1. Introduction

Since 1922, the National Communication Association (NCA, formerly SCA) has sponsored international debate exchange tours to promote cross-cultural debate and discussion (Hall & Rhodes 1972, Sillars as cited in Committee for International Debate and Discussion n.d.) The Japan-US debate exchange officially began in 1969, after three direct exchanges coordinated between Sophia University and the University of Hawaii in 1967 and 1968. There has been 33 tours as of 2008 (Howell, personal communication, 2007, Aonuma 1989: 1).

Although participants prepare reports recounting their experiences, there seems to have been no systematic attempt to trace the historical trajectory of the exchange over time.*1 As with any historical project, gaps exist in the materials that are accessible to the public. This problem is compounded for the Japan-US exchange because a fire at the NCA headquarters in 2000 ruined many CIDD files (Janas, personal communication, 2008). To contend with these gaps in the historical record and research, we make an initial attempt to document and historicize the tour. For achieving our research agenda, we consulted tour reports and supplemented them with oral history interviews of former tour organizers and participants. Oral history is “the recording of personal testimony delivered in oral form,” which can recover undocumented aspects of history (Yow 2005: 3). We asked the narrators a similar set of questions to chart diverse and similar perspectives on the tour. How does the experience of public debate on the tour help participants to see debate in a different light, both competitively and scholarly? What are the layers of culture that participants must negotiate, in terms of both international cultures and argument cultures? The answers to these questions are important not only to the debate communities, but also for the study of intercultural argumentation because they complicate the notion that interactions between nation-states are monolithic in favor of a more nuanced analysis of both international cultures and argument cultures. 

In this article, we focus on the overlapping and recurrent themes emerging from the reports and interviews: cultural interactions, argument cultures and scholarship & institutional involvement.*2

2. Cultural Interaction

Throughout its history, one purpose of the exchange has been to promote cultural interaction. The importance of cultural exchange is recognized by American participants of the tour (Palczewski 1999, 2007, Rao and Lauer 1993). Japanese participants also note the importance of cultural exchange (Matsuyama 1982, Nakamura and Kitabayashi 1991, Kurano 1994, Hayashida & Ogasawara 1998). Matsuyama (1984: 24, 26) notes that information about the US available in Japan is much more prevalent than information about Japan available in the US, so the participants can contribute to offering information on Japan and correcting stereotypes. Because the hosts in the US are colleges and universities, participants attend classes on Japan, Japanese cultures, Japanese society, international relations or comparative cultures (Kurano 1994: 2, Hayashida & Ogasawara 1998: 6).

The cultural exchange extended to interactions with the audiences during public debate events. In one debate on trade issues, Yano had a question from the audience regarding ‘fairness’ in Japan sumo wrestling. The question was if sumo wrestling is unfair to American-born Konishiki, since he was rejected to be promoted to yokozuna, the highest rank wrestler. He replied that he was not a big fan of Konishiki but Akebono, another American-born sumo wrestler, who was then still climbing up the hierarchy. “(T)hat got a laugh from some corners of the audience” (Yano 2007: 9). Yamada (2006) attended a party for international students and observed the ways that those students took pride in their own cultures.

Another recurring cultural topic from female participants is gender.*3 Palczewski and Sprain report that Japanese female debaters voiced their opinions about the value of debate for promoting equality and expressing dissent. “(T)here would be a moment at every stop when women would come up and talk to us about how much they loved debate because debate was the only place where they could speak as equals.” (Palczewski 2007: 6) She (2007: 7) also observes that female debaters were better English speakers, offered better substance of arguments, and performed better in public debate settings than male debaters. Sprain (2005) talked with a female Ph. D. student...
studying in Japan about women debaters in Japan, who suggested as follows: “(S)he thought more women than men were getting involved in debate because speaking English is, generally speaking, of more interest to women than men. Plus she observed women enjoying the opportunity to debate because they don’t always have the opportunity to debate or vocally dissent in their daily lives.” Although some feminist communication scholars (Gearhart 1979, Foss & Griffin 1985) problematize the adversarial nature of argumentation, debate in Japan may provide a constructive forum for women. Palczewski (2007: 6) states: “(t)hey [women] loved debate because it was in English and it liberated. It was one of those liberating things that they did and so that was the upside. It really did heighten my attention to power differentials in language and norms of argument, and how as much as the good feminist in me always wants to rush to adversarial as opposed to cooperative orientation in debate that for some, being allowed to be adversarial is an incredibly liberating moment. So that’s the other side.”

