fourteen 120-minute cassette tapes (sixty minutes each side), and

B. Eight cassette tape recorders.

C. All recorders and tapes were tested prior to the actual tournament and found to be in working condition.

6. The recording was accomplished in the following manner:

A. All quarter-final, semi-final, and final rounds were recorded in both "A" and "B" debate divisions. After four preliminary rounds had been completed, the top eight teams determined by win-loss records advanced into the quarter-final rounds in each division. The winners of the quarter-final rounds advanced into the semi-finals. Finally, the winners of the semi-final rounds advanced into the final rounds. The most rounds scheduled at any given time was eight.

B. For those debates which the researcher was unable to personally attend, the following steps were taken:

1. An individual was assigned in each debate to operate the recorder. These persons were Huron High School debaters who functioned as timers for the tournament. Instructions concerning the use of the recorders and the actual recording were given to the timers by the researcher.⁷
2. Recorders were checked by the researcher immediately preceding each round to guarantee that they were operational.
3. Batteries were tested by the researcher immediately following each round. If a battery was not adequately charged, it was replaced.
4. The tapes were checked before each round to assure that they were functional and recording.
5. The recorders were placed in the area of the room judged best for providing adequate recording. The researcher tried several positions in determining the optimum area.
6. Timers were instructed to return the recorders and tapes to the researcher immediately following each round.

C. Immediately following each round, the researcher collected the tapes and recorders. The tapes were marked to indicate which division ("A" or "B") was involved and the level of competition (i.e., quarter-finals, semi-finals, or finals). These tapes were then turned over to Ralph Wilkinson to be held until the end of

tournament. The tapes then came under the custody of the researcher.

7. The following written statement was provided to judges and coaches immediately preceding the first round to be recorded:

ATTENTION COACHES AND JUDGES:

I am doing a study which necessitates taping debate rounds. This study is being done in completion of the M.A. requirements for speech at South Dakota State University. The study is intended to focus on the sequencing of arguments.

The rounds which will be used in the study are the quarter-final, semi-final, and final rounds. Both "A" and "B" divisions will be used.

After each round has been taped, the tapes will be turned over to Ralph Wilkinson. He will then hold the tapes until the completion of the tournament.

The tapes will be marked so as to only indicate the level of competition and the division. The actual names of the particular schools and contestants will not appear in the study.

I would appreciate the cooperation of those judging the involved rounds. Specifically, I would ask you to make sure that the tape recorder is started at the beginning of the round and that you would flip the tape over at the end of the constructives and start the recorder again.

I thank you for your cooperation. Feel free to ask me any questions that you might have.

Thanks again,

Andy Rist
Graduate Asst. in Speech
South Dakota State University

8. After collecting the tapes, the following method was employed to find answers to the questions raised in procedure two.

A. Written transcripts of purported evidence and the oral documentation were prepared by the researcher and were verified by Dr. Harold Widvey, Director of Forensics at South Dakota State University. Dr. Widvey listened to the tapes and verified the accuracy of the transcripts. Specifically, he listened to the tapes to determine if any purported items of evidence or documentation had been omitted from the transcripts and if all purported items in the transcripts actually appeared in the recordings. On completion, he verified the accuracy of the transcripts.

9. After the written transcripts had been compiled, library research was initiated in an attempt to find the quoted material or evidence to which allusions had been made, when possible, and to discover the evidence's veracity and exactness of documentation.

10. The compiled data was then used to answer the questions noted under procedure two. These answers were then used to determine conclusions concerning the accuracy of documentation and the veracity of evidence and allusions to evidence at the South Dakota High School Championship Debate Tournament.

ENDNOTES

¹Gerald H. Sanders, "Misuse of Evidence in Academic Debate," Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice, and Teaching, ed. David A. Thomas (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1975), p. 220.

²Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede, Decision by Debate, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1978), p. 66.

³Ibid., p. 70.

⁴William R. Dresser, "The Use of Evidence in Ten Championship Debates," Journal of the American Forensics Association (September 1964), pp. 101-106.

⁵James Benson, "The Use of Evidence in Inter-collegiate debate" (Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1969).

⁶Henry Lee Ewbank and J. Jeffrey Auer, Discussion and Debate, 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. 458.

⁷Timers were instructed to check if their assigned tape recorders were operational. If not, they were to return to the researcher. Once operational, timers were instructed to periodically monitor the recorder to assure that it was recording throughout the round. At the end of the constructive speeches, the timers were to turn the tape over. As all of the recorders had automatic volume control for recording, no instructions were provided concerning monitoring the actual recording. At the completion of the round, the timers were to return the recorders and tapes immediately to the researcher.

CHAPTER II

VERIFIABILITY

Before an attempt could be made to determine the veracity of evidence used in the state tournament, it was necessary to verify the existence of the reported sources. This chapter, therefore, deals exclusively with the completeness and accuracy of source citations.

The method employed in this study involved the taping of fourteen rounds of debate at the 1980 South Dakota Debate Tournament. Eight tapes were selected for study on the basis of the quality of the recording. Each of the tapes was subsequently transcribed into partial manuscripts. The manuscripts consisted of apparent evidence citations and allusions to evidence. Both the source and the text of the evidence were included in the transcripts. An identical process was utilized for each of the eight tapes chosen.

In this chapter, the references to source citations will only indicate the debate from which the citation was procured. An appendix of the texts is included at the end of this study. (See Appendix A.) Each debate was randomly numbered one through eight. The names of the schools and participants involved in the individual

debates are not indicated to ensure anonymity. Furthermore, although both the constructive and rebuttal speeches were analyzed for both the affirmative and negative teams, references will only be made so as to indicate side (affirmative or negative). This may further assure anonymity of the participants involved.

Debate One

Affirmative

Periodicals

The analysis of references to periodicals included magazines, journals, and newspapers. For citations involving magazines or journals to be considered adequately verifiable they must have included both the specific name of the publication and the exact date of the issue. The same requirements were applied to source citations for newspapers.

In debate one, the affirmative relied heavily on periodicals. Twenty-five citations were discovered. These included six magazines and six newspapers. U.S. News and World Report was cited twice. The issues involved were the November 5, 1979 and the April 23, 1979 publications. Both of these citations were considered verifiable. The January 15, 1979, February 12, 1979, and

the November 26, 1979 issues of Time magazine were cited by the affirmative. They were considered verifiable. One other citation involved Time magazine, but because only the year in which the issue was printed--1980--was indicated the reference was not considered adequately verifiable. Newsweek was cited twice. In both instances, the exact date of the issue was provided by the affirmative speaker. Representative Mike McCormack was quoted from Nation's Business in the January 1980 issue. Stanford Magazine was cited twice by the affirmative, quoting from the Winter 1979 issue both times. Quoting from the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, the affirmative only indicated that the issue was printed in 1977. Because the Bulletin is a monthly publication, this citation was not considered adequately verifiable. Overall, of the eleven citations involving magazines, nine were deemed verifiable.

Before leaving this section, it should be noted that there was unusual difficulty encountered in finding an article entitled "The Windfall Profits or the Windfall Tax" in the April 23, 1979 issue of U.S. News and World Report. The title of this article was not included in the table of contents at the beginning of the issue, which created some confusion. Later, it was discovered that the material being quoted was taken from a Mobil Oil

Company advertisement. It is assumed that U.S. News and World Report does not generally index advertisements which could explain the difficulty in finding the quotation. The speaker using this source did not indicate that it had been taken from the advertisement.

Thirteen citations of newspapers, encompassing six particular publications, were made by the affirmative. The Wall Street Journal was cited five times. Because in all instances the citation included both the name of the publication and exact date of the issue, all five citations were considered adequately verifiable. In one instance, the affirmative noted the specific title of the article being used--"They've Done It Again" in the May 21, 1979 issue. The Christian Science Monitor was cited twice. The New York Times was cited twice. The Argus Leader was cited once. The Minneapolis Tribune was cited once. The Des Moines Register was cited once by the affirmative. In only one instance was the citation inadequate. The speaker quoting the New York Times only indicated that it was printed sometime in 1977. Since this is a daily newspaper, providing only the year was too vague for purposes of verification.

In summary, of the twenty-five citations involving periodicals, twenty-two were considered adequate for purposes of verifiability. In the three citations not

considered adequately verifiable the specific date of the issue quoted was not indicated.

Books

For citations involving books to be considered adequately verifiable, both the author and the title of the book must have been included.

The affirmative quoted from a book only once. The book was cited as "William E. Simon, A Time for Truth, 1978." This citation was considered to be adequately verifiable because the citation indicated both the author and the title.

Government publications

Source citations for government publications must have included both the name of the publication (i.e., hearing, etc.) and the name of the person being quoted or the page number to have been considered adequately verifiable.

Only two citations involved government publications--the Energy Petroleum and Extension Act Hearings of 1974 and the National University Extension Agency of 1978. Both citations were considered to be inadequate because they failed to provide either the name of the person being quoted or the exact page number.

Other

References were also made to two dictionaries-- Black's Law Dictionary and the Wisdom Dictionary. Because citations for sources other than periodicals, books, or government publications must have included both the name of the publication and the exact date of the publication to be considered adequately verifiable, these two citations were not viewed as being adequate. In both instances, the date had been omitted from the citation.

Negative

Periodicals

Fourteen magazines were cited by the negative in debate one--U.S. News and World Report, Current History, Progressive, Fortune, the National Journal, New Republic, Business Week, Nation, Current, Time, Foreign Policy, Science Digest, Dunn's Review, and Foreign Affairs. Of the twenty-nine times that magazines were quoted, the citations were adequate for purposes of verifiability in only sixteen instances. In all of those instances in which the citation was considered to be inadequate, the speaker failed to provide the specific date of the issue. For instance, there were three times that the speaker only indicated that the Business Week quotation had been taken from an issue printed sometime in 1977. Nation

magazine was cited twice indicating only that the issue was printed in 1978. Foreign Affairs, Dunn's Review, Science Digest, Foreign Policy, Fortune, and Current were each cited once and only the year of publication was indicated. In one citation involving U.S. News and World Report, no date was offered whatsoever. Because these magazines are either weekly or monthly publications, providing only the year in which the issue was printed was viewed as being inadequate for the purposes of verification.

Two journals were quoted by the negative--the Journal of Contemporary Law, Winter 1979, page 19 and the Oil and Gas Journal, 1978. The Contemporary Law citation was considered to be adequate because both the specific date of publication and the page number had been provided. In the four instances utilizing the Oil and Gas Journal, only the year in which the issue was published had been offered. Therefore, all four citations were not considered verifiable.

Overall, of the thirty-four citations involving periodicals, seventeen of these citations were considered adequately verifiable. For those seventeen not considered verifiable, the exact date of the publication had not been provided by the negative speaker.

Government publications

Two references were made involving government publications. The negative cited the Congressional Record and Energy Commission Report. Both citations were considered inadequate for purposes of verifiability because neither indicated the name of the person being quoted nor the page number. Only the year of publication had been provided.

Other

Three sources were cited in such a manner that it was unclear just what type of publication they were. These citations included the Cybernetic Theory of Possession of 1974, the Control of Oil of 1976, and Project Independence of 1977. A listing of periodicals was checked and none of these sources could be found there. If they are books, then the citations are inadequate because the author had been omitted. If they are government publications, the citations were inadequate since neither the name of the person being quoted nor the page numbers had been provided. Furthermore, the origin of the publication had not been offered.

Synthesis

Of the thirty-nine citations made by the negative, only seventeen were considered to be adequately

verifiable. Of the thirty citations made by the affirmative, twenty-three were considered verifiable. Of the sixty-nine citations made in the round, only forty were verifiable.

In those citations involving periodicals, the failure to provide the exact date of the issue made them non-verifiable. For those citations involving books and government publications, non-verifiability was assigned since either the name of the person being quoted or the page number (for government publications) or the date of the printing had been omitted.

Debate Two

Affirmative

Periodicals

The affirmative cited periodicals eleven times in debate two. The Wall Street Journal was the only newspaper quoted. It was cited twice. In the first instance in which the source had been quoted, the citation was considered to be inadequate. Only the month and year of the publication had been provided--September 1979. Because this is a daily paper, the reference was too vague. The second citation included the specific date of publication and therefore was judged verifiable.

Six magazines were cited by the affirmative-- Agenda, the Department of State Magazine, World Issues, Futurist, Food Monitors, and Forbes. The identification given these magazines was considered adequate for purposes of verification. In all instances the specific date of publication was provided.

The only journal source offered by the affirmative was the Georgia Journal of International Law and Comparative Law. This citation was inadequate. Only the year in which the journal had been printed was provided. Because this is a quarterly publication, the citation was viewed as being too vague.

Overall, of the eleven citations of periodicals, five were adequately verifiable. The specific date of publication had not been provided for the four reported source references that were inadequate.

Books

Four books were alluded to by the affirmative-- International Trade by Developing Nations by Peter Gray, The Strategy of International Development--Essays in the Economics of Backwardness by H. W. Singer, U.S. Power in Multi-National Corporations by Robert Dupe, and American Multi-Nationals: American Interest by the Brookings Institute. Each citation was viewed as adequate for

purposes of verifiability. The specific title of the book and the name of the author had been included.

Government publications

Two government publications were cited by the affirmative. One was the "U.S. Department of State, The U.S. and the Third World, a Discussion Paper." This citation was judged inadequate in that the specific date of publication, the name of the person being quoted, and the page number(s) were all omitted. The other citation involved the 23rd Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program in 1978. Since the person being quoted is obvious and the report is only issued once a year, the citation was adequate.

Other

Four additional sources were cited by the affirmative in such a way that it was unclear what type of publications were being quoted. These four citations included: Economic Development in the Third World, 1977; the World Development Report of 1979; Labor Views on Employment in July of 1978; and the M.N.C. State Policy and Its Impact on the United States Economy of Fall 1979. If these sources are books, the citations were inadequate because the author was omitted. If they are government

publications they were inadequate since either the name of the person being quoted or the page number(s) had been omitted.

