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ARTHUR MILLER

*T H E M A N B E H I N D T H E PLAY*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| arthur_miller_1449455c.jpg | Arthur Asher Miller, the son of a women's clothing company owner, was born in 1915 in New York City. His father lost his business in the Depression and the family was forced to move to a smaller home in Brooklyn. After graduating from high school, Miller worked jobs ranging from radio singer to truck driver to clerk in an automobile-parts warehouse.  |
| Miller began writing plays as a student at the University of Michigan, joining the Federal Theater Project in New York City after he received his degree.His first Broadway play, *The Man Who Had All the Luck*, opened in 1944 and his next play, *All My Sons*, received the Drama Critics' Circle Award. His 1949 *Death of a Salesman* won the Pulitzer Prize. In 1956 and 1957, Miller was subpoenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee and was convicted of contempt of Congress for his refusal to identify writers believed to hold Communist sympathies. The following year, the United States Court of Appeals overturned the conviction. In 1959 the National Institute of Arts and Letters awarded him the Gold Medal for Drama. Miller has been married three times: to Mary Grace Slattery in 1940, Marilyn Monroe in 1956, and photographer Inge Morath in 1962, with whom he lives in Connecticut. He and Inge have a daughter, Rebecca. Among his works are *A View from the Bridge*, *The Misfits*, *After the Fall*, *Incident at Vichy*, *The Price*, *The American Clock*, *Broken Glass*, *Mr. Peters' Connections*, and *Timebends*, his autobiography. Miller's writing has earned him a lifetime of honors, including the Pulitzer Prize, seven Tony Awards, two Drama Critics Circle Awards, an Obie, an Olivier, the John F. Kennedy Lifetime Achievement Award, and the Dorothy and Lillian Gish prize. He holds honorary doctorate degrees from Oxford University and Harvard University. Throughout his life and work, Miller has remained socially engaged and has written with conscience, clarity, and compassion. As Chris Keller says to his mother in *All My Sons*, "Once and for all you must know that there's a universe of people outside, and you're responsible to it." Miller's work is infused with his sense of responsibility to humanity and to his audience. "The playwright is nothing without his audience," he writes. "He is one of the audience who happens to know how to speak." --*Rachel Galvin* (www.neh.gov/whoweare/miller/biography.html) |

I n t r o d u c i n g T h e P l a y

*T h e C r u c i b l e*

**Task**:

Read and annotate Arthur Milller’s article: “Why I Wrote The Crucible: An Artist's Answer to Politics,” from T*he New Yorker* (October 21, 1996 ). The questions that follow the article will help you understand key concepts in the play, which you can utilize when discussing and writing about the text.

“Why I Wrote The Crucible: An Artist's Answer to Politics” By Arthur Miller

As I watched *The Crucible* taking shape as a movie over much of the past year, the sheer depth of time that it represents for me kept returning to mind. As those powerful actors blossomed on the screen, and the children and the horses, the crowds and the wagons, I thought again about how I came to cook all this up nearly fifty years ago, in an America almost nobody I know seems to remember clearly. In a way, there is a biting irony in this film's having been made by a Hollywood studio, something unimaginable in the fifties. But there they are -- Daniel Day-Lewis (John Proctor) scything his sea-bordered field, Joan Allen (Elizabeth) lying pregnant in the frigid jail, Winona Ryder (Abigail) stealing her minister-uncle's money, majestic Paul Scofield (Judge Danforth) and his righteous empathy with the Devil-possessed children, and all of them looking as inevitable as rain.

I remember those years -- they formed *The Crucible*'s skeleton -- but I have lost the dead weight of the fear I had then. Fear doesn't travel well; just as it can warp judgment, its absence can diminish memory's truth. What terrifies one generation is likely to bring only a puzzled smile to the next. I remember how in 1964, only twenty years after the war, Harold Clurman, the director of *Incident at Vichy*, showed the cast a film of a Hitler speech, hoping to give them a sense of the Nazi period in which my play took place. They watched as Hitler, facing a vast stadium full of adoring people, went up on his toes in ecstasy, hands clasped under his chin, a sublimely self-gratified grin on his face, his body swivelling rather cutely, and they giggled at his overacting.

Likewise, films of Senator Joseph McCarthy are rather unsettling -- if you remember the fear he once spread. Buzzing his truculent sidewalk brawler's snarl through the hairs in his nose, squinting through his cat's eyes and sneering like a villain, he comes across now as nearly comical, a self-aware performer keeping a straight face as he does his juicy threat-shtick.

McCarthy's power to stir fears of creeping Communism was not entirely based on illusion, of course; the paranoid, real or pretended, always secretes its pearl around a grain of fact. From being our wartime ally, the Soviet Union rapidly became a expanding empire. In 1949, Mao Zedong took power in China. Western Europe also seemed ready to become Red -- especially Italy, where the Communist Party was the largest outside Russia, and was growing. Capitalism, in the opinion of many, myself included, had nothing more to say, its final poisoned bloom having been Italian and German Fascism. McCarthy -- brash and ill-mannered but to many authentic and true -- boiled it all down to what anyone could understand: we had "lost China" and would soon lose Europe as well, because the State Department -- staffed, of course, under Democratic Presidents -- was full of treasonous pro-Soviet intellectuals. It was as simple as that.

If our losing China seemed the equivalent of a flea's losing an elephant, it was still a phrase -- and a conviction -- that one did not dare to question; to do so was to risk drawing suspicion on oneself. Indeed, the State Department proceeded to hound and fire the officers who knew China, its language, and its opaque culture -- a move that suggested the practitioners of sympathetic magic who wring the neck of a doll in order to make a distant enemy's head drop off. There was magic all around; the politics of alien conspiracy soon dominated political discourse and bid fair to wipe out any other issue. How could one deal with such enormities in a play?