American participants’ observations about gender in Japanese debate community goes beyond the debating skills, and discusses a hierarchy between male and female debaters in Japan. Palczewski (2007: 7) recalls that in one debate, two male top debaters decided not to debate against her and her female partner after talking with them, and sent two female students. The explanation of the move by some female debaters was that they did not want to be embarrassed lose female debaters in a public debate. Sprain (2005) also picks up this hierarchy issue and states: “(t)hat two ‘older’ American women are intimidating to male Japanese students.” Although Sprain recognizes that she, Woods, and Baaske often introduced gender as an important issue, she also mentions that Japanese people brought up under-representation of women in the debate community without any prompt.

Japanese participants also talked about gender issues, although with a limited scope. While attending classes at universities, Japanese debaters were often asked questions about female roles in Japan (Kurano 1994: 2, Hayashida & Ogasawara 1998: 6). Hayashida and Ogasawara (1998: 6 translated by Konishi) comment on stereotypes of Japanese women: “We both are Japanese women and debaters, and different from American stereotype of ‘Japanese women’, thus attracted interest on those points. We had such questions as how many women in Japanese debate community, or how the role of women changes in Japan.” Yamada (2006) turns her attention to commercialization of women, referring to her experience of seeing waitresses at Hooters!4

The relationship between verbal/nonverbal communication and culture is another theme that appears in participants’ reports. Matlon, a coach of 1978 tour, is quoted by Hazen (1982: 10-11) as observing that Japanese college students engaged in debate “as a way of learning Western thought, language, and behavior so they can advance both themselves and their country in years ahead.” Davidson (1977: 3) and Hazen (1982: 11) argue that the assumption that English is a logical language functioned as a rationale to debate in English rather than in Japanese. Japanese and American organizers and participants recognize the importance of Japanese people debating in English (Ayabe 2007: 9, Matsumoto 2007: 9, and Pickering 2001). Palczewski (2007: 6) calls our attention to the fact that hierarchies and deference embedded in language make debate an attractive activity for Japanese females to express themselves. Rao (2007: 7-8) refers to his surprise when he found out that smiling and nodding by the public debate audience did not mean they understood and followed his argument.

3. Argument Cultures

Participants said much about the similarities and differences between debate communities in the US and Japan. While scholars often discuss the intercultural aspects of communication, we would like to focus on participant observation of what we call “international argument cultures.” Drawing on Thomas Farrell’s (1993:1) notion of “rhetorical culture,”5 the term “international argument cultures” refers to communicative communities which follow similar “rules of engagement,” broadly defined, in diverse geographical contexts. We argue that studies of cross-cultural argumentation ought to consider both the culture of the nation-state and the culture of the argument communities. The American and Japanese debate communities are ideal examples of international argument cultures because they follow similar “rules,” in terms of the competitive debate format: “In fact of all the countries in the world that practice debate, the Japanese debate most like we [the US circuits] do.” (Davidson 1977: 8) However, they have developed in distinct ways in terms of style and argument choice. The tour highlights these similarities and differences because it puts the two argument cultures into direct conversation.