Negative

Periodicals

In debate two, fifteen negative citations referred to periodicals. Of these fifteen citations, seven were verifiable. The September 5, 1978 issue of the Boston Globe was the only newspaper cited by the negative. This citation was adequately verifiable.

The negative quoted from the following magazines: Time, the Department of State Bulletin, World Issues, the UNESCO Courier, Foreign Policy, Business Week, Fortune, and World Business. In the seven citations which were considered inadequate the negative failed to give the specific date of the issue being quoted. Five of those referred to the Department of State Bulletin. In each instance the citation omitted the specific weekly date and only indicated the month and year of issue. World Issues was cited so as to only indicate the year in which the issue was printed--1978. The same problem existed with the citation of World Business.

Books

Only one book was quoted by the negative. This was the U.S. and the Third World, 1976, by the Department of State. Both the author and title were included, therefore the citation was considered adequately verifiable.

Government publications

Two government publications were cited by the negative. Both were inadequate. The first referred to the source as Energy Conservation and Regulation, April 4, 1977. Neither the person being quoted nor the page number had been provided. The second citation indicated that the source was Mike McCormack in the Congressional Record. Although the speaker's name was provided, no mention had been made as to the date of publication.

Other

Three references were made by the negative in such a way as to defy classification of the source. The International Business Enterprise was cited. It was unclear whether this was the title of a publication or the publisher. Also, no date was provided. The source Foreign Trade Policies of the United States was offered, but the citation did not indicate either the name of the person being quoted or the date of the publication. The

World Development Report of 1979 citation similarly failed to indicate the author or the origin of the publication.

Synthesis

In debate two, a total of forty-two citations were made. Eighteen of these were verifiable. For periodicals, those citations which were inadequate failed to provide the specific date of the publication. All books cited were judged verifiable. The references to government publications considered not verifiable failed to indicate either the name of the person being quoted or the page number from which the quotation had been extracted. Three citations were made in such a way that it was not considered possible to determine the nature of the publication.

Debate Three

Affirmative

Periodicals

In debate three, the affirmative made reference to only one newspaper--the New York Times. The first citation included the specific date of publication--May 22, 1977. The second was not adequate for purposes of verification. No date was offered.

Three magazines were quoted by the affirmative. These included the New York Times Magazine of March 13, 1977, Commentary of December 1978 and American in 1978. The citation for the New York Times Magazine was verifiable. It included the date of publication and the name of the person being quoted (Emma Rothschild). The other two citations were inadequate. As Commentary is a weekly publication, providing only the month was considered insufficient. American is likewise a weekly publication, and the affirmative only indicated the year in which the issue had been published.

Books

No books were cited by the affirmative in debate three.

Government publications

No government publications were cited by the affirmative in debate three.

Other

The affirmative cited six vague sources, providing insufficient information relating to the origin of the publication. One referred to a source called Peace and Change. This was the only information provided. Three citations only indicated the name of the person being quoted. Two quotations were cited as coming in 1978 from

James Grant and Senator Adlai Stevenson. One other citation only indicated that the quotation had been taken from Eckman and Messias. For these last three sources, the affirmative failed to provide the name of the publication being used and the specific date of the publication.

Two other sources were considered too vague to allow adequate verification. A reference was made to a publication entitled the O.D.C. Agenda of 1979 which did not indicate either the name of the person being quoted or the origin of the publication. Another involved a publication entitled Economic Development, January 1979. Once again, neither the name of the person being quoted nor the origin of the publication were indicated.

Negative

Periodicals

As did the affirmative, the negative team made only one reference to a newspaper in debate three. They quoted the November 8, 1978 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Three magazines were cited by the negative. The citation of James Boyce and Betsy Hartman in the March 4, 1978 issue of Nation magazine was considered sufficient for verification. The references to American of 1978

and Foreign Policy of 1977 were both considered non-verifiable. The citations only indicated the year in which the issues had been published.

Books

The negative made one reference to a book entitled Introduction to Nutrition, 1976. This citation was viewed as inadequate because the name of the author had been omitted.

Government publications

Two quotations were drawn from government publications. Both of these citations--Senate Hearings on the Bomb and International Activity, 1978, and Congressional Record, 1974--failed to provide the specific date of publication, the name of the person being quoted and the page number(s) from which the quotation was taken. Both were inadequate for purposes of verifiability.

Other

Eleven citations were made by the negative without offering information to determine the origin of the evidence. Nine citations only indicated the name of the person being quoted and the year from which the quotation was taken. These were: Representative James Stewart, 1978; Saki and Cummings, 1978; Osgoode and Walderstein, 1977; D. L. Johnson, 1978; J. S. Annalt, 1979; Humphrey,

1978; Professors Hopkins and Puchella, 1979; Roger Darwin, 1978; and Morris J. Williams, 1977. All of these citations omitted the name of the publication. Two citations provided the name of the publication but not the names of the persons being quoted. These two sources were cited as the I.N.F. Survey of 1978 and World Population, 1978.

Synthesis

In debate three, there were thirty-five citations. Only six were considered verifiable. The six that were verifiable referred to periodicals. Two citations involving government publications omitted the names of the persons being quoted, the specific date of the printing, and page number(s). Twenty-three citations either failed to give any mention to the person being quoted or only indicated the name of the person being quoted while omitting the name of the publication from which the quotation was drawn.

Debate Four

Affirmative

Periodicals

In debate four the affirmative quoted from two newspapers--the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal.

Both citations involving the New York Times were inadequate because only the year of issue was provided--1978 and 1979. The citation of the Wall Street Journal was considered to be adequately verifiable since the exact date of the issue was given--December 13, 1979.

Thirteen affirmative citations involved magazines and journals. Four were inadequate. Only the year in which the issue was published was provided. These sources were cited as Foreign Policy, 1978; the National Journal, 1979 (twice) and Popular Science, 1978. Each of these publications are printed either weekly or monthly. Citations that were considered to be adequately verifiable involved four issues of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists--January 1980, February 1980, March 1980, and November 1978, the October 23, 1978 issue of Fortune magazine, and the May 1979 article "The Nuclear Dilemma" found in Technology Review.

Books

Two books were cited by the affirmative--Changing Patterns in Foreign Trade and the Geopolitics of Energy. In both instances the author was omitted, and the source was not considered adequately verifiable.

Government publications

Four citations involved government publications. All four were inadequate in that neither the name of the person being quoted nor the page number(s) from which the quotation was drawn or the exact date of the publication had been provided by the affirmative speaker. These were the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1978 (three times) and the Committee on Nuclear Alternative Technology, 1980.

Other

Three citations of other sources were inadequate because only the author or the person being quoted was indicated, or only an acronym was offered as the citation. These were: Peter Dawkins, 1978; William Ingle, 1979; and N.P.A., 1978. The Dawkins and Ingle citations provided neither the name of the publication being used nor the specific date of publication. The N.P.A. citation was viewed as being inadequate. It was unclear whether the acronym involved an agency being quoted or the name of a publication. Also, no specific mention of a date was provided other than to identify the year from which the quotation was taken.

Negative

Periodicals

In debate four the negative cited three newspapers--the Rocky Mountain News, the Minneapolis Tribune, and the Albuquerque Journal. Only the Rocky Mountain News citation was inadequate. The negative speaker indicated that the issue was printed sometime in 1978. The February 6, 1980 issue of the Minneapolis Tribune and the July 6, 1977 issue of the Albuquerque Journal citations were considered to be verifiable.

Fifteen citations, involving eight magazines and journals, were made by the negative. The six citations that were verifiable all came from the same February 18, 1980 issue of U.S. News and World Report. The remaining nine citations, not considered verifiable, were Scientific American, 1978; the Progressive, 1972; Intellect, 1976; Environment, 1973 and 1978; Current, November 1979; Science, March 1977; and the Annals of Science, 1978. Because Current and Science magazines are published weekly, providing only the month and year was inadequate. The remaining publications are either weekly or monthly publications. Because only the year of the particular issue being quoted was indicated, these were also considered to be non-verifiable.

Books

Three books were noted by the negative. All three citations were inadequate. The first cited, Nuclear Power, the Viable Power, did not provide the name of the author. The same omission was found in the citations of Nuclear Weapons and World Politics and Solar Power.

Government publications

Nine citations of government publications, encompassing seven sources, were provided by the negative-- all of which were insufficient for purposes of adequate verification. Quotations were drawn twice from a 1976 issue of the Congressional Record. In neither instance was the exact date, the name of the person being quoted or the page number orally documented. One reference was made to a Congressional Budget Office report in 1977. In this instance, the specific date of publication, the specific name of the publication, and the page number or the name of the person being quoted were omitted. Another reference was made to the Congressional Research Service. The oral documentation offered for this citation only indicated that it was published in 1979. One quotation was drawn from a publication entitled the Review of the National Breeder Reactor Program published in 1976. Once again, the name of the person being quoted and the page number(s) from which the quotation was taken,

the origin of the publication, and the specific date of the publication were omitted. Two citations only indicated the name of the person being quoted and that the quotation was taken from "committee hearings." These citations were offered as "Lewis D. Navenzo, Washington Subcommittee," and "John Litler, Senate Energy Committee." The final citation made from a government publication was offered as Hearings on the House Committee on Government Operations, September 1977. The name of the person being quoted was not provided in the citation.

Other

The negative gave two source citations in which only the name of the person being quoted and the date on which the statement was made were offered. In the first instance, the citation was given as "James Benson, September 20, 1977." The name of the publication from which the quotation was taken was not provided. In the second citation, the only information provided indicated that the quotation was taken from a Frederick Thayer on March 1977. Once again, no mention was made of the publication in which it could be located.

Synthesis

Of the fifty-nine citations in this round, twenty-two were considered verifiable. Of the twelve citations

of periodicals that were judged inadequate, the specific date of the issue being used was omitted. In the six citations involving books, no mention was made of the author. In the thirteen instances in which a government publication was being quoted, either the name of the person being quoted or the actual name of the publication had not been provided by the speaker. In six instances, the information in the citation was inadequate because no determination could be made concerning the origin of the evidence.

Debate Five

Affirmative

Periodicals

The only newspaper cited by the affirmative in debate five was a 1978 issue of the Wall Street Journal. Only the year in which this particular issue was published was indicated. The citation was not considered to be verifiable.

Ten quotations were drawn from magazines and journals. All the citations were inadequate because the affirmative speaker failed to provide the specific date of the publication. These citations were presented as Foreign Affairs, 1979; U.S. News and World Report, 1978; U.S. News and World Report, 1979 (twice); the International

Journal, 1978; Business in America, 1979; Vital Speeches, 1979; Business Week, 1979; the New Republic, 1978; and Nation's Business, 1978. These publications are printed either weekly or monthly. Therefore, the citations were not deemed adequate for purposes of verification.

Books

No books were cited by the affirmative in debate five.

Government publications

No government publications were cited by the affirmative in debate five.

Other

Seven citations were presented by the affirmative that did not include enough information to determine the origin of the material. The citations were stated solely as "International Realities, 1978; Kline in 1978; Economics in 1978; Charles Frank, 1977; Carlson, 1978; Weissberger, 1979; and Ross, 1975." In all of these citations, the failure to provide the actual name of the publication (except for Economics, 1978), the specific date of publication or the origin of the quoted material rendered them insufficient for determining verifiability.

Negative

The negative team offered little evidence in debate five. No periodicals or books were cited. The three quotations that were offered included adequate information to make them verifiable. Two government publications were cited. These were the Congressional Record of February 26, 1979, page H856; and U.S. Trade Policies in the Tokyo Round of Multi-National Negotiations, March 1979. The two quotations taken from U.S. Trade Policies were indicated as being on pages xii and xix.

Synthesis

Of the twenty-one citations found in debate five, only three were verifiable. The eleven citations involving periodicals failed to provide the exact date of the issue. Seven citations provided an insufficient amount of information to determine the origin of the quoted material. All three government publications cited by the negative were verifiable.

Debate Six

Affirmative

Periodicals

In the sixth debate studied, the affirmative quoted from three newspapers--the November 5, 1979 issue of the Des Moines Register; the March 22, 1979 issue of the Wall Street Journal; and the May 23, 1979 issue of the Washington Post. All three citations were verifiable. One other reference was made to the Wall Street Journal in which the citation included only the year--1979--in which the issue was printed.

Eleven quotations were taken from eight different magazines and journals. These citations included the July 13, 1979 issue of Science magazine; the May 14, 1979 issue of Forbes; the May 22, 1978 issue of Business Week; the January 15, 1979 and March 3, 1980 issues of U.S. News and World Report; a February 1979 issue of Newsweek; an August 1979 issue of Nation's Business; and the March 21, 1979 issue of Time magazine. Because the Newsweek and Nation's Business citations did not indicate the week of publication, they were not considered to be verifiable.

Books

No books were cited by the affirmative in debate six.

Government publications

The affirmative cited government publications four times. Only one citation was considered to be verifiable. Two quotations were cited from a 1979 issue of the Congressional Record. In neither instance was the specific date of the publication or the person being quoted identified. The April 5, 1979 citation of Congressional Record was verifiable, both the exact date of publication and the name of the person being quoted--Senator Hart--were identified. One quotation was taken from the Committee on Energy and National Resources. The specific name of the hearings, which house the committee represented, the name of the person being quoted, and the page number were all omitted from the citation. Therefore, it was not considered verifiable.

Other

The affirmative quoted four sources without indicating the name of the publication from which the material was taken. Former President Carter, Joseph Mayers, and the former National Security Advisor Brezhinski were all quoted. However, only their names were cited. Two references were made to a 1975 John Hopkins study. In both instances, neither the original source or the actual title of the study were identified.