*The Crucible* was an act of desperation. Much of my desperation branched out, I suppose, from a typical Depression -- era trauma -- the blow struck on the mind by the rise of European Fascism and the brutal anti-Semitism it had brought to power. But by 1950, when I began to think of writing about the hunt for Reds in America, I was motivated in some great part by the paralysis that had set in among many liberals who, despite their discomfort with the inquisitors' violations of civil rights, were fearful, and with good reason, of being identified as covert Communists if they should protest too strongly.

In any play, however trivial, there has to be a still point of moral reference against which to gauge the action. In our lives, in the late nineteen-forties and early nineteen-fifties, no such point existed anymore. The left could not look straight at the Soviet Union's abrogations of human rights. The anti-Communist liberals could not acknowledge the violations of those rights by congressional committees. The far right, meanwhile, was licking up all the cream. The days of "J'accuse" were gone, for anyone needs to feel right to declare someone else wrong. Gradually, all the old political and moral reality had melted like a Dali watch. Nobody but a fanatic, it seemed, could really say all that he believed.

President Truman was among the first to have to deal with the dilemma, and his way of resolving itself having to trim his sails before the howling gale on the right-turned out to be momentous. At first, he was outraged at the allegation of widespread Communist infiltration of the government and called the charge of "coddling Communists" a red herring dragged in by the Republicans to bring down the Democrats. But such was the gathering power of raw belief in the great Soviet plot that Truman soon felt it necessary to institute loyalty boards of his own.

The Red hunt, led by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by McCarthy, was becoming the dominating fixation of the American psyche. It reached Hollywood when the studios, after first resisting, agreed to submit artists' names to the House Committee for "clearing" before employing them. This unleashed a veritable holy terror among actors, directors, and others, from Party members to those who had had the merest brush with a front organization.

The Soviet plot was the hub of a great wheel of causation; the plot justified the crushing of all nuance, all the shadings that a realistic judgment of reality requires. Even worse was the feeling that our sensitivity to this onslaught on our liberties was passing from us -- indeed, from me. In *Timebends*, my autobiography, I recalled the time I'd written a screenplay (*The Hook*) about union corruption on the Brooklyn waterfront. Harry Cohn, the head of Columbia Pictures, did something that would once have been considered unthinkable: he showed my script to the F.B.I. Cohn then asked me to take the gangsters in my script, who were threatening and murdering their opponents, and simply change them to Communists. When I declined to commit this idiocy (Joe Ryan, the head of the longshoremen's union, was soon to go to Sing Sing for racketeering), I got a wire from Cohn saying, "The minute we try to make the script pro-American you pull out." By then -- it was 1951 -- I had come to accept this terribly serious insanity as routine, but there was an element of the marvelous in it which I longed to put on the stage.

In those years, our thought processes were becoming so magical, so paranoid, that to imagine writing a play about this environment was like trying to pick one's teeth with a ball of wool: I lacked the tools to illuminate miasma. Yet I kept being drawn back to it.

I had read about the witchcraft trials in college, but it was not until I read a book published in 1867 -- a two-volume, thousand-page study by Charles W. Upham, who was then the mayor of Salem -- that I knew I had to write about the period. Upham had not only written a broad and thorough investigation of what was even then an almost lost chapter of Salem's past but opened up to me the details of personal relationships among many participants in the tragedy.

I visited Salem for the first time on a dismal spring day in 1952; it was a sidetracked town then, with abandoned factories and vacant stores. In the gloomy courthouse there I read the transcripts of the witchcraft trials of 1692, as taken down in a primitive shorthand by ministers who were spelling each other. But there was one entry in Upham in which the thousands of pieces I had come across were jogged into place. It was from a report written by the Reverend Samuel Parris, who was one of the chief instigators of the witch-hunt. "During the examination of Elizabeth Procter, Abigail Williams and Ann Putnam" -- the two were "afflicted" teen-age accusers, and Abigail was Parris's niece -- "both made offer to strike at said Procter; but when Abigail's hand came near, it opened, whereas it was made up, into a fist before, and came down exceeding lightly as it drew near to said Procter, and at length, with open and extended fingers, touched Procter's hood very lightly. Immediately Abigail cried out her fingers, her fingers, her fingers burned... "

In this remarkably observed gesture of a troubled young girl, I believed, a play became possible. Elizabeth Proctor had been the orphaned Abigail's mistress, and they had lived together in the same small house until Elizabeth fired the girl. By this time, I was sure, John Proctor had bedded Abigail, who had to be dismissed most likely to appease Elizabeth. There was bad blood between the two women now. That Abigail started, in effect, to condemn Elizabeth to death with her touch, then stopped her hand, then went through with it, was quite suddenly the human center of all this turmoil.

All this I understood. I had not approached the witchcraft out of nowhere or from purely social and political considerations. My own marriage of twelve years was teetering and I knew more than I wished to know about where the blame lay. That John Proctor the sinner might overturn his paralyzing personal guilt and become the most forthright voice against the madness around him was a reassurance to me, and, I suppose, an inspiration: it demonstrated that a clear moral outcry could still spring even from an ambiguously unblemished soul. Moving crabwise across the profusion of evidence, I sensed that I had at last found something of myself in it, and a play began to accumulate around this man.

But as the dramatic form became visible, one problem remained unyielding: so many practices of the Salem trials were similar to those employed by the congressional committees that I could easily be accused of skewing history for a mere partisan purpose. Inevitably, it was no sooner known that my new play was about Salem than I had to confront the charge that such an analogy was specious -- that there never were any witches but there certainly are Communists. In the seventeenth century, however, the existence of witches was never questioned by the loftiest minds in Europe and America; and even lawyers of the highest eminence, like Sir Edward Coke, a veritable hero of liberty for defending the common law against the king's arbitrary power, believed that witches had to be prosecuted mercilessly. Of course, there were no Communists in 1692, but it was literally worth your life to deny witches or their powers, given the exhortation in the Bible, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." There had to be witches in the world or the Bible lied. Indeed, the very structure of evil depended on Lucifer's plotting against God. (And the irony is that klatches of Luciferians exist all over the country today, there may even be more of them now than there are Communists.)