Stylistic aspects of the debates made for common talking points. American participants generally note Japanese debaters’ analytical and delivery skills. Since Japanese debaters typically debate in English, mastery of these skills is particularly impressive (Nobles 1984: 10). Japanese participants tended to view the American debaters on the tour as superior at audience adaptation and providing a “big picture” view of the debate (Aonuma 2007: 1-2, Ayabe 2007: 4-5). While a characteristic of competitive policy debate in both argument cultures is fast delivery, participants report that it is often difficult to balance the desire to speak quickly with ensuring that the audience
members will be able to comprehend speed talking in a non-native language (especially since this is difficult for native speakers!). Some Japanese debaters would prefer to see American debaters speak quickly, but most debates on the tour were performed at a conversational speed in a modified policy format (Palczewski 2007: 3). Palczewski (1999:3) suggest that the best approach is to speak in “thought packages,” or quick phrases or metaphors that would systematically explicate an argument, because “the issue is not speed of delivery, but ease of translation.” Likewise, Japanese debaters who toured the US noted that most schools wanted an easily comprehended speed and preferred that they bring humor and intercultural insight to the public debates (Yano 2007: 4).

Another characteristic of competitive style policy debate in both countries is an emphasis on the evidence to support argumentative claims. Both Hazen (1982: 17-18) and Nobles (1984: 11) noted that based on their observations touring Japan, Japanese debaters tended to put less critical pressure on evidence sources and used less evidence for extending arguments in the rebuttals. In general, the public debate format calls for fewer pieces of evidence than a typical policy debate would. A distinctive challenge of the tour is to find evidence that works well in a different international argument culture. Some Japanese debaters locate evidence from Japanese language sources and translate it into English, while American debaters locate evidence from English sources. The pre-departure research conducted for the tour is often augmented with additional evidence when the debaters travel abroad (Howell 2007: 12). When debating about the US education system on a tour of the US, Yano and his partner did additional research in American university libraries. They attempted to adapt their evidence to their audiences, once even going so far as to quote from a University of North Carolina professor when they debated on the UNC campus (Yano 2007: 7). Yamada also employed this tactic on the 2006 tour of the US, citing evidence from the local newspapers of the cities that they visited.

One unique aspect of the tour is that participants often do public debates in front of non-expert audiences. One criticism of policy debate is that it is highly technical and inaccessible to wider publics. For debaters from both countries, it proved both challenging and rewarding to adapt to international audiences not familiar with competitive debate. This is a significant consideration because for many of the tour participants, the tour debates were the first time they moved beyond the insular argument culture to which they belonged. Palczewski saw a shift in the audience composition from the first and second time she went on the tour. During the first tour, she sensed that the audiences were mostly composed of debaters and members of English Speaking Societies (ESS): “audience members would come up and quote transcripts from the NDT’s final rounds. They would ask us to sign sheets of our flows, to autograph sheets of our flows, so we never had flows at the ends of debates because they were all handed out and autographed” (Palczewski 2007: 3). On the later tour, many of the audiences were composed of lay people, including university students, professors, high school teachers, and community members. Tour debates often serve the public relations purpose of providing non-debaters, including administrators, with a glimpse at the debate activity (Aonuma 2007: 7; Louden 2007: 6). The audiences in the US and Japan generally range from 20 to 100 people, a stark contrast from the small audiences and expert judges that debaters typically would debate in front of in a contest round. Debaters adapted to these audiences in multiple ways. Koresawa (n.d.) recounts how he would email the next university tour stop in advance to learn the size of the audience and types of students that they would be debating in front of. Hagashida and Ogasawara (1998: 5) observe that because non-expert audiences typically do not take detailed notes of the debate, debaters who can tell compelling stories are often the most persuasive in a public debate setting. Audience adaptation was important on the tour because in many cases, the debate moderator would ask the audience to vote for a winner. Audience members were sometimes asked to register their opinion about a topic at the beginning of the debate and then register any change in their opinion after listening to the debate (Matsumoto 2007: 5).

The format of tour exhibition debates varied by hosting institutions and groups. Louden (2007: 6) noted each stop of the tour was different based on audience, host expectations, and format, so it was important for debaters and coaches to adapt at short notice. Some parliamentary debaters have traveled on both tours, and debaters trained in the policy style sometimes participate in the parliamentary format on the tour. Although there is an emerging debate community competing in the parliamentary format in Japan, many Japanese tour participants have their first experience with parliamentary debate in the US (Naito 1984: 21; Yamada 2006). Based on their experiences, Japanese debaters note that parliamentary debaters excel at describing their arguments and holding the audience’s attention, whereas policy debaters focus on the logic, evidence, and refutation (Hayashida & Ogasawara 1998: 5, Koresawa n.d.).