Negative

Periodicals

In debate six the negative team cited only one newspaper--the New York Times. The speaker only indicated that the quotation came from a 1979 issue and the citation was considered to be insufficient.

Eleven citations involving six magazines and journals were made by the negative. The sources cited were a 1979 issue of Business Week; the Summer 1975 issue of Foreign Policy; a 1979 issue of Fortune magazine; a 1979 issue of Business in America; the March 3, 1980 issue of U.S. News and World Report; and the January 21, 1980 issue of Newsweek. Because the citations for Business Week; Fortune; Foreign Policy, 1979; and Business in America only indicated the year in which issue was printed, they were not considered to be verifiable. The remaining citations provided the specific date of publication and therefore were considered verifiable.

Books

No books were cited by the negative in debate six.

Government publications

The negative made two citations of government publications. Both were judged inadequate. The first citation referred to the source as Future Reports, Senate

Subcommittee, 1973. The name of the person being quoted, the name of the subcommittee holding the hearings, and the exact date of the printing were all omitted from the citation. The second citation only indicated that the quotation was taken from a 1976 Federal Energy Administration report. The title of the publication, the actual date of publication, and the origin of the publication were all omitted.

Other

The negative quoted Senator Edmund Muskie and a person by the name of Metzenbaum without indicating the origin of the material. Neither citation was considered verifiable.

Synthesis

Of the forty citations in debate six, only sixteen were verifiable. The twelve citations of periodicals that were not verifiable failed to indicate the specific date of the issue. The five citations of government publications that were not verifiable either failed to indicate the name of the person being quoted or the origin of the quoted material. Seven citations only indicated the name of the person being quoted.

Debate Seven

Affirmative

Periodicals

In debate seven, the affirmative quoted no newspapers. Eight citations, involving seven magazines and journals, were provided. The magazines and journals that were cited were the June/July 1979 issue of Technology Review; the December 25, 1978 issue of Business Week; the September 1975 issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists; a 1977 issue of Nation magazine; the April 16, 1979 issue of Time; the December 3, 1976 issue of Commonwealth; and the March 23, 1979 issue of Conservation Reports. Only the Nation citation was considered non-verifiable. This publication is printed weekly and indicating only the year in which the issue being quoted was taken was considered too vague.

Books

Two books were cited by the affirmative. In both instances, they were verifiable. The books quoted were Donald Kelly's Energy Crisis and the Environment and McKinley Wilson's The Unacceptable Risk. Because the title and the author were provided in the citation, both were verifiable.

Government publications

Three references were made to government publications. One citation only indicated that the quotation was from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. No information was provided in which the actual title of the publication, the name of the person being quoted or the specific date of publication were identified. Another citation indicated that the source being quoted was the Nuclear Oversight Hearings of 1979. The affirmative speaker did not indicate the origin of the hearings, the name of the person being quoted, or the specific date of publication. The third citation noted that the quotation was taken from the April 23, 1976 printing of the Congressional Record. Because neither the person being quoted or the page number were offered, the quotation was not considered verifiable.

Other

Five citations provided inadequate information to determine the origin of the quoted material. Four of these citations were The Silent Bomb, 1977; Nuclear Tyranny, 1979; The Unviable Option (no date given); and Shutdown, 1979. It appeared that the affirmative was quoting a source without providing any information relating to the title of the publication, the name of the person being quoted or the date.

Negative

Periodicals

The September 14, 1977 issue of the New York Times was the only newspaper cited by the negative in debate seven. The quotation was verifiable.

Seven citations encompassing three journals and magazines were offered. A reference to a 1978 issue of Scientific American was not verifiable. The specific date was omitted. A 1977 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences was cited four times by the negative. In each instance, the negative failed to indicate the specific date of the issue being quoted. Issues of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists from 1978 and 1979 were cited. Once again, the exact date of the issue was omitted in the citation.

Books

No books were cited by the negative in debate seven.

Government publications

Only one governmental citation was made by the negative. The title given for the government publication was Geopolitics Energy Report of 1977. The name of the person being quoted, the specific date of the publication

and the origin of the report were all omitted. The source as given was not considered to be verifiable.

Synthesis

Of the thirty-two citations found in debate seven only ten were considered to be verifiable. Eight citations of periodicals were not considered verifiable because the specific date of the issue was not provided. The two books cited in the debate were both verifiable. All four citations involving government publications were non-verifiable, neither the name of the person being quoted nor the actual origin of the quoted material were indicated. In five instances, the speakers failed to provide enough information about the nature and the origin of the quoted material.

Debate Eight

Affirmative

Periodicals

In the last debate studied, the affirmative quoted from two newspapers. The citation of the October 18, 1979 issue of the Washington Post was verifiable because both the date of publication and the page number, page A2, were provided. The citation of an Associated Press release in a 1979 issue of the Los Angeles Times

was not judged to be verifiable. Only the year in which the issue was printed was indicated by the affirmative speaker.

Only one magazine was cited by the affirmative. The citation of the March 13, 1978 issue of Time magazine was judged verifiable.

Books

No books were cited by the affirmative in debate eight.

Government publications

Seven citations from four publications were found in round eight. Four of the seven were judged verifiable. The June 5, 1979; December 11, 1978; and September 5, 1979 issues of the Congressional Record were quoted. Because in each instance, either the name of the person being quoted or the page numbers were indicated, the quotation was considered verifiable. In three citations--the Senate Finance Committee, May 11, 1975; the House Committee on Agriculture, 1978; and the House Committee on Agriculture, June 1, 1978--the quoted material was not judged verifiable. The title of the publication had been omitted.

Other

Four source citations failed to provide enough information to determine the origin of the quoted material. These were cited as "I.S.A; Senator Church, 1979; Julius Katz, 1978; and the President of the American Sugar Institute, 1978." This was the only information provided regarding the origin of the source.

NegativePeriodicals

In debate eight the negative quoted from three newspapers--the Los Angeles Times, the Minneapolis Star, and the Christian Science Monitor. Of the four citations involving these sources, two were judged verifiable. One Los Angeles Times citation indicated that the quotation was taken from the March 16, 1979 issue on page eleven, part two. The citation from the Minneapolis Star indicated that quotation was taken from the June 1, 1977 issue. Both of the citations were judged verifiable. A second quotation taken from the Los Angeles Times only indicated that the issue had been printed in 1979. This was not considered verifiable. When citing the Christian Science Monitor, the negative speaker only indicated that the material being quoted was taken from a 1979 issue.

Thirteen quotations were taken from eight magazines and journals. These citations were stated as "Business Week, July 31, 1978; Business Week, January 29, 1979; Nation's Business, March 1978 (twice); Nation's Business, August 1978; the Monthly Labor Review, May 1978; Vital Speeches, June 1, 1977; Challenge, May/June 1978 (twice); U.S. News and World Report, 1979; the International Journal, 1978; and Business, 1978."

Neither the U.S. News and the Business citations were considered verifiable. In each instance only the year in which the issue was printed was provided. The same problem existed with the International Journal citation.

Books

No books were cited by the negative in debate eight.

Government publications

No government publications were cited by the negative in debate eight.

Other

Six citations failed to provide enough information to allow determination of the origin of the quoted material. These citations were offered as "Fishlow,

1978; George, 1978; Professor Cohens, 1977; Roger Johnston, 1979; the New National Security, 1978; and Thayers, 1978." Because in the five instances in which only the author was indicated, and the title of the publication from which the quotation was taken was omitted, the quotations were not judged verifiable. The New National Security citation was judged non-verifiable. The name of the person being quoted and the nature and origin of the quoted material were omitted.

Synthesis

Of the thirty-eight citations found in debate eight, seventeen were judged verifiable. The ten citations of periodicals that were not adequate failed to provide the specific date of the issue being quoted. The government publications which were not considered to be verifiable, failed to indicate the title of the publication. Ten quotations failed to indicate either the name of the person being quoted or the origin of the quoted material.

Analysis

Throughout the eight debate rounds studied, a total of 336 citations were noted. Of these, only 92, or 27 percent, were found to be verifiable. Inasmuch as only 27 percent were verifiable, the documentation of

evidence by debaters at the high school championship tournament is in question. This is especially poignant when considering that the tournament involved the top teams in the state. This practice of inadequately citing sources suggests that there is latitude for improvement.

Of the 146 citations involving periodicals (magazines, journals, and newspapers) 74, or 51 percent, were judged verifiable. For citations involving magazines, the two most common faults were that the debater only indicated the year in which the periodical was published, or only indicated the month and year of publication. In total fifty citations were judged inadequate for purposes of verifiability because only the year of publication had been indicated for either weekly or monthly publications. In nine instances, the speaker indicated only the month and year of publication. Because these citations involved sources that are weekly publications, the citations were judged inadequate. In one instance, no date was offered whatsoever. In another instance involving U.S. News and World Report, difficulty was encountered in locating the material because the speaker quoted from a Mobil Oil Company advertisement without indicating an advertisement was being used. This fails to indicate the true nature of the source. The potential bias of the source is hidden. The ethical

considerations of this slight will be noted in Chapter III on veracity.

In citing journals, the major inadequacy was that the speaker indicated only the year in which the journal was published. This was too vague. In two citations, no date was offered.

Nine of the thirty-nine citations involving newspapers included only the year in which the paper was published. All of the newspapers in question were daily publications. In two instances, no date was provided in the citation. This failure to specifically document precludes any reasonable attempt to find the original source material.

For citations involving government publications, the two most common problems with verifying the source were (1) failing to indicate either the name of the person being quoted or the page number from which the quotation was drawn, and/or (2) failing to indicate the specific date of publication. In six citations, the speakers failed to indicate the name of the person being quoted or the page number and the specific date of publication. In ten other instances, the specific date was provided but not the name of the person being quoted or the page number(s) from which the quotation was drawn. In thirteen citations the date of publication was not specifically

indicated although the name of the person being quoted was noted. In three citations the speakers indicated that a congressional committee was being quoted. However, the specific name of the committee and the house in which the committee resides were omitted from the citation. In two instances, the name of the specific committee was indicated, but the name of the publication being used and the exact date of publication were not provided. In total, there were thirty-nine citations involving government publications. Of these, only eleven or 28 percent were judged verifiable.

Fifty-five citations were inadequate because it was not possible to determine either the origin or the nature of the publication being quoted. In five instances the speaker indicated only the name of the person being quoted. These citations omitted the name of the publication being used and the date of publication.

There were thirty-two instances in which the date of the publication and the name of the person being quoted were provided, but the name of the publication being used was excluded from the citation. This practice of failing to provide any indication of the publication being used is particularly disturbing. Because of the vagueness of this type of citation it becomes impossible to determine the veracity of the evidence being used. In eighteen

instances the name of the publication being utilized was provided, but the speaker failed to indicate the name of the person being quoted, the date of publication, or the origin or nature of the publication.

It is recognized that much of the evidence being used in the final tournament of the year is quite well-known by the participants and abbreviations of citations may result. This could explain the failure to provide complete source citations. It is further recognized that some debaters may provide shortened source citations to conserve the amount of time used. This may explain why only 27 percent of the source citations were verifiable, but this does not justify the practice. Serious consequences are a likely result. First, those judging debate may not be as familiar with the evidence being used as are the debaters. Many of the source citations as presented would be meaningless to the person criticizing the round. Second, listeners who are not familiar with the evidence being used are left without a means by which to test the veracity of the quoted material. Third, because the evidence is being presented in an attempt to persuade critics, the ethics of excluding information relevant to the nature of the source is questionable.

Overall, there is clearly a need for improvement in the citing of sources. Well over half of the

citations were judged inadequate for purposes of verifiability. This practice has further implications when applied to the veracity of the quoted material (Chapter III). It may not be possible to determine whether the material is being quoted in context. It may not even be possible to determine if the person being quoted actually made the statement attributed to them. While there is no established standard constituting adequateness of verifiability, it is obvious that if only ninety-two out of 336 citations are verifiable, there are serious shortcomings in the documentation of sources in competitive debate.

CHAPTER III

VERACITY

Since only twenty-seven percent of the citations were judged to be verifiable in Chapter II, the material available for study in this chapter is limited. Specifically, out of the 336 citations noted, only ninety-two were found to be verifiable. Therefore, the analysis in this chapter is limited to those ninety-two. It was not possible to determine the veracity of the material quoted in the other 244 instances. With that limitation apparent, this Chapter represents an examination of the accuracy of the reported content of each of those citations of evidence in which the documentation was complete.

In order to determine the veracity of evidence used, two criteria were employed. First, the evidence, as reported by the speakers, was compared to the content of the original work to discover if there were deviations in wording. Second, the evidence was compared to the original work to determine if the reported material complied with the context of the printed original. For a quotation or allusion to be considered an accurate representation of the original source's content it must

have (1) reported the original material's content without modification or, in the case of a paraphrase, it must not have (2) added or deleted any qualifying words that were or were not found in the original statement which could change the interpretation of the material. For a quotation to have been considered an accurate representation of the work as a whole it must not have (1) changed the wording of the material to the extent that it altered the interpretation of the material; (2) taken individual portions of the work which may be accurate, but do not conform to the conclusions of the work as a whole; or in the case of a paraphrase, (3) added or deleted any qualifying words that could have altered the original source's intent.

Debate One

Affirmative

In debate one, the affirmative altered the wording of the original material in their oral presentation once. In another instance, the affirmative seemingly altered the interpretation of the original work.

As was noted in Chapter II, the affirmative drew a quotation from the April 23, 1979 issue of U.S. News and World Report in an article entitled "The Windfall Profits or the Windfall Tax." Although the material was

accurately reported, the actual nature of the source was withheld from the source citation. The particular article being quoted was a Mobil Oil Company advertisement.¹ It was not written by the staff of U.S. News, as was suggested by the affirmative. The specific criteria being employed in this study do not accommodate a violation of this nature. Nevertheless, this misrepresentation of the actual nature of the source seemed significant enough to warrant inclusion in this analysis.