As with most humans, panic sleeps in one unlighted corner of my soul. When I walked at night along the empty, wet streets of Salem in the week that I spent there, I could easily work myself into imagining my terror before a gaggle of young girls flying down the road screaming that somebody's "familiar spirit" was chasing them. This anxiety-laden leap backward over nearly three centuries may have been helped along by a particular Upham footnote. At a certain point, the high court of the province made the fatal decision to admit, for the first time, the use of "spectral evidence" as proof of guilt. Spectral evidence, so aptly named, meant that if I swore that you had sent out your "familiar spirit" to choke, tickle, poison me or my cattle, or to control thoughts and actions, I could get you hanged unless you confessed to having had contact with the Devil. After all, only the Devil could lend such powers of visible transport to confederates, in his everlasting plot to bring down Christianity.

Naturally, the best proof of the sincerity of your confession was your naming others whom you had seen in the Devil company -- an invitation to private vengeance, but made official by the seal of the theocratic state. It was as though the court had grown tired of thinking and had invited in the instincts: spectral evidence -- that poisoned cloud of paranoid fantasy -- made a kind of lunatic sense to them, as it did in plot-ridden 1952, when so often the question was not the acts of an accused but the thoughts and intentions in his alienated mind.

The breathtaking circularity of the process had a kind of poetic tightness. Not everybody was accused, after all, so there must be some reason why you were. By denying that there is any reason whatsoever for you to be accused, you are implying, by virtue of a surprisingly small logical leap, that mere chance picked you out, which in turn implies that the Devil might not really be at work in the village or, God forbid, even exist. Therefore, the investigation itself is either mistaken or a fraud. You would have to be a crypto-Luciferian to say that -- not a great idea if l you wanted to go back to your farm.

The more I read into the Salem panic, the more it touched off corresponding ages of common experiences in the fifties: the old friend of a blacklisted person crossing the street to avoid being seen talking to him; the overnight conversions of former leftists into born-again patriots; and so on. Apparently, certain processes are universal. When Gentiles in Hitler's Germany, for example, saw their Jewish neighbors being trucked off, or rs in Soviet Ukraine saw the Kulaks sing before their eyes, the common reaction, even among those unsympathetic to Nazism or Communism, was quite naturally to turn away in fear of being identified with the condemned. As I learned from non-Jewish refugees, however there was often a despairing pity mixed with "Well, they must have done something." Few of us can easily surrender our belief that society must somehow make sense. The thought that the state has lost its mind and is punishing so many innocent people is intolerable. And so the evidence has to be internally denied.

I was also drawn into writing *The Crucible* by the chance it gave me to use a new language -- that of seventeenth-century New England. That plain, craggy English was liberating in a strangely sensuous way, with its swings from an almost legalistic precision to a wonderful metaphoric richness. "The Lord doth terrible things amongst us, by lengthening the chain of the roaring lion in an extraordinary manner, so that the Devil is come down in great wrath," Deodat Lawson, one of the great witch-hunting preachers, said in a sermon. Lawson rallied his congregation for what was to be nothing less than a religious war against the Evil One -- "Arm, arm, arm!" -- and his concealed anti-Christian accomplices.

But it was not yet my language, and among other strategies to make it mine I enlisted the help of a former University of Michigan classmate, the Greek-American scholar and poet Kimon Friar. (He later translated Kazantzakis.) The problem was not to imitate the archaic speech but to try to create a new echo of it which would flow freely off American actors' tongues. As in the film, nearly fifty years later, the actors in the first production grabbed the language and ran with it as happily as if it were their customary speech.

*The Crucible* took me about a year to write. With its five sets and a cast of twenty-one, it never occurred to me that it would take a brave man to produce it on Broadway, especially given the prevailing climate, but Kermit Bloomgarden never faltered. Well before the play opened, a strange tension had begun to build. Only two years earlier, the *Death of a Salesman* touring company had played to a thin crowd in Peoria, Illinois, having been boycotted nearly to death by the American Legion and the Jaycees. Before that, the Catholic War Veterans had prevailed upon the Army not to allow its theatrical groups to perform, first, *All My Sons*, and then any play of mine, in occupied Europe. The Dramatists Guild refused to protest attacks on a new play by Sean O'Casey, a self-declared Communist, which forced its producer to cancel his option. I knew of two suicides by actors depressed by upcoming investigation, and every day seemed to bring news of people exiling themselves to Europe: Charlie Chaplin, the director Joseph Losey, Jules Dassin, the harmonica virtuoso Larry Adler, Donald Ogden Stewart, one of the most sought-after screenwriters in Hollywood, and Sam Wanamaker, who would lead the successful campaign to rebuild the Old Globe Theatre on the Thames.

On opening night, January 22, 1953, I knew that the atmosphere would be pretty hostile. The coldness of the crowd was not a surprise; Broadway audiences were not famous for loving history lessons, which is what they made of the play. It seems to me entirely appropriate that on the day the play opened, a newspaper headline read "ALL 13 REDS GUILTY" -- a story about American Communists who faced prison for "conspiring to teach and advocate the duty and necessity of forcible overthrow of government." Meanwhile, the remoteness of the production was guaranteed by the director, Jed Harris, who insisted that this was a classic requiring the actors to face front, never each other. The critics were not swept away. "Arthur Miller is a problem playwright in both senses of the word," wrote Walter Kerr of the *Herald Tribune*, who called the play "a step backward into mechanical parable." The *Times* was not much kinder, saying, "There is too much excitement and not enough emotion in *The Crucible*." But the play's future would turn out quite differently.