Regardless of whether the tour debates were conducted in a modified parliamentary or policy format, public debate sparked much reflection about the relative merits of policy debate on the part of American and Japanese participants. By bringing competitive debate to a public format, the tour prompted participants to think about whether debate is best thought of as a game, an educational activity, or some combination of the two. When Palczewski (2007: 6) went on the tour as a debater,
she noted that because the tour was seen as an opportunity for top debaters in the US, there was an “adulation of debate as a game” in Japan. Even though the “debate as a game” mentality is pervasive in the US as well as Japan, the American debate communities’ connection to the communication discipline is seen as way to ground the activity in education and scholarship. For example, Ziegelmueller (1992: 7) suggested that in Japan, training in debate “needs to focus more on the fundamental skills of argument and less on the strategies of the game.”*6 Morooka (2007: 6) argues that this is a primary difference between the argument cultures in the US and Japan because “debating in Japan takes place in ESS as an extracurricular activity, so faculty members do not get rewarded by supporting debating. So it will not have any positive effect on promotion. So they would rather spend more time writing papers, teaching, doing administrative work than helping ESS members to improve their debating skills.”*7 There have been repeated calls for there to be a clearer link between argument scholarship and debate practice in the United States (Zarefsky 1980, Goodnight 1981).

The most significant insight from the experience of public debating on the tour was the idea that debate could be meaningful beyond the insular competitive debate community. Competitive debaters may not make the connection between debate and the “real world” until they are faced with adapting to a public audience:

Debate is one thing and real world is another—that was my view toward debate. Suddenly, during the tour, I noticed that when I can gain the ability of debate, it might be very influential amongst the real world audience… I should have noticed when I was debating, but I had a simple view. I thought it was just a game when I was a college kid. I just changed my mind” (Yano 2007: 10).

Morooka (2007: 7) suggests that although the effect of public debate on Japanese society is difficult to measure, there is a potential for tour debates to have a positive impact on the English debate circuit in Japan by getting more and more students interested in the activity. Exposure to public debate on the tour may be one of the forces behind the current effort by some JDA members to make debate more accessible by organizing public debates on campus and in communities (Morooka 2007: 7-8).

In addition to connecting participants to different forms of debate, the exchange debate has provided them with opportunities to observe differences and similarities in debate theories or arguments employed in different communities. Davidson (1977: 5-6) observed the debate in Japan in the late 1970s was similar to American debate in the 1960s. Hazen (1982: 16-7) noticed changes in the affirmative constructive speeches, such as more varied case formats used (goal/criteria, comparative advantages, stock issues, etc.), less time spent on defining the proposition, decreased use of charts in the speeches. Matsumoto (2007: 10) understood the importance of arguing for advantages during the 1979 tour rather than arguing for need for change as he did in Japan, and he used that lesson when he participated in tournaments in Japan in his final year. Although different accounts are given for the changes in case formats*8, these observations mark the shift of the Japanese debate community closer to the American counterpart. Palczewski (2007: 4) remembers coach Tim Hynes frequently lecturing on debate theories in the 1987 tour of Japan. Ziegelmueller (1992: 7) also remarks that Japanese debaters are fairly familiar with debate theories of the time. These synchronic developments of debate theories made it easy for Japanese participants of the tour in the US to debate in the tour. Aonuma (2007: 4) remembers that in one public debate American debaters advanced arguments on population explosion, common among Japanese debaters around that time. Morooka (2007: 3) states that in most cases he could argue advantages or disadvantages, as he did in the Japanese policy debate community. These observations seem to support previous research (Aonuma 1989, Woods et al 2006) that the US and Japanese policy debate communities kept in sync with debate theories and arguments to a great degree.