The March 12, 1979 issue of Time was the source of a second instance in which evidence was not exactly reported by the affirmative. In the oral presentation an omission of a qualifying phrase was discovered. As offered in the debate, the quotation was as follows:

Levi readily admitted that this approach collapsed in Iran. Supporting the status quo, he said, "Maybe it's another five to ten years in Saudi Arabia."

The statement as printed reads:

Levi readily admitted that this approach collapsed in Iran. "Call it shortsighted," he said, "but supporting the status quo may give us another five or ten years in Saudi Arabia."²

The omission of the phrase "call it shortsighted" could result in an interpretation of the material other than what was intended by the authors. This phrase could suggest that Levi recognized the limitations of his conclusion. This did alter the original wording.

These were the only two instances in which it was judged that the veracity of the material as presented may have misrepresented the original work. There was an instance in which the affirmative substituted one phrase and two words from the original and added one phrase. This particular case involved the March 3, 1980 issue of Newsweek. Added and substituted material are indicated in brackets in the following evidence:

Their broadest objective was to expand their [Soviet in the original] influence in the Middle East. The CIA is convinced [estimates that] in the original] that the Russians will be oil importers by the mid-1980s, said Newman former ambassador to Afghanistan. That by itself will [would in the original] make the area very important to them.³

This particular rendition of the original material does not seem to have significantly altered the interpretation of the wording. However, the substitution of "is convinced" for "estimates that" and "will" for "would" could result in an unintended interpretation. In the former substitution, the altered language usage assigns a degree of certainty not found in the original wording. In the latter substitution, the nature of the wording appears to have been altered in such a manner so as to eliminate the conditional nature of the phrase. In other words, the original wording suggests that the action "would" occur if the "estimates" are accurate. This

alteration gives the impression that the CIA is "convinced" that the Soviets will be oil importers, and therefore, "will" be concerned with the Middle East.

Negative

In debate one, the content reported by the negative differed from the original wording through either the omission or substitution of words and/or phrases. In three instances, it was not possible to find the original quotation despite the adequacy of the source citation. The negative drew quotations twice from the July 31, 1979 issue of Fortune magazine on page 58. Neither quotation was discovered in print since there is no July 31, 1979 issue of Fortune. In one other instance, the negative cited the June 16, 1979 issue of the National Journal. Once again, the evidence was not found in the source cited.

In two instances the negative omitted phrases and substituted words from the original wording. Words found within brackets indicate the phrases and words substituted or omitted. Underlining signifies those words which were not found in the original nor had synonyms found in the original.

Current History, July/August 1978.

New Federal regulations and incentives and Federal oil policy can alter this situation. For example, Congress is has mandating ed a minimum automobile average gas mileage under

the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, cars must obtain an average of twenty-seven miles per gallon allowance.⁴

Time, February 11, 1980.

The U.S. ambassador Sol Linowitz managed at least to mount a a minor breakthrough in the stalled talks between Egypt and Israel on autonomy for the West Bank and Gaza. With only four months left before the expiration of the May deadline limit on the issue for a Palestinian autonomy plan, which Cairo and Jerusalem accepted at Camp David, the Carter administration is has been anxious to speed up the pace of the negotiations.⁵

Of the two quotations indicated above, neither usage of the material appears to have significantly altered the intent of the original work through omission. However, the tense changes do suggest a condition exists in the present tense, which the original wording does not indicate. Also, substituting "to mount" for "a minor" ignores the measure of significance suggested in the original wording.

Synthesis

Of the thirty-six citations found in debate one, six instances (16 percent) arose in which the evidence was potentially manipulated through either reporting evidence as coming from a source which did not exist, misrepresenting the actual nature of the source, or through the substitution and/or omission of words and phrases which have the potential for altering the intended

meaning of the original wording. In two other instances, the original wording was altered through the substitution and/or omission of words and/or phrases. However, in these two instances the interpretation of the original work was not apparently misrepresented, although potentially important tense changes were made and a measure of significance was omitted.

Debate Two

Affirmative

In debate two, the affirmative altered the wording of the original material in their oral presentation of purported evidence once. In this instance, the tense was changed from past to present. Taken from Lester R. Brown's article in the June 1978 issue of Futurist magazine, the quotation was read in the debate as follows:

Looking at the developing countries as a whole, the International labor office estimates that 24.7 percent of the total labor force is either out of work or underemployed in 1970. The comparable figure for 1980 is expected to approach 30 percent.⁶

"Is" (underlined in the quotation) was substituted for "was." This substitution was judged not to significantly alter the meaning of the original work. It is still clear that the unemployment and underemployment rates refer to the year 1970.

Overall, of the ten verifiable quotations offered by the affirmative only one was altered in the oral presentation. This substitution of "is" for "was" did not appear to lessen the veracity of the evidence.

Negative

In debate two, the negative paraphrased one item of evidence. This paraphrasing did not significantly misrepresent the original wording. Citing the UNESCO Courier, November 1978, the negative presented the evidence as follows: x

Thirteen to fourteen million people are employed by multi-nationals directly.

The original wording is as follows: x

It has been estimated that the multi-nationals employ a total of thirteen to fourteen million people.⁷

The phrase "it has been estimated" was omitted in the oral presentation. The word "directly" was added. The omission of the qualifying phrase suggests a certainty that the original wording does not provide.

In two instances, it was not possible to find the quotations cited. One was reported as taken from the December 22, 1978 issue of Time and the other from the August 14, 1978 issue of Fortune. There is no December 22, 1978 issue of Time. Although there is an August 14,

1978 issue of Fortune, the material being referred to could not be found in that issue.

Of the eight verifiable citations provided by the negative, one (or 12 percent) was altered in the oral presentation from the original wording. There were two instances (or 25 percent) in which the quotations could not be found in the source cited.

Synthesis

In debate two, the wording of the original material was altered twice in the oral presentation of the evidence. In neither instance did the alteration misrepresent the intent of the original wording. In two other instances, evidence was reported as having been taken from a source that either did not exist or from an issue that did exist, but the particular reported wording could not be found.

Debate Three

Affirmative

In debate three, only two affirmative citations were verifiable. In each instance, the oral presentation of the evidence accurately reported the original wording. The quotations were from the March 13, 1977 issue of the

New York Times Magazine⁸ and the Summer 1978 issue of the Atlantic Community Quarterly.⁹

Negative

As with the affirmative, the negative offered only two verifiable citations in debate two. In one of these instances the wording of the original material was altered in the oral presentation. The change in the wording did not appear to alter the meaning of the original. The negative reported that the quotation was taken from the March 4, 1978 issue of Nation. As presented in the debate, the quotation was as follows:

If the government does not have the will to help the small farmers outside organizations can't force them to do it. We can advise, we can write provisions in our projects, but without that genuine commitment on the part of the government, it just won't work.

The original wording was slightly different:

A World Bank official explains if the government does not have the will to help the small farmers we can't force them to do it.¹⁰

This omission and substitution of words in the oral presentation from the original work does not appear to misrepresent the evidence.

Synthesis

Inasmuch as only four citations were verifiable in debate three, the potential exists for challenges to

the veracity of evidence. However, an examination of non-verifiable evidence is not possible. For the four citations which were verifiable, the oral presentation altered the text of the material in two instances. In neither instance was the original wording seemingly misrepresented, however.

Debate Four

Affirmative

Of the six verifiable sources presented by the affirmative in debate four, one situation arose in which material was added to the original wording. This alteration did not change the meaning of the material. The affirmative merely supplied the qualifications of the person being quoted within the text of the article. Found in the April 1979 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,¹¹ the added wording is bracketed in the following quotation:

As for the problem of waste disposal, Mr. Frazier [leader of the liberal national country coalition and prime minister of Australia] said, "the technology for the handling, solidification, and safe storage of high level radioactive liquids exists."

The qualifications of Frazier were provided earlier in the article and were accurately reported by the speaker.

Negative

In debate four, the negative presented eleven verifiable source citations. Of these eleven, there were four instances (36 percent) in which the original wording was altered in the oral presentation. In the first case, the negative made two tense changes. The quotation taken from the February 18, 1980 issue of U.S. News and World Report¹² was reported as follows by the negative. The involved tense changes will be underscored.

All together developing nations, outside of OPEC, owe banks around the world an estimated \$180 billion at the end of 1979, over four times the claims of five years earlier.

In the original it was indicated that the developing nations owed an estimated \$180 billion. This changing of tense does not appear to misrepresent the original. Even with this alteration, it is still apparent that the time frame being dealt with was 1979.

The second alteration of material in the oral presentation of evidence by the negative also involved a tense change. From the same U.S. News article indicated above, the quotation was presented as follows:

Ten countries are in hock to U.S. banks for more than \$1 billion each . . .

The original wording was that the ten countries "were" in hock to U.S. banks.¹³ This substitution of "are" for

"were" does alter the meaning of the original somewhat. It suggests a "present" state which the authors may not have intended.

In the third alteration, one phrase was omitted from the original wording. Once again, from the February 18, 1980 issue of U.S. News, the material was reported as follows:

It may take as much as eighty percent of Brazil's 1980 export earnings just to service debts [according to U.S. regulators].

The omitted phrase is indicated in the brackets. This alteration of evidence as orally presented does appear to accurately represent the U.S. News article.

The fourth alteration similarly involved the February 18, 1980 issue of U.S. News. In this case, the negative added one phrase. They also substituted "through" for "by." The added phrase is indicated in brackets in the following quotation:

In the process [of giving loans to the LDCs] the banks assumed a role previously performed by publicly supported financial institutions such as IMF and the World Bank or handled by [through] bilateral government aid.

Immediately preceding this quotation in the original article, it was made clear that the statement was being made in reference to loans being given to LDCs. Therefore, the phrase could scarcely misrepresent the original wording. Rather this alteration made the context of the

quotation clearer. The substitution of "by" for "through" similarly does not appear to misrepresent the original wording.

Synthesis

Of the fifteen verifiable quotations reported in debate four, five instances (33 percent) arose in which the original wording of the material was altered. In three cases phrases were added to the original. These alterations did not seemingly misrepresent the original material. The phrases added merely made the context of the original wording clearer by either adding the qualifications of the person being quoted or by explaining to what the article was referring. In the other two instances in which the material was altered in the oral presentation, words were substituted for the original wording. The wording was altered to indicate that the original was dealing with present tense rather than past tense. Since other material was available in the reported content (the specific time frame involved) the substitutions did not misrepresent the original material.

Debate Five

Affirmative

Of the twenty-four citations reported by the affirmative in debate five, only one (4 percent) was

verifiable. The affirmative accurately reported the original wording of the definition of foreign trade from the 1968 edition of Black's Law Dictionary.¹⁴

Negative

In debate five, the negative only offered three pieces of evidence. In each instance, the source as reported was verifiable. Furthermore, the negative did accurately report the material. The oral presentation of the evidence did not result in any alteration of the original wording whatsoever.

Synthesis

Although all verifiable evidence was accurately reported in debate five, it is not possible to make a clear determination of the veracity of the reported material. Only four the the twenty-seven citations (approximately 15 percent) were verifiable.

Debate Six

Affirmative

Of the thirteen verifiable quotations found in debate six, the affirmative altered the original wording in three cases (23 percent). In the first instance, the May 22, 1978 issue of Business Week was cited. One phrase was omitted in the oral presentation. The omitted

phrase is indicated by brackets in the following quotation, as reported by the affirmative:

According to Joel Popkin of the NBR, the oil price rise was responsible for about one-third of the increase in U.S. prices between the last quarter of 1973 and the last quarter of 1975.¹⁵

Although the omitted phrase specifies the involved time span referred to in the original, its omission does not seem to misrepresent the original wording. However, the omission of the time frame could suggest an inaccurate sense of recency to the evidence.

The second instance in which the oral presentation represented altered wording involved the July 13, 1979 issue of Science. The reported content of the evidence is as follows:

Of the 8.5 million barrels of oil imported a day by the U.S., no less than five to six million are directly attributable to the low price policy.

The actual wording found in the original is--

Of the 8.5 million barrels a day imported by the U.S., no less than five to six million are directly attributable to the low price policy.¹⁶

This alteration of the wording found in the oral presentation does not change the meaning of the material. The actual wording change is minor.

The March 3, 1980 issue of U.S. News and World Report was the source in the third case in which the

original wording was altered. In this specific case, the word "rising" was substituted for "larger." The placement of this substitution is indicated in the following quotation by brackets.

At the same time, another White House official concedes, "in the short-term we can't control inflation." These officials contend that foreign prices stem mainly from larger [rising in the original] oil costs,¹⁷

This substitution is an insignificant altering of the original wording and therefore is not considered to have misrepresented the original source.

Negative

In debate six, the negative altered the wording of two original items of material. The first case they substituted words. This substitution was minor and did not constitute a misrepresentation of the original wording. Material from the March, 1980 issue of U.S. News and World Report was reported as follows:

Here at this strategic part on the Horn of Africa, the U.S. is set to convert a one-time Soviet base into a key link of a military chain designed to block Russia from seizing control of the flow of Mideast oil.¹⁸

In this particular oral presentation, "set" was substituted for "said" and "a" was substituted for "the." The substitution of "set" for "said" does appear to alter the interpretation of the original wording. "Set" suggests

a certainty of action. "Said" does not.

The second instance involved the January 21, 1980 issue of Newsweek. The negative omitted a phrase at the end of the quotation found in the original wording. The omitted phrase is indicated by brackets in the following quotation:

With the Soviet Union flexing its muscles and with the government of Ankara a bit weak on its legs, Turkey agreed to allow the U.S. to stay in twenty-six bases temporarily until a final understanding can be drawn-up .

The omission of this phrase has the potential for creating an unintended interpretation of the material. As reported by the negative, one could be led to believe that the bases may be retained permanently. However, the omitted phrase would make this conclusion questionable. Therefore, this reporting of the original material seems to misrepresent the original wording.

