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FORMING THE KUSOL DEBATING SOCIETY

The success of a Debating Society depends first upon the presence of a nucleus of people who have a lively interest in the practice of debate, and the kind of temper and temperament which makes friendly give-and-take debate possible; second, upon the existence of a larger number who are sufficiently interested in a general way to support the proposed KUSOL Debating Society immediately with their attendance, and votes, and later, it is hoped, with their spoken contributions; third, upon the right choice of officers and committee; and fourth—and by far last—upon the drawing up of suitable rules.

THE EXECUTIVE

This will usually consist of a President, any number of Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, Secretary and Assistant Secretary, and Committee.

For Vice-Presidents it is well to approach people who can be depended upon to help the society not only with administrative tasks, but also with a really distinguished speech if they are given ample notice, though they may not be likely to attend meetings otherwise.

For the President, on the other hand, it is better to approach a local personage who, whether he is a specialist speaker or not, is of some distinction, and will attend meetings at least occasionally. To choose as President a non-attending figurehead is a mistake. Given the right man, he will help to give the Society focus and character.

Of the rest of the Executive, by far the most important are the Secretary and his Assistant. A thriving Society will survive, at least for a year, an indifferent Treasurer and a tepid Committee, but a lax Secretary will wreck it in months. He/she should not only be punctual and business-like, but also be able to get on with everyone in a friendly way.

The Committee may include some members who are useful from the debating point of view; but, more importantly, it should number several who are useful on the social side—those hospitable ones who can be depended upon to bring the right air of comfort into any meeting which they attend, and to spread the news of the Society to any suitable potential members whom they may meet.

RULES

Excellent rules will not weld the wrong people into the right Society, but their absence may lead to confusion and profitless discussion. It is therefore wise to ensure their soundness at the outset. The following example has proved effective, and can easily be adapted to particular requirements:

1. That the Society be called "THE SCHOOL OF LAW DEBATING SOCIETY."

2. The Society shall meet on Saturday evenings (for example) at 4 p.m., at Room U2 (for example) unless otherwise determined by the Executive. In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents a Chairman shall be elected by the
members present.

3. The Executive shall consist of a President and Vice-Presidents, Secretary, Assistant Secretary and Treasurer, together with a Committee of ten other members of the Society. All members of the Executive shall retire at the Annual Business Meeting and shall be eligible for re-election. At meetings of the Executive five shall form a quorum.

4. Speakers and readers of papers shall be allowed up to forty minutes; openers of debates, twenty minutes each; subsequent speakers, ten minutes or less, at the discretion of the Chairman. All speeches, etc., shall be open to criticism and discussion.

5. Members shall be at liberty to introduce their friends to all ordinary meetings of the Society. Visitors may be invited to take part in the discussion at the discretion of the Chairman.

6. Written notice of any motion affecting the business of the Society shall be given to the Secretary and shall be read at the meeting previous to the one at which it is to be proposed. Any motion dealing with a matter of urgency may, however, be discussed at once if this course be desired by a majority of two-thirds of the members present when such motion is proposed.

7. The Chairman shall put to the vote of the meeting all motions duly moved and seconded. Members only shall be allowed to vote.

8. The Executive shall arrange the Syllabus and shall have power to fill any vacancies which may arise in the Committee during the course of the Year. Other vacancies arising in the Executive shall be filled at an ordinary meeting of the Society.

9. The Annual Subscription (if there is to be a fee payable) shall be payable on or before --------------------------- in each year.

10. That a Business Meeting be held at the close of each Session, at which the Executive shall be elected for the ensuing year, and the Report of the current year laid before the Society.

11. No alteration or addition to these Rules shall be made except it the Annual Business Meeting of the Society, or at an Extra-ordinary General Meeting specially called for that purpose, at the request of not less than ten members. Such alteration or addition shall not be made unless sanctioned by the votes of three-fourths of the members present when the vote is taken.
DEBATING is one of those useful games which can be undertaken by any number from two upwards. It has been in vogue since the first day recorded in history, and was doubtless played long before that, though possibly with less decorum and observance of seemly procedure. Modern developments have not lessened its value either as entertainment or as a means of mental exercise. Indeed, in these days of omnipresent TV, radio, and press, when the frequency with which we are told what to think makes thinking difficult and places a premium upon mental inertia and passive acceptance of opinion and idea, it may be said that debating is more valuable than ever it was, and a vigorous Debating Society more necessary to groups of people who are united by kindred interests and ideals.

Profitable debate depends upon
the choice of the right chairman,
the choice of subject,
the attitude of the debaters.

The first two essentials will be considered in due course. The third may be discussed at once. It is of such radical importance that one would suggest that a new Society could not choose a better text for discussion than that which heads the next paragraph.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF DEBATE?

In two phrases, one would suggest that the answer is:

to cultivate the rare art of straight thinking;
to acquire a flexible adaptability in applying one's own ideas and appreciating other people's.

Incidentally, and almost inevitably, of course, one acquires ideas and knowledge in the course of a debate, particularly if the leaders for and against have given as much trouble to their preparation as the subject deserves. But information alone does not make a good debate. It is possible, and indeed not infrequent, for a subject to be debated with the greatest erudition, yet with curiously little profit, at least beyond mere self-satisfied complacency, to anyone. Conversely, it is possible to hold a most profitable debate upon a subject where little "knowledge" is involved, or even upon one concerning which the debaters' information is, to put it mildly, incomplete. Everything depends ultimately on the approach, and upon the good humour and sense of proportion of all concerned.

Give and take provides the essential motto of the acceptable debater, and the essential atmosphere of the successful Debating Society. The failure of a Society, or of a single debate, is usually the result of a few members' failure to realize that personal display is not its be-all and end-all. They may be—they often are—the cleverest people in the assembly, but their cleverness does not include the perception necessary to understand that they are offending the less distinguished people upon whom the life of the Society ultimately depends. The rank and file may not fancy themselves as speakers, but, consciously or unconsciously, they
resent the minority who too obviously do. And they are right; because such complacency is an indication that its subject has overlooked the fact which is the foundation of good and enjoyable discussion: that the debate is of more importance than the debater.

This realization is of such importance to the health of Debating Societies that a more personal return will have to be made to it in Chapter 3; but the suggestion may be made at once that it is an excellent plan for the choice of leading speakers to be left to a small committee entirely or largely composed of members who rarely speak themselves. They may be depended upon to represent the feeling of what may be called the electorate, and to circumvent the minority, which almost every Society attracts, of those who are inclined to regard meetings as their private stamping-ground.
III
PREPARING FOR A SPEECH

ONE's first invitation to propose or oppose a motion for debate usually produces a momentary elation followed by a far from momentary intimidation. This self-distrust, if analysed, will usually be found to be based upon three fears: that your talk will be too much like a talk and not enough like a speech; that you may break down; and that, even if you do not, the audience will not be greatly impressed.

In short, you are thinking about yourself and your audience—and that, for the beginner, is a paralysing mistake. The experienced speaker learns to consider his audience and its reactions to himself, himself and his reactions to his audience. Indeed, these subtleties are among the most interesting things in public speaking; but their study can be based only upon the experience which is precisely what the novice lacks.

For him or her, there is only one rule: by hook or by crook forget both yourself and your audience; concentrate, to the exclusion of both, upon your subject.

As to your talk lacking formality, that will be all to the good: the more conversational your style, the less you speechify, the more effective you will be. As to your breaking down: if you prepare soundly, you will not. Indeed, you will probably be surprised at the ease and fluency you develop, once you have made a beginning. As to your audience: you may take it for granted that at least the majority are kindly people who are quite prepared, particularly if they know you are a beginner, to lend you a moral support so powerful as to affect you almost like a comforting physical sensation. If your matter, and still more your manner—which we shall consider in the next chapter—invites them to meet you half-way, they will do so, and more.

Finally—a consolation which will soon become as doubtful as it is now real—your first speech will probably be the best you will make for some time. For debaters, as for novelists, it is not difficult to score an initial success: repeating it is the test.

GENERAL PREPARATION

Confronted with the responsibility of proposing or opposing a motion for debate, the beginner who knows a good deal about the subject is apt to feel that there is so much to say that he will never get it all into the limits of a short speech.

The Leader's Job

This feeling is evidence of a common misapprehension which spoils many debates. The leader's job is not to say all that can be said, but to open the debate—to set the ball rolling and to suggest to their potential supporters ways and means of kicking it effectively. An exhaustive first speech is not a good speech. It is a bad speech. It exhausts the possibilities of debate.

This should provide consolation for the other sort of debater, who is
overcome by a panic feeling that he knows nothing about the subject
with which he has to deal. His instinct is to fly to the nearest book which
promises aid. This gesture of self-distrust is natural, but mistaken.
Consulted at the proper time, books are a help. Consulted too soon, they
merely produce indigestion.

Whether you are Proposer or Opposer, the first thing to do is to look at
the subject for yourself, both from your own point of view, and, quite as
much, from what you imagine will be that of your opposer. This double
method will not only ensure your view being as comprehensive as
possible; it will also forearm you against the opposition, and enable you
to avoid those vulnerabilities which purely one-sided consideration is
bound to leave.

Also, if you are the first speaker, it will enable you to forestall the
arguments of the opposer. That does not mean—and this is to be noted as
much by the experienced as by the beginner—that you will indulge in
such phrases as “Mr. X will probably tell you,” etc. Such overt
anticipations are not in the spirit of good debate. They do a disservice to
listeners by taking the gloss off your opponent's speech. That is a form of
unfairness. If the debate is to be a success, he must be allowed full scope
to be entertaining. By all means spike his guns after their first firing; do
all you can to prove that his shells were mere squibs; but do not deprive
the audience of his broadsides by stuffing his muzzle too soon.

Besides, by so doing, you may easily put into Mr. X's head ideas
which, without your aid, he might have over-looked!

Taking Rough Notes
As ideas occur to you in the course of your mental exploration, take
rough notes as reminders, and write out in full any original phrases which
you think may be useful. Your best plan will be to use a loose-leaf note-
book small enough to go into the pocket. You can then carry it with you
and at once note such ideas as crop up at odd times. If you trust to
memory you will probably forget a good deal and irritate yourself
considerably.

You will often find that a particular note suggests a general heading. If
so, write it on a separate page with the heading at the top. Later, as other
allied points and phrases occur to you, jot them down on the same page.

Even if you work upon these lines you will probably find your notes
getting into a considerable muddle before long. That does not matter.
Order will come later.

Your present business is to explore the ground and to collect raw
material; to attempt too precise an orderliness at this stage will merely
hamper you.

Using Books & Sources
When you have carried this first survey as far as possible, it will be
time, if there is need, to turn to books for supplementary material and
corroboration. Various year-books and other publications are almost
always useful, and may be found in the KUSOL library. The full edition
of *Webster's Dictionary* or the *Oxford English Dictionary* will also be
found extremely useful for odd information and classifications. The
internet is an indispensable tool for any debater’s research.
ACHIEVING ORDER

By the time this stage is reached, or even before, you will have realized that the two major problems of speech-making are of omission and order. Far from not knowing what to put in, you will be puzzled what to leave out. You will solve this problem more or less arbitrarily, choosing the arguments which seem most radical and suitable to yourself, and noting the rest to be used in composing the sort of conclusion to your speech which we shall presently consider.

To the arranging of your chosen material in the best way, you will be the more willing to devote trouble if you realize that order is the major problem of every sort of composition, from a news paragraph to an epic. Ordered, a given set of arguments will be brilliantly effective; disordered, they will be a damp failure. Upon order depends on sound structure, which is your best guarantee at once of safety and effectiveness. You may have an excellent supply of material, but if it is not clearly ordered you will fail. Indeed, the richer your supply of material, the easier it is to get lost and to find yourself paralysed halfway through your speech by the horrid realization that you forgot something absolutely essential near the beginning.

The simplest way of achieving order is to use a computer, open Word, and using cut and paste, simply joining up your notes in sequence. That done to your satisfaction, you are in a position to proceed with actual composition—proceed, not begin; for you will find, and be encouraged to find, that the actual composition has been more than half achieved by this preliminary orderly muddling.

FINDING THE WORDS

How you will set about clothing your structure in words and sentences will depend upon your temperament and confidence. If you have plenty, you may be content merely to prepare certain parts of your speech in detail, leaving the rest to the spur of the moment and to the sort of notes which are described in a later section.

On the other hand, you may prefer to write out in full at least a part of what you are going to say. This is a tedious business, but excellent practice if you do not allow yourself to adopt a “literary” style. Try to hear yourself speaking all the time, and to put down just that, without frills or adornments.

One of the advantages of writing out your whole speech is that it impresses the outlines upon the mind. Another is that it enables you to gauge your length with fair exactness, allowing about 100 words a minute. There is no need to point out that excessive length is fatal in debate. If the Society wisely imposes a time-limit, good—do not strain it. If not, keep your speech short.

In passing, it will be well to point out the value of practising variations of length. If you have prepared a twenty-minute speech, try dealing with the same material in ten minutes or less. For achieving lucidity, relevance and adaptability, there is no more valuable discipline.
Opening Sentences

Whatever the subject of your speech, you will be wise to pay particular attention to three parts of it: the beginning, the end, and what may be called the links with which you will "join your flats".

Your beginning and ending you will be wise to commit to memory. They are too important to be left to chance. A good beginning is half the battle, not only because it gains your listeners' attention, but also because it will give you confidence to proceed.

The essence of a good opening is that it should inform your audience briefly and lucidly what you are going to talk about. If you are experienced, you may like to devote a few sentences to getting on terms with your audience. If you are not, you will probably be better advised to plunge straight to your text or brief catalogue. The rest of what you say will then be devoted to an orderly expansion of the headings you have suggested. Should you, in spite of inexperience, decide to attempt a rather personal introductory paragraph, take care that it is neither aggressive nor apologetic. The one antagonizes your audience, the other bores it.

Ending a Speech

A good beginning prepares for a good speech; a good ending confirms it, making it seem even better than it is. The commonest fault of speech-ends is that they are too long, and become as tedious as the guest who cannot say good-bye. The first and last rule for ending a speech well is to have a few good sentences ready and to come to them a trifle before the listeners expect them.

The end of a non-debating speech should summarize and enforce what has gone before, and be really conclusive, the end of a debating speech is easier in that it need not, indeed should not, be conclusive. It should leave the subject open, not closed.

As good an ending as any runs something like this:

My time is almost at an end, and I am aware, as you are, that I have not yet half dealt with the subject of debate. I have left a dozen questions untouched, unanswered. For example, what are we to say about (here you enumerate a number of points which will supply your supporters with productive texts). If what I have said came at the end of our debate, I should be unhappy at the thought of these radical omissions. As it is, I am happy, because I know that there are more than enough speakers ready and able to give them the attention they deserve. In doing so they will, I am sure, more than ever convince you that (here add the motion and sit down without more ado).

Links

A good speech, like a train, is in sections; but if those sections are not joined, the train is not a train, but a mere collection of coaches. You, having devised your sections, will be aware of their essential separateness; but you do not want this to be unduly apparent to your
listeners. In other words, you do not want a firstly-secondly-thirdly effect, which always causes the listener to wriggle between the paragraphs.

Links are not at all difficult to devise—phrases which land the listener into the next section a little before he knows it, leaving no time for loss of momentum, no time for wriggles, and no time for you yourself to lose either the thread or the comfortable feeling that all is going swimmingly.

Occasionally you may be unable to avoid a break. You may even desire it as an effect. In either case you will be ready to leap the fissure neatly, taking up on the other side with a changed and brightened tone of voice and with some such useful verbal gambit as "It has often been said that..." This is an easy enough trick, yet, since it awakens curiosity, almost unfailingly effective.

**SPEECH NOTES**

Even though you write out or dictate your whole speech, you will be wise to have nothing to do with reading it out at the actual debate. To read a speech well is an ability which few people possess at all, and practically no beginners. Besides, each speech you read will make you less able to speak without text, thus removing you farther from that flexibility which is the essence of good debate.

Neither will you learn by heart, for a recited speech has a way of sounding even more unreal than a read one. Besides, memorization is not to be trusted. The trouble is not so much that you may forget, as that you may be overtaken by a sense of unreality which will so undermine your confidence as to bring you to an ignominiously premature end, your speech short-circuited and un-finished.

The object of preparing a speech in full is to discipline the mind and to provide material for the making of really useful speech notes.

The briefer and bolder these are, the better. Their purpose is first, and above all, to keep your speech firmly upon the rails of order; secondly to serve as a reminder of useful incidentals which you might otherwise forget. If you will be able to lay them on a table they may be written, or, better still, word processed on a single A-4 sheet.

The chief feature of your notes should be the necessary number of paragraph headings, brief, numbered and boldly displayed in black capitals. Over towards the right-hand margin you may have a reminder or two in red—single words which will ensure your bringing in at the right moment an apt story or instance.

Finally, it is not a bad plan to write, also in red, a word or two to remind you of your paragraph links; but these also should be brief. Better nothing at all than anything which will tempt you into the sort of momentary half-reading which will make your speech seem patchy to your listeners, and also hinder you much more than it helps.
THE OPPOSER'S SPEECH

We seem so far to have been paying attention to the Proposer at the expense of the Opposer; but actually this neglect has been more apparent than real. Admittedly the Opposer's task is more difficult than the Proposer's, since the latter is first in the field, and calls for more ingenuity, adaptability and resource; but in actuality there is little difference in the method of preparation. If anything, the Opposer should pay an even more prophetic attention than the Proposer to his opponent's potential arguments; also he must be prepared to extemporize more—at least, in the latter part of his speech—but apart from that he should allow himself a free hand. Merely to deal with the Proposer's arguments one by one is a dull and scrappy method: something more constructive is advisable.

Our quickest method will again be to look at the matter from the point of view of the beginner—the speaker who has been called upon to lead the opposition for the first time.

Quite the best way of opening an opposition speech is to compliment the Proposer in some such way as this:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,
In his very able speech Mr. X has put before you so many arguments to prove that . . ., and has put them so convincingly, that you may have felt from time to time, as I felt myself, that this meeting was as good as over bar the voting.

But, fortunately for this debate, there are two sides to every question, and actually a good many of his statements, though so convincingly and positively made, are highly controversial—so controversial, indeed, that I am tempted to cross swords with him at once and in detail.

However, since our object is to look at our subject as thoroughly and dispassionately as possible, I shall for the moment deny myself that pleasure, and ask you to forget Mr. X for a time, while we look at the matter from a rather different point of view.

You may then go on with your prepared speech, taking care that it is not too long and does not seem obviously self-supporting, afterwards embarking upon a detailed assault upon some of Mr. X's chief arguments. Your attack will be all the more impressive by reason of the fact that, if you prepared with proper thoroughness, you were, before Mr. X had spoken at all, ready with word-for-word answers to some of his statements; but the audience, being unaware of your guileful anticipation, will greatly respect your readiness in impromptu.

A common fault with Opposers, as with Proposers, is to cover the ground so thoroughly that nothing much is left for their supporters. This is to be guarded against. Partisans should be not stifled but provided with openings in the same way as has been already advised for the Proposer.
SUPPORTING SPEAKERS

The chief thing for the supporting speaker to remember is that he is a supporter and not a kind of deputy leader. Supporters who take it upon themselves to re-open the debate are bores of the first water. People who do so may usually be depended upon to take up all the suggestions thrown out by the leaders—and to spoil the lot.

The wise supporter will select one and no more of his leader's suggestions. He will simply say, “Among the points which Mr. A named as needing attention was . . .”, and then deal with that suggestion briefly, leaving the rest for others.

Similarly, if he wishes to take up some point from the speech of the leader whom he is not supporting, he will lead off with, “In the course of his speech Mr. X said that ...” and then deal with the point and have done.

The essence of a good supporting speech is that it should particularize, be compact and precise, and recognize the existence of other people who are also waiting their turn.

THE DEBATER'S DAYBOOK

Before leaving the subject of speech construction and the preparation of notes, a final suggestion may be useful. If it is your ambition—as it should be every keen debater's ambition—to debate freely and often, you will find it a productive plan to-devote a part of your note-book to suggestions for possible subjects, and notes for material to be used for debates which have not yet appeared upon the schedule. Newspapers, for example, are full of raw material for potential debates. Once you hit upon a likely subject, you will find apt material presenting itself which you would otherwise have overlooked or forgotten; and before long you will find yourself armed and well prepared with topical material for a speech for which it will need only a little tact and resource to provide an opening.
IV

EFFECTIVE SPEAKING

Burns's prayer,

O wad some pow'r the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as ither's see us!

is not likely to be answered, at least in any detail—which is perhaps as well. Another gift—that of hearing ourselves as others hear us—which would be extremely useful to debaters, is even less likely. Failing them, the next best thing is a friendly critic, observant, interested, with a sense of detail yet not finicking, who will describe one's good points without flattering, and one's bad without being irritating.

But even without the help of one of these not too common paragons, it is possible, by means of a not too anxious self-examination, to see that one obeys most of the following rules, many of which, indeed, are so obvious that only the frequency with which they are ignored excuses their being set down here.

**Breathing and Stance**

Breathe easily and deeply without the haste which leads to gasping. The taking of half a dozen slow inhalations through the nose just before beginning to speak is the best cure yet discovered for nervousness.

Really stand while speaking. A lounging speaker produces mentally lounging listeners.

Stand with the weight on the balls of the feet, and keep still, unless you have reason to move. Many speakers indulge in meaningless and often unconscious movements. Swaying is the commonest, and hand fiddling and slight bouncing on the toes are the most annoying. Such mannerisms are to be avoided.

This rule of stillness also applies to gesture. If you are going to gesticulate, gesticulate; but avoid mechanical habit. If you can get the same effect without gesture as with, omit the gesture.

If you really need to clear the throat, clear it before speaking. Usually you don't—most throat clearing is merely another nervous mannerism.