About a year later, a new production, one with younger, less accomplished actors, working in the Martinique Hotel ballroom, played with the fervor that the script and the times required, and *The Crucible* became a hit. The play stumbled into history, and today, I am told, it is one of the most heavily demanded trade-fiction paperbacks in this country; the Bantam and Penguin editions have sold more than six million copies. I don't think there has been a week in the past forty-odd years when it hasn't been on a stage somewhere in the world. Nor is the new screen version the first. Jean-Paul Sartre, in his Marxist phase, wrote a French film adaptation that blamed the tragedy on the rich landowners conspiring to persecute the poor. (In truth, most of those who were hanged in Salem were people of substance, and two or three were very large landowners.)

It is only a slight exaggeration to say that, especially in Latin America, *The Crucible* starts getting produced wherever a political coup appears imminent, or a dictatorial regime has just been over-thrown. From Argentina to Chile to Greece, Czechoslovakia, China, and a dozen other places, the play seems to present the same primeval structure of human sacrifice to the furies of fanaticism and paranoia that goes on repeating itself forever as though imbedded in the brain of social man.

I am not sure what *The Crucible* is telling people now, but I know that its paranoid center is still pumping out the same darkly attractive warning that it did in the fifties. For some, the play seems to be about the dilemma of relying on the testimony of small children accusing adults of sexual abuse, something I'd not have dreamed of forty years ago. For others, it may simply be a fascination with the outbreak of paranoia that suffuses the play -- the blind panic that, in our age, often seems to sit at the dim edges of consciousness. Certainly its political implications are the central issue for many people; the Salem interrogations turn out to be eerily exact models of those yet to come in Stalin's Russia, Pinochet's Chile, Mao's China, and other regimes. (Nien Cheng, the author of "Life and Death in Shang- hai," has told me that she could hardly believe that a non-Chinese -- someone who had not experienced the Cultural Revolution -- had written the play.) But below its concerns with justice the play evokes a lethal brew of illicit sexuality, fear of the supernatural, and political manipulation, a combination not unfamiliar these days. The film, by reaching the broad American audience as no play ever can, may well unearth still other connections to those buried public terrors that Salem first announced on this continent.

One thing more— something wonderful in the old sense of that word. I recall the weeks I spent reading testimony by the tome, commentaries, broadsides, confessions, and accusations. And always the crucial damning event was the signing of one's name in "the Devil's book." This Faustian agreement to hand over one's soul to the dreaded Lord of Darkness was the ultimate insult to God. But what were these new inductees supposed to have done once they'd signed on? Nobody seems even to have thought to ask. But, of course, actions are as irrelevant during cultural and religious wars as they are in nightmares. The thing at issue is buried intentions -- the secret allegiances of the alienated hearts always the main threat to the theocratic mind, as well as its immemorial quarry.

C h e c k F o r U n d e r s t a n d i n g

 *I N T RO D U C T O RY S E L E C T I O N S*

**Task**:

Answer the following questions regarding the article to further your understanding of some of the key concepts in the play.

1. In what year was the play written?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What political ideology were many American’s, including Senator Joseph McCarthy, vehemently opposed to?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What book inspired Arthur Miller to write about the Salem witch trials?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Which character in the play did Miller most associate with?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Define the word allegory and explain how *The Crucible* is allegorical.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What was the newspaper headline from the play’s opening night and why did it worry Miller?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Miller states in the last paragraph that, “the thing at issue is buried intentions -- the secret allegiances of the alienated hearts.” In a PEE/PQC paragraph, related this comment to another text we have studied this year.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

S o c i o – H i s t o r i c a l Con t e x t

 *Exploring the Social and Political Climate*

**Task**:

This webquest will help set some of the historical background in which *The Crucible* was written, and also the context of the time in which it was set. For this activity, you will be placed into groups and assigned a specific task. Use the outline below to help guide your research. **Record your information in a graphic organizer that can be easily reproduced for your classmates and be prepared to share / defend your work.**

**Group 1**: McCarthyism

 In the aftermath of World War II, Americans reacted with dismay as relations between the United States and the Soviet Union deteriorated, the Russians imposed communist control over much of Eastern Europe, and China was on the verge of going communist. In America and other western countries, people worried that communists might try to subvert schools, labor unions, and other institutions. Government agencies and private groups began to look for evidence of subversive activity. In this climate of fear and suspicion, the House Committee on Un-American Activities became active.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **In a graphic organizer, show Arthur Miller’s connection to McCarthyism and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.**
* **Be sure to include any information that you find relevant to our discussion of the play.**
 | Image of Herblock's "We now have new and important evidence" |

**Group 2**:Puritanism

 The writings and ideas of John Calvin, one of the religious leaders during Reformation, helped give rise to Protestantism and were pivotal to the revolt against the Church of England. Protestants contended that The Church of England had become a product of political struggles and man-made doctrines. The Puritans were one branch of Protestant dissenters who decided that the Church of England was beyond reform. Escaping persecution from church leadership and the King, they came to America.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **In a graphic organizer, demonstrate the connections of John Calvin and the Puritan movement to the setting in which the play takes place.**
* **Be sure to include any information that you find relevant to our discussion of the play.**
 | Image of Herblock's "We now have new and important evidence" |

**Group 3**: Ergotism

 Numerous hypotheses have been devised to explain the occurrence of the Salem witchcraft trials in 1692, yet a sense of bewilderment and doubt pervades most of the historical perspectives on the subject.  The physical afflictions of the accusing girls and the imagery of the testimony, therefore, is dismissed as imaginary in foundation.  One avenue of understanding that has yet to be sufficiently explored is that a physiological condition, unrecognized at the time, may have been a factor in the Salem incident.  Assuming that the content of the court records is basically an honest account of the deponents' experiences, the evidence suggests that convulsive ergotism, a disorder resulting from the ingestion of grain contaminated with ergot, may have initiated the witchcraft delusion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **In a graphic organizer, explain what ergotism is and the theory behind its connection to witch trials around the world.**
* **Be sure to include any information that you find relevant to our discussion of the play.**
 | Image of Herblock's "We now have new and important evidence" |

**Group 4**: Gendercide

 For three centuries of early modern European history, diverse societies were consumed by a panic over alleged witches in their midst. Witch-hunts, especially in Central Europe, resulted in the trial, torture, and execution of tens of thousands of victims, about three-quarters of whom were women. Arguably, neither before nor since have adult European women been selectively targeted for such largescale atrocities (Gendercide.org).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **In a graphic organizer, examine the phenomenon of witch hunts from a feminist perspective.**
* **Be sure to include any information that you find relevant to our discussion of the play.**
 | Image of Herblock's "We now have new and important evidence" |

**Group 5**: Existentialism

Jean Paul Sartre is one of the most renowned existentialists. He believes that “existence precedes essence.” In other words: actions determine who a person is more than his/her thoughts. In commenting on *The Crucible,* Sartre states that "We define man only in relation to his commitments."