Synthesis

In debate six, there were five instances in which the original wording was altered in the oral presentation of the evidence. In three cases, the substitution of words for the original was minor and did not appear to alter the meaning of the involved material. In the last two instances, phrases were omitted in the oral presentation. In the first, the meaning does not appear to have been altered by the speaker. This report does make it

less clear in terms of the involved time frame, however. In the second case in which a particular phrase was omitted in the reporting of the evidence, the omission does alter the apparent intent of the authors of the original work. The oral presentation could suggest a permanent situation while the original wording suggests only a temporary situation. This could be considered to be a significant alteration of the interpretation of the original wording.

Debate Seven

Affirmative

In debate seven, the affirmative offered nine source citations which were verifiable. Of these, the original wording was altered in five instances (55 percent). In two instances, the affirmative was paraphrasing the original wording. In another case, a phrase was omitted. In two other situations, the affirmative either omitted or added words not found in the original.

The first paraphrase involved the September 1975 issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. The material was reported by the affirmative as follows:

Using EPA statistics and ERDA statistics, Comey concluded that the fatality rate is 982 deaths per kilowatt year, which would equal 8,400 deaths per year from mill tailings.

This paraphrasing was mostly accurate. On pages 44-45 of the issue, most of the information presented by the affirmative was found. The article does refer to an Environmental Protection Agency study which draws the conclusion indicated in the oral presentation. However, no reference was made to ERDA (presumably the Energy Research and Development Administration).¹⁹ By adding ERDA to the evidence, more credibility may have been given to the conclusions drawn in the paraphrase than was deserved.

The June/July 1979 issue of Technology Review was the source of the second paraphrase. The affirmative reported the content of the material as follows:

Dr. Sprung calculated that the early fatalities if any of the operating reactors should suffer an accident would be about 30,000 to 40,000 people.

The original wording from which this quotation was drawn is:

Dr. Sprung calculated that the "early fatalities" that would result if any one of eleven operating reactors should suffer an accident in which a "non-bouyant plume" of "relatively cold" radioactive gases were released to the atmosphere. About 30,000 to 40,000 people would die within several months following such a release from the Zion nuclear reactor . . .²⁰

The involved paraphrase here does seem to accurately reflect the wording of the original source.

In another case involving the June/July 1979 issue of Technology Review, the affirmative slightly altered the original wording in their oral presentation. In this case the affirmative substituted two words and added one other. The added word is underscored in the following reported quotation:

After November 30, 1978, seventy-two commercial reactors held operating licenses with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The ["an" in the original] initial ["additional" in the original] ninety reactors have been issued construction permits, four more have limited work authorizations, and thirty-seven more are on order.

The substitutions of "the" for "an" and "initial" for "additional" do not appear to alter the meaning of the original material. The addition of "more" similarly does not significantly change the wording of the original content.

In one other instance the affirmative slightly altered the wording of the original work in their oral presentation. This particular instance involved the December 25, 1978 issue of Business Week. The content was reported as follows by the affirmative:

Carter will push for nuclear licensing reform, and a recommendation to support current generation nuclear reactor construction more forcefully will soon reach him.

The original wording is--

Carter will push for reactor licensing reform ["his aides say"], and a recommendation

to support current generation nuclear reactor construction more forcefully will soon reach him.²¹

The substitution of "reactor" for "nuclear" and the omission of the phrase "his aides say" do not appear to alter the intended meaning of the original work.

In the final instance in which the affirmative altered the wording of the original work, one phrase was omitted. The omitted phrase in the April 16, 1979 issue of Time is noted in brackets.

Despite the uproar on U.S. policy on nuclear energy it is not expected to change significantly [although Congress is sure to demand tighter safeguards and a far more active Nuclear Regulatory Commission]. Quietly but firmly, Carter maintained his commitment to nuclear development.²²

Although the omission could understate the resolve of the status quo, the conclusions regarding Carter's commitment to nuclear energy do accurately reflect the original wording. Perhaps some "card-stacking" by the debaters may be evident here.

Negative

Of the nine citations offered by the negative, only one (11 percent) was verifiable. The one verifiable source citation involved the September 14, 1977 issue of the New York Times. The quoted material exactly matched the original wording.

Synthesis

In debate seven, the original wording was altered in five cases. In none of these instances did it appear that the original material was significantly misrepresented. Two instances involved the paraphrasing of the original wording. In one paraphrase it was suggested that the conclusion drawn in the original was the result of EPA and ERDA studies. Only reference to the EPA was made in the original. The other three alterations of the original wording involved either the substitution of words for the original or the omission of phrases found within the original. These alterations did not significantly alter the meaning of the involved material.

Debate Eight

Affirmative

Of the seven verifiable citations offered by the affirmative in debate eight, there was one occasion (14 percent) in which the original wording was altered in the oral presentation of the evidence. This alteration involved a paraphrase of the March 13, 1978 issue of Time. In the debate, the material was reported as follows:

We are the world's largest importer of sugar, importing eleven million tons a year.

The original wording was,

As the world's biggest importer (eleven million tons a year), the U.S. used to control its vast imports by doling out quotas to exporting nations.²³

This particular paraphrase does appear to accurately report the meaning of the original work.

For the six additional pieces of evidence presented by the affirmative in which the source citation was verifiable, the wording was reported exactly as it appeared in the original source.

Negative

Of the eleven verifiable pieces of evidence presented in debate eight by the negative, all were reported exactly as they appeared in the original work.

Synthesis

Overall, of the eighteen pieces of evidence in which the source citation was verifiable, only once (approximately 6 percent) was the original wording altered. In this particular instance the speaker paraphrased the original work accurately.

Analysis

Of the ninety-two pieces of evidence examined in which the reported source citation was verifiable, the wording was altered in the oral presentation from the

original work in twenty-four instances (26 percent). In these twenty-four cases, the speaker changed the wording through the substitution and/or omission of phrases and/or words or by paraphrasing the original wording. In one instance, the actual nature of the source being reported was withheld. In three instances, the reported source was not in print. In two additional cases, the reported source was in print, but the particular wording could not be found in the indicated issue.

Of the twenty-four instances in which the original wording was altered, the interpretation of the material may have potentially been changed in five cases (21 percent). Although the importance of the alterations varied, the reporting of evidence did not appear to specifically conform to the original interpretation. Degrees of certainty were suggested in the oral presentation which were not found within the original work. Potentially important qualifying phrases were omitted. This alteration of evidence may not have been intentional. It may have been the result of careless reporting due to the time constraints and pressures of the particular debate. However, that does not excuse the practice. Ehninger and Brockriede have noted that

Deliberate attempts to manipulate data to give them more weight than they deserve violate what may be termed an ethic of evidence.²⁴

The implications of this manipulation are suggested as they continue their discussion.

Such deliberate suppression of unfavorable evidence throws judges' views of a problem out of balance and makes a critical decision difficult.²⁵

In those situations in which the omission and/or substitution of words and/or phrases potentially alters the interpretation of the original work, ethical considerations are paramount. Ehninger and Brockriede further argue that the willful modification of the wording of statements in order to mislead falls within the realm of deliberate falsification.²⁶ Furthermore, they indicate

. . . deliberate falsification not only violates the principles of critical deliberation but also constitutes dishonesty of the worst sort.²⁷

Erwin P. Bettinghaus extends the ethical considerations to persuasive situations of all kinds. He notes:

. . . when we use persuasion, we should do so from a position consistent with the set of ethical and moral standards we have.²⁸

This manipulation of data may not have been deliberate, and therefore, the intentions of the involved individuals may not be deserving of such ethical questioning.

However, the seemingly deliberate misrepresentation of the true nature of sources being quoted (Debate One-- "The Windfall Profits or the Windfall Tax," U.S. News and World Report) is deserving of question. Also deserving

of ethical questioning is the reading of evidence in five instances from sources that are not in print. This problem further extends itself to the reporting of evidence when the source exists, but the actual wording cannot be discovered.

Overall, as has been previously mentioned twice, the reporting of sources that do not exist and the seeming misrepresenting of the wording of original sources may be the result of careless practice. This practice is not excused. Furthermore, since only 27 percent of the reported citations were verifiable, the findings in this section are subsequently limited. Further misstating of sources and altering of evidence most likely exists. Debaters would be well advised to more carefully and accurately cite sources and more exactly report the evidence utilized.

ENDNOTES

¹"The Windfall Profits or the Windfall Tax" (Mobil Oil Advertisement), U.S. News and World Report, April 23, 1979, p. 92.

²"Searching for the Right Response," Time, March 12, 1979, p. 30. (Underscored phrases found in original but omitted in the oral presentation.)

³"Saudi Arabia: A Shaky U.S. Pillar of Security," Newsweek, March 3, 1980, p. 37.

⁴John H. Gibbons and William U. Chandler, "A National Energy Conservation Policy," Current History, July/August 1978, p. 14.

⁵"Progress and Protests," Time, February 11, 1980, p. 42.

⁶Lester R. Brown, "Global Economic Ills: the Worst May Be Yet to Come," Futurist, June 1978, p. 167.

⁷"The Multinationals and the Third World," UNESCO Courier, November 1978, p. 15.

⁸Emma Rothschild, New York Times Magazine, March 13, 1977, p. 20.

⁹Edwin M. Martin, "Should Observation of Basic Human Rights Be a Prerequisite for Aid?" Atlantic Community Quarterly, Summer 1978, p. 217.

¹⁰James K. Boyce and Betsy Harman, "U.S. Aid for the Rich: View from a Bangladesh Village," Nation, March 4, 1978, p. 239.

¹¹Joseph Camilleri, "Nuclear Controversy in Australia: the Uranium Campaign," Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, April 1979, p. 42.

¹²"Concern Rises Over Third World Loans," U.S. News and World Report, February 18, 1980, p. 93.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Black's Law Dictionary, 4th ed., St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1968, p. 776.

¹⁵"OPEC's Continuing Impact in Fueling U.S. Inflation," Business Week, May 22, 1978, p. 132.

¹⁶"Synfuels in Haste, Repent at Leisure," Science, July 13, 1979, p. 168.

¹⁷"As Pressure Mounts for Wage-Price Controls," U.S. News and World Report, March 3, 1980, p. 19.

¹⁸"Naval Base in Somolia--Exit Russia, Enter U.S.," U.S. News and World Report, March 3, 1980, p. 24.

¹⁹David Dinsanure Comey, "The Legacy of Uranium Tailings," Bulleting of Atomic Scientists, September 1975, p. 44.

²⁰"Nuclear Insurance: How Much is Enough (and from Whom)?" Technology Review, June/July 1979, p. 73.

²¹"Nuclear Dilemma," Business Week, December 25, 1978, p. 60.

²²"Now Comes the Fallout," Time, April 16, 1979, p. 24.

²³"Farmers: Beat-Red, Raising Cane," Time, March 13, 1978, p. 14.

²⁴Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede, Decision by Debate, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 65.

²⁵Ibid., p. 65.

²⁶Ibid., p. 65.

²⁷Ibid., p. 66.

²⁸Erwin P. Bettinghaus, Persuasive Communication, 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehard, and Winston, 1980), p. 17.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The use of evidence in competitive debate has dramatically increased over the past twenty years. With this increase, questions have arisen concerning the ethical use of evidence. Specifically, allegations have been made which suggest that some debaters manipulate the material they are quoting in a manner which alters the original interpretation. Also, allegations have been made that occasionally debaters fabricate evidence. This study represents an attempt to discover the merits of these claims as demonstrated at one particular tournament--the 1980 South Dakota State High School Debate Tournament.

To complete this analysis, fourteen rounds of debate were electronically recorded on tape. These rounds of debate included both the "A" and "B" divisions and the quarter-final, semi-final, and final rounds. Permission to conduct the study was granted by Ralph Wilkinson, Executive Secretary of the South Dakota High School Activities Association. After the taping was completed, eight tapes were selected for study. The names

of the schools and competitors were not included in the study to assure anonymity. Transcripts were then made which included only the apparent evidence citations and allusions to evidence. Evidence citations were analyzed to determine the adequacy of documentation. Library research was then initiated, for those evidence citations that were judged verifiable, to discover if they reported content of the source material was accurately presented by the debaters.

An analysis was undertaken to examine the accuracy of documentation. Of the 336 citations offered throughout the eight debate rounds studied, only ninety-two (26 percent) were verifiable. The most common faults in the citing of sources were the failure to provide the exact date of publication, the name of the person being quoted or the page number (in the case of government publications). In five instances only the name of the person being quoted was indicated without noting the publication from which the quotation was drawn or the date of the publication. In thirty-two instances the name of the person being quoted and the year from which the quotation was drawn were indicated. However, no other information was provided relevant to the source. In eighteen additional cases, the debaters made unclear references to a source without indicating the name of the

person being quoted, the date of publication, and/or the origin or nature of the source.

Further analysis was undertaken to examine the accuracy of the reported content when compared with the original source. The findings of this section were limited because of the inability to verify many of the reported sources. Less than one-third of the evidence citations were complete enough to allow discovery of the original material.

Of the ninety-six verifiable citations, there were twenty-four instances (26 percent) in which the reported content differed from the original wording. In five instances, the alteration appeared to change the intended interpretation of the material. This was done through the substitution of and/or the omission of words and/or phrases. The change in wording either added degrees of certainty not found in the original or omitted potentially important qualifying phrases. In one case the actual nature of the source was withheld. The source was reported as U.S. News and World Report. Although the reported content was found in this publication, the actual source was a Mobil Oil Company advertisement. In three other instances, the reported source was not in print. In two additional instances, the reported

source was in print, but the particular wording could not be found.