**Voice and Enunciation**

Speak clearly, with particular attention to word-endings; but do not overdo it. The sort of clearness which “shows the works" is distracting.

Remember that only ventriloquists can achieve clearness with motionless lips. Audiences listen quite a lot with their eyes, and inert lips defeat them and produce the effect of dullness.

Consider your average pitch. Too high an average produces restlessness; too low, sleep.

Vary your pitch around this average centre. A speech delivered on a mere two or three notes is anesthetic. Besides, speech tunes (intonation) are capable of expressing subtleties and nuances which are beyond the scope of mere words.

Take care to keep the tone and interest going right to the end of each sentence. Quick-witted speakers, owing to their tendency to think ahead, are apt to be interested in the coming sentence rather than in the one
actually in progress, and thus are particularly prone to fade at the end of the phrase.

Maintain a good average speed, but do not be afraid to vary it. Speed variation—a matter too subtle to be more than mentioned here—is one of the surest means of maintaining interest and gaining expressiveness.

**General Points**

Try to acquire the habit of seeing the end of the sentence right from the beginning, and go straight for it, avoiding **ums** and **ers**. When master of this clearness you may attempt long sentences. Till then you will be safer with short. In any case they are generally the more effective.

Try to obey the same rule in the larger sense. If you realize that you have forgotten something that should have come before, avoid the natural tendency to hark back after it at once. If it does not really matter, let it go. If it does, try to introduce it at a suitable moment without the suggestion of going back on your tracks.

Use your own words and avoid cliches such as "I am sure you will agree with me when I say ", "As I said before ", etc. If you said it before, why say it again?— and if you must, why underline the fact that you are repeating yourself? A little thought and observation will bring dozens of such trite phrases to your mind. Avoid them all. They are dead wood.

So much for positive suggestions. A few negatives may also be useful. **Don't "try to be clever".** The attempt may give you satisfaction, but it is bad policy, producing in impartial listeners a mild alienation which will express itself in deflected votes. Trying to be clever most commonly takes the form of irony, sarcasm and, most tiresome of all, superciliousness. Irony is sometimes described as a double-edged weapon. Actually it more often has a single edge, which wounds only the wielder.

Another and simpler form of “trying to be clever” calls for the use of still another phrase:

**Don't try to be funny.** If you have a natural turn of humour and humorous phrase, good. These aptitudes are a blessing alike to the debater and his listeners, but if they seem forced, they are tiresome. The commonest forms of forced funniness are the irrelevant anecdote and funny story. These may gain the easy laugh, but audiences are quick to see their purpose and irrelevance, and to register their disapproval in the usual way.

Finally, **don't try to score by irrelevant methods.** Quite apart from the question of manners, it is bad policy, for example, to try to embarrass one's opponent by those half-interruptions and asides which are as improper in debate as trips on the football field.

Considering all these suggestions, both positive and negative, you will realize that they can all be summarized in a single rule:

Present your subject with all possible lucidity, and avoid anything which will put yourself between the listener and it.

Observance of that cardinal rule is the foundation of good debate. It will prevent you, as an individual, from slipping into the crowded ranks of those spoilers of debate who are out merely to win. Everyone knows the type. He may be obtuse, he may be clever. It makes no difference: he
is obviously thinking more about himself than either his subject or his company—and that, whether in debate or elsewhere, remains the first and last qualification of a bore.

It is this too-ardent desire to win which produces the vote-touter. The vote-touter, whether in debate or electioneering, is unconvincing because he is obviously more concerned with the immediate end than with the ultimate purpose. Radically, in his willingness to obscure rather than to analyse his opponent's claims, he is trading in ingenious dishonesty.

Naturally, in debate as in the field, one likes to win; but it should be the first rule of the debater that he will play the game generously and fairly, that he will use every legitimate means at his command, and that he will give his opponent every opportunity to do the same, leaving the result to be decided according to the merits of the case. The voting is really the least important part of the debate.
THE CHAIRMAN'S DUTIES

The success of any debate depends so largely upon the temperament and expertness of the chairman that the greatest care should be exercised in choosing him, or the deputy who must be voted to officiate in his absence. He must be able to control without seeming dictatorial, and to manage people without the management seeming obvious or pedantic. He must also know the rules. Born chairmen are not common, and those who really know their business are still more rare. It will therefore be well to set down in some detail what is generally established by custom as being the best procedure.

1. **Opening the meeting.** A good way to begin is to announce the object for which the meeting has come together. Special care should be taken to do this if there is any danger of the object having been only indefinitely grasped by those attending. If the purposes for which the meeting has come together be well understood, this explanation is not necessary.

2. **Minutes.** His next duty is to call upon the secretary to read the minutes of the last meeting, and, after the reading, to ask the meeting if they are approved as correct. It is here in order for any one to rise and criticize the minutes as inaccurate or defective, and if the criticism is held to be just by the meeting, the secretary must alter accordingly. If, on the other hand, the meeting approve the minutes, then, after they are signed by the chairman, the business proceeds, the chairman calling for the

3. **Reports of the standing committees** (if any). Every Debating Society will almost certainly have at least one standing committee, whose members are appointed at the Annual Meeting, and who transact the business of the Society. As this committee has considerable trust reposed in it, there should be a report of its proceedings laid before the Society from time to time for the information and the satisfaction of the members of the Society. The powers of this committee are often defined in the rules.

4. **Reports of special committees** (if any). The distinction between a standing and a special committee should be carefully observed. A standing committee is appointed by the Society for the quick despatch of its ordinary business, and its powers are usually defined in the rules; but often special questions arise involving inquiries, or the drawing up of documents or the like, and it is very convenient in these cases to appoint a special committee for the particular business. These special committees always receive instructions at the time of their appointment, and when they have discharged the duty laid upon them, they report to the Society, and are dismissed from the duty, or have the matter referred back to them for reconsideration, in which case they must report again before they can be dismissed.

5. **Orders of the day** (if any). Sometimes it is appointed by the Society that a certain matter shall be discussed upon a certain day, and when this comes the matter must be given precedence. If it is left till later in the evening it runs the risk of being shelved for lack of time, and then the chairman puts himself in the unfortunate position of having, by bad management, really defeated what he had previously appointed to be considered. If for any reason the orders of the day are not discussed, they fall to the ground, and must be renewed if they are to be discussed at the next meeting.
6. **Business unfinished.** If any notices of motions have been given at the previous meeting, the motions are discussed under this head.

7. **New business,** such as election of new members, notices of motions, etc. The chairman, having thus cleared the ground, can now proceed to the

8. **Main object of the meeting.** This may be *(a)* to hear a paper, *(b)* to hold a debate, or *(c)* to listen to a lecture. The chairman will of course modify his action according to the form of the matter in hand.

   *(a)* If an essay is to be read, the chairman should briefly state its subject, and call upon the writer to read it.

   *(b)* If there is to be a debate, the chairman announces the subject, reminds the audience of the rules as to time, drawing attention to any special regulation which may have been made by the committee, and then calls upon the opener to lead off the debate. It is very advisable that any special regulation should be laid before the meeting in order that the chairman may get authority to enforce it.

   *(c)* If it is a lecture, the chairman may briefly introduce the lecturer to the audience and bespeak an attentive hearing.

9. *(a)* When the paper is read, the chairman may throw open the meeting to those who wish to make any remarks on the subject of the essay, or, with the permission of the writer, invite questions. Finally he is given an opportunity for reply, and the meeting is closed by a few words from the chair, summing up the proceedings and calling for any votes of thanks which may have been arranged.

   *(b)* When the debate is over, it is usual for the chairman to sum up briefly and impartially. This requires a clear and a cool head, and unless the chairman feels capable, it is better not attempted, except in general terms. Then he should call upon the Opposer to reply, and afterwards he should call upon the Proposer. After this, the chairman clearly recapitulates the question in debate, in such a way as to leave no doubt as to the exact nature of the issue. Then the votes are taken, first for the negative, then for the positive, either by show of hands, or by division, or by ballot. In any case, there must be more than one counter of votes. When the tellers are agreed, they inform the chairman of the result, and he announces it to the meeting and with a few words brings the proceedings to a close.

   *(c)* When the lecture is over, the chairman may make a few remarks, and give an opportunity for some one to propose a vote of thanks, which, on its being seconded and passed, he presents (as it were) to the lecturer, who replies briefly, and the chairman closes the meeting. When a vote of thanks is proposed to the chairman, it is customary for the seconder to put it to the meeting.

   Meetings are held for many other purposes than those mentioned, but it is usually easy enough for the chairman to modify his methods to suit the particular case.

   In addition to the general duties so far discussed, there are one or two matters of detail which it will be as well to consider separately.

**METHOD OF DEALING WITH GENERAL MOTIONS**

**[AMENDMENTS, ETC.]**

In dealing with such matters as these, chairmen frequently fall into confusion through not being sufficiently careful to observe the useful rule that there should not be more than one motion before the meeting" at a time. Suppose a meeting has been called for which there is no definite agenda paper through the items of which the chairman can methodically
move, but has met to deliberate or consult. The chairman will begin by calling for some motion to be laid before the meeting. This motion should be handed to the chairman in writing, and he should distinctly announce the name of the speaker to it. We can call this, for the sake of convenience, “Motion A”. When the proposer of this motion sits down, the chairman asks for a seconder. If any one should rise at this stage to criticize the motion, or to propose another, or to propose a direct negative, or to do anything but second the motion, he is out of order, and must be at once ruled so by the chair. Motion A cannot be laid before the meeting until seconded, and if, if it is not seconded, it falls to the ground.

When duly seconded, Motion A is laid by the chairman before the meeting, and the following courses of procedure are now in order:—

1. The Previous Question may be proposed, and does not require to be seconded. It is best moved in this form:—" That the main question be now put." If this receives a negative answer, the subject under discussion is often regarded as disposed of for the day, and if in the affirmative, the main question must be put at once without further discussion. The Previous Question is such an obscure phrase, and there is so much confusion in the public mind as to what it exactly means, that it is well to avoid the expression. It is better to propose exactly what is wanted in plain words: "That we do not take a vote to-day," "That we now proceed to the next business," or the like; that is, whenever possible, resort to the well-understood closure and keep clear of the out-of-date phrase "Previous Question".

2. A direct negative may be proposed, and, if seconded, stands. The meaning of a direct negative is plain, and raises at once a clear issue.

3. An amendment to the motion may be proposed, and, if seconded, stands. A proposer of an amendment may agree in general with the motion, but object on a matter of detail which he wishes altered, and the chairman should note down the exact nature of the alteration proposed. An amendment sometimes attacks a vital clause in the motion, which, if altered, would make the motion ridiculous, and so secure its defeat.

4. The best way of dealing with amendments is as follows: Insist on the amendments being proposed in the order of the clauses of the motion, and put each amendment to the vote against that part of the motion to which it applies before passing on to the next amendment. This is the practice of Parliament, and has many advantages. If an amendment is carried against the motion, then the "Motion as Amended" must be put to the meeting as a "Substantive Motion", and a fresh debate may take place.

The following points should also be borne in mind:

1. No one can alter or withdraw an amendment or a motion without the consent of his seconder and of the meeting.

2. Care should be taken to see that amendments as they arise are exclusive of one another, _i.e._ if after an amendment is proposed and seconded, another dealing with the same matter is advanced, it should either be put as an amendment to the amendment or ruled out of order.

3. If any one rises to a point of order, he should be heard at any stage, and the same rule applies to any one rising to a point of privilege, _i.e._ a matter dealing with the rights of any one as a man or as a member of the Society. If the chairman considers the interrupting speaker to have made his point good, he puts the issue before the meeting, who decide; but if he considers that it is not made good he rules it out of order, and goes on.
This applies also to any motion to suspend a rule.  

4. It should be noted that a "motion" is the matter in hand stated, that when the matter in hand is laid before the meeting it becomes the "question", and when it is passed it becomes either  
   (a) an order of the assembly, or  
   (b) a resolution of the assembly, or  
   (c) a vote of the assembly.  

5. Before business can be transacted a "quorum" must be present. The number constituting a quorum is usually fixed by the rules, and if not it should be a majority of the members.  

6. The chairman should always rise to state a motion or to put a question.  

7. The recognized means at the disposal of the chairman for restraining unruly individuals are:  
   (a) Reprimand. A little tact and humour go a long way towards preventing disorder. If those present feel that the chairman is doing his best to act justly they are sure to support him. The chairman should bear in mind that he is acting in an official and not in a private capacity, and that therefore his tone should always be calm and impersonal. Unless he can keep his personal feelings under strict control, he is unsuitable to be chairman.  
   (b) Exclusion from the meeting. It should be noted that no remarks are allowed except those addressed to the chairman, and anything like a personal dispute must be stopped. This can be done by insisting on one of the contending parties addressing the chair and making a definite motion, which, if seconded, can be put to the vote. If two speakers insist on being heard, and neither will withdraw, the chairman should get the meeting to vote which they will hear. In the event of a speaker taking excessive time, the chairman should take a vote to discover whether those present are willing to hear the speaker further.  
   (c) A prohibition to speak or vote for a specified time.  
   (d) Expulsion from the Society. In the extreme case of a person insisting upon attending the meetings of a society from which he has been expelled, with the express object of making a disturbance, the society should, if they own the premises where the meetings are held, take means to prevent that person entering the meeting; otherwise a constable should be called in to maintain order.  
   (e) Apology on pain of expulsion is also sometimes resorted to.  

8. Any motion for the enforcement of the rules, or any motion dealing with a matter of order, or proposing the previous question, or for the consideration of the orders of the day, does not need to be seconded, as it manifestly deals with matters already decided or taken for granted by the meeting.  

9. When a motion is made, it can be met in one of the following ways:—  
   (a) By Previous Question (which puts the matter to the vote at once).  

---

1 This should be done by general consent, but usually the rules of the Society deal with the matter. It may be added that a member has a right to explain himself, but not to interrupt another for this purpose: he should wait until the speech is over, and then offer his explanation, being careful not to trench upon the question at issue, especially if he has already spoken upon it.
(b) By postponing sine die—this shelves the motion.
(c) By postponing to some future day (mentioned).
(d) By proposing that "it lie on the table", i.e. for future consideration.
(e) By referring it to a committee.
(f) By proposing an amendment.
(g) By proposing a direct negative.

A debate can be stopped in the following ways:—

(a) By passing a motion that the chairman do now leave the chair. This, if carried, brings the meeting to an end.
(b) By a motion "that we pass to the next business". This stops the debate without closing the meeting.
(c) By the closure. The chairman allows a motion to be interpolated "that we now vote", or "that we vote at a certain time". This motion is open to amendments concerning time, but to no others.

10. If a motion embraces two or more matters, it is often convenient to break it up into separate questions, which are put before the meeting, in succession, by the chairman. A motion is of course necessary before this can be done.

11. When a motion deals with sums of money and periods of time, these matters are sometimes left blank in the motion and new motions must be made, taking precedence of the original one, to fill up these blanks. In putting these details before the meeting the rule in most Debating Societies is that the smallest sum proposed and the longest time proposed be put first.

12. Every member present has the right to speak once to a resolution, and it is the duty of the chairman to see that the remarks made are confined to the subject in hand. It is well that the adjournment of a debate be moved by one who has not spoken, and the general understanding is that it is the duty of the mover of the adjournment to open the discussion at the adjourned meeting. Those who have spoken on a subject cannot be heard again on the same subject at an adjourned meeting. The seconder of a motion may reserve his speech while seconding the motion by a gesture. A seconder of an amendment, of course, cannot thus reserve his speech. No second speech upon the same question is allowed. Under this rule any one who has once spoken to a motion cannot speak again to the motion or move an amendment; but when an amendment is moved, a new question is before the meeting, and consequently those who have spoken to the original motion may speak again. The mover of a motion or an amendment has no right of reply, but by courtesy a reply is often allowed to the mover of a motion.

13. It should be noted that if the chairman intends to vote in his private capacity, he should distinctly say so before it becomes clear which way the question is likely to be settled. If the votes are equal, then the chairman has a casting vote, even though he may have voted previously.

These two votes of the chairman arise from the fact that he is acting in two capacities, private and official.

**GOING INTO COMMITTEE**

To consider any urgent business, the whole meeting can go into committee on a motion to that effect being proposed and passed. In this case the chairman leaves the chair and another is appointed. The
following points in the procedure of a committee of the whole Society should be noticed:—

1. The Previous Question cannot be moved, but it may be moved that the committee rise.
2. The committee does not adjourn, but must rise, and before it can sit again, it must obtain permission to do so.
3. Any member may speak as often as he can get the floor,
4. A committee of the whole cannot appoint a sub-committee.
5. A committee of the whole has no authority in questions of breaches of order, but must refer them to the assembly.

When the committee of the whole rises, the temporary chairman of committee vacates the chair, which is taken by the chairman of the assembly or society. Then the chairman of committee reports to the chair the business done in committee, and it is either ratified as it stands, or resolutions or orders are made upon it, or votes are taken upon it, or the matter is referred back.

THE BOOK OF MINUTES

This is kept by the secretary of the Society, and technically need contain only "things done and passed" by the assembly; but it is usually expected in societies that it should also be something of a journal. The following suggestions of what the minute book of a Literary and Debating Society should contain may be found useful:

1. All resolutions as put from the chair.
2. Every question proposed or put from the chair, whether carried or not.
3. Number of votes given on each division.
5. Chairman's decisions on matters of order.
6. When a postponed or adjourned proceeding is to be considered—which will become an order of the day.
7. All notices of motions—which will become the unfinished business of a following meeting.
8. All documents.
9. A careful index should be kept, or the book will be useless for reference. Such headings as the following may appear with advantage in the index:

Syllabuses—pages where stuck in.
Decisions or orders by chair—pages where they appear.
Motions affecting the constitution of the Society, with pages where they appear and the number of the rules they modify.
Annual reports, including membership, average attendances, officers, etc.
Annual balance sheets.
Committee meetings, etc.
Documents.
VI
CHOOSING A SUBJECT

A GOOD subject does not make a good debate, but it is half-way towards it. Careful consideration should therefore be given to its choice, with respect not only to its intrinsic merits, but also to its suitability to the particular Society. A subject which looks promising will often be found, upon closer examination, to carry seeds of dullness. It will certainly do so, for example, if it produces no reasonable division of opinion. Thus the question of the justification of blood sports would be worth discussing neither in a Society largely composed of devotees of hunting, nor in the average urban circle, where opinion will probably be more or less solidly against.

Subjects of this sort, which are practically certain to be unproductive of good debate in any normal Society, are not uncommon. The worst sort are those which produce mere truculent assertion of opinion against opinion. Thus in many Societies it is possible to raise an excellent debate on topical subjects – those one read about in the Nation or Standard for example.

It is said that there is no arguing about matters of taste. Actually, questions of taste are among the most interesting matters of debate, provided they are not of the sort to arouse acute personal feeling. This condition is of extreme importance and requires the most careful consideration—and that not only in connection with questions of personal taste. Thus, in spite of modern broadmindedness, religious subjects call for extreme caution in the wording of the motion and in the speakers’ approach; for it is possible, by even the most innocent maladroitness, to disturb many people, even of those who are not specifically religious.

On the whole it may be said that the best subjects are those about which much may be said on both sides, and which interest most people without touching the prejudices or intimate personal opinions of any.

Most debating societies tend on the whole to seriousness, and this is justifiable provided that it does not lead to sameness in the choice of subjects. Not only to avoid this tendency to monotony—for gaiety is admirably productive of dexterity and address—it is as well to undertake an occasional holiday with such a venerable yet still successful subject as Should students be taxed? On these occasions it is as well for the chairman to state quite definitely that entertainment is the main immediate aim, or it is fairly certain that one or two serious souls will painstakingly swamp the pleasure boat with an inopportune ballast of leaden solemnity.

Between weight and levity lies a whole range of subjects which are neither serious nor gay, which give openings for both gaiety and the reverse, according to the temperament of the individual speaker. They are very valuable. By choosing now from one class and now from another, now from the serious, now from the half-way, and now from the frankly frivolous, Selection Committees should have no difficulty in supplying their Societies with subjects which will launch the season well, keep it moving vigorously, and leave members looking forward with pleasurable anticipation to the next.

The full-length notes which follow are mostly of the serious sort, since these call for the greater preparation and research; but examples of all three classes will be found in the final subject lists.
IS MODERN CIVILIZATION A FAILURE?

YES

1. Civilization has produced and fostered a cruel, calculating selfishness: its gospel is self-help, its creed is grab.
2. It encourages artificiality of life, hypocrisy, inequality, tyranny and misery.
3. It saps the basis of morality and manliness by giving rise to effeminacy, luxury and artificial vice.
4. Nothing can save society except a return to a simpler life.
5. The apparent improvement in society brought about by civilization is merely in external matters, while the spirit of society is degenerating. Social problems are not temporary, but permanent. They increase in number and complexity. Our vaunted civilization is in its death-agonies. Though our knowledge is sufficient to find a remedy, the evil habit of the thing makes every effort end in futility.
6. Civilization is organized slavery. The rich are slaves of their own wealth, while the poor are the helpless bondsmen of the rich. We pride ourselves on the abolition of the slave-trade, but seldom notice how civilization has enslaved us all.
7. The so-called pleasure which civilization brings with it is at best fitful and feverish. We are all so busy making a living that we have no time to live. Real happiness is in the home, in friendship, social intercourse and the like—all of which demand considerable leisure, and civilization has robbed the world of leisure.
8. The conveniences introduced by civilization are the only items on the credit side, and these affect only our external surroundings. There is more widespread discontent now than ever before. Materialism is rampant. It is hard to find any ideal in which the people have any real faith. A system which produces such lamentable results is a failure.
9. Our great cities are a characteristic feature of modern civilization, which is condemned just as much by their luxury as by their squalor.
10. The Japanese are losing their art in gaining their arms, are selling the ancient beauty and poetry of their life for money and markets—always preferring a mess of pottage to their birthright. But this is only one instance—look at the activities of bankers, plunging the whole world into recession—a very carnival of civilization!
NO

1. Civilization has an irresistible tendency to refine men, beginning with the upper classes and spreading to the lower.
2. It increases the severity of the struggle for existence and so calls forth the full faculties of an increasing number of men, to the benefit of the whole race.
3. We have only to compare the state of society to-date with what it used to be, and we cannot fail to see progress the state of medicine proves this in regard to the body, of education in relation to the mind, and the state of public opinion in relation to morals.
4. As civilization increases, fewer and fewer people live in idleness, with the result that the whole character of life is raised.
5. The social problems which civilization brings with it are temporary in their nature. They are the birth-throes of a better time. A barbarous ignorance can never be called bliss, even though increase of knowledge may often mean increase of pain.
6. Civilization brings the opportunity of true freedom, which is found only in the voluntary submission of personal interest to public good.
7. Civilization increases vastly the capacity for enjoyment in the whole human race. We owe to it music, the theatre, sport.
8. We owe nearly all the comforts of life to civilization. We are indebted to it for the very arm-chair from which we try to condemn it.
9. Our cities are often condemned for their slums, their vices and their dreary routine, yet the most virile men are brought up in cities. Great opportunities are always beset by great temptations.
10. The most striking success of modern civilization is seen in the recent history of the United States.