The synchronic theoretical development seems to have ended in the mid-90s, when the US policy debate circuit took a performative turn and started to use kritiks, a type of argument that challenges the assumptions of opponent’s arguments or the debate process. Several participants in the tour of the US (Morooka 2007: 3, Hayashida & Ogasawara 1998, Koresawa n.d.) were exposed to kritiks, but no US debaters visiting Japan report this type of argument Japan tour. Koresawa (n.d.) provides a detailed account of the ‘performative turn’ in the US policy debate circuit, which uses hip-hop to discuss socio-political problems in the US. He doubts if people who regard debate as a game could truly appreciate this line of expression.

Another recurring theme brought up by the participants or planners is the harm/impact debate. Hazen (1982: 18) notices that Japanese debaters do not distinguish qualitative harms and quantitative harms. However, Young (1980) observes the US debate communities also de-emphasize qualitative arguments; Woods et al (2006) suggest that the Japanese debate community was experiencing a shift to accommodate arguments on qualitative harm. Besides the lack of distinction between qualitative and quantitative harms, American participants notice different terminal impacts argued. Palczewski (2007: 6) states that in many debates she did on the
tour, arguments focused the economic and national security impacts of opening the rice market of Japan. Sprain and Woods (2005) notice that many Japanese debaters were surprised when they ran an economy argument ending in nuclear war because a common terminal impact of economic arguments in the Japanese debate community was suicide. They also recount their own surprise when they learned that human rights of foreigners are not highly valued in Japanese policy debate community: “Even in a case arguing for human rights provided by amnesty, we couldn’t assume this referred to our same notions of rights and protections.” These observations suggest that acceptability of an argument is dependent upon common sense/knowledge of particular communities, and we believe that the debate exchange can help expand horizon of acceptable arguments by exposing debaters in two countries to different insights and realities about how arguments function in two seemingly similar academic debate communities.

4. Scholarship & Institutional Involvement

Another dominant theme was the impact of the tour on participants’ careers, pedagogy, and scholarship. These observations were often connected to remarks about the institutional involvement of organizations such as the NCA, JDA, JEFA, and Communication Association of Japan (CAJ) in the tour’s planning and purpose. Participants and planners explicitly linked the tour to academic activities in both countries, particularly in the area of debate and argument research. These observations ground our argument that in addition to “exchanging” debaters and debate arguments, the tour has also been a catalyst for the fruitful exchange of ideas between scholarly communities.

Traveling around to universities in Japan and the United States, many participants make contacts and have conversations that bear on their future career plans. The tour enabled many Japanese participants to get a better idea of the communication discipline in the United States. In some cases, this understanding later manifested in professional relationships when students returned to the United States for graduate study in communication. Ziegelmueller (1992: 7-8) explained in 1992 that this was because communication, “as a separate and legitimate academic discipline, is still in its infancy in Japan.”

Many Japanese students become interested in graduate study in communication based on their interactions with Americans on the debate tour (Howell 2007: 17). This seems to be true for Japanese students who were audience members or debated against the Americans when the US team toured Japan, and in the case of Japanese debaters who traveled to the US. Japanese students who observed or debated against American debaters on their Japan tour also had the opportunity to interact with the American coach or “chaperone,” who is a communication professor. The American coach serves a unique function during the tour because they provide commentary on the debates and are often invited to give speeches on debate theory or argumentation theory, perhaps exposing Japanese audiences to trends in communication scholarship for the first time. Rao (2007: 8-9) notes that for many of the Japanese students he interacted with, participation in the US debate community was a gateway into communication studies. He recalls being judged by a number of Japanese graduate students, including four Japanese judges at the National Debate Tournament. This observation provides texture to the idea that coaching debate served as an integral entry point into the academic study of communication in the US.