Conclusions

This study dealt with selected debates at the 1980 State Tournament. Only the quarter-finals, semi-finals, and the finals of the "A" and "B" divisions were taped. While this study only analyzes one particular tournament, it, nevertheless, should be representative of high school competitive debate. These teams should represent the finest skill and training in South Dakota debate. The tournament is intended to include only the top sixteen debate teams in both divisions. Therefore, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. For more than half of the instances, the reported source citations were inadequate and did not allow the listener to verify the source.
2. Either carelessness or the deliberate manipulation of evidence resulted in a number of alterations in the original wording in the oral presentation.
3. To the extent that the findings of this study are representative of high school debating, serious shortcomings of debate ethics appear to exist with regard to the use of evidence.

Recommendations for Further Study

As the findings of this study are limited, future study could more fully determine conclusions to be reached concerning the practices of high school debaters. Further study could be useful in determining how widespread the problems of inadequate source documentation and evidence manipulation are. Therefore, the following recommendations for further study are suggested.

1. Future South Dakota State High School Debate Tournaments could be studied in order to further test the findings of this study.

2. The National Forensic League's annual high school tournament could be studied. This might provide a broader view of the accuracy of documentation and evidence citations as utilized by "top level" high school debaters from various sectors of the United States.

3. The methods employed in this current study could be applied to championship tournaments in surrounding states. This might allow a more complete analysis of the practices of competitors from adjacent states regarding accuracy in documentation and evidence citations.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTS

This appendix includes evidence transcripts of the eight rounds of debate studied. Only in those instances in which the source citation was judged verifiable was the entire text of the quotation included. For those citations judged inadequate, only the source, as reported has been provided.

Debate One

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, 1977."
2. "Representative Mike McCormack, Nation's Business, January 1980.
"A catastrophic depression would result if we lose Saudi Arabian oil."
3. "Newsweek," January 7, 1980."
"Their broadest objective was to expand Soviet influence in the Middle East. The CIA is convinced that the Russians will be oil importers by the mid-1980s, said Neumann, former ambassador to Afghanistan. That by itself will make the area very important to them."
4. "Newsweek," March 3, 1980."
"Even so, it is the external threat that most worries the Saudis. They have already been buffeted by

the revolutionary unrest in Iran. The invasion of Afghanistan has given them migraines about the territorial integrity of the Persian Gulf states and even prompted them into what one diplomat calls a 'shotgun wedding' with leftist Iraq to bolster regional security."

5. "Stanford Magazine, Winter 1979."

"A natural consequence of these policies has been the creation of a great deal of uncertainty for those contemplating research energy investments, which also causes them to direct their efforts towards getting around the regulations rather than towards finding more energy. The result is burgeoning oil imports now putting pressure on world prices to the detriment of all importing countries."

6. "Stanford Magazine, Winter 1979."

"However, disincentives remain. The windfall profits tax as proposed will impede investment. This falls from the proposition that windfall profit is defined in terms of profit from oil sold at the world price, if future real oil prices are expected to increase."

7. "Time, January 15, 1979."

"But within a decade, according to intelligence reports, the Soviet Union will be running short of the oil it needs to fuel an expanding economy. Thus, the region could easily become the fulcrum of world conflict in the 1980s."

8. "Time, March 12, 1979."

"Oil expert Walter Levi wondered if the U.S. should instead do its best to prop up the present leaders, trying to buy time. Levi readily admitted that this approach collapsed in Iran. Supporting the status quo, he said, 'Maybe it's another five or ten years in Saudi Arabia.'"

9. "Time, November 26, 1979."

"The U.S., which is still hurting from the two-month loss of Iranian crude earlier this year, almost any new interruption of supply no matter how modest or brief, will lead to tighter markets."

10. "The Windfall Profits or the Windfall Tax," U.S. News and World Report, April 23, 1979."

"The President's windfall tax plan would impose on the American consumer the burden of higher prices without the prospect of increased supply by taking away money needed for increasing production and exploration."

11. "U.S. News and World Report," November 5, 1979."

"The most immediate concern of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Bahrain, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and Oman is the spillover from the Islamic revolution in Iran. But all worry also about the lengthening shadow of the Soviet Union . . . Two million barrels of oil go to the U.S. alone, about one-quarter of U.S. total imports."

Newspapers

1. "The Argus Leader, November 21, 1979."

"We better believe the United States has allowed its self-reliance on Arab oil. The two biggest exporters are Saudi Arabia and Iran, both solid American friends."

2. "The Des Moines Register, November 5, 1979."

"Today's troubles--high inflation, energy scarcity are attributable by contrast on our abilities to trust these problems at home and abroad."

3. "The Minneapolis Tribune, January 22, 1980."

"Saudi leaders believe the Kremlin is bent on consolidating a strip on South Yemen as a part of a plan to encircle the Persian Gulf resources and vital shipping lanes and sources at it."

4. "The Christian Science Monitor, January 2, 1979."

"As the government holds down the price of crude oil from pricing controls, this country continues to be in the bizarre position of subsidizing the oil imports. The same the government regularly denounces as excessive and dangerous to national security."

5. "The Christian Science Monitor, January 30, 1980."

"The purpose of decontrol is to provide dollars to producers to extract more oil and natural gas in America. By taking away these dollars, Congress will make us more dependent on foreign oil and domestic production will decline further just as it has since price controls have been imposed."
6. "The New York Times, 1977."
7. "The New York Times, 1980."
8. "The Wall Street Journal, May 14, 1979."

"With the tax in effect permanently continues to domestic crude price control with the severity of the OPEC price increases, Mr. Wallace added."
9. "The Wall Street Journal, January 14, 1980."

"A former top Carter administration official noted that the monetary system is in danger of avalanche that can be set off by anything."
10. "The Wall Street Journal, January 21, 1980."

"However serious the threat from outside, the biggest danger to Saudi oil can come from inside the country. Saudi Arabia has suffered from more than one internal shock lately."
11. "The Wall Street Journal, 'They've Done It Again,' May 21, 1979."

"This time indeed again the Administration has outdone itself. It's OPEC tax, a fifty percent tax on any future increases in the real price of energy carries a double whammy. First, it converts controls that expire in two years into affirmative tax. Second, it falls most heavily on oil that has not yet been discovered. It not only drains revenues from the oil business, but dampens the incentive to find new energy."
12. "The Wall Street Journal, February 22, 1980."

"Carter indicated he signed the windfall profits legislation. The levy will start March first."

Books

1. "William Simon, A Time for Truth, 1978."

"If the energy industry were simply freed from the regulatory bondage and allowed to function sanely, they will pay for their own expansion out of their own profits. That is free enterprise. And in the entire history of mankind, nothing has ever served better as a catalyst and stimulant to invention and innovation than the profit system. That system will quickly bring about the increased production for self-sufficiency."

Government publications

1. "The Energy Petroleum and Extension Act Hearings of 1974."
2. "The National University Extension Agency, 1978."

Other

1. "Black's Law Dictionary."
2. "The Wisdom Dictionary."

Negative

Magazines

1. "Business Week, 1977." (cited three times)
2. "Current, 1979." (cited two times)
3. "Current History, July/August 1978."

"New Federal regulations and incentives and Federal oil policy can alter this situation. For example, Congress is mandating a minimum auto average gas mileage allowance. Tax rebates and low cost loans to be provided to all owners who insulate their homes. New Construction standards for improved energy efficiency are being promulgated."

4. "Current History, January 1980."

"Two, we have cooperated with all of these countries in past and been involved in the peace process as a full partner."
5. "Current History, January 1980."

"In 1978, Saudi Arabia established an upward ceiling of five million barrels daily as a conservative measure. Recent increases in output above that ceiling is opposite decline and shortages in the U.S. and elsewhere. In return, the Saudi's expect the U.S. to use its influence to induce Israel to reach an overall settlement, including a West Bank."
6. "Foreign Policy, 1975."
7. "Foreign Affairs, 1974."
8. "Fortune, 1974."
9. "Fortune, July 31, 1979, page 58." (This source was cited twice. There is no July 31, 1979 issue of Fortune magazine.)
10. "Nation, 1978." (cited twice)
11. "The National Journal, June 16, 1978, page 118." (The quote was not found in this issue.)
12. "The New Republic, July 21-28, 1979, page 14."

"Taxes paid on profits in no way limit the ability of a company to make profits--in other words to compare."
13. "The Progressive, February 1980, page 23."

"The phased-in decontrol of crude oil prices launched last June by the Carter Administration will boost domestic crude prices from the present average of about \$12 per barrel to the world cartel price, now more than \$27, by October 1981. If Congress doesn't reverse the Administration's action, he will cost consumers about \$50 million a year, through OPEC price increases. Oil company profits will nearly double."

14. "The Progressive, February 1980, page 25."
 "The supplies of these other fuels are important to the extent that they can be substituted for imported oil."
15. "The Progressive, February 1980, page 25."
 "The average retail price of gasoline, including taxes, has been raised from about seventy cents per gallon in January 1979 to more than one dollar at the end of the year."
16. "The Progressive, February 1980, page 25."
 "The 1979 Opec price rises, as large as they have been, would have justified a gasoline price rise of only twelve to fifteen cents."
17. "Science Digest, 1976."
18. "Time, February 11, 1980."
 "The U.S. ambassador Sol Linowitz managed at least a minor breakthrough in the stalled talks between Egypt and Israel. With only four months left before the expiration of the May deadline limit on the issue, the Carter administration is anxious to speed up the pace of the negotiations."
19. "Time, February 18, 1980."
 "Saudi Arabia's domestic problems and its oil policy are inextricably linked. The Saudi's acknowledge that their national security depends ultimately on the United States' power."
20. "U.S. News and World Report."

Journals

1. "The Journal of Contemporary Law, Winter 1979, page 19."
 "Energy Research and Development Administration reports and Federal Energy Administration Programs. Estimated solar energy could provide two to three percent of national energy needs in 1985, seven percent by 2000, and twenty-five percent by 2020."

2. "The Oil and Gas Journal, 1978." (cited four times)

Newspapers

(none)

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "The Congressional Record, 1979."
2. "The Energy Commission Report, 1977."

Other

1. "The Control of Oil, 1976."
2. "The Cybernetic Theory of Possession, 1974."
3. "Project Independence, 1977."

Debate Two

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Agenda, Agency for International Development, August 1978."

"Mounting evidence of such problems has begun to focus attention on the growth of labor intensive, small-scale industries in providing employment and promoting development."

2. "World Issues, December/January 1978."

"Tax provisions law on foreign subsidiaries of the United States corporations defers payment of taxes

of foreign earnings. The total earnings are remitted to the United States' parent. This allows U.S. corporations to accumulate funds in the form of tax savings, paying little or no tax on them.

3. "Agenda, Agency for International Law, August 1978."

"Studies by the World International labor office have indicated that there is considerable scope for using more efficient labor intensive methods and for relatively simple technologies are available to raise human productivity."

4. "Lester R. Brown, Futurist, June 1978."

"Looking at the developing countries as a whole, the International labor office estimates that 24.7 percent of the total labor force is either out of work or underemployed in 1970. The comparable figure for 1980 is expected to approach 30 percent."

5. "Agenda, Agency for International Development, August 1978."

"The comparison between the two technologies is striking. An investment of twenty-million rupees can establish one modern plant capable of producing about 12,000 tons of sugar a year with 900 employees. The same investment can build 47 small plants and a total output of about 30,000 tons and total employment of nearly 10,000."

6. "World Development Report, 1979."

7. "Food Monitors, July/August 1978."

"During the fiscal years 1974 through 1976, Fortune's top 500 corporations and top 50 banks, utilities, and transportation companies receive 89 percent of the dollar volume of OPEC's insurance, financing and management, 71 percent of the insured products."

8. "Forbes, June 1979."

9. "Agenda, August 1978."

"The wheel barrows, ox carts and hand operated rail carts, to all materials ox-drawn, plows to break the ground and block and tackle systems exists in order

to reduce the back-breaking toil and raise productivity to the point where labor-intensive construction is cheaper than capital intensive methods."

10. "World Issues, May 1978."

"Where the American capital intensive technology has been transferred to labor intensive in varying stages in developing countries, it has put millions of farmers out of work."

11. "World Development Report, 1979."

Journals

1. "Georgia Journal of International Law and Comparative Law, 1979."

Newspapers

1. "Wall Street Journal, September 1979."
2. "Wall Street Journal, September 25, 1979."

"MNC's have a third world investment exceeding \$70 billion. But the United Nations says these problems have created fewer than four million jobs for the 680 million third world people who need them."

Books

1. "H. W. Singer, The Strategy of International Development--Essays in the Economics of Backwardness, 1979."

"Support for their view is found in rising unemployment rates, around 25 percent in LDC's, which corresponds with exports. A causal relation, then, probably exists between exports and employment. That is, increased exports generate employment of otherwise unemployed or underemployed resources. Export earnings are the LDC's cheapest form of foreign exchange while scarcity of foreign exchange is the central obstacle to economic growth. Increased trade, for example, means broader and more stable tax bases for the LDC government."

2. Robert Dupe, U.S. Power in Multi-National Corporations."

"Multi-national corporations along with the phenomena of foreign direct investment constitutes a major innovation in the history of international politics, in that it seeks to enable the industrial technological leader to maintain its dominant economic position. Although technical innovations still diffuse abroad, they do so under control data barriers. They are part of a package of capital management and technology. Foreign direct investment becomes, therefore, essentially a strategy by which to arrest relative political and economic decline."

3. "Brookings Institute, American Multi-Nationals and American Interest, 1978."

"OPEC tends to promote investment in sectors of U.S. exports which might not provide maximum output for those countries."

Government publications

1. "23rd Annual Report of the President of the United States on Trade Agreements Program, 1978."

"One of the important objectives of the United States' international trade and investment policy is to encourage more rapid economic growth in LDC's."

2. "Department of State, August 1978."
3. "Congressional Administrative News, Cooperation Act of 1979, September 1979."