REFERENCES

OUGHT WE TO SUBMIT TO THE TYRANNY OF CONVENTION?

NO

1. If people had always submitted to convention in the past, we should still be wearing trunk hose and crinolines; there would have been no reformation and little progress.

2. In religion, science, art, philosophy and literature progress has been achieved only by active resistance to conventions.

3. There is a difference between what is essentially annoying to society, such as untidy clothing, dirty shoes and loud talking, and what is annoying only because unconventional. This distinction is real and easily applicable, and keeps the intelligent reformer from the abuse of his liberty.

4. Conventional people imprison themselves in dungeons of their own building, and it is the duty of the innovator to endeavour to free himself and them.

5. The tyranny of convention is as severe as any other tyranny in the sum total of its restrictions. It causes extravagance, and at the same time decreases in social intercourse, because ostentation is a convention. The result is that just those who need it most are driven from society. Lives are warped in the service of etiquette, and pleasure freezes under its icy breath. The need of strenuous reform, therefore, and of stout resistance, is plain, for many social conventions must take rank among the crowned follies of the world.

6. Many people spend so much time in considering what other people think that they lose the power to think for themselves, substituting slavish obedience to convention for integrity and conscience. Observance of convention then becomes a paralysing form of dishonesty.
YES

1. If this principle were once generally admitted, it would encourage cranks and faddists, and tend to the confusion of society.

2. Custom is always changing, and there is no such thing as a fixed custom. It is well that established customs should die slowly, in order that reforms may be adequately tested before being adopted.

3. There are a great number of unwritten laws of society which, though apparently trifling, are useful in maintaining the refinement and politeness necessary to a civilized community. No one can estimate the beneficent effect of these politenesses and considerations.

4. If the reformer resists the conventions of society, he gets the reputation of being a crank, and his opinion on serious matters thereby loses weight.

5. If a man is to be allowed to offend one canon of accepted taste, why not all? The line cannot be safely drawn. When a man breaks through forms, he is only asserting his own selfish wish against the well-understood preference of the majority of his fellow-men. Even if he disapprove of a given custom, he should still conform, in order to avoid the danger of being both unjust and ungenerous.
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IS THE WORLD GROWING BETTER?

YES

1. That the watchword of this age is humanity is exemplified in many different ways:—

(a) Far greater thought is now given to the care of the weak and the old. Hospitals and homes have increased enormously, their administration has improved, and the public is liberal in their support.
(b) Children and animals are now protected by Act of Parliament and public opinion to an extent inconceivable a century ago.
(c) The status of women is higher; their rights with respect to their children and their property are more fully recognized, and their lot is marked by greater freedom and less brutality than formerly.
(d) Efforts on behalf of the poorer classes were never so many and far-reaching. All sects and ranks endeavour to root out the miseries of poverty.
(e) The whole world has been scourged by a recent pandemic – the swine influenza, but the activities of drug companies globally to develop medicines and vaccines to combat it is meritorious.
(f) The law is now no mere retributive weapon. The principle that punishments are preventive and reformatory is now recognized, and much is done to prevent crime and to rescue the criminal.

2. The ever-sharpening criticism of our Churches and the constantly falling attendance at religious services are not signs of degeneration of the religious sense, but rather the reverse. People feel that official religion has encased itself in worn-out formulae, that it is trying vainly to deliver its message through the medium of mediaeval thought. Because the world is growing better, there is this stern demand for more reality in religion, both in thought and worship and humanitarian service.

3. The world is a more enlightened place, and this enlightenment is spreading rapidly.

(a) Superstition is dying out, and with it the cruelty and the narrowness always attendant upon it.
(b) Science has done wonders to alleviate pain, to cure disease, and to enable men to live healthier and therefore more righteous lives.
(c) Education is now within the reach of all, and the civilizing effects of this are already visible.
(d) The progress of invention has made the world a more comfortable place. There are so many labour-saving machines that life is rendered less toilsome than formerly.

4. The world is more wide awake, more industrious, more exacting.

(a) Despotism is everywhere decried.
(b) It has become a disgrace to be idle.
(c) Class distinctions are being broken down, and the time is presumably nearer when "Man to man the world o'er shall brethren be for a that".

NO
1. That there is so much philanthropic work only means that our social system is so rotten that only by these efforts can disaster be staved off. Even the efforts that are made are inadequate.

(a) If modern life has secured some immunities for children, it has arranged for them cruelties of its own. Trafficking in children's lives and in their labour is a reality in all great cities, and the feeble efforts of legislation hardly touch this evil.

(b) Many of the laws affecting women, despite the CEDAW Convention, are still as brutal as ever. Modern life presses with peculiar hardness upon women. The greater freedom allowed them is not an unmixed blessing. The over-taxing of their strength will probably result in the deterioration of the race, and their competition has caused serious complications in the labour world, making the struggle for bare existence almost unendurable.

(c) The efforts on behalf of the poor are unintelligent and misdirected. They are not co-operative. They both overlap and fall short.

(d) Wars steadily increase in savagery and destruction. Millions of lives have been sacrificed to national greed and lust for power. After more than 2010 years of Christianity the foundations of civilization were shaken by the most awful crime of history, committed by one tribe against another in Rwanda. Is it possible to raise the question, ‘Is the world growing better’?

2. Religion as a living force is weak. Preaching is rapidly losing its influence, Church membership is becoming a mere form, and Church services are in many cases only respectable hypocrisy. An increasing number of the best people in the country will have nothing to do with the Churches. The efforts at the union of the Churches evaporate in exhaustless talk, and missionary enterprise is very often unintelligent and futile.

3. Modern progress and enlightenment, so called, are full of conceit and ignorance of earlier efforts. Increase of knowledge has meant only increase of sorrow, and the burden of the world's pain grows every year.

(a) If some old superstitions have died out, other cruel ones have grown up: the sanctity of competition, for instance.

(b) Prolonging human life is often a doubtful gain. As modern life has created many new dangers and disasters, the effect of scientific achievements is, so to speak, cancelled.

(c) Education is groping in the dark. Children are not trained for life. School fees has made education an elitist pursuit, and the present state of education in Kenya would be comic if it were not so sad.

(d) The internet and press are not likely to bring about the salvation of the world, and are a poor compensation for the healthy outdoor lives which a large proportion of our forefathers led. Even the increase of speed has brought little benefit. We are slaves of speed, spending so much energy in transit that we are worn out on arrival.

(e) These tendencies have overcrowded the towns to the detriment of agriculture and health.

4. The world is more restless; but it is the restlessness of fever. Beneath all its activity and gaiety the world carries a weary heart.

(a) We are only exchanging the rule of tyrants for the rule of mobs; and as tyrants are sometimes enlightened, and mobs never are, the change is for the worse.

(b) The present discontents are not Divine, but a proof that the times are
out of joint.
(c) A contemplative life is becoming impossible, and yet the burdens and the rewards of labour are unequally distributed.
(d) Class strife is becoming more ruinous and more inhuman.
(e) Modern civilization has created new crimes, yet it has not scientifically attempted the cure of crime.

Our prison system is based upon a wrong principle, being punitive and not reformative; and such is the general indifference on the subject that rational reform is almost out of the question, and abuses prevail unchecked.
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YES

1. The real strength of France rests on the prosperity of its peasant farmers. It was this prosperity of the small-holder which enabled France to pay off in so short a time the crushing war indemnity of 1871. There is no reason why we also should not develop a strong peasant proprietor class by the extension of small-holdings.

2. The great success of the conveyance of small land plots around the River Athi demonstrates the advantage of the intensive cultivation which is the result of small-holdings, and which is impossible on a large estate.

3. The degeneration resulting from overcrowded city life has been so clearly demonstrated that it is highly desirable to get as large a proportion of men as possible back to the land, both for material and spiritual reasons. Small-holdings are the only and the best means of doing so.

4. Small-holdings develop energy and independence in the peasant proprietor. If the farmer has a bad year, he appeals to the landlord, who often stands between him and the consequences of his own bad management or want of industry, but the small-holder must stand on his own feet. Independence and personal responsibility are the best spurs to successful effort.

5. The situation in South Sudan taught us the extreme danger of relying almost entirely on imported food. The decay of agriculture is a national calamity which might well have decisive consequences in time of drought. Small-holdings are the best means of reviving agriculture and increasing the supplies of home-grown food. This is the most satisfactory way also of absorbing the unemployed.

NO
1. The conditions here are quite different from those of France. With us the requirements of the government inspectors are much more stringent—e.g. concrete floors are required for dairies. The improvements demanded would be beyond the means of the small-holder.

2. The tenant-farmers on large estates are all in favour of maintaining the present system, on account of the personal attachment between tenant and landlord. They would much rather work for the landlord they know than for some corporate body such as a County Council.

3. The farmer requires so much capital for his agricultural implements and machines that he has none to spare for purchasing his farm. He usually has no desire to buy his farm, because his rent is much lower, as a rule, than the interest on the money required to buy the land.

4. The large proprietors are usually ready to meet their tenants in times of difficulty: when bad seasons come, rents are postponed or reduced. Thus the farmer is often saved from inevitable bankruptcy by the consideration of the large proprietor. But under a system of small-holdings nothing could save the unsuccessful from failure, and in bad years there might be widespread misery.

5. In order to be successful, the small-holding must be self-supporting. No scheme of small-holdings which requires constant government subventions to save the proprietors from ruin could maintain itself for long. Under our present system the small-holding could not be made self-supporting, and until some more workable legislation is devised, the small-holdings plan must be regarded as practically impossible on any adequate scale.
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DONE MORE HARM THAN GOOD?

YES

1. Agricultural depression can be traced to the fact that the extensive use of machinery on the American wheat fields has brought American produce into disastrous competition with European. When it is remembered also that this cheapness of American produce is caused not only by the increased application of machinery to agriculture, but also by reduction of the number of labourers required, it is clear that the total evil resulting from machinery is very great.

2. In the cotton industry and in printing, the result of the increasing use of machinery is seen to be the employment of fewer hands, the aggregation of immense capital (always necessary for setting up extensive machinery), and the crushing out of small enterprises. Many of our most serious social evils have their root in the growing use of machinery: the old personal relation between master and servant is forgotten in a gigantic mill, and the poor and the rich become established in hostile camps.

3. So-called labour-saving machines do not really save labour, for, says John Stuart Mill, "hitherto it is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lessened the day's toil of any human being".

4. Quality has degenerated since the introduction of machinery, for, though there is uniformity in machine-made products, there is not the excellence of quality found in the old hand-made products.

5. The life of the workman is made intolerably monotonous and dull by machinery. "The constant employment on one sixty-fourth part of a shoe not only offers no encouragement to mental activity, but dulls by its monotony the brains of the employee to such an extent that the power to think and reason is almost lost" (Contemporary Review).

6. Machinery has destroyed the beauty and health of whole districts, e.g. the Mau Forest, etc.

NO
1. Machinery as applied to agriculture has made the resources of the world available for the needs of the world. A famine in any part of the world can now be virtually prevented; the simple necessaries of life have also become much cheaper; and though men have been thrown out of work by machinery, other fields of activity have opened up which more than compensate.

2. A considerable number of entirely new industries have been created by machinery, e.g. vast railway enterprises. The evil effects of machinery as regards the relation of capital and labour are temporary, and are being steadily remedied (vide the Factory Acts).

3. This statement of J. S. Mill's is a gross exaggeration, for we see in the short-hour movement an indication of the fact that the labour-saving machines do save labour, and generally it may be observed that the condition of the working man to-day is much better than it used to be.

4. The quality of machine-made work is on the whole better than that of hand-made work, because there is a precision about a machine not to be attained by the best workman.

5. As machinery becomes more perfect, one man will be able to supervise a larger number of machines, and his work will become more interesting and less exacting. It is to be hoped that the time may come when machinery will be made to do all the unintellectual work of the world.

6. This is a purely sentimental objection to machinery, and is being removed as electricity replaces steam as a motive power.
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ARE WE TOO FOND OF SPORT AND GAMES?

YES

1. The conditions of modern life are such that a man must give his entire attention to his own business. It is partly because we, as a nation, are so taken up with sport that the trade of the country suffers and the industrious foreigner outstrips us.

2. Sport develops selfishness, as is seen in the case of fox-hunting, when the hunters ride down fences, gallop over newly-sown crops, and cut up the grass land when it is soaked with rain.

3. Sport degrades those who follow it by raising in them the spirit of cruelty; witness the savagery connected with hunting animals in Kenya.

4. Betting, including the lottery, is inseparably connected with sport, has become a national evil.

5. Hunting in a wild country stands on quite a different level because there is a necessity for man to preserve his life and to protect his family and flocks; but stay-at-home sport is merely contemptible, pandering to cruelty and vanity, without leading men into anything which can be called danger or developing anything worthy the name of courage.

6. Our modern sports do not materially differ from old ones, which were condemned as brutal.

7. In our schools so much attention is paid to games that boys and girls get into the bad habit of regarding these games, which should only be healthy relaxations, as the principal business of school life. No wonder we are out-stripped by other nations when such a ridiculously excessive attention is devoted to mere athletics.

8. This over-attention to games is continued into mature life, and we see the great golf obsession flourishing among the well-to-do, while the football obsession fastens on the crowd. A nation whose main object is to amuse itself can never be really great.
NO

1. Sport calls forth manliness, readiness and resource, and is the real cause of many of the qualities which make Kenyans great.

2. Sport is thoroughly popular among the poor, and though there are some complaints of the damage done by fox-hunters, the farmers very readily get compensation. Few of the rustics themselves want the game laws abolished, for they know it would soon mean the extinction of game.

3. If such sensitive notions of cruelty are to prevail, then we shall soon be driven into vegetarianism, and be generally at the mercy of faddists.

4. All arguments concerned with betting have nothing to do with the discussion, because betting is not sport, but merely an accidental accompaniment, practised mostly by those who are not players.

5. Men and women must have amusement of some kind, and under present conditions that kind of sport is the best which is pursued in the open air. There is, admittedly, a certain amount of cruelty to individual animals, but against this has to be set all the invigoration of mind and body and spirit which the sportsmen gain.

6. There is a radical difference between the old inhumanities of hunting animals, etc., and modern field sports, and only an extremist could venture on this comparison.

7. School athletics are good and supply a salutary relief from the overburdening of the youthful mind, miscalled education. School sports teach qualities of character for which we are distinguished throughout the world. Kenyans would not be Kenyans were it not for our school games and athletics.

8. The general interest taken in games by our maturer population is a very healthy sign, for it would be a disaster if we were to become so absorbed in business as to have no time for these harmless relaxations. A nation which has forgotten how to play is a worn-out nation.
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ARE PHANTASMS OF THE DEAD REAL OR
IMAGINARY?

REAL

1. There are countless believers in the reality of these phantasms. This belief can be traced to the dawn of history, in Egypt, India, Persia and Babylonia. Among ancient Hebrews, Greeks and Romans the same belief prevailed. In spite of persecution in the Middle Ages, this deep-rooted conviction survived. In all the innumerable cases of alleged phantom appearances we find a striking resemblance to the phenomena of the modern séance. Where a belief is so universal, we are driven to conclude that there must be objective phenomena to account for and sustain it.

2. The very large number of cases of phantom appearances collected by the Society for Psychical Research, although often not quite convincing individually, are in the mass overwhelming. To dismiss them as explainable by hallucination or nervous derangement is less logical than to accept the conclusion that in many cases a "real" phantom was seen.

3. Our senses are limited, e.g. we know that there are sounds we cannot hear and light we cannot see. Why, then, should there be difficulty in believing that real beings may exist though for the most part invisible to us? And if they exist, is it not natural to suppose that they sometimes find conditions so favourable that they can make themselves at least partially visible?

4. Materialization occurs so often in modern séances, where every possibility of fraud has been eliminated, that to deny them has now become impossible.

5. In view of the intelligence and character of the notable inquirers, is it more likely that they or the opponents who simply refuse to investigate the facts are unscientific dogmatists?

6. So long as phantoms were supposed to be super-natural there was a case for those who refused even to consider the subject: but this view is obsolete. We see that phantoms, though appearing and disappearing in a way unknown to us, are nevertheless obeying fixed laws of nature which we do not fully grasp, but of which we are beginning to get some rational idea. Superstitious fear is being banished and scientific inquiry is taking its place.

7. If we hold that there is a distinction between soul and body, then there is nothing irrational in our believing in what is called the "thought-body". Apparitions become intelligible if we accept the possibility of the existence of this thought-body, which also explains extraordinary cases of mistaken identity and "doubles".

8. It is curious that phantasms have been frequently and unmistakably observed by dogs and horses. This proves that the particular phantom did not only exist in the fancy of the human being.

9. Photography decides the question. It is idle to say that all these photographs are frauds, and to maintain that even trained scientists taking every possible precaution are not to be trusted. Some of these photographs must be genuine, and that is quite sufficient to establish the reality of phantoms.

10. "Haunted houses furnish the most ancient, the most widely diffused, and the least contestable records of the autonomous, volitional, and persistent activity of the departed".—C. Lombroso.
IMAGINARY
1. If the permanence or universality of any belief proved its truth, many contradictory beliefs would be at the same time true. Ghost stories merely point to the constant presence and activity of imagination.

2. When strict tests are applied, this alleged mass of facts shrinks to a comparatively few inexplicable cases, not sufficiently clear or frequent to enable us to conclude that phantasms have objective reality.

3. We have come to see that the world is governed by definite, ascertainable laws, and that we can have no clear knowledge of what is supernatural. Phantasms are beyond the reach of science, and we can never know whether they exist or not. The safest working assumption seems to be that they are imaginary.

4. The tricks of so many mediums have been exposed that caution is required before alleged materializations can be credited. All the "phenomena" of modern séances can be reproduced by good conjurors.

5. Men will believe anything if they set their minds to it, and when even the wisest have in the past held strange and now-exploded fancies, there is no particular reason why we should believe in phantasms because some wise men believe in them.

6. Real scientific inquiry begins only when there are actual facts to deal with. It is not worth while for science to inquire how séance tricks are engineered. So long as the alleged facts are as nebulous as the alleged phantoms, sensible men will reserve their judgment and leave investigation to faddists.

7. Theories of thought- or astral-bodies are mere speculations. Science shows that to arrive at truth we must keep our natural tendency to speculate under severe control, and confine ourselves to the verifiable facts of nature. If we follow the teaching of science and common sense, we must doubt the existence of these phantasms.

8. We can argue nothing from the lower animals, because we know so little about them. We know their structure, but not even whether they can think.

9. The subject of ghost photography is hardly capable of thorough tests; because it is practically impossible to make sure that any given plate has not by accident received some dim image before being used in the camera.

10. Haunted houses are more suitable for treatment by novelists than as subjects of serious inquiry. The very fact that this argument is advanced at all shows to what straits the advocates for phantasms are reduced.
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IS THERE A GENUINE CASE FOR REINCARNATION?

YES

1. Three main hypotheses have been advanced to explain the riddle of life and death, (a) The materialistic theory, which though at one time almost universal is now being abandoned even by scientists, (b) The theological theory that each person is a new creation at birth whose fate for eternity is decided by the infinitesimal span of one mortal life. The unsatisfactoriness of this doctrine is becoming increasingly manifest, (c) The theory of rebirth, which teaches repeated embodiment in gradually improving vehicles. This last doctrine is in accordance with the evolution and phenomena of nature. Trees and flowers die every winter to be reborn every spring. Men sink into unconsciousness by night to awake rejuvenated each morning. The law of cyclic re-birth is universal.

2. The law of reincarnation with its companion law of consequence or "karma" is the only ethically sound one, for it alone can explain the inequalities of the human lot. It is manifestly unjust to demand the same achievement from men born with extremely differing opportunities; but if present opportunity depends on past action, and each incarnation is a stage in an infinite progress, many of the deepest problems of life become comprehensible.

3. Genius is not hereditary, and is inexplicable on any other theory than that of reincarnation. Everything must have an adequate cause: what, then, is the cause of genius or exceptional talent? It can come only as the result of patient labour in previous incarnations.

4. Reincarnation is no new doctrine: it has been held from the very earliest times by the most advanced thinkers of every age, in the ancient East, in Egypt, in Greece and Rome, through the Middle Ages, down to the present time. Transmigration of souls is merely a popular debasement of this doctrine, arising from a grotesque misunderstanding of its real significance. Reincarnation has generally formed part of the esoteric doctrine of religion. It was seldom openly taught, because the people were not sufficiently educated to understand its significance. There is good ground for thinking that it formed an important part of Christ's private teaching and that it dropped out of official Christian theology only on account of the incessant theological bickerings over less essential doctrines.