Matsumoto (2007: 3) got to know communication studies during the tour and determined to go to graduate school in the US. Next year, when Matlon visited Japan as a coach of the tour, he talked with him and end up studying under him at University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Aonuma returned back to the United States to receive his PhD in Communication from Wayne State University. He (2007: 7) stated, “there were a lot of impacts during the tour, or toward the end of the tour, I was convinced that probably going to the United States and becoming part of American debate is something that I should do after graduation. So, you know, that actually determined my future.” Similarly, Morooka was able to have an informal interview at Wake Forest University while on the tour. He ended up attending Wake Forest for his master’s degree and then continued on to receive his PhD at the University of Pittsburgh. He (2007: 4) believes that the people he met while on the tour helped to ease his transition into graduate life in the United States. Participants like Matsamoto, Aonuma and Morooka have returned to teach at Japanese universities after earning degrees in the United States. They remain active in international conferences such as the Tokyo Argumentation Conference, the Alta Argumentation Conference, and the National Communication Association Convention, fueling the exchange of academic ideas internationally.

While the infrastructure and nature of communication as an academic discipline constrains the possibility for a reciprocal connection for US tour participants pursuing graduate study in Japan, many participants from both countries noted the tour’s impact on their pedagogical approaches outside the tournament setting and their subsequent scholarship. Palczewski (2007: 11) was able to trace a direct relationship between her experiences with teaching debate to Japanese students and teachers on the 1999 tour and her activities as a professor at the University of Northern Iowa. She notes that many students and teachers in Japan were interested in learning how to integrate debate into the curriculum in Japanese high schools and universities. After
the tour, she was asked to facilitate a communication-across-the-curriculum program, and her reflections on her cross-cultural pedagogical experiences proved useful in developing the program. Other American debaters and coaches have continued their connection to the Japanese debate and scholarly communities through participation in international conferences, debate workshops, and cross-cultural scholarly collaborations (Mitchell & Suzuki 2004). For Palczewski (2007: 15), the link between debate pedagogy and argument scholarship is especially strong given the tour experience: “I think that the move in the United States, led by Gordon Mitchell, towards public deliberation, public argument, and the role of public argument and its connections to policy debate and public argument developing on a campus or within the community is a really good thing. I think it’s perfectly in line with what is happening pedagogically in Japan.”

The connection between educational and scholarly applications outside the tournament setting and tour experience is also prevalent in the reflections of Japanese participants. Aonuma (2007: 13-4), now a professor in the Department of International Communication at Kanda University of International Studies, teaches public speaking, communication theory, debate, and rhetoric to Japanese university students. Yano, a professor of Sociology at Chuo University, believes that his experience on the tour influenced both his view of the debate activity as well as his own scholarly interests. His trip to the US affected the way that he read and interpreted Max Weber’s work, in addition to reinforcing his love for sociological research (2007: 10): “I noticed the similarities of human beings, but at the same time, I noticed that there are huge differences. That’s partly the reason I am involved in sociology. I have to study these kinds of differences and similarities. It had a huge impact.”

Although the pedagogical and scholarly applications springing from the tour experience are varied, the tour clearly holds the promise of transforming its participants beyond a typical cross-cultural exchange. Participants regularly encourage supporting organizations such as NCA and JDA to continue the tour for the purpose of cross-cultural scholarly exchange. While the effect of this exchange cannot be directly measured, it yields “international connections at a disciplinary level that expand the scope and reach of what communication scholars can do” professionally, pedagogically, and academically (Palczewski 2007: 14).

5. Conclusion
Our investigation has demonstrated that intercultural argumentation scholarship must be complicated to account for the layers of culture and argument in any given exchange. Previous scholarship (Hazen 1986) emphasizes the differences between Japan and the West. Tour participants’ observations about international culture covered the similarities and differences with varied emphases. Even with these wide-ranging perspectives, because the two argument cultures share the same basic “rules of engagement,” participants were able to see the layers of culture present in the exchange. Wida compares claims made in intercultural communication scholarship about Japanese communication styles with his own observations about style on the tour: “[debate] stresses a type of communication and decision-making that [the Japanese are] not comfortable with -- although from the quality of debating we’ve seen here, they’re adapting to it quite well.”(Kane, Davidson, and Wida 1977: 10) Another insight from our investigation is the possibility that argumentation may hold for marginalized groups to express dissent. We have traced the theme of gender and found anecdotal stories suggest that female debaters in Japan saw the activity as liberating rather than oppressive. This challenges current feminist scholarship that views adversarial argument as problematic.

