

Oregon Weekly.



UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

VOL. IX.

EUGENE, OREGON, MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1908.

No. 25

AFFIRMATIVE MEN DEFEATED

By Idaho's Strong Negative Trio—Decision Was Two to One Against Oregon.

The University of Idaho's negative debating team won a two to one decision from Oregon's affirmative team last Thursday evening, thereby reversing the outcome of last year's debate between these two institutions. The question was, "Resolved, that the present laws relating to the admission of Chinese into the territory of the U. S. should be extended to Japanese immigrants." Oregon's team had prepared strong argument for the exclusion of the Jap which had as their basis his undesirability as a citizen. The negative, however, by admitting these arguments practically dulled their edge and by centering their attack upon the present laws against Chinese, proving them not to be the best means for exclusion, they constructed a case which the affirmative after valiant attempts, failed to refute.

W. C. Nicholas for Oregon opened the debate. He defined the question and outlined affirmative line of argument, stating that two things would be proven; that the Japanese should be excluded and that the Chinese exclusion laws are the best means for that purpose.

His line of argument consisted principally in showing that the Japanese are an undesirable class of citizens because their continued admission leads to lawlessness, because of their immorality, and because of their inability to become Americanized. He closed showing that the barring of these immigrants would put an end to an immense amount of disorder and lawlessness.

B. D. Mudgett, for Idaho, followed: He began by admitting the substance of his opponent's argument that Japanese immigration should be restricted, but stated that it would be the policy of the negative team to show that the present laws relating to Chinese immigration were not the best means of

such restriction. He brought in evidence to show that these laws had been ineffective in excluding Chinese, and further that they were not adapted to meet the conditions in different localities in this connection comparing the conditions in the Philippines, Hawaii and different portions of the United States. At his conclusion, he handed a question to the affirmative team asking if it would not be better for Japan to enact the restrictive legislation.

Walter H. Eaton was the second speaker for Oregon, and answered directly the question of the negative asserting that Japanese legislation would be unsatisfactory, unreliable and ineffective. He spoke also on conditions in Hawaii, showing that the whole field of labor was not monopolized by the Japs.

J. D. Matthews, of Idaho, followed, and pursuing the line of his colleague, showed that the Chinese immigration laws are unjust in that they infringe upon the natural rights of man.

He also stated that the extension of these laws to include the Japs would be an inexpedient measure in that hostilities between the two countries would inevitably ensue.

Jesse H. Bond, leader of the Oregon team, spoke next and made a strong refutation of his opponent's arguments. He quoted President Roosevelt and other authorities to show that the present immigration laws have been and are effective. Also he argued that drastic measures are required owing to the nature of the people dealt with, but the laws were far from being unjust. Answering the argument for Japanese restrictive legislation, he quoted a Japanese authority which stated that Japan had no intention of taking such steps, and Mr. Bond brought in further proof to show that the promises of Japan were unreliable and that such legislation would be ineffective.

R. O. Jones closed the debate for the negative, summing up the arguments of his colleagues and showing further that the affirmative's plan for exclusion was not only ineffective, unjust, and

(Continued on Page three.)

NEGATIVE TRIO IS DEFEATED

At Seattle Thursday Night by Washington Varsity's Affirmative Squad

Oregon's negative team met an honorable defeat last Thursday night at Seattle when the affirmative debaters representing the University of Washington won a unanimous decision over the Oregon men. It is difficult to say just why Oregon lost; but it is certain that the excellent work of Washington's leader, Thos. E. Latimer, in rebuttal, was a very potent factor, in bringing about the defeat. The judges were Judge Milo A. Root, Judge R. A. Falkner and Superior Judge P. D. Albertson, all of Seattle.

Leo Jones opened the debate for Washington and in a clear and concise manner outlined the affirmative case. He argued that the Japanese cannot be assimilated and that they will not adopt American customs. Hence they will form an alien class in our midst and become a danger to our social welfare. For this reason the Japanese should be excluded.

Earl Kilpatrick opened the argument for Oregon. He maintained that Japanese exclusion must be justified on two main grounds, social and economic. In rebuttal, he argued that exclusion could not be justified on social grounds since the Japanese are not a dangerous element in society; and likewise such exclusion can not be justified on industrial grounds since the Japanese do not seriously compete with American workmen. Further he continued, the Japanese are an absolute economic necessity to the Pacific Coast. He showed conclusively that there is a class of work which none but Japanese labor will do and hence exclusion would be unwise. A great many quotations from employers of labor all over the Pacific coast were read to prove the truth of his contentions.

N. G. Harris spoke next for Washington and argued on industrial grounds that the Japanese should be

(Concluded on Page 5)