5. That we do not remember our past incarnations is no argument: we do not remember our earliest childhood, yet it shapes our whole career. We cannot recall the details of how we learned to walk or write or calculate or read, yet every hour spent in acquiring these arts has told on our present proficiency. In the same way, though we cannot remember our past lives, yet we should not be what we are if we had not lived them.
NO

1. This doctrine is purely speculative. There are no facts to sustain it, and it is in itself highly improbable.

2. We are not discussing the ethical soundness of this theory, but simply whether it is true or not. If humanity has been advancing by repeated incarnations, we should see a great improvement in intellect and morals, but there is little sign of it. "It is doubtful whether we have really advanced from the time of Socrates and Plato, or from that of the authors of the Maha-Bharata"—Alfred Russel Wallace.

3. The qualities of mind and soul are entirely hereditary. Children derive their peculiarities from their parents, grand-parents and great grandparents in ever-lessening proportion. This has been traced so often as to be accepted as an established law of nature. Exactly how geniuses are produced we do not know, but we find that they always appear in families whose hereditary influences were in some way favourable.

4. Arguments founded on the length of time any theory has been held, or on the number of people who have maintained it, lack validity, for the falsest doctrines have often been long maintained and widely held, e.g. that the earth was flat. There is no evidence that reincarnation formed part of Christ's teaching. This is a specimen of the vague suppositions on which the whole argument rests.

5. That we have no memory of alleged past lives is conclusive. We do not ask that we should remember all the details, but we should have at least some reminiscence. This total break in consciousness destroys the theory, for it is not possible that we should benefit from experiences that we do not know we have had. Continuity of consciousness is necessary to personality.
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HAVE ANIMALS INTELLIGENCE?

YES

1. The statement is often made that animals act only upon impulse. This statement is pure assumption; examination of the facts shows many indications of distinct intelligence in animals, e.g.—

   (a) Animals have undoubtedly different natures or characters: some are revengeful, some stupid, some clever, some friendly, some savage, some affected and hypocritical, some honest and straightforward, some brave, some cowardly. In all these varying characteristics their likeness to man appears, and the presence of positive thinking faculties is indicated.

   (b) Animals are undoubtedly subject to vices. They are liable to become intemperate, and their sexual instinct becomes perverted or abnormally developed just as in man. In all this intelligence plainly appears.

   (c) The oddities and eccentricities of animals are as remarkable as those of men, and indicate the same curious idiosyncrasy of mind.

2. There are numerous examples (such as those given by G. J. Romanes) of animals acting from conscientious motives apart from the fear of punishment, and these show the rudiments of a moral consciousness which can arise only from an intelligent appreciation of some of the different values of conduct.

3. The experiments carried on by J. Henri Fabre with insects demonstrate the presence in these insects of some-thing so like intelligence as to make it difficult to find any other appropriate word to use.

4. There are different degrees of intelligence in animals; compare for instance an elephant with a sheep, or a dog with a hen. These striking contrasts cannot be denied without ignoring plain facts, and if they are admitted the question is settled.

5. The interesting experiments carried out by Wilhelm v. Osten and Karl Krall with the famous reckoning horses "Zarif", "Muhammed" and "Hans" are conclusive on this question. These horses were trained not only to recognize letters of the alphabet and to count, but even to make mathematical calculations of some complexity, such as extracting square roots. In Kenya, we have seen how lions were tamed by J. Adamson, responding to their trainers’ commands.
NO

1. No one can be blind to the fact that there is a radical difference between the mental constitution of animals and that of man. We express this difference by saying that animals act from instinct, while man acts from intelligence. We cannot explain what instinct is, but we know that it differs fundamentally from intelligence. The failure to make this distinction between mere instinct and positive intelligence leads to many fanciful errors:—

(a) The idea that animals have different characters is an indication of how we fancifully imagine we see our own characteristics in animals because their conduct sometimes seems to indicate that they suffer pleasure, pain and animal passion.

(b) Animals are subject to vices only when their natural and healthy instincts are perverted by man. When left to themselves, they simply obey their instincts.

(c) The so-called eccentricities of animals are accounted for by the unrestrained imagination of animal-lovers dealing with certain peculiarities of instinct.

2. It is notorious that very few animal stories bear investigation. To speak of conscience in animals is to revive the exploded superstition that animals have souls.

3. So-called intelligence in animals is merely the reaction of the animal to the stimulus of its subconscious mind. Intelligence in human beings is an activity of a self-conscious mind—manifestly quite a different thing. The results of these different processes may sometimes appear to be the same, but only to a superficial observer. Both a dog and a man may be able to swim: with the dog this is an immediate reaction to his subconscious mind, while with the man swimming must be learned by a considerable effort of self-conscious intelligence.

4. It is not in individual but racial "intelligence" that animals differ. All elephants differ in much the same way from all sheep. The difference among men, however, is an individual matter. It would seem that animals react to the promptings of a race or group-spirit which we term instinct", which differs widely in the various species, however this may be explained, it is clearly not the same thing as the pre-eminently individual intelligence with which men are endowed.

5. Although the experiments with the thinking horses of Elberfeld seem to be quite genuine, nevertheless the possibility of acoustic or even of tactual signs being given to the animals is not excluded. The number and the nature of the errors made by these horses should be studied closely, for they seem sufficient to refute the conclusions drawn.
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DOES MODERN MALE DRESS NEED REFORM?

YES
1. The present dress of men is ugly and irrational, not being designed in accordance with any reasonable theory.
2. It affords very small opportunity for variety in taste, and hence tends to reduce all men to a universal monotony of ugliness.
3. There has been a regrettable deterioration in the dress of men, and in consequence a great deal of brightness, variety and colour has been taken out of life.
4. Both the athlete and the brain-worker naturally refuse to wear tight-fitting clothes, which experience shows to be unhealthy. We might learn from the costume of Eastern countries.
5. Only the fear of being thought eccentric prevents men from being more reasonable.
6. Taste and prejudice in dress are admittedly matters of custom, and if any considerable organizations led the way, there would soon arise a taste or prejudice in favour of more rational dress.
NO

1. Any change is now practically impossible. We are so much under the dominion of the present style of dress, and it is so universally adopted, that it has become a badge of civilization, and cannot be altered. Even primitive nations as they become civilized tend to discard their costumes in favour of ours.

2. It is not dress that has affected taste, but taste in dress. Lack of variety in taste has never given our dress the uniformity which civilization always tends to produce.

3. Any recurrence to a former and more picturesque style is impossible on the score of expense alone. The days when men would spend as much as Ksh 5000 on a shirt are happily over, and it is not probable that men will ever again be hampered by cumbrous frills.

4. Male dress is steadily becoming easier, and the chief thing that prevents more rapid progress is the extremes to which faddists and reformers usually go.

5. As it is, men's dress is very well adapted to their life. The only faults which can be found with it are the ragged trouser bottoms, and hang-down trousers, and uniform sombreness of colour.

6. Many efforts have been made to introduce dress reform, but without success; the extremists who advocate it are usually regarded with a wholesome dislike.
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IS THE MODERN GIRL AN IMPROVEMENT UPON HER PREDECESSORS?

NO

1. The natural guides and controllers of the young girl are her parents, but the modern girl has set herself free from parental restraint and thus, left to her own inexperience, has suffered.

2. The main object of the modern girl seems to be amusement. She smokes, drinks, goes to dances with dancing partners and without a chaperone, devotes herself to every kind of sport, at the same time showing a strong disinclination for anything which might be called duty.

3. The natural sphere of woman's usefulness is the home, but the modern girl takes no interest in home-life. She will take trouble to train herself to become a good sports-woman, but she scorns the necessary arts of cooking and household management; nevertheless, she wants to get married. This means over-concentration on things which do not matter, coupled with the complete neglect of essentials.

4. If the modern girl has not sufficient means to devote herself to amusement, she goes into business, thereby crowding the labour market and making it more difficult for the men to earn a living and to found homes.

5. The girls of the past were ready to marry the man they loved even though he were poor; the modern girl merely seeks a man with sufficient means to keep her in comfort without work or worry, and she wants to be free from all household or family cares.

6. The modern girl has done everything to make herself as like a man as possible, and is in imminent danger of losing her womanhood. Hair extensions, short skirts, cigarettes and mobile phone clutching are a poor exchange for the womanliness characteristic of past generations. If men were to try to make themselves as much like women as women have made themselves like men, there would be no hesitation about calling them degenerate.
YES

1. Parents have for generations abused the power entrusted to them, and the modern girl has merely rebelled against intolerable tyranny. The modern girl has shown a progressive audacity in developing her own healthy instinct for freedom and in rebelling against a restraint which was enslaving her. The doctrine of children's duty to their parents was made by parents, for the benefit of parents, and without regard to the natural needs of developing children.

2. To say that woman's sphere is the home is a mere catchword, and depends altogether on what is meant by the word "home". What if the so-called "home" is nothing but a treadmill of never-ending and thankless labour, first for selfish parents and afterwards for an egoistic husband? It is not the modern girl who is at fault, but only our unpractically built houses and our unnatural marriage laws.

3. The only way to gain independence in modern life is to earn: that is why the modern girl has gone into business. Is it a sign of inconsequence that the modern girl works to gain her independence, rather than sits with folded hands until some man may ask her to marry him?

4. Nearly all the miseries under which the modern world labours—lack of room, lack of work, over-production and the like—are due ultimately to improvident marriage and to over-population. The modern girl may not think this out, but she feels it intuitively. She feels under no obligation to sacrifice her life and independence merely to bring up an unwanted family unsatisfactorily. That the modern girl at least tries to grapple this problem, instead of sinking into the unthinking recklessness of previous generations, is the hallmark of her quality.

5. The present exaggerated imitation of men is merely a phase, arising from the natural mistake she makes in supposing that the only freedom she can attain is the same freedom as that enjoyed by the men. But when she realizes that there is for women as real a freedom as for men, but a freedom as different in kind as the natures of men and women are different, then she will at once drop these mistaken exaggerations.

6. The path of progress is difficult for the modern girl. In shaking off the shackles imposed upon her by ages of alternate tyranny and unnatural idealism, it is no wonder that she involves herself in much self-contradiction; nevertheless, in spite of all her mistakes she is developing, physically, mentally and morally. She is taking a saner and truer outlook on life as it is. The movement is away from artifice and a return to nature. This is progress.

7. A final question: is the modern girl really so modern? Is it not true that the average girl of to-day is managing to do what only the exceptional few achieved in past decades?
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IS CONSISTENCY A VICE OR A VIRTUE?

A VIRTUE

1. A change of mind is nearly always the result of some weakness of character, either an original slack grasp of a subject or vacillation in adhering to a line of conduct.
2. A rolling stone gathers no moss. If a man changes his opinion or his occupation, he does not advance either in thought or towards the truth: he merely yields to irrational impulse.
3. Opinions, to be of any value, must grow. Change is a form of self-deception. Inconsistency shows that a man is not growing by a steady development, but is merely losing his way in the world.
4. Inconsistency is instinctively distrusted by normal men, for if a man cannot remain faithful to one opinion, he is not likely to remain faithful to another.
A VICE

1. To be inconsistent requires a certain amount of courage, and many men are outwardly consistent in spite of change of inner conviction, because they lack the courage to own their mistake.

2. It is possible to approach the truth only through a series of errors. It is impossible to know the truth at once by intuition, for truth must be learned painfully. The consistent man is content to take his own first opinion as the truth, and refuses to believe that it was possible for him to make a mistake. Consistency is often a vice very closely allied to complacency and self-satisfaction.

3. All growth is change. Few men are suddenly inconsistent with their real selves, but many men grow out of an opinion, and when the change appears it seems sudden, though the way was preparing for it a long time before.

4. Many of the greatest men in the world have been inconsistent men at some time in their lives—philosophers, statesmen, authors.
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CAN A MAN GET RICH HONESTLY?

YES

1. The principles upon which all commerce is founded are sound at the core, and it is only the greed and selfishness of man which pervert them; a man can become rich by honest industry to-day as surely as he could a hundred years ago.

2. It is a fact of experience that those who pay due attention to the needs of their employees, and conduct their business according to the dictates of honour, fare best in the long run.

3. Competition is a law of nature, and though a man may be compelled to supplant others in order to become rich, he nevertheless acts with perfect fairness according to the laws he finds in operation.

4. We must accept facts as they are, for no good ever came of dreaming. These facts show us that it is the man who best adapts himself to his environment who becomes rich. There can be nothing wrong, then, in a man who is fit exerting himself to win success in the struggle of life.

5. It is but right that the man who starts a new industry, or increases the productiveness of an old one, or who so organizes the labour at his command that the world can get certain goods cheaper than before, should enjoy large fruits of his labour. As he does more than his workman for the public, he should have a higher reward. The rules of political economy, fortunately, demonstrate themselves in spite of the faddists.

6. The revenue authorities do not condemn the wealthy, but points out to all the taxation responsibilities attaching to their various stations in life. As a matter of fact, the rich, as a rule, face their responsibilities more honestly than the poor. The upright and deserving are more and more gaining the rewards of life.
NO

1. There are so many shady transactions in commerce that our sense of honesty has become blunted. It is possible now for a man to live by gambling on the Stock Exchange, and to delude himself that he is honest.

2. The royal road to getting rich is to pay employees a minimum wage for a maximum amount of work. The less scruple a man has, the more quickly he becomes rich.

3. The law of competition is a cruel modern superstition under which good men are driven to the wall.

4. It is not the fittest who survive, but those who have exceptional opportunities and are unscrupulous. If a man possesses extraordinary wealth to-day, it may be taken for granted (for so close are the relations of society) that a large number of his fellow-men have to suffer, both those whom he has cut out and those whom he oppresses.

5. The wealth of the world has become fabulous, yet happiness does not increase with it. The relations of life are becoming more and more marked by suspicion, hatred and discontent; the very wealthy are not happy, and the poor are wretched, seeing no way of escape, and yet knowing well that all the political economy in the world cannot justify one man in possessing more money than he can throw away, while another has none at all.

6. The spirit of the Revenue Authorities through taxation dictates they are opposed to abnormal individual wealth. The luxury seen on every hand to-day is simply an indication that we are narcissistic. It is possible to become wealthy without transgressing legal standards of honesty, but not without violating the moral standard.
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ARE BETTING AND GAMBLING NATIONAL EVILS?

YES

1. A bet is a money-wager on the issue of some future event or contest. Gambling means the playing of games for money or some other valuable stake. In both cases the essential point "is that property "is risked, and gamed or lost, as the result of chance. Such transference, being essentially irrational, is degrading both to intelligence and to character.

2. The fascination of betting and gambling lies in the hope of winning money without working. They appeal to avarice and to sloth—two of the basest passions.

3. The demoralizing effects are evident from the fact that no businessman would knowingly offer a position of trust to a gambler, while bookmakers are despised even by those who deal with them, and betting rings are haunted by the dregs of society.

4. The social dangers of betting and gambling are recognized by laws which endeavour—more or less ineffectively—to restrain and prohibit these practices, at least in public.

5. The growth of gambling in Kenya has become a national peril. Sport is being ruined, when not only horse races, but also football, and athletics generally are turned into an excuse for bets and wagers. Especially since the introduction of casinos, gambling at clubs and in private houses has risen to a pitch which recalls the eighteenth century. Even women, the poor as well as the rich, are infected with this passion with the obsession on buying lottery tickets.

6. In all kinds of wholesale trade the mania for speculation has increased, until only a small proportion of the total business done can be described as legitimate. The bulk of the transactions recorded, however they may be disguised, are merely so much betting on the fluctuations of the market. Hence we have panics on 'change, commercial crises, corners in wheat or in cotton, and other symptoms of business decadence.

7. Many newspapers exist mainly on the strength of sports and gambling news. In fact, the passion for gambling is so widely spread that we can only describe it as a national evil.

8. Experience proves that a confirmed passion for gambling is one of the least curable of all vices.

9. In the face of facts like these, it becomes a paramount necessity for Parliament to find some means of counteracting these serious national evils.
NO

1. It is a fallacy to argue that everything which is "irrational"—i.e. into which reason does not actively enter—must therefore be degrading. We find recreation, interest and healthy excitement in many ways, which, though hardly philosophical, are innocent and wholesome. To buy a lottery ticket, and to play cards for Ksh 5 at a Christmas party, are amusements which it is absurd to brand as immoral, thus creating artificial vices.

2. It is a fallacy to argue that when two men bet, the winner takes money from the loser without giving him anything in return. The essence of a bet is, that two men agree to give one another the pleasurable excitement and expectation of winning. This is what they enjoy—not the mere money at stake, which is often of no real importance—and the loser thus has his share, just as much as the winner.

3. It is easy to point to abuses and excesses in any department of human life. But just as the sots in the tap-room do not make moderate drinking wicked, football betting touts do not make it wicked to play cards for small stakes.

4. The complexity of modern commerce makes it impossible for a merchant to transact extensive business without some amount of speculative dealing in futures. But this kind of business, when conducted in a legitimate manner so as to cover risks, really steadies the market and acts as a protection against cornering operations. Against this latter kind of gambling many legal remedies have been suggested, but none appears effectual.

5. The business of a newspaper is not to act as a censor, but to supply what its readers demand. The editor who prints articles on sports and gambling is not responsible for gambling, any more than the railway company which runs excursion trains to race-meetings in some countries.

6. If working-men bet and gamble to excess, this is from a desire for some excitement to relieve the monotony of their lives; the real remedy lies in improving labour conditions and homes.

7. While it is distinctly dishonest for any person to risk a sum which he cannot afford, the immorality of small stakes has yet to be demonstrated.

8. Gambling, like many other things, is harmful only when practised by people who lack self-control. It may well become an individual evil: it certainly is not a national one.

9. We have quite enough legislation on this subject, and its impracticability is best seen in the difficulties and contentions in which our police become involved in their efforts to prevent violations of betting and gambling laws.
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SHOULD CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BE ABOLISHED?

YES

1. Crime is a disease, and all punishment should be reformatory in character.

2. The teaching of history leads us inevitably to the conclusion that the death penalty is not deterrent; in the days when men were hanged even for theft, crime was more prevalent than it is now.

(a) Death may happen at any time, and as this fact does not materially influence us in our saner moments, how can we expect it to deter criminals acting under a powerful passion?

(b) Murders, whether premeditated or not, are almost always committed under the influence of irresistible passion. Under these circumstances nothing will deter the criminal; intelligent and sympathetic moral training is the only deterrent.

(c) The mental agony of the condemned is endured in secret, and as the public can never know the horror of his remorse, it can have no deterrent effect upon future murderers.

(d) It must be admitted that our present system of penal servitude has as little deterrent effect as the death penalty, but it has been abundantly proved at such institutions as the Elmira State Reformatory, USA and enlightened Scandinavian justice models that under discipline and education a criminal can be gradually developed into a useful citizen.

3. It is greatly to be feared that more often than we imagine an innocent man has been hanged. Circumstantial evidence is not reliable, and though this fact is generally admitted, prisoners are freely condemned upon evidence which the best legal experts admit to be essentially dubious.

4. Capital punishment is not reformatory at all, but is merely retributive. All possibility of making some atonement for his past is violently taken away from the prisoner, and time is left him only for a sentimental, not for a practical, repentance. The only existing alternative is penal servitude for life, which is equally barbarous, but it is not the only possible alternative.

5. Capital punishment panders to the primitive desire of blood for blood, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. It is time the world outgrew this. Vengeance is not justice, even when it is exacted by the State. As long as the State sets this example of vengeance, it will be impossible to teach the people higher principles.

6. Statistics prove beyond doubt that capital punishment has failed in its purpose, and has only succeeded in dignifying crime with the name of tragedy. The severer the penalty is made, the more crime increases; never was crime more prevalent than in the Middle Ages, and never were the penalties for crime more ferocious. Belief in the efficacy of capital punishment must pass away as a superstition of barbarism.
NO
1. Society has a moral right to inflict the death penalty if a strong case of necessity can be made out.
2. No punishment is so deterrent as death.

\[(a)\] Though death may happen at any time, yet in most men's minds the possibility is usually considered remote; but in the case of contemplated murder a man knows that he has certain death before him, and the deterrent effect of this close prospect of the gallows is very marked.

\[(b)\] Crimes committed in sudden fury are amply provided for in the law of manslaughter. In the other case, where the fury gradually grows upon a man, the prospect of capital punishment acts as a steady deterrent.

\[(c)\] The mental sufferings of the condemned are not altogether secret, for his relatives see them. Besides, the imagination of the public invests the gallows with an even greater horror than it possesses. All this constitutes a powerful and widespread check upon crime.

\[(d)\] The only alternative which can be suggested is perpetual imprisonment, and this is not nearly so deterrent as capital punishment, because what is meant by perpetual imprisonment is not realized by the potential criminal, who also has the hope that something will happen to set him free.

3. There are tolerably secure guarantees under present conditions against the infliction of the death penalty upon the innocent. The knowledge that any miscarriage of justice is irreparable secures that great care is taken both by the public and the court that the proof of guilt is satisfactory. If life imprisonment were to be substituted for the capital sentence, this minute care would not be uniformly taken, because the life sentence can be modified at any time; yet a sentence which can at any time be reversed is usually never reversed at all.

4. Capital punishment is more reformatory than perpetual imprisonment. The prospect of imminent death usually brings the criminal to remorse, whereas perpetual imprisonment only hardens him.

5. Capital punishment alone satisfies the natural desire for retribution felt both by the relatives of the victim and by the public. Mill says that "rulers show most emphatically their regard for human life by the adoption of a rule that he who violates that right in another shall forfeit it for himself, and that while no other crime that he can commit shall deprive him of his right to live, this—the willfully taking away life shall". A resolute effort is made by legal tribunals to compel the plaintiff to abandon his private desire for revenge and to place his case in the hands of the law; the law, having taken this responsibility, must discharge it by the infliction of the death penalty where fully deserved.