Furthermore, this research has implications for the future of the tour, because it allows for reflection on the relationship between the two debate communities and communication studies. Many narrators observed that the tour is at a crossroads because of the decline of the policy debate circuit and the rise of other forms of debate. In both countries, narrators expressed concerns about the sportification of debate, and suggest that debate needs to take an “educational turn” in order to be better situated within the societies. The tour provides a glimpse of the promise that public debate holds as a remedy for these problems. In Japan, more institutional backing and greater involvement of those other than ESS members are needed to make public debate events possible (Koresawa n.d., Matsumoto 2007, Morooka 2007, Tajima n.d., Yano 2007). In the US, there needs to be renewed dedication to public debate and cultural exchange through debate and discussion. The history of the Japan-US exchange is worth remembering because it helped to fuel the emergence of communication studies in Japan. Our suggestion is for the CIDD and JDA to have greater interactions in order to increase awareness and interest in the tour in both countries.

In the end, we return to our original question: what has been exchanged? The answer emerging from the analysis of tour materials and interviews is that there has been an exchange of the debate values, arguments, and scholarship as well as a nurturing of communication and cognate fields. This exchange
has occurred both between the debate communities and the nation-states. Additionally, a lot has been exchanged in the process of researching and writing this article. We suggest that research collaboration is a type of exchange that is often undervalued in the humanities. The value of collaborative research is being developed by the Schenley Park Debate Authors Working Group (DAWG), of which we are both members, and this study questions the role of self-reflexivity in the process of co-authorship. One of us is a participant of the tour who is involved in the argumentation and debate communities in the US, and the other is involved in the argumentation and debate communities in both Japan and North America. These backgrounds enabled us to envision this project, carry out the necessary research, and check against cultural biases; however, some bias is inherent in the process of interviewing our own colleagues and mentors. These are considerations that call for further exchange among scholars interested in argumentation, feminist scholarship, co-authorship, and historical approaches.

Endnotes

*1 These reports have been published in Spectra, Speaker and Gavel, Forensics Journal, as well as on the websites of the Japan Debate Association (JDA) and the CIDD. An attempt has been made to historicize the tour in a symposium at the first Tokyo Conference on Argumentation.


*3 Palczewski, Sprain, and Woods consider themselves feminists, and Woods interviewed interviewed Palczewski, which some people argue for bias from a feminist perspective. Although it could be the case, it must nonetheless be noted that detailed observation about gender issues does not come from male participants regardless of masculinity or femininity.

*4 Sprain (2005) also remarks on women being used to promote products in Japan with her blog entry “Love Body Beauty Queen.”

*5 Others have also made use of the idea of “argument cultures” or “cultures of argument”. For example, Tannen (1998) uses the term “argument culture” to refer to the tendency for Americans to use aggressive tactics and make every issue a two-sided debate. Matsumoto (2000) uses the term giron bunka (a culture of argument) to refer to social practices that value exchange of arguments.

*6 Since this observation was made by Ziegelmueller, there have been some developments in the area of Japanese language argumentation texts designed to teach argument and debate basics (Matsumoto 1996, 2001, Ando & Tadokoro 2002, Konishi, Kanke & Collins 2007).

*7 While most participants and organizers think that the connection to disciplines is beneficial, Janas (n.d.: 7) praises Japanese debate for its grassroots support and suggests that it is not as top down as US debate.

*8 Howell (2007: 3-4, 17) ascribes these changes to US debaters and Japanese exchange students who debated in the US. Matsumoto (2007: 11) ascribes them to the same Japanese exchange students and active people in National Association of Forensics and Argumentation (NAFA).

*9 Ziegelmueller (1992: 7-8) also observes that, “virtually all of those present at the meeting [of the CAJ] had first been introduced to the communication discipline through debate or other speech activities”. This parallels the history of speech communication’s trajectory in the early 20th century United States. A glance at the discipline’s flagship journal, at that time called the Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking and the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, reveals that many prominent contributors to the field emerged from the competitive debate tradition (Keith, 2007: 59-87).
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