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **In a graphic organizer, illustrate the philosophy of Existentialism and how Jean Paul Sartre is connected to *The Crucible*.**
* **Be sure to include any information that you find relevant to our discussion of the play.**
 | Image of Herblock's "We now have new and important evidence" |

**Note**: What is a Graphic Organizer?

Graphic organizers, also called concept maps, entity relationship charts, and mind maps, are a pictorial way of organizing information.

Below are a few examples of shapes that a graphic organizer could be:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSeuk8HUXDL-vO7F3CBhnH_cEzc2_kUcRf6UFNCRsWogXkVMvzRGsD6nQ | http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSwBSE1JeMndR8BLbFskRKKIyyFI-5M9SnBtrvWTgKUmJdAZ-3xBTsXL50 | http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQLj7xrjGykA1Cs2Fl6uZ2L4dvQG2STDObObJQeb-uHrk6SXGi8oBpuxg |
| http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQEhgUphbHBHbegBQ_ufwoBhbtBt4baFqjYiaiYDfMicGSQTz82lUPQvj8 | http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQQyYIk-NuESqreVh4uQ-lYCzoNYLCwkC_j9Phrxy7w5hboR-wamic6qyc | http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcRj0IXEZU5iQJg9yJGEeKOBfYiWUo_jpWTPQJFKkaMXzaYFtoRL9MRfhi4 |
| http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTvvl7He-I9eT0kXzbM1jy85YZC1bBkgnKUtaFucpiZ2KoqVd5vMZ4hsA4 | http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQlN1eunMLSGzQKYGGuga78syKVzZuuGt_yCsON9cqKqjoeHP9C5Ccg37sn | http://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcQJUGGFerL0dvOFBfw6elLSgBrfevxlXMvd3yNGAKaema0Vs8IlTP1p6ey3 |

The Crucible

by Arthur Miller

 *The Cast of Characters*



R e a d i n g S c h e d u l e

 *Using Conventions of Oral Language Effectively*

**Task**:

Throughout our reading of the play, everyone is required to read a part. This reading will be used as a formal assessment. Before beginning the play, a reading schedule will be made (and posted in the classroom) to ensure equitable distribution of the parts. Be sure to record when you are scheduled to read a part and what part you are reading so you can preview it, practice it, and if you are feeling daring, memorize it!

Part: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Have I read the selection?
* Have I practiced it aloud?
* Have I looked up the pronunciation of words I am unfamiliar with?
* Have I reviewed the rubric on the following page prior to my reading?
* Have I memorized my part?

Assessment Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VALUE | PREPARED-NESS | CLARITY/VOLUME | EYE CONTACT /POSTURE | VARY TONE/ EXPRESSION |
| Excellent | Student has memorized the part. | Volume is used for effect and all words are articulated perfectly. | The student use eye contact to effectively engage the audience and his/her posture enhances the characterization of the part. | Tone and expression are used to engage the audience and bring insight to the character’s lines. |
| Proficient | Student is completely prepared and has obviously rehearsed. | Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words. Volume is loud enough to be heard by all audience members throughout the presentation. | Stands up straight, looks relaxed and confident. Establishes eye contact with everyone in the room during the presentation. | Tone and expression are appropriate to the lines being read. |
| Satisfactory | The student is somewhat prepared, but it is clear that rehearsal was lacking. | Speaks clearly and distinctly most ( 94-85%) of the time. Mispronounces no more than three words. Volume is loud enough to be heard by all audience members at least 60% of the time. | Sometimes stands up straight and establishes eye some contact. | Tone and expression may be lacking at times, but not to the extent that the audience is distracted. |
| Limited | Student does not seem to have rehearsed or prepared | Often mumbles or cannot be understood OR mispronounces more than five words. Volume often too soft to be heard by all audience members. | Slouches and/or does not look at people during the presentation. | There is no variation in tone or expression, or the tone and expression are inappropriate for the part. |
| TOTAL | X2 = /8 | /4 | /4 | 4/ |

|  |
| --- |
| P o e t r y a n a l y s i s**Task**:We will read the poem in class and in groups of two or three, you will answer the analysis questions on the attached sheet.*Making connections to other texts* |
| “**HALF-HANGED MARY**”("Half-hanged Mary" was Mary Webster, who was accused of witchcraft in the 1680's in a Puritan town in Massachusetts and hanged from a tree - where, according to one of the several surviving accounts, she was left all night. It is known that when she was cut down she was still alive, since she lived for another fourteen years.)  |