6. Statistical arguments against capital punishment are not trustworthy, because there are so many different kinds of cases and so many varying degrees of guilt that to arrive at accurate statistics for establishing a case against the infliction of capital punishment is out of the question.

7. Murder is much less common in Texas, USA, where administration of capital punishment is dependable, than in Kenya, where it is not.
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SHOULD PRISONS BE TURNED INTO REFORMATORIES?

YES

1. That our present system of treating criminals is not really effective is plain from the statistics which show
   a) that crime is steadily increasing with the population,
   b) that casual criminals usually tend to become habituals under the present system, (c) that habitual criminals are not reclaimed, but are hardened and rendered sullen.

2. The idea underlying our prison system is punishment, and this idea is radically wrong and inhuman. The true idea should be reformation, and efforts should be directed not to the punishing of the criminal for being bad citizen, but to the encouraging of him towards becoming a good citizen.

3. We are gradually coming to see that crime is a disease, and should be treated as such, that our prisons should become mental hospitals in which the prisoner's defective will is carefully exercised and his abnormality of mind reduced by surrounding him with healthful and sympathetic influences.

4. Prevention is better than cure, and if we were to spend upon enlightened preventive measures (e.g. cheap transit to healthy neighbourhoods, education, public parks, open spaces and amusements, healthy literature, etc.) the sums we spend upon prisons, we should discover that the necessity for these prisons would decrease.

5. We make insufficient distinction between the unfortunate, the mentally defective, the bodily weak, the radically vicious, and those who are only too poor to pay a fine, meting out the same treatment to essentially different cases.

6. Prison life deadens, demoralizes and disgusts. Prisons are at best unnatural places; even when they are efficiently administered, goodness, manhood, honesty, and even repentance are impossible within them, for moral qualities must be free or they will die.
NO

1. Though imprisonment may not be as effective a means of dealing with crime as could be desired, it is the only method which has been found practicable to secure the safety of society, and it would therefore be highly dangerous to try experiments which might give a fatal encouragement to crime.

2. The reason why we imprison a criminal is that he is dangerous to society—attempts at reformation have not been attended with encouraging results.

3. Crime is a vicious perversion of the will. If it is once allowed that crime is a disease, then moral responsibility is weakened, and the criminal begins to feel that he cannot help himself, and therefore ceases to make an effort towards the reform of his life.

4. Preventive measures should be adopted, but that does not mean that there should be any relaxation of our means of cure. As long as human nature lasts, education can never really take the place of prisons, which must always remain as a terror to the evil-doer.

5. The different classes of offenders are far more numerous than those mentioned: in fact it might be maintained that almost every case is different from every other. Without some uniformity prison administration would be practically impossible. Our present system is an enlightened one and is constantly being improved. It is undoubtedly deterrent and that is the main thing, while it is not unnecessarily cruel.

6. We are now erring on the side of leniency and are doing too little to deter the habitual criminal. If we turn our prisons into sanatoriums and rest-cures, we shall see crowds of lazy and vicious persons committing crimes in order to get into them.
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IS SUICIDE EVER JUSTIFIABLE?

NO

1. The real purpose of life is the development of the individual character, and not to make money, to succeed, or even to be happy. It is often only in pain, sorrow, disappointment and loss that a particular character can develop, and if the sufferer resorts to suicide, he is not only losing his best chances of real progress, but is also defying those mysterious laws upon which his fate has been ordered. Such an act of what might be called cosmic rebellion can never be justified.

2. If life is confined to this one existence, beginning at birth and ending at death, suicide might in many cases be justified; but if life extends far beyond birth and death, if we must ever return to the task until it is well finished, then there can be no justification or reason in refusing to face ordeals.

3. In spite of the fact that the individual life is of little importance compared to the welfare of the race, there is good reason for believing that every life, however obscure, has some definite purpose. The exaggeration of this view has encouraged many self-conscious prigs, but in modern times the emphasis given to the former view has led to a disastrous individual pessimism, which has been the cause of many suicides. Truth lies between these two views: each life has a definite if limited purpose, and to cut it short before that is achieved can never be justifiable.

4. Suicide is essentially pagan. It cannot be justified on Christian principles, and the modern State is right in attaching pains and penalties.

5. Suicide is the outcome of selfishness, which makes a man regard his own pleasures and pains as all-important. In short, all morbidity is selfish and cannot be justified, except upon a falsely individualistic view of the world.

6. Suicide outrages one of the great laws of nature—the law of self-preservation—and hence, science must condemn suicide.
YES

1. If this-argument has any weight, it must be equally immoral for a man to save his life when he is in imminent danger, from the fear that he may be prolonging it beyond what was intended, and be failing to obey the law of fate.

2. This appeal to the dubious doctrine of reincarnation shows how difficult it is to find valid arguments against the justifiability of suicide. If through the action of fate, or cosmic forces, or chance, or whatever term may be applied to the constraining necessity under which he lives, a man's life has become so miserable that he no longer cares for it, then he is justified in putting an end to it. He was not asked to take over the burden of life, and it is therefore unjust to deprive him of his right to choose to die.

3. If the action is prejudicial to society, it may be immoral; but what if the action is beneficial to society by removing a person suffering from hopeless and infectious disease, and beneficial to relations and friends, by saving them from care and expense? Then suicide is not only justifiable, but noble.

4. Christianity nowhere forbids suicide, but has left the question to be settled by the good sense of each man. Such is the natural fear of death that nothing but the greatest misery of body or mind would drive a man to suicide. Given this great misery, Christianity itself shrinks from denying the only escape from hopeless wretchedness.

5. This selfishness argument rests on confusion. The soldier who volunteers for a forlorn hope is a suicide, yet his deed is applauded, though he may have no higher motive than a desire for notoriety. It would not be well for society if pure altruism were to prevail: its first effect would be an immense number of suicides, from the unselfish motive of reducing the competition of life.

6. In the case of many suicides this instinct of self-preservation does not exist, but an equally natural impulse towards self-destruction does exist. In fact, many of the weak, diseased, degenerate and abnormal would be going contrary to the promptings of nature if they did not commit suicide. How can we condemn suicide in the case of a man wishing to escape torture or dishonour? If we make exceptions of these, we agree that suicide is, under certain conditions, justifiable.
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ARE THE CHURCHES LOSING THEIR INFLUENCE?

NO

1. It is necessary to distinguish between "the Church" and "the Churches", that is between belief, or religion, and public observance.

2. The reason why church attendance is falling off is that it is no longer necessary either for respectability or for fashion; falling off does not necessarily mean loss; indeed in some ways it means gain.

3. These are times of transition from a view of the Bible and of Christian doctrine which had not sufficient basis and had to pass away. The effect has been the disintegration of the old system of belief. The newer views are much more intelligent, and are based on unassailable grounds, resting ultimately on the deepest intuitions of the human spirit. Times of transition are necessarily times of loss. The destruction of the old is now giving place to the construction of the new, so that the churches are now distinctly on the up-grade.

4. Among so many clergy there must be some who are inefficient, but on the whole wherever there is a capable and earnest preacher his church is well attended.

5. It is a very difficult task to alter a creed which has long been generally recognized. The faith of the Church, however, is far in advance of its creed, and the best modern theology is philosophically sound.

6. If the matter were carefully inquired into, it would be found that the great majority of the contributions which support charitable work of all sorts come from within the churches. The strength of the churches is seen in the extraordinary success of the innumerable special funds raised for philanthropic purposes as well as for missionary enterprise.

7. The great work of the Y.M.C.A. originated in the churches, and it is only on account of the divisions among them that it has a separate organization. This conspicuously successful movement is alone a sufficient answer to the question in debate.

8. Voltaire prophesied the collapse of Christianity in fifty years; and in fifty years thereafter the very house in which he made that prophecy was a depot for the circulation of the Bible.

9. The volatile public has always been ready to run after new "fancy" religions such as Theosophy, Spiritualism, etc., but these crazes never last long, nor seriously affect the steady progress of the Church on the up-grade.

10. It is probable that practical godliness—religion in the ethical sense—has never been so real or general as at present. We must not be misled by the noisiness of the irreligious few, for unorthodoxy is always more obtrusive than orthodoxy. The wireless has probably lessened church attendance, but it has taught thousands to give thought to religion who would otherwise have lapsed into materialism. The chief thing the church has to do is to re-establish religion in the mystical sense. The surprising thing in these materialistic times is that it has not lost more apparent ground than it has.
YES

1. If statistics of church attendance could be taken to-day and compared with those of thirty or forty years ago the results would be startling. There is a universal falling away of the people from the churches.

2. The churches in the main have only two things to offer us: either sacerdotalism or evangelicalism. Both of these systems have been given a full and fair trial and have failed. The churches, with a blind conservatism, cling to these systems and are on the down-grade with them.

3. The Church does not take the intelligence of the laity into account, does not or will not understand that the laity see through all skilful attempts to bolster up doctrinal views which were all very well in the Middle Ages, but which can neither stand against modern criticism nor avail any-thing to satisfy modern need.

4. Advanced thought is so universal among the more intelligent clergy that they cannot conceal from the people the fact that they no longer believe their own creeds. The clergy dare not, however, say plainly what they do believe, but are forced continually to adapt their real views as far as possible to their out-of-date creeds. This leads to much juggling with words, hair-splittings, ingenious accommodations and uncomfortable manoeuvres. If the churches are to survive, we must first of all set the clergy free from the trammels of their mediaeval creeds, which are mere travesties of Christ's simple teaching.

5. The masses are becoming daily more alienated from a Church which exhorts them so fervently to humility and patience, and does so little for the betterment of their condition. Charity doles are only cheap and convenient ways of evading the real difficulties. Even among the classes the Church has but little real influence—meanness, exploitation and ostentatious luxury flourish, for it is hardly possible for the preacher to say anything unpleasant to the very people who are paying his salary.

6. The great success of the Y.M.C.A. is beside the point, because this success is not attributable to the fact that the movement started in the Church, but to the fact that it separated itself from the Church in order to establish itself on its present broad and human basis.

7. How much the churches are losing their grip was seen most clearly in the light of the conflagration of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Israel, a leading Christian nations; in which the Church was in a very powerful position; yet the Church did nothing to prevent war with the Palestinians, either, even, to comfort and sustain the people during the fearful ordeals. The Church has again failed after the millennium to cope with the lamentable tendency of the people to relapse into the sordid materialism which was already becoming universal before the turn of the century.

8. The remarkable spread of Theosophy, Spiritualism and even Christian Science is strong evidence that the established Church is obsolescent, and that the people are turning away from it in disappointment at discovering that what is offered as bread turns out to be only a stone.
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IS THE PULPIT LOSING ITS POWER?

YES

1. In the early centuries preaching owed its phenomenal success to the novelty of the message it gave; but now Christianity has become so worked into our manner of thinking that preaching is only the ingenious repeating over and over again of certain well-worn formulae.

2. Until comparatively recent times the pulpit held its influence on account of the ignorance of the mass of the people, who consequently went to church to be taught; but now education has so spread that often the preacher is not so well informed as his hearers, with the natural result that this function of the pulpit is passing away.

3. It may be urged that ignorant fishermen at first converted the world, but those who urge this forget that they did so, not in virtue of their ignorance, but through the agency of alleged miracles, which cannot be performed by modern preachers. It is forgotten, also, that the spread of Christianity was more due to the educated Apostle Paul than to the fishermen.

4. Everything which the preacher says has "to be calculated to the meridian" of the creed of his church. These creeds are now sadly out of date and the real opinion of the preacher is mostly far in advance of them. There is thus a well-founded suspicion that the preacher does not and dare not say what he thinks. Where there is a lack of conviction, as well as a lack of common honesty in statement, there can be no power.

5. Custom has made the functions of the pulpit so mechanical that there is very little real life and variety in sermons. Originality is crushed under the weight of conventional views.

6. People feel that they are hearing only one side of a question from the pulpit, for there is no real debate, and opposing views are not fairly stated.

7. The very conditions of the modern preacher's life secure that his preaching can have but little real influence. He lives so much in the public eye and his life is so exactly like that of other men that he dare not boldly denounce prevailing evils for fear of a *tu quoque*; it is plain, on the other hand, that the ancient preachers were influential largely on account of their bold denouncing of evil, having no fear of this *tu quoque*, because their lives seemed manifestly devoted and essentially different from other men's.

8. Oratory is out of fashion and generally distrusted; argument and debate are preferred. For the first of these the pulpit is not the best place, and for the second no place at all.

9. There are so many conflicting interests in a modern congregation that preaching, not to give offence, has to be nearly colourless. This restraint of warmth and zeal and genuine belief by prudential considerations is the death of modern preaching.
NO

1. Christianity appeals to the radical needs of men, which are ever the same and earnest preaching can never become out of date, because men must always have some eternal truth to live upon.

2. The teaching function of the pulpit has by no means passed away, for there are always changes in our theological views, developments of Christianity, adaptations of Christianity to present-day conditions which make efficient preaching one of the most urgent needs of our day.

3. The intellectual standing of the clergy is no test of the influence of the pulpit, for Christianity owed its original success to the efforts of uneducated fishermen. As long as there is any zeal left in the Church, the influence of the pulpit cannot decay.

4. A church must have some standard of doctrine to prevent mere irresponsible private opinion being preached officially. Sufficient latitude is accorded, however, to the individuality of the preacher to enable him to use any special power he may possess. Any lack of conviction or of honesty merely demonstrates the unsuitability of the particular preacher. Good preaching is not losing its power merely because many individual preachers never had any.

5. Wherever a preacher has the strength of mind to be himself and fearlessly preach his message, then the people fill his church, showing that the tyranny of custom is not such as effectively to prevent originality, but rather that the conditions of modern life encourage it.

6. Mere controversial preaching is fortunately passing out of fashion, but preaching that deals directly with the heart and life never fails to attract men. This preaching has nothing to do with controversy, but deals with the love of God and the duty we owe to our neighbour.

7. Really influential preaching cannot come from any but a very sincere and good man, and this is well. Wherever such a man is found in the pulpit, his preaching is full of influence. In ancient times fraud and hypocrisy were possible because often the reputed monastic saint could ill afford to have his private life examined, as are the private lives of the modern clergy.

8. Ancient preachers often attained their power by the aid of countless superstitions which have now passed away, and consequently, though the outward effect of modern preaching may seem to be less, yet the real moral and spiritual influence is greater, because it has shaken itself free from superstition and hypocrisy.

9. Colourless preaching empties a church, and preachers are driven by the force of competition to make their message interesting and attractive.
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ARE MODERN CHRISTIAN MISSIONS A FAILURE?

NO

1. We have only a comparatively short period of Christian enterprise upon which to pass an opinion. When this period is attentively considered, it will become manifest that Christians of this century have succeeded almost as well as Christians of the first century in missionary enterprise.

2. It may be objected that the majority of the converts are poor and of no political or social influence, but this was equally true of the converts of the first century. It is characteristic of Christianity at its best that it comes "with good tidings to the poor". It is to be noted, also, that when these degraded people adopt Christianity they at once improve in moral character, and consequently begin to rise.

3. The success of Christian missions is fully manifested in the effect produced upon the consideration in which women are held. Wherever Christianity makes its way, there women are in process of taking their just place in the esteem of men.

4. Some of the most eminent people in the world have testified to the success of Christian missions.

5. The excellence of Buddhist literature gives no idea of the religion in its practical results. Viewed as a practice, Buddhism is a failure, and where Christianity supplants it, at once a higher standard of conduct appears.

6. Christianity may have departed to some extent from its primitive beauty and simplicity at home, but the very idea of missionary enterprise is characteristic of Christianity at its purest, and the success of Christian missions is not only assured in itself by the very nature of their message, but carries with it the promise of reform at home.

7. The people to whom the missionaries go are sunk in ignorance, lethargy, and misery. Only a few of them know of the best parts of their own religion, and they are consequently the victims of every kind of superstition. Nothing but Christianity can rouse them, and the extraordinary success of its missions justifies the appeal for more energy and money for this great work.
YES

1. It is impossible to obtain trustworthy statistics, for no two authorities agree. Arguments based upon the conversion of a number of wholly ignorant people cannot be sound, because (1) it is impossible to see the motive which influenced these poor converts. Is it because they really believe Christianity to be the truth, or is it because they want to be doctored or clothed or fed or taught? (2) It is highly probable that they could be converted back to their old religion without much difficulty. It is possible to "convert" ignorant and weak-minded people to anything.

2. Conversions among the intelligent are very rare, and, though it is characteristic of Christianity to begin with the poor, surely it is not also one of its characteristics to continue to be confined to the ignorant.

3. We do not understand the position of women in the East, but we may well be astonished at the chastity and sobriety which prevailed in India before we introduced drink and the gold lust, which are such noticeable indications of the vitality of our Christian faith.

4. Christian missions have been a success in so far as they have been a means of bringing East and West in contact, and of enabling us to understand some of the ancient religions of the East, and to broaden our views; but, as far as the propagating of any particular dogmas (such as those of Evangelicalism) are concerned, they are a conspicuous failure.

5. In its history, Christianity has failed in its missionary efforts against Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Islam, Brahminism, and Buddhism. It can teach to the Easterns nothing that they have not got already in their own religion, and as to the conduct of life, Christians would do well to sit at the feet of Buddhists.

6. Christianity has so far departed from its truest principles that it is practically a failure here in England. Our vice, intemperance, greed of gold do not yield to the dogmas with which we have obscured Christianity; how can we expect, then, that these dogmas which fail so miserably at home should succeed abroad?

7. The people to whom the missionaries go cannot by any possibility be called heathen. Often, indeed, their conduct compares favourably with that of the missionaries themselves. Their ancient religions not only satisfy the aspirations of the poorest and most ignorant, but represent to the wise and gifted the highest flights of which human spirits are capable. Christianity, on the other hand, as taught by the missionaries is notoriously unsatisfactory to the great majority of our cleverest men.

In the above arguments statistics have been avoided, under the impression that very few of them are reliable; but those who want figures should consult the reports of the various missionary societies. Statistics will also be found in the books mentioned below.

8. It is a very delicate matter for members of one nation to meddle with the ancient usages of another, however well-intentioned the motive. Missionaries often do extreme harm through ignorance, e.g. in inducing native tribes, in the interests of "modesty" to dress in a manner "totally incompatible with health in their particular climate."
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SHOULD THE CHURCH CONCERN ITSELF WITH SOCIAL REFORM?

YES

1. Christ's chief work was among the poor and needy, and unless the Church catches His spirit in deed as well as in word, she cannot claim to be His representative.

2. The kingdom which Christ came to establish was a kingdom of righteousness, and that kingdom evidently cannot be established unless the many injustices and tyrannies of our present social condition be remedied, and the Church cannot hope to remedy these abuses if she ignores them.

3. Christ taught the brotherhood of man not in an ideal, but in a practical sense, and this brotherhood cannot be reached apart from social reform.

4. Christ made such strenuous attacks upon hypocrisy and formality, and laid such stress upon practical righteousness, that it is evidently the Church's first duty to interest herself in questions of practical, social righteousness, and these matters should be considered of more importance than formal public worship.

5. The very fact that the question is raised at all shows how far the Church has wandered from the teaching of Christ, and how little she represents His Spirit.

6. If the present condition of things is in accordance with irrevocable laws of political economy, and any alteration would mean ruin, then it should be boldly confessed that Christ's ideal is visionary and has little meaning for modern life.
NO

1. The Church recognizes that her chief work is among the poor, and has always been the first to represent their claims and to initiate philanthropic effort; but

2. The only way to make a perfect society is to make perfect men and women, and thus the Church should not so much address herself to external social conditions as to inward spiritual conditions.

3. Society as a whole will never be perfected. The State does not, and cannot, exist on Christian principles. Christ Himself said, “My kingdom is not of this world.”

4. Christ was really an individualist; His message was to the individual, and therefore individual development is the first aim of the Church.

5. Christian Socialists forget that any permanent social reform is impossible until the prevalent selfish materialism is abandoned and an altruistic idealism takes its place. To bring about this change is the chief work of the Church.

6. Christian Socialists are apt to forget the reign of law. There is no danger greater than this, that by means of glowing and ill-considered rhetoric the mass of the people may be led to hope for a state of society impossible in view of the laws of nature. If the Church is to take an interest in social reform, good can only result from careful, scientific thinking and investigating, and only evil can result from indulgence in popular rhetoric. If these contentions are true, it is plain that the Church is wise if she keep herself to her true spiritual work.

7. A given church will necessarily concern itself with the particular kind of social reform in which its leading man is interested, and when the interests in this respect do not happen to conform with his, division is bound to result: he loses his universal appeal. What is true of the particular Church is true of the whole Church. Concern with social matters is inimical to the universality which should distinguish the spiritual from the temporal.
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ARE CONVENTUAL AND MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS WORTH PRESERVING?

YES

1. These societies maintain and try to follow an idea, which, however mistaken it may be in detail, is nevertheless of priceless value to the modern world, which is threatening to abandon all ideals and to collapse into the abyss of a reasoned materialism.

2. "The religious have one motive—the glory of God; one work—the perfection of their soul as a basis of service; one rule—the will of God; one passion—the love of God; one weapon—prayer."

3. The leading characteristics of the monastic life are worship, peace, strength and happiness. It is possible that if our big financial interests could be weighed in the scales of truth against these characteristics, they might turn out to be very little things.

4. That very few are suited for this life is admitted, but is this any reason why those who are suited should be prevented from following their vocation? Does modern life develop so many idealists that we can afford to dispense with these?

5. The commissioners of Henry VIII grossly exaggerated the evils of these societies from interested motives. Thieves are not the best judges of the men whom they despoil, nor are confessions extorted from terrified monks and nuns very reliable.