"Recent economic analysis indicates that the growth and stability of developed countries' economies are closely linked to the economic health of developing countries. A 40 percent increase in growth rates of non-oil exporting developing countries it is estimated could bring about an annual increase of one percent in growth rates of the western developed countries."

4. "U.S. Department of State."

Other

1. "Lockheed Aircraft Corporation vs. Spiran Corporation in Los Angeles County, California."
2. "Labor Views on Employment Policy, July 1978."
3. "MNC State Policy and Its Impact on the United States, Fall 1979."
4. "International and Composition Law Center, 1978."
5. "Lawrence White, Princeton University, February 1977."

NegativeMagazines

1. "Time, March 26, 1979, p. 48."

"The material results of foreign aid are often significant, but little-known factories, dams and agricultural projects that create jobs and food, which in turn contribute to economic and political advance--and to good business for the United States."
2. "Department of State Bulletin, January 1976." (cited five times)
3. "World Issues, 1978."
4. "UNESCO Courier, November 1978."

"Thirteen to fourteen million people are employed by multi-nationals directly."
5. "Ibid."

"This figure takes no account of indirect employment effects of jobs created through activities of multi-national enterprises other than direct investment."
6. "Foreign Policy, Winter 1978."

"The U.S. government reserves the right not only to protect and promote subsidiaries in foreign lands but also on occasion to command and direct them."

7. "Time, December 22, 1978."

"While foreign investors may bring capital intensive labor-saving equipment in one country to where there is massive unemployment, they do so only to offset high wages that governments and trade unions would otherwise force them to pay."

8. "Business Week, October 8, 1979."

"With exports making up about 50 percent of total GNP and its multi-nationals spanning the globe, Holland is perhaps the most open economy in the world. Six Dutch-based companies are ranked in the top 100 corporations outside the United States. Dutch investments overseas are enormous for its size."

9. "Fortune, August 14, 1978."

"Foreign multi-national corporation sales equal 3003.15 billion dollars in sales in 1978."

10. "World Business, 1978."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "Boston Globe, September 5, 1978."

"Only last week General Motors announced it would spend four million dollars on improving worker's facilities in South American plants, provide training programs for black workers for supervising in management jobs."

Books

1. "Department of State, The U.S. and the 3rd World, 1976."

"Most multi-national corporation's activities take place within the industrial world itself, only a minor part in the 3rd world."

Government publications

1. "Energy Conservation and Regulation, April 4, 1977."
2. "Mike McCormack, Congressional Record."

Other

1. "International Business Enterprise, 1978."
2. "Foreign Trade Policies of the United States."

Debate Three

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Emma Rothschild, New York Times Magazine, March 13, 1977."

"The program has failed first of all in its humanitarian purpose of helping hungry people. During the world food crisis in 1973-74, the U.S. actually reduced its aid to many poor countries, above all to Bangladesh at the time of the 1974 famine."

2. "President Carter, Atlantic Community Quarterly, Summer 1978."

"To have sufficient food, to live and work, to be adequately sheltered and clothed, to live in a healthy environment and to be healed when sick, to learn and be taught--these rights, too, must be the concern of our governments. To meet these needs, orderly economic growth is crucial."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "New York Times, May 22, 1977."

"The difference between adequate food and the world food crisis is a multi-calculated tons of wheat-- only 4 to 5 percent of the 1976-77 total grain production."

2. "McLaughlin, New York Times." (cited twice)

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Food for Peace, P.L. 480."

"Title I of P.L. 480 provides for the congressional sale of agricultural commodities to friendly countries."

Other

1. "Basic Needs--Some Issues, 1978."
2. "ODC Agenda, 1979."
3. "Eckman and Messias."
4. "James Grant, 1978."
5. "Senator Adlai Stevenson, 1978."

NegativeMagazines

1. "American, 1978."

2. "James K. Boyce and Betsey Hartman, Nation, March 4, 1978."

"If the government does not have the will to help the small farmers outside organizations can't force them to do it. We can advise, we can write provisions in our projects, but without that genuine commitment on the part of the government, it just won't work."

3. "Foreign Policy, 1977."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "Christian Science Monitor, November 8, 1978."

"Attempts to use western style facilities such as bulk silos and industrial conduit dryers in order to increase efficiency have always failed."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Senate Hearings on the Bomb and International Economic Activity, 1978."
2. "Senator Henry Burke, Congressional Record, 1974."

Other

1. "John Osgoode and Mitchell Walderstein, 1977."
2. "D. L. Johnson, 1978." (cited six times)
3. "J. S. Annalt, 1979." (cited three times)
4. "Senator Hubert Humphrey, 1978."

5. "World Population, 1978."
6. "Professors Hopkins and Pucella, 1979."
7. "Saki and Cummings."
8. "INF Survey, 1978."
9. "Interdependent, April 1979."
10. "Representative James Stewart, 1978."
11. "Introduction to Nutrition, 1976."
12. "Roger Darwin, 1978."
13. "LCD in the Third World, 1978."
14. "Morris J. Williams, 1977."

Debate Four

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Chester Cooper, Foreign Policy, 1978."
 "Potential customers are increasingly prone to look to other countries for nuclear purchases which, in many cases, follow American designs in these equipment made under licensing arrangements with the U.S. vendors."
3. "Technology Review, 'The Nuclear Dilemma,' May 1979."
 "From this point of view then the weapons proliferation threat to international instability is real, but is best addressed at the level of influencing the incentives and disincentives for the acquisition of weapons. As for the linkage to nuclear power, it is small."
4. "Don Cook, Fortune, October 23, 1978."
 "Carter's restrictive policies have dealt a blow to two U.S. nuclear giants--Westinghouse and GE--in

the stiffening competition for major oversea reactor orders, particularly against the West Germans and the French. Last year, twelve new power reactors were ordered throughout the World at a price of roughly \$1 billion, according to IAEA. The U.S. lost out on every foreign bid and its share of the reactor export market was temporarily reduced to zero."

5. "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, February 1980."

"As more effort is devoted to searching for uranium and lower types of deposits are investigated, there is a good prospect that our uranium resources base will grow."

6. "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, April 1979."

"As for the problem of waste disposal, Mr. Frazier (leader of the liberal national country coalition and prime minister of Australia) said, 'the technology for handling, solidification, and safe storage of high level radioactive liquids exists. It is now being developed on a commercial scale.'"

7. "Popular Science, 1978."

8. "USA Today, 1979."

Journals

1. "National Journal, 1979." (cited twice)

Newspapers

1. "New York Times, March 7, 1978."

"At stake is a potential export business that Westinghouse estimates at 25 billion dollars over the next five years."

2. "Wall Street Journal, December 13, 1979."

"A joint venture of several major energy companies is discovering significant uranium deposits on a 6,000 acre track in Wyoming. The deposit may have forty million pounds of uranium at about average grade

of .3 percent. Elsewhere, uranium is mined with a content as low as .05 percent.

3. "New York Times, 1978."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1978." (cited three times)
2. "Committee on Nuclear Alternative Technology, 1980."

Other

1. "Dictionary of Foreign Trade."
2. "Changing Patterns in Foreign Trade, 1978."
3. "Peter Dawkins, 1978."
4. "William Ingle, 1979."
5. "NPA, 1978."
6. "Geopolitics of Energy, 1978."

Negative

Magazines

1. "Scientific American, 1978."
2. "Atlas World Press Review, 1976."
3. "Progressive, 1972."
4. "Intellect, 1976."
5. "Environment, 1978."
6. "Environment, 1973."

7. "Current, November 1979."

"Right now it is cheaper to install a solar collector to meet 50-60 percent of your heating needs than to heat your home over the next fifty years with electricity from nuclear power plants."

8. "U.S. News and World Report, February 18, 1980."

"All together developing nations, outside of OPEC, owe banks around the world an estimate 180 billion dollars at the end of 1979, over four times the claims of five years earlier."

9. "Ibid."

"Ten countries are in hock to U.S. banks for more than one billion dollars each: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Taiwan, South Korea, Peru, Thailand, Mexico, and the Phillipines."

10. "Ibid."

"Causing Federal bank regulators the most worry right now are Brazil and South Korea which are being flagged for special commitment because they are viewed as particularly shaky."

11. "Ibid."

"Brazil has some fifty-two billion dollars in outstanding loans from the world's major banks--almost fourteen billion dollars of that from U.S. financial institutions. It may take as much as 80 percent of Brazil's 1980 export earnings just to service debts."

12. "Ibid."

"In the process of giving loans to the LDCs, the banks assumed a role previously performed by publicly supported financial institutions such as IMF and the World Bank or handled by bilateral government aid."

13. "Ibid."

"Many insist that it is a role the banks are not suited for.. They can't force debtor nations to cut imports, devalue their currencies, and limit their

means as the IMF can do as a condition of extending credit."

14. "Lewis Dunn, Science, March 1977."

"Nuclear proliferation is likely to be accompanied frequently at least partially by a fairly intense qualitative and quantitative nuclear arms race. There is no reason to believe that the major countries in the mid-east, South Asia, and the Persian Gulf, for example, would acquiesce easily to second class non-nuclear status or a position of marked nuclear inferiority vis-a-vis the original opponents."

15. "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, November 1978."

"Proliferation would severely complicate the already difficult management of superpower nuclear relations and increase the probability of a nuclear war occurring because of a miscalculation."

16. "Annals of Science, 1977."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "Rocky Mountain News, 1978."
2. "Minneapolis Tribune, February 6, 1980."

"A reporter who was hired as a guard of the TMI plant, gained entry to the control room through an unlocked door, his newspaper reported Tuesday. He is quoted as saying, 'TMI--it is a paradise island for the saboteurs' says one headline. 'I waltzed into the unlocked control room in Unit II.' Unit II was severely damaged last month in the worst accident in the history of commercial nuclear power."

3. "Albuquerque Journal, July 6, 1977."

"The primary direct impact of solar energy on the local government will be the elimination of adverse

environmental effects attributable to the burning of conventional fossil fuels."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Congressional Budget Office Report, 1977."
2. "Congressional Record, 1976." (cited twice)
3. "Review of the National Breeder Reactor Program, 1976."
4. "Comptroller General Report, September 1977."
 "ERDA, NRC, and the National Academy of Science all agree that the primary barrier for isolating high levels of transuranic contaminated waste must be surrounding geology. Because of the long-lived nature of these wastes, about 500,000 years, the waste form and its container would break down much sooner than it would take the radio-nuclei to decay to innocuous levels."
5. "Congressional Research Service, 1979."
6. "Lewis D. Navenzo, Washington Subcommittee, September 1978."
7. "John Littler, Senate Energy Committee, June 1977."

Other

1. "Insular Affairs, 1977."
2. "Nuclear Power, 1978." (cited twice)
3. "Nuclear Weapons and World Politics, 1977."
4. "Solar Power."
5. "James Benson, September 20, 1977."
6. "Frederick Thayer, March 1977."

Debate Five

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Foreign Affairs, 1979."
2. "U.S. News and World Report, 1978." (cited twice)
3. "Business in America, 1979."
4. "Vital Speeches, 1979."
5. "U.S. News and World Report, 1979."
6. "Business Week, 1979."
7. "New Republic, 1978."
8. "Nation's Business, 1978."

Journals

1. "International Journal, 1978."

Newspapers

1. "Wall Street Journal, 1978."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "U.S. Code Services, 1979."

Other

1. "Kline, 1978."
2. "Economics, 1978."

3. "Charles Frank, 1977."
4. "Black's Law Dictionary, 1968."
"Foreign Trade. Commercial interchange of commodities from different countries; export and import trade."
5. "Carlson, 1978."
6. "Ross, 1975."
7. "International Realities, 1979."

Negative

Magazines

(none)

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

(none)

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Congressional Record, February 26, H856."
2. "U.S. Trade Policies in the Tokyo Round of Multi-National Trade Negotiations, March 1979, page xii."

"A reduction of trade barriers would only have a small impact on the general rate of inflation, much more than the effects of the federal monetary policy."

3. "Ibid., page xix."

"Estimates of the activities in employment will result from the trade liberalization of short changes discussed in Geneva at generally less than one-half of one percent of the total labor force."

Debate Six

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Science, July 13, 1979."

"Of the 8.5 million barrels a day imported by the U.S., no less than five to six million are directly attributable to the low price policy."

2. "Forbes, May 14, 1979."

"Petroleum, of course, is at the root of the problem. The U.S., a country that never lived by trade, is suddenly having to import huge amounts of oil, probably to the tune of over fifty billion dollars this year alone."

3. "Business Week, May 22, 1978."

"According to Joel Popkin of the NBR, the oil price rise was responsible for about one-third of the increase in U.S. prices."

4. "U.S. News and World Report, January 15, 1979."

"Soviet Russia has been stimulating and exploiting instability in this vast area. At stakes are enormous Persian Gulf oil supplies and control of strategic choke points that are of life and death importance to the U.S."

5. "Newsweek, February 1979."

6. "Nation's Business, August 1979."

7. "Foreign Policy, Summer 1978."
8. "Nation's Business, May 1979."
9. "U.S. News and World Report, March 3, 1980."

"At the same time, another White House official concedes 'in the short-term, we can't control inflation.' These officials contend that foreign prices stem mainly from larger oil costs, which by and large are beyond U.S. control."

10. "Time, March 21, 1979."

"Morgan Guarantee Trust Company estimates that oil prices in the U.S. will increase at least 15 percent by the year's end. That will be at a minimum of a one-half percent of a point jump in consumer's prices."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "Des Moines Register, November 5, 1979."

"Today's troubles--high inflation, energy scarcity--are all trivial by contrast. Our inability to treat these problems at home weakens us at home and abroad. Increasingly our domestic policy is our foreign policy."

2. "Wall Street Journal, March 22, 1979."

"Overall oil imports account for 45 percent of the U.S. oil use. Thirty-four percent in 1975 and 18 percent in 1959."

3. "Wall Street Journal, 1979."