2. Define "trussed".

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *7pm*1. What types of people were vulnerable to these kinds of charges during this period?Rumour was loose in the airhunting for some neck to land on.I was milking the cow,the barn door open to the sunset.I didn't feel the aimed word hitand go in like a soft bullet.I didn't feel the smashed fleshclosing over it like waterover a thrown stone.I was hanged for living alonefor having blue eyes and a sunburned skin,tattered skirts, few buttons,a weedy farm in my own name,and a surefire cure for warts;Oh yes, and breasts,and a sweet pear hidden in my body.Whenever there's talk of demonsthese come in handy. | *8pm*The rope was an improvisation.With time they'd have thought of axes. Up I go like a windfall in reverse, a blackened apple stuck back onto the tree.Trussed hands, rag in my mouth,a flag raised to salute the moon,old bone-faced goddess, old original,who once took blood in return for food.The men of the town stalk homeward,excited by their show of hate,their own evil turned inside out like a glove,and me wearing it.3. How is she similar to a flag being raised? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *9pm*4. Who are "the bonnets"? Why are they afraid?The bonnets come to stare,the dark skirts also,the upturned faces in between,mouths closed so tight they're lipless.I can see down into their eyeholesand nostrils. I can see their fear. You were my friend, you too.I cured your baby, Mrs.,5. What favors had she done for these women?and flushed yours out of you,Non-wife, to save your life.Help me down? You don't dare.I might rub off on you,like soot or gossip. Birdsof a feather burn together,though as a rule ravens are singular.6. What could happen if they try to help her? What would "rub off"?In a gathering like this onethe safe place is the background,pretending you can't dance,the safe stance pointing a finger.I understand. You can't spare8. How is Death like a crow? A judge? A dark angel?9. What is she trying to convince herself to do?anything, a hand, a piece of bread, a shawlagainst the cold,a good word. Lordknows there isn't muchto go around. You need it all.*10pm*Well God, now that I'm up herewith maybe some time to kill7. What are her feelings toward God right now? How do you know?away from the dailyfingerwork, legwork, workat the hen level,we can continue our quarrel,the one about free will.Is it my choice that I'm danglinglike a turkey's wattles from thismore than indifferent tree?If Nature is Your alphabet,what letter is this rope?Does my twisting body spell out Grace?*I hurt, therefore I am.*Faith, Charity, and Hopeare three dead angelsfalling like meteors orburning owls acrossthe profound blank sky of Your face. | *12 midnight*9. What is she trying to convince herself to do?8. How is Death like a crow? A judge? A dark angel?My throat is taut against the ropechoking off words and air; I'm reduced to knotted muscle.Blood bulges in my skull,my clenched teeth hold it in;I bite down on despairDeath sits on my shoulder like a crowwaiting for my squeezed beetof a heart to burstso he can eat my eyesor like a judgemuttering about sluts and punishmentand licking his lipsor like a dark angelinsidious in his glossy featherswhispering to me to be easyon myself. To breathe out finally.*Trust me*, he says, caressingme. *Why suffer?*A temptation, to sink downinto these definitions.To become a martyr in reverse,or food, or trash.To give up my own words for myself,my own refusals.To give up knowing.To give up pain.To let go. |
| *2am*Out of my mouth is coming, at somedistance from me, a thin gnawing soundwhich you could confuse with prayer except thatpraying is not constrained.Or is it, Lord?Maybe it's more like being strangledthan I once thought. Maybe it'sa gasp for air, prayer.Did those men at Pentecostwant flames to shoot out of their heads?Did they ask to be tossedon the ground, gabbling like holy poultry,eyeballs bulging?10. What two different kinds of prayers is she talking about? What is HER prayer?As mine are, as mine are.There is only one prayer; it is notthe knees in the clean nightgown |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| on the hooked rug13. How long has she been hanging?*I want this, I want that.*Oh far beyond.Call it *Please*. Call it *Mercy*.Call it *Not yet, not yet,*as Heaven threatens to explodeinwards in fire and shredded flesh, and the angels caw.*3am*Wind seethes in the leaves aroundme the tree exude nightbirds night birds yell insidemy ears like stabbed hearts my heartstutters in my fluttering clothbody I dangle with strengthgoing out of me the wind seethes11. Why is the wording so deliberately awkward here? What is the poet trying to show us?in my body tatteringthe words I clenchmy fists hold Notalisman or silver disc my lungsflail as if drowning I callon you as witness I didno crime I was born I have borne Ibear I will be born this is a crime I will not12. What does she see as her only crime? What is the significance of the repetition of the word "born/borne"?acknowledge leaves and windhold onto meI will not give inbear I will be born this is a crime I will notacknowledge leaves and windhold onto meI will not give in*6am*Sun comes up, huge and blaring,no longer a simile for God.Wrong address. I've been out there.14. Why is the sun no longer a simile for God?Time is relative, let me tell youI have lived a millennium.I would like to say my hair turned whiteovernight, but it didn't.Instead it was my heart:bleached out like meat in water.Also, I'm about three inches taller.This is what happens when you drift in spacelistening to the gospelof the red-hot stars.Pinpoints of infinity riddle my brain,a revelation of deafness. | At the end of my ropeI testify to silence.Don't say I'm not grateful.Most will have only one death.I will have two.*8am*When they came to harvest my corpse(open your mouth, close your eyes)cut my body from the rope,surprise, surprise:15. How might the townsfolk have felt when they found her still alive?I was still alive.Tough luck, folks,I know the law:you can't execute me twicefor the same thing. How nice.I fell to the clover, breathed it in,and bared my teeth at themin a filthy grin.You can imagine how that went over.Now I only need to lookout at them through my sky-blue eyes.They see their own ill willstaring them in the foreheadand turn tail16. Why does she say this?Before, I was not a witch.But now I am one.*Later*My body of skin waxes and wanesaround my true body,17. How do the townsfolk feel about her now? Why?a tender nimbus.I skitter over the paths and fieldsmumbling to myself like crazy,mouth full of juicy adjectivesand purple berries.The townsfolk dive headfirst into the bushesto get out of my way. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| My first death orbits my head,an ambiguous nimbus,medallion of my ordeal.No one crosses that circle.18. How have things changed since her hanging? How has she changed? What is her mental state?Having been hanged for somethingI never said,I can now say anything I can say.Holiness gleams on my dirty fingers,I eat flowers and dung,two forms of the same thing, I eat miceand give thanks, blasphemiesgleam and burst in my wakelike lovely bubbles.I speak in tongues,my audience is owls.My audience is God,because who the hell else could understand me?Who else has been dead twice?The words boil out of me,coil after coil of sinuous possibility.The cosmos unravels from my mouth,all fullness, all vacancy.MC900329240[1]~ Margaret Atwood |  |

Vocabulary and Study Questions

*Reading for Understanding*

**Task**:

As you read you will be required to complete the study questions and vocabulary. There will be an end of unit quiz; questions will be taken directly from this study guide.