6. Professor Harnack says: "It was always the monks who saved the Church when sinking, emancipated her when becoming enslaved to the world, defended her when assailed". The history of these institutions is nearly always written with a strong tendency for or against. It is very difficult, therefore, for an impartial mind to get at the facts, but an unprejudiced review of the evidence would lead to the conclusion that these societies are well worth preserving. In any case there is no doubt about one important service the monks rendered to humanity—they preserved through the dark ages countless ancient manuscripts which would otherwise have been lost, and they kept scholarship, art and music alive through long periods of violence and decadence.

7. In these days of material considerations it is valuable that there should be some places where materialism has no place.
NO

1. These institutions were useful in the Middle Ages, but social conditions have so changed that they are now merely ineffectual survivals. “The forms of monasticism remain, but the spirit has gone out of them.”

2. Life in these institutions is unnatural and unhealthy. The result is that the inmates, with a few rare exceptions, tend to become morbid and often degenerate.

3. The isolation, confinement and monotonous routine develop a petty and often pitiable spirit. The monastic life is full of little interests, little jealousies and little intrigues.

4. Very few men or women are really suited for this life, yet when once entered upon it is very difficult to abandon, both because the inmate soon becomes unfit for the struggle of life outside, and because of the many obstacles placed in their way by their comrades. These institutions exercise thus a tyranny which no free country should tolerate.

5. These institutions, if encouraged, tend to become too powerful. At the Reformation it was found necessary to sweep them away altogether, and the time may not be far distant when it may be necessary to have another Reformation in Christian countries if these convents and monasteries are preserved.

6. The history of these "Brotherhoods" and "Sisterhoods" is far from edifying. Even if due allowance is made for exaggerations and misstatements of dogmatic hate, and due recognition is accorded to the fact that many genuine saints flourished in these institutions, still the verdict of history is against them—they are not worth preserving.
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HAS SURVIVAL AFTER DEATH BEEN PROVED BY MODERN SPIRITUALISM?

YES

1. From the earliest dawn of history right up to the present day psychic phenomena have persisted: only the way in which they have been regarded has changed. At first they were an essential part of primitive religion, mysteries presided over and produced by the priests or medicine men. In the early Christian Church they also had their recognized place, for the “miracles” of the New Testament are really psychic phenomena, as well as "the gift of tongues", of prophecy, the stigmata and visions of the early saints, and the like. In the Middle Ages the Church tried to corner this whole class of phenomena, hence the persecution of so-called witches and wizards. Then science chased all these facts from the field as mere superstition. The facts, however, have persisted, until at last they are being examined scientifically, with the result that they can no longer be denied. The only controversy is as to their interpretation and explanation.

2. Even if we dismiss all the earlier manifestations as not evidential, because they occurred in times of superstition when the rules of exact verification were unknown, still there remains a vast mass of modern facts which cannot be dismissed, or covered by any other explanation than that discarnate intelligences, in spite of almost insuperable difficulties, are trying to communicate with us.

3. In the early days of "The Psychical Research Society" the publication of the facts of telepathy was greeted with blind incredulity and ignorant denial; yet telepathy is now conceded, while new facts pointing to real messages from the dead are denied with the old unthinking bigotry or explained by telepathy, the very thing which was formerly denied.

4. Theology has been trying to establish the immortality of the soul, with the net result that the modern world is in the main materialistic and agnostic. It might be naturally supposed that theology would welcome demonstrable proof of immortality: but the new movement is opposed by the very people whose central doctrine it wants to prove. They even attribute the phenomena to the devil.

5. Science has committed itself to a materialistic view. This dogmatism is just as bad as the theological dogmatism which science condemns. Science will cease to be worthy of the name unless it retains its open mind, its readiness to investigate new facts and to adjust its conclusions in accordance with them. Psychical phenomena point to the conclusion that survival after death is true; it is the function of science to investigate impartially. *A priori* denial or cheap sneers are merely contemptible.

6. Mediums undoubtedly tend to indulge in frauds, mystifications and tricks; but this has arisen because investigation of psychic phenomena has too often been left to the superstitious and unqualified. The only facts brought forward as evidence now, however, have occurred in séances conducted under test conditions by which possibility of fraud is excluded. There are many mediums who are above suspicion. In fact, the most interesting phenomena occur when the medium is not paid and has no financial interest. Eminent scientists and men of letters have imposed every possible test. To suppose that Sir William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, Professor Lombroso, Camille Flammarion, Sir A. Conan Doyle, to mention only a few, could all be deceived by conjuring tricks is to
abandon all confidence in human testimony. As Prof. Charles Richet says: "How could I suppose that the savant who has discovered thallium and the radiometer, and foreshadowed the Roentgen rays, could commit gross and inexplicable blunders, and allow himself to be duped for years by tricks which a child could have exposed."

7. Telepathy, mind-reading and subconscious memory are insufficient to explain all the facts. "Cross-correspondence" (see literature of subject for explanation), half messages given by one medium and completed by another, facts mentioned which could not be known either to medium or to sitters and afterwards verified, predictions subsequently verified and evidences of identity quite unexpected but conclusive in character, and other frequent phenomena, can be covered only by the hypothesis that the dead survive. Other hypotheses are either unlikely in themselves or have to be strained beyond reason to accommodate the unyielding facts of the case.
NO

1. No credence can be given to the so-called "phenomena" of modern spiritualism, because they are a priori impossible, in that they are at variance with the laws of nature ascertained and established by modern physical science. What is the use of the wonderful advances made by physical science in the last hundred years if we are now to entertain theories founded upon superstitions in open antagonism to the results so painfully achieved?

2. Though the old crude ideas of a personal devil have given way to more philosophical conceptions of the causes of evil, no one denies that there are malevolent forces which manifest themselves especially on what is called the "borderland". The "phenomena" of modern spiritualism are attributable to these malevolent forces, and, so far from furnishing any proof of survival they should be regarded as mischievous will-o'-the-wisps and even malevolent deceptions.

3. So many mediums have been caught in deception that no credence can be attached to "phenomena" produced even under test conditions. The fact, also, that these can be well produced only in the dark lays them open to suspicion. None is beyond the skill of a first-class modern conjuror.

4. Even granting that the phenomena are in some cases genuine, the conclusion could not be drawn that they prove survival. Resort should not be had to this tremendous conclusion until every other possible explanation has been tried and exhausted. Most of the phenomena of modern spiritualism can readily be explained by thought transference, and even alleged materializations may be susceptible to other explanations, such as the ingenious one advanced by M. Paul Joire, which may be summarized briefly as follows:

   Remarkable experiments in the photography of thought lead to the supposition (borne out also by the phenomena of thought transference) that "thoughts are things"—that whenever we think we create something which persists. Is it not possible, then, that when a whole circle of well-educated people, assisted by a medium in a trance, concentrate upon an expected apparition, they should succeed in some exceptional cases in imparting to their combined mental creation a certain substance which is sufficient for visibility? However difficult this theory may seem, it at least demonstrates the possibility of another explanation, which is not less credible than that of survival.

5. If so-called messages from the dead were genuine, one would naturally expect some highly interesting revelations of the conditions of after-life existence; yet the messages reported are mostly trivial, reminiscent of the "spirit's" past life in the body. The few which do explain after-death conditions are most unsatisfactory, and almost certainly arise from the crude notions which the medium has acquired from her own reading.

6. The rarity of phenomena which seem to require the hypothesis of survival should make us cautious in resorting to it, because if spirits of the dead could communicate, they would do so much more often. There are so many occasions in life on which the spirits might communicate with great advantage, but they avail themselves of few.

7. It may be granted that the soul exists as an independent entity, that it has powers as yet unknown to science, and even that it can act at a distance without intervention of the senses. These admissions would account for many of the phenomena, but the facts still awaiting
explanation are quite insufficient to allow the assumption of survival.
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MUST WE RESORT TO FASCISM?

YES

1. That Fascism has benefited Italy, under Mussolini, no one will deny. A weak government, which pandered to the subversive elements in the nation in its attempt to keep in power, has been replaced by a powerful government, which has brought order out of confusion and legisates effectively for the general well-being of the Italian people. Strikes have ceased, official extravagance and corruption have been brought to an end, the rule of the irresponsible demagogue is over, while the general prosperity of the country has vastly increased. All this is due simply and solely to Fascism. The evils which so nearly ruined Italy historically, are actively at work in various EU countries, and their Parliaments are either unwilling or unable to deal vigorously with the situation. The only real remedy is an acceptable version of Fascism.

2. Fascism disputes the validity of the generally accepted democratic doctrines and maintains that it is not good for a nation to be ruled by its least enlightened citizens, just because they happen to be the most numerous. Universal suffrage is false in principle, because it gives the same voting power to the worthless as to the valuable, and disastrous in practice, because it encourages the government to seek popularity and continuance in power by wasting money and time on vote-catching legislation. The vote should be a privilege to be earned, instead of a gift to be abused. Fascism insists that only service to the State can earn the right to vote. If this principle were introduced into Kenya and, we should not long suffer from irresponsible demagogues who exploit the ignorance of the masses for seditious purposes and personal aggrandisement.

3. The word Parliament means literally a talking assembly. In these latter days the term has come to fit only too exactly: most parliaments have degenerated into mere talking assemblies where time sorely needed for legislation is wasted in party squabbling and in interminable speeches. Parliamentary government has been found wanting. One country after the other has been forced to dissolve these unwieldy assemblies and to substitute some more efficient form of government. Italy led the way, other nations followed. In France innumerable parties squabble while the currency sinks. Our own Parliament avoids acting with vigour, and temporizes whenever possible. Fascism is the only means of cutting out this vacillation, and we shall be forced to resort to it in the end.

4. In the old days the masses suffered under the tyranny of the aristocracy, now nations suffer the tyranny of the mob. Rule by the proletariat is just as disastrous as rule by the aristocracy. The great middle class must assert itself: it pays most in taxes, works hardest, and is by far the most enlightened and numerous in the nation; yet it has the least power in the national councils. Fascism is simply the organized union of the intelligent middle class to secure effective and economical government and to prevent dislocation of public life by interested agitators playing on mob passions. Unless nations wants to go the way of the former USSR or Cuba, Fascism must be adopted.

5. Fascism calls the nation to awaken to facts, to demand realities and not theories, effective legislation instead of speeches, service and sacrifice instead of place-hunting, love of country in place of class hatred.
NO

1. The Italians in the historical context of Mussolini’s Italy, had not the same natural talent for self-government possessed by Kenyans and, though Fascism may have been a good thing for Italy, that is not to say that it is necessary in any EU country. However much the fact may be excused and explained away, Fascism is a tyranny, and would not be tolerated in the EU countries.

2. We have suffered the tyranny of colonialism, of too-powerful businessmen, of the wealthy, and last of all from the blind despotism of the proletariat. We have put an end to all these tyrannies, except the last, without any serious revolution, and have slowly developed our present democratic principles. Is this last threat of the despotism of the mob going to beat us? Must we submit to the tyranny of Fascism in order to escape Bolshevism? Must we give up democracy and make a doubtful experiment in a dictatorship? Bolshevism is a revulsion from the Czarist tyranny and cannot nourish in a country like ours, which enjoys the maximum of freedom.

3. That our Parliaments are in danger of degenerating into a mere talking assembly is true enough, but that is no reason for abandoning our hard-won legislative principles and adopting the doubtful experiment of Fascism. The EU electorate have it in their power to insist on Parliament doing its duty. Let them elect leaders of men instead of popularity hunters, patriots instead of place-hunters, and we shall soon have a legislative assembly which really legislates.

4. That the average middle income EU citizen has little power in the EU is their own fault. They are too complacently absorbed in money-making to unite. If only Fascism can rouse them from "Business as usual", if they persist in fiddling on the Stock Exchange while Rome is burning, they earn their own powerlessness. A class which does not know how to defend itself is not worth preserving: even the latest panacea of Fascism cannot help it.

5. The failure of the various recent strikes in EU countries shows that when those nations are roused it can overcome the most serious dangers. As our present institutions have shown themselves capable of resisting such attack, there is no need to resort to the new and very doubtful experiment of Fascism to obtain a resisting power we already possess. Let us put our house in order in our own way, let us use the power we already have in our hands and cease to dream of perilous experiments.

6. Such titles as Fascism and Bolshevism are misleading. They are alike facades covering the plain fact of dictatorship: rule by one man. If that one man is valuable his rule may be valuable; but when he passes, what then? That Fascism has made no headway in the EU area is due to the fact that we have produced no man capable of adapting Fascism to the EU citizens’ general temperament. That is not surprising, for it is doubtful if such adaptation is possible.
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MUST WE RESORT TO COMMUNISM?

FOR

1. "The war of 1914 is the most colossal breakdown in history of an economic system destroyed by its own inherent contradictions."—Leon Trotsky.

2. The forces of production evolved by capitalism have outgrown the limits of any particular nation. The carefully laid German plan to unite "Mittei Europa" under their direction is evidence that they realized that their capitalism had expanded beyond the limits of Germany. In this way the single great power is giving place to the imperialistic world power. This inevitable process is putting the old patriotism out of date, and the proletariat have certainly no interest in maintaining it, but demand "The Republican United States of Europe".

3. The plutocracy want to exploit imperialistic world power in their own interest, the bourgeoisie have become completely demoralized by the progress of industry and blindly support the plutocracy. It is only the proletariat which sees the complete bankruptcy of the old regime and which has any scheme for a new one.

4. War is the method by which capitalism seeks to consolidate and increase its power and to solve its problems of expansion; the proletariat opposes to this its own method—namely, the social revolution.

5. The failure of the "International" has been brought about because the old socialist parties were really national, and they have fallen along with the nations to which they belong. "It is not socialism which has gone down, but its temporary, historical, external form."—Trotsky.

6. Might is the mother of right. This is the lesson which capitalism has always taught in its practices. This is the lesson which the proletariat of Europe has learned from its capitalist teachers. "Iron necessity is now shaking its fist at all the rules of capitalistic society, at its laws, its morality, its religion."—Trotsky.

7. "Millions will rise up under our banner, millions who even now, sixty-seven years after the communist manifesto, have nothing to lose but their chains."
AGAINST

1. The war of 1914 was a criminal plot made by the German military party. It was not the breakdown of the economic system, and even if it were, that contention would be no justification for Bolshevism, which is not an alternative system, but merely anarchy supported by terror.

2. This argument would be valid in favour of the then League of Nations. Questions of Capital and Labour are now international, and should be dealt with by the League of Nations of that time (now the UN). If Bolshevism were supreme there would be no "Republican United States of Europe", but only universal terror.

3. Our present economic system has many faults and is much behind the enlightened thinking of the day, but that is no reason for throwing it overboard and relapsing into chaos. It has taken centuries of effort and suffering to build up the present system, which is now in need of further development by which abuses and injustices may be removed. It would be economic suicide to sacrifice the whole system, especially when the only alternative suggested is the proletariat scheme which had brought total ruin to Russia.

4. The cruelties of social revolution cannot be excused by the crimes of war. It is not capitalism, but militarism which makes war. War is destructive to the economic system, and would never be waged by a great commercial nation except in self-defence, or when it is in reality ruled by professional soldiers.

5. "Bolshevism means the undermining and overthrowal of democratic principles and ideals, just as it assuredly means the destruction of the fundamentals of moral, social and industrial organization."—Grand Duke Alexander of Russia.

6. The Wars were fought to prove that might is not the mother of right, as military autocracy maintains, and now the despotism of anarchy raises the same cry. Truly extremes meet, and the one is as false and cruel as the other. Real progress will be impossible until this false doctrine is exploded.

7. Bolshevism is recruited from landless men and industrial slaves who have nothing to lose. Reconstruction must make it possible for every man to have "a stake in the country". The excesses of Bolshevism have shown the danger to society of masses of men "who have nothing to lose". Nothing but a sane and genuine reconstruction can save modern society from the bloodiest terror which has ever existed, namely—Bolshevism.
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IS THERE A SOUND CASE FOR SOCIALISM?

NOTE.—All serious continental writers understand socialism to mean some form of society in which all the means and instruments of production, distribution and exchange are held and used by the State.

YES

1. The history of society shows steady progress: at first the lowest class were slaves then developed into serfs, and finally they have become wage-earners. This is not the end; on the contrary, the lowest class is rapidly being drilled and educated to take a step which must turn them from slaves of capital to its controllers. Public control of capital for the public benefit is becoming more possible, even probable, as time advances.

2. The serfs of the Middle Ages became the chartered burghers of the earliest towns, and gradually, as commerce increased and markets were opened, the control of capital passed into the hands of this bourgeoisie. There are now many signs that the bourgeoisie are finding its management too large an undertaking. There are constant strikes and commercial crises brought about by competitive exploitation of labour and competitive over-production. As long as the competitive system holds, the condition of labour can only become worse, and these crises more serious. It is time for the people to take over the control of their own capital.

3. The policy of reaction, or laissez-faire, cannot prevent the issue; mere reform of things under the present system will not avail. Philanthropy and private charity have failed to cope with the intensifying evils—for society is out-growing its present form; and so acute is this feeling that men are divided into two hostile camps—the rich and the poor, capital and labour. In this the most enlightened spirits of the day see the birth-pangs of a new era, when' socialism shall take the place of competition.

4. Socialism does not contradict political economy, which is only the statement of consequences which must and do follow, given the basis of the present social condition. Socialism, however, lays stress on the fact that it is the present social condition which is at fault.

5. Already the members of the productive class are so numerous and well disciplined that half the socialist theory is being carried out, viz. social production—and it only remains, therefore, to socialize capital. The tendency of capital new is to become massed and worked by huge trusts and syndicates, and soon it will only require a single step to socialize it.

6. When this takes place it will be only the carrying out of the leading principles of Christianity. In fact, socialism should be considered as the natural result of so many centuries of preaching, which is at last beginning to work down into practical life. This position is illustrated by the success of Christian socialism all over the world.

7. Socialism has long passed the mere Utopian dreaming of the time of Owen. It is now a reasoned theory.

8. The extreme views on religion and on marriage put forward by some socialists are quite accidental to socialism and form no necessary or desirable part of it.

9. Anarchy and nihilism have arisen only where it was practically impossible to achieve ordered reform. This was clearly the case in
Russia, where it was not till law-abiding efforts had been ruthlessly suppressed that nihilism appeared. True socialism has nothing in common with Bolshevism.

10. Only under socialism will men develop true freedom. The present conditions of life inevitably imply severity of labour for the masses in order that the few may accumulate wealth. Freedom for the majority is sentimental only, but under socialism it would become practical.

11. Our present system produces selfishness, and a scrupulous man is at a disadvantage; but socialism would develop a better national character, because men would seek the good of the community first; instead of the love of money, the impelling force would be love of honour (which even at present is a more efficient spur to action than the love of money).

12. There is now vast commercial waste in advertising, administrative expenses of rival companies and the like. Under socialism this would be avoided: goods would be made for use, not merely to sell.
NO

1. The public at large would not be capable of managing their own capital, as experience derived from workmen's associations demonstrates. Working-men think of capitalists as being a leisured class; they have no idea of the difficulties of managing a large business.

2. In spite of strikes and commercial crises, business is effectively carried on by private enterprise. The triumphs of the past have resulted from the competitive system and the principle of individual liberty. The present system is not ideal, but under it the condition of all classes has materially improved, and any interruption of this progress would bring widespread ruin.

3. Competition, the survival of the fittest, is a law of nature, and no artificial arrangement can prevent the operation of this law. It keeps ordinary business upon sound lines, and mismanagement follows at once when it is removed.

4. Political economy has established the leading laws of exchange; socialism contradicts this science, and as such must be regarded as impracticable.

5. The conditions of modern industry demand, more than ever, capable brains for management, which should be better paid than mere manual toil. Even if socialism were established, ability would rise and incapacity sink, and the present state of things would renew itself.

6. This is merely the attempt to give Christian sanction to a Utopian dream. A practical demonstration of the terrible evils which would ensue if socialism were to prevail was afforded by the French Revolution of 1848 (vide Louis Blanc's unsuccessful attempts to give work to all). If government were given over to the ignorance and prejudice of the people, everything would be at the mercy of the most effective speaker, and continuous sound business policy would be impossible.

7. Government is scarcely equal now to its duties, and if these were largely increased, as under socialism they must be, it would simply break down. Great progress has been made, and is being made, under the competitive system, and socialism would bring this to an end. Experience proves that under stress, trial and difficulty the best qualities of men emerge; if men were lifted into physical comfort, degeneration would inevitably be the result. As Benjamin Kidd points out in Social Evolution, every quality of the mind and body of man is the product of competition.

8. The extreme views which most socialists hold on religion and marriage show that the natural tendency of the movement would be materially to damage the Church and the family.

9. There is a tendency for thoroughgoing socialists to develop into anarchists and nihilists. The Russian revolution began with socialism, which developed rapidly into Bolshevism. That socialism makes its strongest appeal to the lowest classes is an indication that its real motive is self-interest. It stirs up class warfare, and if there is to be any hope for ordered society, it must be consistently resisted.

10. Socialism would establish a worse despotism than the world has ever seen. It would en feeble self-reliance and individuality, and reduce all to dependence upon the State. The lazy and inefficient would live upon the industrious and capable.

11. Our present system deals with the social crisis through philanthropic effort, and thus the evil causes self-sacrifice and devotion. Under socialism this private philanthropy would be replaced by State philanthropy, and the result would be the loss of character in individuals.

12. Under present conditions the pressure of competition produces a
high average of work, for unless articles are well made they will not sell; but under socialism workmanship would degenerate and all special excellence, which is the condition of progress, would be discouraged. This is proved by the fact that trades unions reduce skilled labour to the level of unskilled.
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SHOULD PARLIAMENT RESTRAIN EXCESSIVE LUXURY?

YES

1. Whatever a man has in excess of what is necessary for maintaining the health and comfort of life should be devoted in some way to the public good, and just in proportion as he spends this surplus upon himself in useless luxury does he defraud the community.

