

The Evergreen.

Published every Thursday during the College year by the Students of the State College.

Vol. XI.

Pullman, Washington, Thursday, April 27, 1905.

No. 30



McLean

DEFEAT ONCE MORE

University of Montana Wins Debate at Missoula.

By a 2-1 decision our team was defeated in the annual debate with the University of Montana at Missoula last Friday night. The debate was the hottest contested of the year, and there is a grain of consolation in a 2-1 decision.

Our team, composed of McLean, Baske and Kreager arrived in Missoula, Friday morning, and were immediately taken in by the most cordial hospitality of the Northwest. The best hotel of Missoula, carriage, and all that, and the entire University were at their service during the entire stay. Special convocation was held and a royal greeting extended the team Friday morning. The team made their maiden speeches before the University. A most pleasant day was spent, largely in telling and hearing of "those who had been there before."

THE DEBATE.

A small but remarkably attentive audience greeted the debaters Friday night. After some excellent music by the ladies double sextette, the big fight was on.

McLean opened for the affirmative with a clear cut and logical address. The question: "Resolved that the U. S. should withdraw from the Philippines, following its own precedent in Cuba," was defined and analyzed. The main points of McLean's argument were, The Cuban plan has been a complete success in Cuba; conditions in the Philippines are similar; the Filipinos want self government and under Cuban plan are capable of it. We hold the Philippines in trust for the people.

Williams opened for Montana by making the broad statement that Cuba was rapidly becoming demoralized. He maintained that the Filipinos were three fourths barbarians and not capable of self government. The constructive argument of the negative was then taken up. The title of the U. S. to the Philippines is valid. U. S. is under no obligations to withdraw. Permanent retention is in harmony with past policy and is constitutional.

Zaske then followed—attacked the argument of the negative by showing defects of constitutional and past policy argument.

The plan of the affirmative was further advanced by pointing out the danger of permanent retention.

Goodbourn for Montana devoted his time to an able exposition of the good we are doing the Filipinos.



Baske

Kreager for the affirmative grouped the negative argument, and showed that their attacks on Cuban self government and capacity of Filipinos were not backed by facts or authority; that the argument that we were advancing the Filipinos applied with equal force to Cuba.—as did all the argument urged by the negative. The case of the affirmative was then completed by showing that the interests of both the United States and the Philippines demand the Cuban plan of withdrawal.

Harmon, for Montana, dwelt upon the advantages of retention to the United States. He then declared that it had always been the intention of our government to give the Filipinos freedom.

Williams closed for the negative by reiterating that the Filipinos were not capable.

Kreager, in rebuttal, attacked the admission of the negative, "that it was the intention of the United States to give the Filipinos freedom," and urged that since the negative had proposed no plan, the Cuban plan was the only practical plan of withdrawal.

After the debate a royal banquet was served to the teams and judges. Sometime after midnight "the banquet hall was deserted." At four o'clock a silent little group of three still sat on the edge of the beds in the hotel room and realized it all—three defeats.



Kreager