4. "Washington Post, May 23, 1979."

"Secretary of the Treasury, Blumenthal, said the U.S. oil will jump to fifty-two billion barrels compared to forty-two billion barrels last year."

5. "Ibid."

"Relying on a computer analysis of U.S. economic prospects that assume passage of the pending Senate compromise on President Carter's energy proposals, economic models forecast an increase in the oil deficit from forty-eight billion dollars in 1978 to \$102 billion in 1985."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Senator Walt, Congressional Record, November 16, 1979."

"The combination of the tax on the controls will result in reduced incentives to produce known domestic crude oil reserves, which means greater dependence on imported crude oil."

2. "Congressional Record, 1979."

3. "Senator Hart, Congressional Record, April 5, 1979."

"The overall potential embargo or other interruption has not decreased since the embargo in 1973. It is unquestionable that such a risk threatens national security."

4. "Committee on Energy and National Resources, March 1977."

Other

1. "Editorial Research Reports, March 22, 1979."

"According to a recent study by the Petroleum Institute Research Foundation, energy demand in the U.S. grows at an annual rate of 3.8 percent--slightly above the 1960-76 rate of 3.7 percent. The U.S. will be importing twelve million barrels of oil a day by 1985."

2. "Jimmy Carter, November 8, 1977."
3. "Economist Joseph Mayers, 1978."
4. "National Security Advisor Brezhinski, 1979."
5. "John Hopkins Study, 1975." (cited twice)

Negative

Magazines

1. "USA Today, 1979."
2. "Business Week, 1979." (cited four times)
3. "USA Today, September 1979."
4. "Foreign Policy, Summer 1975."

"At the present rate of exploration the U.S. will exhaust its own petroleum reserves in about ten years."

5. "Foreign Policy, 1979."
6. "Fortune, 1979." (cited twice)
7. "Business in America, 1979."
8. "U.S. News and World Report, March 3, 1980."

"Here at this strategic part of the Horn of Africa, the U.S. is set to convert a one-time Soviet base into a key link of a military chain designed to block Russia from seizing control of the flow of Mideast oil."

9. "Ibid."

"The U.S. move signals American resolve to challenge Soviet encirclement of oil-rich Persian Gulf region by countering the Russian military presence in the neighboring Ethiopia, in South Yemen, and in occupied Afghanistan."

10. "Newsweek, January 21, 1980."

"U.S. strategists count on shoring up the eastern and western flanks of a forward U.S. defense with help from Turkey and Pakistan. With the Soviet Union flexing its muscles and with the government of Ankara a bit weak on its legs, Turkey agreed to allow the U.S. to stay in twenty-six bases."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "New York Times, 1979."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Future Reports, Senate Subcommittee, 1973."
2. "Federal Energy Administration, 1976."
3. "U.S. Code Services, 1970."

Other

1. "Black's Law Dictionary, 1968."
"Foreign trade. Commercial interchange of commodities from different countries; export and import trade."
2. "Three pieces of evidence apparently were read without any source being indicated."
3. "Senator Muskie, 1979."
4. "Metzenbaum, 1979."

Debate Seven

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Technology Review, June/July 1979."

"After November 30, 1978, seventy-two commercial reactors held operating licenses with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. An additional ninety reactors have been issued construction permits, four more have limited work authorizations, and thirty-seven are on order."

2. "Business Week, December 25, 1978."

"Carter will push for nuclear licensing reform, and recommendations to support current generation nuclear reactor construction more forcefully will soon reach him."

3. "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, September 1975."

"Using EPA statistics and ERDA statistics, Comey concluded that the fatality rate is 982 deaths per kilowatt year, which would equal 8,400 deaths per year from mill tailings."

4. "Nation, 1977."

5. "Technology Review, June/July 1979."

"Dr. Sprung calculated that the 'early fatalities' of any of the operating reactors should suffer an accident would be about 30,000 to 40,000 people."

6. "Time, April 16, 1979."

"Despite the uproar on U.S. policy on nuclear energy is not expected to change significantly. Quietly, but firmly, Carter maintained his commitment to nuclear power."

7. "Commonwealth, December 3, 1976."

"In the last election, six states voted on placing restrictions on the development of nuclear power. All six states lost."

8. "Conservation Reports, March 23, 1979."

"By 1985 there will be at least 136 nuclear reactors in operation."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

(none)

Books

1. "Donald Kelly, Energy Crisis and the Environment."

"Nuclear pollution strikes more directly than does pollution from oil or coal. In 1961, three workmen died from accidental exposure to the AEC's Idaho Falls testing station."

2. "McKinley Wilson, Unacceptable Risk, 1976."

"Nuclear plants routinely release radioactivity into the water and air during normal operations. The cumulative effect of the radioactive discharge may be showing thousands of cases of cancer, leukemia, and heart disease."

Government publications

1. "Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1976."
2. "Congressional Record, April 23, 1976."
3. "Nuclear Oversight Hearings, 1979."

Other

1. "The Silent Bomb, 1977." (cited twice)
2. "New Tyranny, 1979." (cited twice)
3. "The Unviable Option."
4. "Shutdown, 1979."
5. There appeared to be one piece of evidence read without the citing of any source.

Negative

Magazines

1. "Scientific American, 1978."
2. "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 1978."
3. "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 1979."

Journals

1. "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 1977." (cited four times)

Newspapers

1. "New York Times, September 14, 1977."

"The Institute for Contemporary Studies' study calls for a three phase-out of all oil and gas price controls. It argues that this would allow enough additional production to reduce oil imports to as little as five million barrels of oil a day by 1981."

Books

(none)

Government publications

(none)

Other

1. "Geopolitics Energy Report, 1977."

Debate Eight

Affirmative

Magazines

1. "Time, March 13, 1978, page 14."

"We are the world's largest importer of sugar, importing eleven million tons a year."

Journals

(none)

Newspapers

1. "Associated Press release, Los Angeles Times, 1979."
2. "Washington Post, October 18, 1979, page A2."

"Cheap foreign sugar now accounts for one-half of U.S. consumption."

Books

(none)

Government publications

1. "Assistant Secretary Julius Katz, Senate Finance Committee, May 11, 1975, page 35."

"We have a major stake in the world's sugar market. We import a large portion of our sugar required-- almost 50 percent in some years. We are a major factor in the world market, accounting for some 20 percent of all world sugar imports in the free market."
2. "Representative Duran, Congressional Record, June 5, 1979, page E267."

"U.S. production accounts for approximately 55 percent of sugar used. The remaining 45 percent must be imported."
3. "Representative Gore, October 5, 1978."
4. "Representative John ?, Congressional Record, December 1978."
5. "Thomas Moore, House Committee on Agriculture, 1978."
6. "New York Journal of Commerce (reprinted with permission in the Congressional Record), September 5, 1979."

"Alfred Kahn, the President's chief inflation fighter said every cent rise in the price of sugar used 250 million to 300 million dollars directly out of the consumer's pocket and as much as 150 to 200 million dollars indirectly."
7. "D. J. DeGraber, House Committee on Agriculture, June 1, 1978, page 201."

"U.S. consumers need a dependable supply of sugar. The oil prices and recent run-up of coffee prices show the dangers of dependence on foreign suppliers for important commodities. U.S. consumers depend on foreigners for 45 percent of the sugar we consume. Unless we reduce foreign competition, this heavy dependence on foreign unreliable sources will increase substantially."
8. "Representative Delakarza, Congressional Record, 1978."

9. "GATT, International Trade, Congressional Record, 1979."
10. "Representative Johnson, Congressional Record, 1978."
11. "Congressional Record, 1978."
12. "Congressional Record, 1979." (cited twice)

Other

1. "ISA."
2. "Senator Church, 1979."
3. "Julius Katz, 1978."
4. "President of the American Sugar Institute, 1978."

Negative

Magazines

1. "Business Week, July 31, 1978."
"Most economists regard 5.5 percent unemployment as the lowest rate that can be achieved under the present economic conditions without causing inflation to accelerate."
2. "Business Week, January 29, 1979."
"To cope with inflation and maintain their standard of living, more households are becoming two-wage-earner families. According to Kenny, 44 percent of all households had two salary checks coming in 1970. By 1977 this had risen to 53 percent. And the sharpest increase occurred in the under-35-age group, in which home ownership is relatively low."
3. "Vital Speeches, June 1, 1977."
"The tax free unemployment payments, which were extended in 1975 to sixty-five weeks, plus supplementary unemployment insurance, food stamps and other benefits. The incomes of many unemployed workers runs between 90 and 100 percent of their

regular pay which is subject to income tax so that there is no economic need for them to look for work."

4. "Challenge, May/June 1978."

"Without a low wage labor force willing to bear economic flux and uncertainty most of our declining industries, such as textiles, shoes, garments, would be forced to move abroad much more rapidly. This would in turn threaten the employment of higher-paid, more secure workers who service these industries. It would lead to a decline in our standard of living."

5. "Ibid."

"The basic explanation of the high relative unemployment of certain groups is that jobs which they hold relatively high rates of entrance into and exist from the labor force. Two factors are related in order to get people who are willing to accept the menial low-wage jobs involved. One has to call upon groups that need work and these groups tend to have high rates of movement into and out of the labor market."

6. "Nation's Business, March 1978."

"The imposition of an import tariff provides only temporary relief to the industry. It produces substitutes for the affected import."

7. "Ibid."

"Another undesirable aspect of tariffs is the likelihood that they will bring retaliatory actions on the part of other nations. Under the first economic rate system, others will certainly feel encouraged to protect their balance of trade by imposing restrictions on U.S. exports. Under full exchange rates the retaliation is automatic. A decline in U.S. imports results in a depreciating dollar, and this will automatically decline the demand for our own exports."

8. "Ibid."

"Dr. Jack Carlson, the chief economist for the National Chamber, says protectionism is the biggest

danger to this country's world trade since the 1930s when high American tariffs helped worsen the depression."

9. "U.S. News and World Report, 1979."

Journals

1. "Monthly Labor Review, May 1978."

"As a result of legislation enacted last year, 97 percent of the waged and salaried workers are now protected against the short-term effects of unemployment through the Federal-State insurance program."

2. "International Journal." (cited twice)

Newspapers

1. "Minneapolis Star, June 1, 1979."

"The nation's unemployment rate remained at 5.8 percent in May, the Labor Department reported today. The total employment began to rebound from a sharp decline a month ago."

2. "Los Angeles Times, 1979." (cited twice)

3. "Los Angeles Times, March 16, 1979, part 2, page 11."

"Financial aid to developing countries is of the greatest value when it serves the ventures that can provide capital and income. If we insist on protecting our markets against imports from foreign countries, then we are rendering much of the aid that we provide quite useless."

4. "Christian Science Monitor, 1979."

Books

(none)

Government publications

(none)

Other

1. "Fishlow, 1978."
2. "George, 1978."
3. "Professor Cohens, 1977."
4. "Roger Johnston, 1979."
5. "New National Security, 1978." (cited twice)
6. "Thayers, 1978."
7. "Business, 1978."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "As Pressure Mounts for Wage-Price Controls." U.S. News and World Report, March 3, 1980, p. 19.
- Benson, James. "The Use of Evidence in Intercollegiate Debate." Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1969.
- Bettinghouse, Erwin P. Persuasive Communication, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1980.
- Boyce, James K. and Hartman, Betsy. "U.S. Aid for the Rich: View from a Bangladesh Village." Nation, March 4, 1978, p. 239.
- Brown, Lester R. "Global Economic Ills: the Worst May Be Yet to Come." Futurist, June 1978, p. 167.
- Camilleri, Joseph. "Nuclear Controversy in Australia: the Uranium Campaign." Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, April 1979, p. 42.
- Comey, David Dinsanure. "The Legacy of Uranium Tailings." Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, September 1975, p. 44.
- "Concern Rises Over Third World Loans." U.S. News and World Report, February 18, 1980, p. 93.
- Dresser, William R. "The Use of Evidence in Ten Championship Debates." Journal of the American Forensics Association, September 1964, p. 101-06.
- Ehninger, Douglas and Brockriede, Wayne. Decision by Debate, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1978.
- Ewbank, Henry Lee and Auer, J. Jeffrey. Discussion and Debate, 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
- "Farmers: Beat-Red, Raising Cane." Time, March 13, 1978, p. 14.

- Gibbons, John H. and Chandler, William U. "A National Energy Conservation Policy." Current History, July/August 1978, p. 14.
- Martin, Edwin M. "Should Observance of Basic Human Rights Be a Prerequisite for Aid?" Atlantic Community Quarterly, Summer 1978, p. 217.
- "The Multinationals and the Third World." UNESCO Courier, November 1978, p. 15.
- "Naval Base in Somalia--Exit Russia, Enter U.S." U.S. News and World Report, March 3, 1980, p. 24.
- "Now Comes the Fallout." Time, April 16, 1979, p. 24.
- "Nuclear Dilemma." Business Week, December 25, 1978, p. 60.
- "Nuclear Insurance: How Much is Enough (and from whom?)." Technology Review, June/July 1979, p. 73.
- "OPEC's Continuing Impact in Fueling U.S. Inflation." Business Week, May 22, 1978, p. 132.
- "Progress and Protests." Time, February 11, 1980, p. 42.
- Rothschild, Emma. New York Times Magazine, March 13, 1977, p. 20.
- Sanders, Gerald H. "Misuse of Evidence in Academic Debate." In Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice, and Teaching, pp. 220-27. Edited by David A. Thomas. Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1975.
- "Saudi Arabia: a Shakey U.S. Pillar of Security." Newsweek, March 3, 1980, p. 37.
- "Searching for the Right Response." Time, March 12, 1979, p. 30.
- "Synfuels in Haste, Repent at Leisure." Science, July 13, 1979, p. 168.
- "The Windfall Profits or the Windfall Tax." U.S. News and World Report, April 23, 1979, p. 92.