2. Although this is acknowledged by many as an abstract principle, it is only acted upon in very exceptional circumstances, and in order to secure the working of the rule, society will have to take some active measures.

3. Society has the right to protect itself against the individual luxury because it is only through the protection afforded to them by society that the wealthy members are able to absorb an undue share of the available good.

4. That luxury is a direct danger to society is proved by the decay of ancient civilizations through the enervation of the rich. If means are not devised to check this evil, we can only hope to follow the path of national degeneration until some more healthy and virile race arises to supplant us.

5. The failure of the ancient sumptuary laws does not imply that legislation for the restraint of luxury is impossible in modern times. Heavy taxation of luxuries would restrain their use and bring revenue to the State.

6. It is idle to contend that luxury is not mischievous in its working because private expenditure encourages trade. Money spent selfishly may give work with a resulting gratification to the individual, but money spent unselfishly creates just as much work and the result is to the permanent good of the community. If there were any value in the argument, it would apply with equal force in favour of gambling, the drink traffic, etc.

7. Ancient kings, chiefs and conquerors, who sought their own pleasure and aggrandisement only, do not differ essentially from modern luxurious men; the latter deserve all the condemnation heaped upon the former.
NO

1. If this rule were carried into practice, men would not exert themselves beyond the point where their exertions would benefit themselves, and the result would be that enterprise would be checked, work would become more scarce, and the conditions of life harder.

2. It is impossible for society to insist upon general benevolence, for this is an individual matter over which society has no control.

3. This principle of the State's right to interfere cannot be admitted without the most extensive consequences; if society has this right it also has the right to protect itself against individual malice, meanness, hypocrisy and the like. The result of the establishment of this theory would be a new and unique tyranny.

4. It was not so much luxury as idleness which was the ruin of ancient society. In modern times luxury is seldom attainable except by the most energetic members of society, who are best fitted to withstand its temptations. Even where wealth is inherited, there is a tendency for the inheritor, if he is lavish and wasteful, to sink into a lower social position in which waste is no longer possible. In this way culpable luxury corrects itself by the automatic working of economic laws.

5. Ancient sumptuary laws, such as those of Rome, were conspicuous failures, and we have no evidence that modern revivals would be more successful.

6. Lavish expenditure is not an evil altogether, for part of the expenditure goes directly to benefit trade. This is shown by the fact that when the tourist visitor figures lessen, Kenyan coastal trade suffers severely, because the expenditure of the wealthy visitors is reduced.

7. It is easy to denounce ancient tyrants, and to forget that through their energy and ambition modern nations have grown, and peace and good order have been made possible. The future will probably owe as much to our wealthy and enterprising men of to-day.
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SHOULD THE "UNFIT" BE RESTRAINED FROM PARENTHOOD?

YES

1. Modern research in heredity proves that some of the worst radical poisons and defects are handed on from parent to children. If the insane, feeble-minded, criminal and alcoholic could be restrained from bringing into the world unhappy children, weighed down with their parents' unfitness, a long step would be taken towards the permanent betterment of the world. This restraint might with advantage be extended to deaf-mutes and habitual drug-takers, as well as sufferers from heritable diseases.

2. We must distinguish between the right to live and the right to become a parent. Eugenics is really the discouragement of unworthy parenthood. The present effect of the law of the survival of the fittest leads to mortality among infants. Why not avoid this by regulating parenthood? The proposal is constructive, as opposed to the present destructive working of natural law.

3. We are forced to abandon the idea of raising any special stocks, because any stock will contain sharply contrasted individuals of vastly different growth: but if we can only raise the average we shall have done much. Preventive eugenics should in the meantime be our only aim.

4. The imperative need of this reform is proved by the frequency of "cures" in our asylums. These people are released, because they are no longer technically insane; under outside conditions the insanity often revives, yet they are allowed to pass it on to their children unrestrained.

5. In one European country alone, there are 200,000 deaf mutes. This defect is almost certainly hereditary. More research is wanted, but as soon as any defect of this kind is proved to be hereditary it is not only foolish but positively criminal not to take steps to eradicate it.

6. Undiscriminating demands for an increase in the birth-rate are foolish, for it is not mere numbers we want, but a better race, freed as far as possible from avoidable hereditary taint. Eugenics aims at quality rather than quantity.

7. Eugenic knowledge should be spread. The object is not to elevate the race by destroying the unfit at any stage, ante-natal or post-natal, but by preventing their conception. If only women were free to choose their mates unfettered by monetary considerations a great advance would be made. "It seemed to me then that to prevent the multiplication of people below a certain standard, and to encourage the multiplication of exceptionally superior people, was the only real and permanent way of mending the ills of the world. I think that still."—H. G. Wells.
NO

1. Heredity and genetics are still under scientific investigation. Parents with some "taint" often have healthy children. Even slum children are often robust and fit. The question is still far too obscure to justify any restraint of parenthood.

2. The proposal is an unjustifiable interference with the liberty of the subject. Any conceivable legislation would be tyrannous in its effects, and intolerable in a free country.

3. You cannot "breed" human beings as you can horses. The higher you get in the scale of life the more complicated and difficult become the problems of heredity, until in human beings reliable calculation seems out of the question.

4. It is always possible to advocate any proposed "reform" by citing an extreme case which it would meet. It is a truism that hard cases make bad law. We do not legislate for extreme and exceptional cases, but for the common good. In general this proposal certainly would not work, and would raise more difficulties than it would solve.

5. Science has not yet been able to decide whether the defect of deaf mutes is hereditary. Even if it should turn out to be, we could not prevent deaf mutes from parenthood without resorting to impossibly draconic measures.

6. Our falling birth-rate is one of the most alarming signs of the times. No nation can long survive whose birth-rate falls below a certain level. At such a crisis in our national life and after a devastating war it is proposed to reduce our birth-rate still further by Utopian eugenic legislation!

7. "Eugenics has often been used as an agent of class prejudice, an argument against love, a reason for cruel and wicked surgical operations, for defending the neglect of infancy and for wild talk about lethal chambers and stud-farms." "Fitness" is far more a question of environment than of birth.

8. Genius is proverbially allied with insanity, or at least abnormality. Such legislation might deprive the world of some of its greatest benefactors.
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IS THE DIVISION OF LABOUR NOW CARRIED TO HURTFUL EXCESS?

YES

1. Every man has varied capacities, and the modern habit of confining a man strictly to one definite form of activity cramps his whole nature and starves his life.

2. A certain amount of specialization is necessary from the fact that men's qualities are different, but this differentiation has in modern life been carried to a mischievous extreme, making men one-sided.

3. The triumphs of ingenuity in labour-saving machinery have tended to subdivide labour until artisans are confined to so small a detail of production that they lose interest and become discontented. If this process is allowed to go on unchecked, it will spread into all departments of life, until the majority of men become slaves of routine.

4. Excessive subdivision is not in the interest of efficiency, as is seen by comparing modern craftsmanship with ancient. A workman must have a sufficiently wide field to develop his interest, or he will become a mere machine, turning out work because he has to, and not because he likes it.
NO

1. The modern subdivision of labour makes men specialists. They develop an expertness otherwise unattainable; their work is thus done more easily and commands higher wages.

2. It is the teaching of science that, as development advances, specialization of function increases. This tendency cannot be successfully resisted.

3. The scientific triumphs of the age are due to this subdivision of labour. It is only by men devoting their whole lives to one special branch of knowledge that this progress has been made. The present social evils cannot be attributed to machinery or the excessive subdivision of labour, but are mainly attributable to the selfishness of the few luxuriating upon the labour of the many.

4. The cramping effect of increasing subdivision on labour is more than counterbalanced by the innumerable wide interests which have been brought into the lives of all by the development of popular institutions, the newspaper press, cheap books, general education, rapid communication, internet, and the like. Life is far richer than it used to be, in spite of all the subdivision of labour.

5. The opposition to specialization and mechanization is largely based upon the hypothesis that all men are capable of acquiring skill, and that all want to work and are willing to be interested in work. This, as psychologists admit, is a sentimental fallacy. Many employees work only because they must. Even of those who are capable of skill, many are unwilling to give the concentration and accept the responsibility which skill entails. They would rather work mechanically, particularly as mechanical labour frees the mind to go about its own affairs. This is a very real reason why so many people prefer factory work to domestic work, even of the latter is to be remunerated.
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IS THE INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHIC PHENOMENA DANGEROUS?

YES

1. The investigation of these phenomena is at best unhealthy for the ordinary person, because it develops a morbid, superstitious temperament, leading to a loss of interest in ordinary affairs. Curiosity easily develops into a feverish absorption dangerous to mental stability.

2. Traditions of evil spirits date back to the earliest times; and the forces brought into manifestation at séances, whatever their nature or cause, are undoubtedly in many cases mischievous, if not positively malevolent. Hence it is often dangerous to tamper with what we understand so little.

3. Cases of double personality lead to the conclusion that it is possible for the normal personality to be dislodged for a time and its place taken by another personality, frequently of quite a different character. There is danger of this taking place at a séance. No one should run such risk for the sake of idle curiosity.

4. Séances are dangerous also for mediums, who may suffer from nervous attacks during hypnosis, and experience difficulty in awaking them afterwards. The medium becomes also too easily hypnotized, falling at last completely into the power of the hypnotizer. If the medium is self-hypnotized, then there is a danger of this becoming an involuntary habit. All these and other dangers are manifest, while the small results of these investigations do not compensate for the risks.
NO

1. It is only superstition which has surrounded these phenomena with an atmosphere of terror. The object of modern investigations is to strip these facts of their superstitious accretions by finding out their causes, nature and methods of working. Insanity may arise from fear, but hardly from a desire for enlightenment. To admit that weak-minded and superstitious people should avoid these subjects does not imply that they are dangerous for normal and healthy minds.

2. There is hardly any healthy exercise which under certain circumstances may not become dangerous. Shall we give up motoring, sailing, climbing and flying because accidents happen? Actually, if these experiments are undertaken in the right spirit there is little danger from the occasional mischievousness and even malevolence of the forces set in motion. These investigations are of course unsuited for children and nervous dyspeptics.

3. The danger of obsession is serious, if it exists. The whole subject of dual personality is, however, at present very obscure, and the best way of reaching some reasonable understanding is by the investigation of these phenomena. We have only the vaguest notions of what the human spirit is, and whether it survives death or not. Psychic investigations promise to throw light on these and kindred questions. Is it reasonable, then, to decry an inquiry which may lead to the removal of the danger itself?

4. Anaesthetic sleep is dangerous because anaesthesia is really a poisoning of the system. There is no danger, however, in hypnotic sleep, which is exactly like real sleep. In skilful hands there is no trouble about the re-awaking. The hypnotic state passes like a period of sleep without leaving any injurious trace on the intellectual faculties. Even fatigue and headache in the medium are usually caused by waking them too suddenly. Any evil effects which may arise can easily be prevented by judicious suggestion. Of course it is taken for granted that experiments of this kind should be undertaken only by serious-minded people who take every precaution. In short, there is no danger inherent in the investigation when properly conducted.
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OUGHT WE TO ENDOW RESEARCH?

YES

1. At present most of the resources of our universities are used with a view to the teaching of existing knowledge, and there is little time, energy or funds left for the acquiring of new knowledge. The public are willing to admit the claims of technical education, but they do not understand the importance of pure science. “The worker in pure science discovers: his fellow in applied science utilizes.” The talent for original research is rare, and at present its possessors are usually rewarded and cramped by being appointed to a teaching post. This system is wrong. The claims of pure scientific inquiry should be acknowledged and funds provided by the State to permit those qualified to follow out their researches free from material anxieties. Such work is never in the first instance remunerative, but as it is carried on for the public good, it should be maintained at the public expense.

2. Scholarships for research are useless, because they are insufficient to enable any particular investigation to be carried through. There must be professional posts tenable for life and with salaries likely to tempt the best men. There should also be special institutions for this purpose presided over by capable heads. "There is no influence, no training, no development so important and so entirely without possible substitute, as that arising from the association of younger men in research and investigation with an older, gifted and authoritative investigator who makes them co-workers with him in some great line of inquiry."
Charitable doles to poor students are no substitute for this.

3. It is for want of research that our business men have been content to cling to antiquated methods which ought to have been long superseded. They let their dyes be manufactured abroad in a way they never even attempted to understand, and then these methods were taught to their dyers without any effort to teach them the reason why. The result of all this has been industrial dependence. It is high time for us to be active in research: any money spent on it is the best possible national investment.

4. We want all our different research bodies co-ordinated. There must be a clearing-house for scientific facts and a central authority to prevent overlapping, as well as to give guidance as to the most necessary lines of inquiry. Our youth must not only be taught the facts of science, but also its methods, and this can only be done by giving scope for research. There is the research which the individual firm, or group of firms, or industry may finance, but there is also research which the State alone is in a position to finance. It is for this last kind that we demand proper endowment.
NO

1. The more science is left to itself the better. State interference with science is more likely to mean obstruction than progress.

2. The endowment of research would mean the setting up of a Government department with a host of officials, who would be appointed less for their scientific attainments or suitability for their posts, than for services rendered to one or other of the political parties. Research would be chiefly confined to their own documents, files, memoranda and card indexes, and there would be an enormous waste of public money.

3. Research led Germany to a useless elaboration of details. The collection of data became a craze. It is claimed, on the other hand, that France has made many discoveries of the first rank. Science must be free or it will not flourish.

4. If the State endowed research it would naturally want some control over the expenditure of the money. Functionaries would be appointed, and these would surely begin to impose methods and preconceived ideas on the investigators. This would stifle initiative; we might even reach the stage at which really valuable discoveries would be officially suppressed, because they were not on prescribed lines. The State may be able to manage a Post Office, but it certainly could not organize research.
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WHICH IS THE BETTER: CLASSICAL OR MODERN EDUCATION?

CLASSICAL
1. The Greek and Latin languages contain the history of our origins and explain so much in our literature, language and ideals, that no education can be called complete which has not included a study of the classics.
2. They unfold a literature, art and life which are in themselves of inestimable value. This is demonstrated by the tremendous effect of the rediscovery of these classics at the Renascence, while the Middle Ages before this great awakening give a vivid picture of what the world became when deprived of classic literature and art.
3. Classical literature is full of the key thoughts upon which intellectual life depends. It is a mistake to suppose that the classical authors are antiquated simply because they knew fewer facts than we. Greek literature has become a standard for the whole world of thought: some acquaintance with it is therefore indispensable.
4. The classics supply a mental discipline and thought-gymnastic absolutely necessary in education and not so easily obtainable elsewhere.
5. We dare not cut ourselves off from the two greatest and most influential civilizations on which Europe is built up, nor from two literatures whose completeness and excellence have never been surpassed.
6. The classics supply us with the only really independent and reliable standards by which we can judge our own times.
7. The difficulty many boys find in deriving real benefit from their classical studies arises from bad methods of teaching. This difficulty should not be advanced as an
MODERN

1. That a young man should be familiar with the origins of our literature, language and ideals is doubtless important, but it is far more important that he should have some real knowledge of the world in which he lives and of the laws relating to his own existence in it. This he can learn from modern science alone.

2. That classical literature, art and life are valuable is not denied, but it should be manifest that a modern education is indispensable to a modern man. First and foremost the young must be taught what the world is to-day. The purpose of education should be to make our boys and girls into active and useful men and women. A certain number of antiquaries are useful, but not a whole nation.

3. It is precisely in its method of thought that science is pre-eminent: observation, experiment, working hypothesis, ending in a conclusion, always subject to revision by new facts arising. To acquire this habit of thought should be one of the chief objects of education. A modern education is plainly better fitted for this purpose than a classical.

4. The mental discipline and thought-gymnastic of science and modern languages are as good as, and often better than, those of the classics. The vast majority of boys are incapable of really competent study of the classics: the result is inattention, idleness and boredom. Teach a boy a modern language and you interest him. He sees the practical use of it. He keeps it up. Teach him a dead language such as Latin or ancient Greek and he becomes bored. Even should he become fairly expert in Latin verse, he soon forgets it all. Youth requires life, not antiquity.

5. We dare not separate our youth too far from the life they will have to live. An exclusively classical education puts youth out of touch with modern life, and fosters an intellectual conceit and exclusiveness which can only react unfavourably on its victim.

6. The classical scholar is not open to new ideas, nor has he the adaptability necessary for successful living under the swiftly changing conditions of modern life. He is out of touch with reality.

7. At present we cram the young with indigestible classics and then apply the "emetic of an examination". A modern education trains the young to think for themselves in the present world in which they live, while a classical education overburdens their memories with facts about remote antiquities and grammar of dead tongues.
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OUGHT COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS TO BE ABOLISHED?

YES

1. Experience proves that it is not the best educated, but the best "crammed" man who succeeds in competitive examinations.
2. Some system of probation would be preferable, and much more certain and satisfactory in its results.
3. The competitive examination system trains only the intellectual powers, and not the physical or moral. Examinations are but poor tests of judgment, discretion, temper, trustworthiness, self-control and sagacity; yet these are better things than mere learning.
4. Many of the best minds mature slowly, and examinations fail to make room for these men.
5. It is always found in experience that competitive examinations tend to overstrain the competitors, and permanently to injure their health and usefulness.
6. A striking number of the men who have done great deeds, mental, moral and physical, were notoriously feeble in examinations, which are merely tests of how much the mind can retain, not at all of what it can produce.
NO
1. Under the competitive system the best man gets the prize, or the post, while every man has an equal chance; thus all the abuses of favouritism and influence are done away with.
2. It is the only practical means of testing results both as regards the teaching and the learning.
3. Competition is the life of all trades and professions, and the survival of the fittest is the law of life. There is as much need for this stimulus in school as in business.
4. Free competition is the only means by which an obscure man can rise.
5. If the examination is conducted with care, the examiners can make sure they are getting the man with the particular qualification they require, and this is very desirable in the case of Government service.
6. By experience it is found that those do best in competitive examinations who do not overwork, so the effect cannot really be described as unhealthy.
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ARE SYSTEMS OF MENTAL TRAINING WORTH WHILE?

NO

1. Mental training itself is of course always worth while, but "systems" are usually not. Our educational system has been developed into a state of such practical efficiency that no one can pass through the curriculum without receiving all the mental training of which he or she is capable; special systems of mental training are therefore unnecessary.

2. Systems tempt people who want to make short cuts to culture. Real mental efficiency can only be reached by hard work. There is no royal road to learning.

3. Most of these systems aim at the special and exclusive development of memory. Prodigious feats of memory are of course possible with the aid of a carefully planned scheme of mnemonics, but are they worth while? We do not want to rival Datas even though he had all the dates of history at his finger ends.

4. We do not want to regimentalize the mind. Organization is good in its place, but when it is carried to the length of systematizing the mind itself then the ordinary mortal cries, "Enough! I do not want to be arranged and tidied out of my very personality".

5. Modern life is far too strenuous to make systems of mental training worth while. A man's energies are so fully absorbed in his business or vocation that it is practically impossible for him to undertake any special system of mental training in addition. Nearly every one works far too hard nowadays. What we want is to reduce this excessive labour if possible, and not to add to it. Our forefathers managed to get through life pretty well without these mental gymnastics; it is clear therefore that the effort is hardly worth while for us.
YES

1. Our present educational system is mainly a system of cramming. We proceed on the assumption that the brain is passive that it should be made to contain as much information as possible. We pump knowledge into the youthful brain. We overfill it, distend it, distress it: then we harass and punish it for not being able to hold any more. No wonder originality is crushed, while reaction and mental lethargy are too often the result of the painful process. We need a totally different system. Mental training must be substituted for mental stuffing. The mind is active, not passive. Its powers are not confined to assimilation, but range through observation, perception, reflection, deduction, decision, action and confidence. All these powers, and many more, are just as susceptible to training as the muscles of the body. It is clear, then, that a well-thought-out system of mental training is one of the great needs of the day.

2. Most of the systems which have been advanced to meet this need may be put aside on the ground that they are merely mnemonic—that is, they are memory-aid schemes which merely systematize cramming. The best-known system, Pelmanism, really attempts to develop the thinking powers scientifically. Whether a system of this kind is worth while depends on whether it is constructed on sound psychological principles, and on whether the results achieved are satisfactory.

3. No system is or can be perfect, but Pelmanism certainly is based on the best psychological thought of the day, applied in the light of vast experience in dealing daily with numerous and sharply contrasted individual cases, while its practical success is indisputable; it follows then that this particular system is worth while.

4. All our knowledge comes to us originally through the senses. It is therefore an evident and reasonable course that a sound system of mental training should commence with exercises carefully calculated to increase the efficiency of these senses, especially of sight and hearing, on which we principally rely for our knowledge. In order to observe facts correctly and to remember them, the attention must be trained, interest aroused, mind-wandering checked and the powers of concentration developed; hence it is logical that a systematic training and exercising of these all-important mental powers. This is entirely neglected in our present educational system. The necessity for accurate observation is, indeed, emphasized in all scientific education, but this is not enough. Unless there is some definite system or course of training, the expanding mind will not be able to make anything like a full use of its inherent powers. The mind, like the athlete, is trained not by over-feeding, but by exercise.

5. Even the best and most systematic training of these powers of the mind will be of little avail if we neglect the will, which is the driving force of personality. The will is just as responsive to proper training as is the power of observation, or attention, or interest, or concentration. Fear is nothing but a bad habit, as is shyness, lack of self-confidence, and many other weaknesses which militate against success in life. A systematic discipline of the will can expel these habits. We can if we will. This: great fact is totally lost sight of in our current educational methods. It is therefore high time that our educational authorities should adopt some definite system of mental training, such as Pelmanism, so that the rising generation may be effectively taught how to discover, develop and exercise all the wonderful powers and capacities of the mind to the highest pitch of excellence of which it may be individually capable. Education will then cease to be a useless accumulation of mental
lumber, and will be transformed into a real and effective training for a useful and successful life.
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IS THE INFLUENCE OF THE TV FILMS DELETERIOUS?