Reading Assignment 1: Using Prior Knowledge and Contextual Clues

Below are the sentences in which the vocabulary words appear in the text. Read thesentence. Use any clues you can find in the sentence combined with your prior knowledge, and write what you think the underlined words mean in the space provided.

1. There is a faction that is sworn to drive me from my pulpit. Do you understand that?
2. Abominations are done in the forest—
3. But Betty collapses in her hands and lies inert on the bed.
4. He need not have been a partisan of any faction in the town, but there is evidence to suggest that he had a sharp and biting way with hypocrites.
5. Why, we are surely gone wild this year. What anarchy is this?
6. This is a beloved errand for him; on being called here to ascertain witchcraft he felt the pride of the specialist whose unique knowledge has at least been publicly called for.
7. And it is no accident that we should be so bemused.
8. How could it be the Devil? Why would he choose my house to strike? We have all manner of licentious people right here in the village!
9. You cannot evade me, Abigail. Did your cousin drink any of the brew in that kettle?

# Act I Study Guide Questions

1. "So now they and their church found it necessary to deny any other sect its freedom, lest their New Jerusalem be defiled and corrupted by wrong and deceitful ideas." What is the irony in that statement?

2. Explain how the witch-hunt years were a time of "general revenge."

3. Identify Tituba, Abigail, and Betty.

4. Why does Mrs. Putnam believe there are witches in Salem?

5. Why is Thomas Putnam bitter?

6. Parris says, "Oh, Abigail, what proper payment for my charity! Now I am undone!" What does that mean?

7. What is Mary's argument to Abby?

8. Describe Proctor’s character and personality.

9. What happened between Abigail and John Proctor prior to the opening of the play?

10. What was the "sign" that Betty was bewitched?

11. Identify Francis and Rebecca Nurse.

12. Explain the political relationship between the Putnam and Nurse families.

13. What is Rebecca's explanation of the girls' behavior?

14. "There are wheels within wheels in this village and fires within fires." What is meant by this phrase?.

15. What is Proctor's reason for his not regularly attending church?

16. What is Parris’ motivation?

17. Giles says, "Think on it now, it's a deep thing, and dark as a pit." To what is he referring literally and symbolically?

18. What do Putnam and Proctor argue about? What does this demonstrate about each character’s priorities?

19. Who is Rev. John Hale, and why does he come to Salem?

20. Hale says, "They [the books] must be [heavy]; they are weighted with authority." What is the significance of this remark?

21. To what did Tituba confess? Why?

22. What do the girls do at the end of Act One?

Reading Assignment 2: Using Prior Knowledge and Contextual Clues

Below are the sentences in which the vocabulary words appear in the text. Read the

sentence. Use any clues you can find in the sentence combined with your prior knowledge, and write what you think the underlined words mean in the space provided.

1. Proctor, holding back a full condemnation of her: It is a fault, it is a fault, Elizabeth--you're the mistress here, not Mary Warren.

2. Her strangeness throws him off, and her evident pallor and weakness.

3. Elizabeth, perplexed, looking at the doll: Why, thank you, it's a fair poppet.

4. Mary Warren, with an indignant edge: She tried to kill me many times, Goody Proctor!

5. Believe me, Mr. Nurse, if Rebecca Nurse be tainted, then nothing's left to stop the whole green world from burning.

6. Cheever, ineptly reaching toward Elizabeth . . .

7. I had my doubts, Proctor, I had my doubts, but here's calamity, *To Hale, showing the needle:* You see it, sir, it is a needle!

8. Proctor, *moving menacingly toward her:* You will tell the court how that poppet came here and who stuck the needle in.

9. Abby'll charge lechery on you, Mr. Proctor!

10. It is a providence, and no great change; we are only what we always were, but naked now.

Act II Study Guide Questions

1. Where does Elizabeth want John to go, and what does she want him to do there?

2. What is John's response to her prodding?

3. What gift did Mary give to Elizabeth?

4. What was the "evidence" against Sarah Good?

5. Why doesn't Proctor want Mary to go back to court?

6. Why does Elizabeth think Abigail wants to kill her?

7. Why did Hale come to Proctor's house?

8. What things are "suspicious" about Proctor and his family?

9. Hale asks Elizabeth if she believes in witches. What is her reply?

10. On what charge(s) was Rebecca Nurse arrested?

11. Explain the significance of the needle in the "poppet."

12. What will happen to Proctor if he tries to discredit Abby?

13. Why doesn't Mary want to testify about the doll?

Reading assignment 3: Below are the sentences in which the vocabulary words appear in the text. Read the sentence. Use any clues you can find in the sentence combined with your prior knowledge, and write what you think the underlined words mean in the space provided.

1. Giles Corey, sir, and a more contentious--

2. And how do you imagine to help her cause with such contemptuous riot? Now be gone.

3. Mary Warren, *hardly audible:* Aye.

4. But if he hide in anonymity I must know why. Now sir, the government and central church demand of you the name of him who reported Mr. Thomas Putnam a common murderer.

5. . . . I dare not take a life without there be a proof so immaculate no slightest qualm ofconscience may doubt it.

Act III Study Guide Questions

1. Why do Giles and Francis want to talk to Danforth?

2. What is Parris's argument against Proctor?

3. What does Mary tell Danforth?

4. When Danforth hears that Elizabeth is pregnant, what does he allow?

5. What paper did ninety-one people sign?

6. ". . . a person is either with this court or he must be counted against it, there be no road

between." Explain the importance of Danforth's statement.