YES

1. Parents exercise a certain discrimination, when their children want to go to the theatre, with regard to the character of the play; but the frequent change of TV films makes discrimination almost impossible. The result is that unripe minds are presented with dramas and problems with which they have not sufficient experience to deal.

2. TV films depends for much of its popularity on pure erotic sensation. Sensational literature is bad enough, but sensational pictures are far worse, because more vivid. The whole range of human passion is acted out before young eyes before they have gained any real understanding of the meaning of life. The result is an unhealthy over-excitement.

3. Though the TV films are generally so arranged that virtue triumphs in the end, nevertheless their morality is essentially shoddy.

4. In spite of a certain amount of restriction on the part of authority, films still, and inevitably, do much to exhibit the methods of crime.

5. The television might be made of great educational value if films were shown which would rouse interest in certain branches of science and industry, but unfortunately TV films is a purely commercial undertaking, and the consequence is that most of the pictures shown are artificial, meretricious, untrue to life, false in sentiment, hectic and exaggerated.

6. It is not only the young who suffer. Partly on account of their cost, films must appeal to the masses. Producers admit that they must keep in mind the lowest common denominator of intelligence. No popular amusement calls for less collaboration and intelligence on the part of the public. Intelligent people cannot accept more than a small proportion of films.
NO

1. The appeal of the TV is even more universal than that of the Stage: it is not meant for young people alone. If all novels were written for "the young person" they would cease to be interesting: it is exactly the same with films. The young develop nowadays much more quickly than in the old time, and nothing is shown on the TV that can really do any harm.

2. Even children are unlikely to be harmed by TV films. From films, as from books, they select only what they can assimilate, and their instinct maybe trusted to reject what does not suit them. They gain much more knowledge than they lose.

3. This same charge of sensationalism was hurled at the modern novel, when it began to make its wide appeal. It is based on the old-fashioned, false identification of virtue with innocence. Young people are not hot-house plants. A little healthy excitement does not do them any harm, especially in view of the fact that their work is usually monotonous and uninteresting. To stimulate the mind, to show it some of the colour, richness and variety of life will not harm but benefit it.

4. The censorship bans immoral films. If evil were not shown the picture would not be true, but good always triumphs in the end. In fact so generally is this the case that it might be called untrue to life. The moral ending in the film is becoming as inartistic as the happy ending in the novel.

5. The stories of boys incited to crime by TV films are becoming ridiculous. Boys brought before the Magistrates are merely astute in making TV an excuse for their fault. We never hear of the boys who have been effectively warned against crime by the TV films, nor of the girls who have been stimulated to some real heroism in their life by some example they have seen on the TV.

6. The TV film is entertainment. It is a commercial undertaking and must be made to pay. Scientific films will be presented when the public demands them. Television generally, is an amusement and not a classroom. The TV is the poor man's theatre. He goes to be recreated after tiring and dreary work. The great success of TV films shows that they fulfil their purpose and in the main the effect is good.
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IS PROFIT-SHARING THE CURE FOR LABOUR TROUBLES?

YES

1. This is the most equitable way of remunerating the three industrial agents, capitalist, employer and employed, and gives satisfaction to all.

2. Under the profit-sharing system the product of any given industry tends to increase, because the employee who has a personal interest in the success of the undertaking becomes diligent, and ceases to aim at a minimum of work. Partners work together for the good of a business in a quite different manner from employees. What we want is so far as is possible to make the workmen partners.

3. Under this system the quality of the work is raised: the workmen of the famous "Maison Leclaire" had a high reputation for skill.

4. Waste is caused in every industry by careless use of implements and machines, but under profit-sharing work-men take much greater care of the implements entrusted to them, and the result is a saving which in itself goes a long way to pay the bonus to the men.

5. It secures industrial peace, for both the workmen and the owners are satisfied with the results achieved.
NO

1. It is not a practicable scheme, because the tendency is for firms to enter into combination, and any firm not doing so suffers. It is only applicable, therefore, to the monopolies and the largest firms.

2. In most cases where it has been tried it has failed, and even the enthusiasts have been sadly disappointed.

3. Employees see that the scheme does not go to the root of the problem, and is only an unsatisfactory make-shift.

4. Workmen know that any bonus paid to them is only made possible by their own harder labour, and that the bonus is only a part of the product of this increased labour, for the employer and capitalist get the lion's share. The bonus bears no proportion to the wages, and is a small and delusive gain.

5. Industrial problems of ever-increasing magnitude and complexity are developing all the world over, and the inevitable crisis cannot be stayed by any such superficial schemes as profit-sharing. For the small benefit he receives, the workman has to sacrifice his right of striking: and thereby throws away his strongest industrial weapon.
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IS THE THEORY OF EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK TENABLE?

YES

1. This question is quite clear on ethical grounds. Work is work whether it is done by a man or a woman, and if the same amount of work is done, the same pay should be given.

2. It is not just to pay the man or woman more on the evidence that productivity has increased or overtime hours worked.

3. Women are not forcing themselves into work out of distaste for home duties, but from sheer necessity, for family life cannot be maintained without their help.

4. Opposition to this principle is founded on the outworn superstition that women are inferior to men as workers in a manual work setting; whereas women do some kinds of work more efficiently than men, and are also keener and more willing, adaptable and intelligent.

5. Unless this principle is conceded, women will underbid men, with the result that wages will fall to the detriment of the standard of living.
**NO**

1. This theory may seem sound ethically, but its application works out disastrously in the long run.

2. If the fact that in most cases the man has to support his wife and family is left out of account, just because the other members of the family often help him, the only result can be to discourage men from marriage. Equal pay means; in short the ultimate break-up of the family.

3. The conclusion is obvious—a man must either not marry or not have a family, and both of these courses are disastrous to the State.

4. There is no doubt that, circumstance; being equal, a man can do more work than a woman and should rightly receive higher pay.

5. There are certain jobs suitable for women, and men. will have to give these up, but in the main to talk of women as a class underbidding men as a class is nonsense, for there are vast fields of labour unsuited to women where any employer is glad to pay higher wages to get a man.

---
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ARE STRIKES JUSTIFIABLE?

YES

1. Morally they are justifiable, because they benefit more than they injure the majority of mankind.
2. Capital is organized with the object of allowing labouring the minimum of the fruits of industry. The only available weapon to the worker is the strike.
3. Arbitration cannot be considered the universal cure for labour troubles. The arbitrator is necessarily chosen from the upper classes, whose interests are always, directly or indirectly, with capital. It is only the fear of strikes that makes arbitration possible.
4. Too much attention is paid to the direct expense which strikes cause, and even to the privation which they entail upon the unemployed. These evils obtrude themselves upon the notice of every one, but relatively to the issues at stake they are not great. The policy of a campaign is not to be judged by the gain or loss of a particular battle. Even defeat is no proof that the strike was a mistake.
5. Men are free to withhold labour if they please. If this is so individually, why not collectively?
NO
1. They entail suffering upon a far greater number than benefit by them.
2. The interests of capital and labour are in the end identical, and except when stirred up by strikes, there is no general hostility to labour on the part of capital.
3. They are unnecessary. Arbitration is more effective. It is untrue that arbitration tells unfairly in favour of employers. On the contrary, it tells in favour of labour, since the employer agrees to leave to the decision of the uninitiated technical points with which he alone can really deal. Moreover, there is a natural tendency on the part of an outsider to be biased in favour of the worker, who is regarded as the weaker of two opponents.
4. Even if successful, their cost is excessive: gain in wages is balanced by loss in unemployment. In the last fifteen years wages have advanced most in trades where conciliation has been most freely adopted.
5. They make for corruption in trade union officials, and encourage the paid agitator.
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OUGHT ARBITRATION IN TRADE DISPUTES TO BE ENFORCED BY LAW?

YES

1. Private arbitration has not proved successful, as the history of the long series of disastrous strikes sufficiently shows.

2. Industrial strife is apt to reach dangerous dimensions, threatening the public good if not the public peace, and hence the Government has a right to make arbitration compulsory. It may be said that a man's business is his own, and that workmen have a right to combine; but the prosperity of the nation cannot be allowed to be endangered through the selfishness of either or of both parties.

3. It may be urged that a man cannot be forced to open his works or men be compelled to work; this is true, yet both parties can be indirectly forced by fines. It has been urged against the Shop Hours Acts, Employers' Liability Acts, etc., that they infringed the liberty of the subject; yet they are obeyed, and the case would be the same with compulsory arbitration.

4. The findings of arbitration courts would create no more trouble than the findings of our courts of law, and as the one is submitted to because in the main its decisions are felt to be just, so would the proposed arbitration courts be obeyed.

5. A scheme of compulsory arbitration could readily be fenced with safeguards sufficient to prevent the irresponsible summoning either of masters or men on frivolous charges. If arbitration is not thus made compulsory, strikes become inevitable, to the impoverishment of the country and the waste of its resources.

6. There are admittedly difficulties involved, but they are small compared with the evils of allowing capital and labour to fight out their quarrel at the public loss.
NO

1. Compulsory arbitration could not work in practice. For it would resolve itself into practical confiscation. If the men found it impossible to work at the wages offered, it would be a palpable injustice to fine them for refusing to obey a judgment that they should return to work, and public opinion would never allow them to be driven back to work at the point of the bayonet; so with the masters it would be unjust to force them by fines to keep their works going at a loss, and barbarous to compel them by force.

2. For compulsory arbitration to succeed it would have to control the consumer as well as the producer; if a man were forced to sell his goods at a certain price, the public would have to be made to buy them at that price.

3. If the employer were thus coerced, he would be driven to adulterate his goods to cover his loss, or combine with other employers to control prices.

4. Gradually all employers would be driven by the arbitration courts into these trusts, until at last State socialism would be established.

5. No arbitration court would have sufficient technical knowledge to settle the majority of trade disputes, and the whole system would be a violation of the rights of man; indeed, from the very fact of its being compulsory, it would cease to be arbitration.

6. A number of State functionaries would have to be created, and this would mean a large increase in taxation, with little prospect of good results.
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ARE TRADE UNIONS ON THE WHOLE MISCHIEVOUS OR BENEFICIAL IN THEIR EFFECT?

BENEFICIAL

1. The only way to rebut tyranny is to combine to put it down; trade unionism is the only resource for the labouring classes.
2. The right of combination must be conceded to the men if this is to be a free country.
3. The workman's skill is the commodity which he has to sell, and he is right, according to the whole practice of commerce, in making the most of it.
4. Employers, especially when united in large companies, have little sense of responsibility for their employees, and the workmen must force them to understand this obligation.
5. Trades Unions are of practical benefit to the men in assisting them to get work, to travel in search of work, and even to emigrate.
6. They have fully justified their existence by their success in so frequently getting the wages of the men raised.
7. They develop the capacity for self-government among the men, and create in them a strong feeling of self-respect.
8. The leaders get little more than their wages, and suffer loss by being in bad odour with the employers.
9. Trades Unions call forth a spirit of sympathy and brotherhood among their members.
10. Trades Unions mark a progress from violent remedies to legal and pacific remedies.
11. Political economy is not an exact science, and though some of its exponents pronounce Trades Unions harmful, that is not an indication that they are so. Unions are at present only developing, and therefore any final pronouncement on their effect is premature.
12. Strike organization is not by any means the only work of Trades Unions—they make provision against accident and sickness, and strengthen the feeling of the unity of labour.
MISCHIEVOUS

1. A man has the right to manage his business as he finds best, and when Trades Unions bring force to bear against what they call his tyranny, they are despotically seeking to interfere with his private rights.

2. The despotism of the Unions over the men is far worse than that of the masters, and initiative is crushed.

3. Trades Unions intensify the antagonism between rich and poor, increase the difficulty of the social problem by rousing the hostility of the masters and, by trying to sell the labour of the men wholesale, do not get the best terms for it.

4. It is impossible to force employers to understand a moral obligation to their men, and the use of compulsion will only harden them.

5. Any small benefits which the Unions confer are dearly bought by levies on the wages of the men.

6. They stand self-condemned, because their inevitable effect is seen to be the driving of trade from the country.

7. They encourage among the men a spirit of unrest and even of sedition, which is directly harmful to the trade of the country.

8. Trades Unions are often worked by unscrupulous agitators, whose minds are more occupied with their own personal interests than with the good of the workman.

9. Trades Unions reduce the skilled workman to the level of the unskilled, and really constitute a despotism of ignorance and inefficiency over intelligence and skill.

10. Trades Unions, by the constant resort to intimidation and even to violence, rouse the spirit of anarchy, and constitute a menace to the public peace.

11. The ratio of supply to demand is a natural one, and cannot be altered by arbitrary means.

12. Better provision against illness and accident is made by clubs which exist for that purpose alone, and whose funds are not liable to be exhausted by long, disastrous strikes.
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SHOULD ALL PATENTS BE ABOLISHED?

YES

1. A poor man rarely receives much benefit from a patent, for he has not the necessary capital, and so has to sell to a body of capitalists, who reap all the profit.

2. Patents directly assist in building up monopolies. Several of the large American trusts are greatly aided in maintaining their position by the fact that they have secured the exclusive privileges of valuable patents.

3. If the patent laws were repealed, more efficient means of rewarding inventors could be found; some honour might be conferred upon them or a sum of money proportioned to the value of their inventions.

4. Large companies of capitalists sometimes obtain control of new inventions with a view of suppressing them, to save the expense of adapting existing machinery or buying new. In this way self-interest holds back progress through the operation of the patent laws.

5. Every invention ought to be used for the good of all, and not exploited for the good of the few.
NO

1. Patents are the inventor's only encouragement. Few would trouble to invent new things unless he were thus assured of some protection and consequent reward.

2. It is but right that those whose capital actually brings the patent to bear upon life should be rewarded. The original idea is the inventor's property, but if he sells it he has no cause of complaint if the buyer company profit.

3. It would be almost impossible to find another means of rewarding inventors, because the value of a patent is impossible to estimate before its utility has been tested.

4. Every law is open to abuse, and no doubt the patent laws might be amended with advantage; but their repeal would be a serious loss to the nation.

5. Under the present system the company is the means whereby the invention is made available: and but for the company the inventor could seldom carry out his idea.
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SHOULD THE DRINK TRADE BE NATIONALIZED?

YES

1. Under present conditions there is so powerful and wealthy a class in the country vitally interested in the maintenance of the drink traffic that all efforts at radical reform are frustrated: if the Government took charge, reforms would be much more easily introduced, because private interest would not conflict with public duty.

2. Profits would be devoted to the national welfare.

3. Trade competition has led to adulteration, which under Government control would cease.

4. There would be no more injustice in removing competition from the liquor traffic than in allowing none in postal affairs.

5. The conditions of those employed in breweries and in bars would be greatly improved.

6. Sweden and Norway operate a monopoly over alcoholic drinks.
NO
1. It is now only the interest of a comparatively small class to maintain the drink traffic; but nationalization would then give the whole nation financial interest in keeping it up, and reform would be impeded.
2. The whole nation would be put in the position of hypocrites, for they would be profiting by what they pretended to wish to reform.
3. Competition makes public services more efficient. Adulteration would be as likely under official control as under private management. Efforts to restrain the efficient service of common necessity manifestly emanate from the sort of fanaticism which sees only one-half round a subject.
4. So many vested interests have grown around this traffic that it would be a glaring injustice to nationalize the industry without adequate compensation, which would be ruinously expensive. There is no analogy in the Post Office, because this has been managed by Government practically from the beginning.
5. Private companies treat their servants well in their own interest, and Government control would not produce improvement. Many postal employees, indeed, are notoriously underpaid.
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FURTHER SUBJECTS FOR DEBATE

GENERAL

What is success in life?
Is real partnership possible in married life?
Is family life doomed?
Are only children to be pitied?
Is the happiness of childhood commonly over-estimated?
Is the “modern child” to be welcomed or deplored?
Are women constitutionally conservative?
Has the “emancipation” of women increased their happiness?
Is the insular position of Great Britain an advantage under modern conditions?
Is state ceremonial worth what it costs?
What honours ought to be bestowed on the King's next birthday?
Are museums a failure?
Is vegetarianism a fad?
Is Zionism a tenable proposition?
Are houses ever really haunted?
Should tipping be abolished?
Should the game of cricket be reformed?
Should the Fire Brigade be a branch of the Army?
Is the tram: problem capable of solution?

The following subjects are good for debate of the lighter kind, though of course many of them are suitable for serious debate, just as many of the more obviously serious subjects are capable of being turned to the purpose of diversion.

Would we choose to live our lives over again?
In what period would you choose to live?
What is the most satisfactory age to be?

Which does experience justify, the optimist or the pessimist?
Which are the greater trial, poor relations or rich?
Should students be taxed?
Is there any foundation for the argument that a man is either a fool or his own doctor by forty?
Is hypocrisy one of our national characteristics?
Is suburban life duller than country life?
Should the ringing of church bells be prohibited?
Should we keep diaries?
Women's dress, and men's—which is preferable?
Is modern feminine fashion a thing of beauty?
Is the speedy variation of feminine fashion a boon or a nuisance?

ETHICAL

How can we best serve our country?
Has a man any natural rights apart from the welfare of the race?
Can self-denial ever be immoral?
Is there such a thing as a disinterested motive?
Is the principle of utility a safe moral guide?
Is every man the best judge of his own interests?
Ought a man always to obey his conscience?
Which is worse, the hypocrite or the liar?
Is persecution ever justifiable?
Is lynch law ever justifiable?
Is duelling justifiable?
Is there a case for euthanasia?
Is death a curse or a boon?
Under modern conditions is celibacy preferable to married life?
Does evolution conflict with ethics?
Are Eastern races happier than Western?
What is a gentleman?
Is chivalry decreasing?
Is pleasure the end of moral conduct?
Ought entertainments risking human life to be prohibited?
Ought gambling and the lottery be abolished?
Is an age of general intellectual culture favourable to the development of great men?
Does ill-health improve character?
Is slavery really abolished?

RELIGIOUS

Are Christians happier than other people?
Which should be supreme, the Bible, the Church, or the conscience?
Should the clergy be priests or pastors?
Is there real moral value in the confessional?
Does the Higher Criticism do more harm than good?
Can the Church keep her hold on young men?
Is Christianity made ineffective by division among the churches?
Is church-going valuable to the average man?
Are religious revivals eventually salutary or the reverse?
Is the Sermon on the Mount practicable to-day?
Is religion compatible with modern business methods?
Is spiritualism consistent with efficiency in everyday life?
Should pulpits be thrown open to women?
Is the celibacy of the clergy desirable?
Ought Churches to abolish pew rents?
Should theological difficulties be freely discussed?
Ought all pastors be graduates with theology degrees?

POLITICAL

Has democratic government justified its existence?
Has the extension of the franchise justified itself in practice?
Has the extension of the franchise to women justified itself in practice?
Have women a real place in politics?
Would a woman president be an advantage to the country?
Ought government to be in the hands of lawyers?
Should the parliament be further reformed?
Is the draft Constitution a flawed instrument?
Are we over legislated for?
Is the system of one man one vote justifiable?
Should canvassing at parliamentary elections be abolished?
Should the pay of parliamentarians be increased or decreased?
Is government more necessary or less as civilization advances?
Ought the U.S.A. to take a permanent place in world politics?
Is there a case for dictatorship in African countries?
Have we anything to fear from our own militarism?
Is another drought inevitable?
Should MPs be university graduates?
Is it true that the less the State meddles with the individual the better?
Can the United Nations be a success in cases of war between nations?
Is Free Trade or Fair Trade better?
Should the UN be reformed?
Is the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations outdated?

SOCILOGICAL

In what does the prosperity of a nation consist?
Ought Kenya to exclude foreigners?
Does the worker know what he wants?
Is the Co-operative Movement a failure?
Are private monopolies public evils?
Are we on the road to solving the Housing Problem?
Is the increase of housing estates beneficial to the nation?
Ought we to nationalize orphanages?
Should we have a ministry of Eugenics?
Ought punishment to be retributive or reformatory?
Is psychology becoming an exact science?
Has Psychical Research become a branch of scientific research?

EDUCATIONAL

Is true education a mental training or a preparation for special pursuits?
Ought we to agitate for definite ethical training in schools?
Does modern education develop character?
Is special educational treatment necessary for the only child?
Is there a case for free discipline in the upbringing of children?
Can conscientious parents make use of boarding-schools?
Are public schools a benefit to the nation?
Should games be compulsory?
Should children's reading be strictly controlled?

Is the play element too pronounced in the modern class-room?
Which is the better for a country—well-endowed professorships or richly revenued bishoprics?
Is a university education helpful in business?
Is travel the best education?
Is simplified spelling practicable and desirable?
Should Kiswahili be adopted as an international language?

LITERARY AND ARTISTIC

Is the art of letter-writing declining?
Is our literature decadent?
Is literature, economically, a form of productive labour?
Is Ngugi wa Thiongo over-estimated?
Is detective fiction worthy of serious attention?
Is "modern" poetry poetry?
Has the "brightening" of journalism improved our newspapers?
Can any type of humour be universal in appeal?
Does fashion in humour ever really change?
Is there any real foundation for the assertion that genius is akin to madness?
Is science antagonistic to art?
Do we want realism or impressionism in art?
Is music suffering through technical dexterity?
Can modern architecture be considered as an art?
Could women architects substantially improve domestic architecture?
Modernism v. Tradition in houses and furnishing.
Can the cinema be considered as an art?
Are lawyers greedy and manipulative narcissists?

COMMERCIAL

Is credit capital?
Should there be an international East African Area currency?
Must we fight for new markets?
Can the middleman be eliminated?
Can multiple stores be justified?
Is there any place for the small trader: commerce?
Is commercial retaliation justifiable?
Is it sound business to tax amusements?

END
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