7. What quote did Proctor use to help Mary remain brave?

8. Of what does Giles accuse Putnam?

9. What is Hale's problem as Proctor and his friends present evidence to Danforth?

10. Hawthorne thinks of a test for Mary. What is it? Can she do it? Why or why not?

11. Proctor calls Abigail a whore, and he confesses his lechery. Danforth tests Proctor's statement by calling for Elizabeth and asking her why Abigail was dismissed. What does Elizabeth say? Why?

12. What do the girls do to Mary? What is her response?

13. What happens to Proctor?

14. What does Hale do?

Reading Assignment 4: Below are the sentences in which the vocabulary words appear in the text. Read the sentence. Use any clues you can find in the sentence combined with your prior knowledge, and write what you think the underlined words mean in the space provided.

1. He charges contemplation of murder.
2. She glances at Abigail, who is staring down at her remorselessly.
3. Now hear me, and beguile yourselves no more.
4. . . . reprieve or pardon must cast doubt upon the guilt of them that died till now.
5. Is he yet adamant?
6. Giles is dead. *He looks at her incredulously.*
7. He would not answer aye or nay to his indictment; for if he denied the charge they's hang him surely, and auction out his property. So he stand mute, and died Christian under the law.
8. I have confessed myself! Is there no good penitence but it be public?

Act IV Study Guide Questions

1. What explanation does Cheever give for Parris' "mad look"?

2. What did Abigail do?

3. Parris says, "You cannot hang this sort. There is danger for me." What "sort" does he mean, and what is the danger to him?

4. Explain Danforth's reason that a pardon would not be just.

5. Why has Hale come back to Salem?

6. What does Hale want Elizabeth to do?

7. What happened to Giles?

8. Proctor says, "My honesty is broke, Elizabeth, I am no good man." Explain.

9. What "confession" did Elizabeth make to John?

10. What did Proctor do after he signed the confession? Why?

11. "I have given you my soul; leave me my name!" Explain.

12. "He have his goodness now. God forbid I take it from him!" What does Elizabeth mean?

C l a s s D e b a t e

 *Using Conventions of Oral Language Effectively*

**Task**:

Tomorrow you will be required to participate in a full class debate. Your team—either affirmative or negative—will plan each team member’s responsibilities. Thereby, you must thoroughly prepare your side of the argument in order to be prepared and not be a liability to your team.

A full-class debate certainly parallels the one or two person debate style you’re accustomed to in your Social Studies’ classes with a few differences considering the amount of people present. If you happen to be absent tomorrow (I strongly recommend you are not) you will have to do a small group/individual debate and present it to the class. Yes, that means a lot more preparation!

**The Rules of the Speakers**

* In a debating team, each speaker has specified roles that s/he must fulfill to play his/her part in the success of the team.
* They are laid out below in the order that the speakers will speak:

**1st Affirmative must:** (3 minutes)

- define the topic.

- present the affirmative's team line.

- present the most compelling evidence of the affirmative case.

**1st Negative must:** (3 minutes)

- accept or reject the definition. If you don't do this it is assumed that you accept the definition.

- present the negative team line / rebut the main point presented by the 1st affirmative

- present the most compelling evidence of the negative team's case.

**2nd Affirmative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the affirmative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 1st negative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the affirmative's case. (another member)

**2nd Negative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the negative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 2nd affirmative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the negative's case. (another member)

**3rd Affirmative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the affirmative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 2nd negative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the affirmative's case. (another member)

**3rd Negative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the negative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 3rd affirmative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the negative's case. (another member)

**4th Affirmative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the affirmative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 3rd negative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the affirmative's case. (another member)

**4th Negative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the negative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 4th affirmative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the negative's case. (another member)

**5th Affirmative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the affirmative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 4th negative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the affirmative's case. (another member)

**5th Negative (two members) must:** (4 minutes)

- reaffirm the negative’s team line.

- rebut the main point presented by the 5th affirmative. (one member)

- present another piece of evidence of the negative's case. (another member)

**Final Affirmative must:** (3 minutes)

- reaffirm the affirmative's team line.

- rebut all the remaining points of the negative's case.

- present a summary of the affirmative's case.

- round off the debate for the affirmative – summarize key points.

**Final Negative must:** (3 minutes)

- reaffirm the negative's team line.

- rebut all the remaining points of the affirmative's case.

- present a summary of the negative's case.

- round off the debate for the negative – summarize key points.

**\*Neither final speaker may introduce any new parts of his/her team's cases.**

**\*\*Depending on your group’s numbers, some members may have to assume multiple roles.**

**Preparation for the Whole Class Debate**

Your tasks for today:

* Assign speakers. Please mark this on a copy of the handout to be submitted to the teacher.
* Propose collectively all the points for both the affirmative and negative side – the best offence are a good defense! **This is a doozy of a brainstorming session.** Understandably, those that are providing rebuttals are operating in the dark so to speak. You don’t know what evidence the opposing team is going to zing at you so be prepared for anything! The five of you should work together and pinpoint what the opposite team’s main points will be and what you will say in response. It is imperative that each of you have detailed notes so that regardless of what evidence they pose, you have something to rebut with.
* Assign evidence to be researched by each speaker.
* Break open your books and look for **actual evidence –** quotations to support your points.
* You will be evaluated **as a team** on your ability to present viable arguments rooted in sound and defensible evidence as well as your orderliness in presenting your case. **Individually**, you will be assessed on your listening/speaking skills including poise, pacing and pausing – the three “P’s!” Yes, you must be confident in your argument and present it convincingly! (Rubric to follow.)

Please use this page to record the roles of each individual on your team.

Name:

Role:

Name:

Role:

Name:

Role:

Name:

Role:

Name:

Role:

Name:

Role:

The following organizer is useful in a debate but can also be applied to any writing where you are asked to provide literary evidence and analysis thereof (think essay!) Use it as a guide to inform your argument.

**P**oint:

What exactly are you trying to prove? What’s your point? It should be meaty and worded convincingly.

**E**vidence:

Okay, so you’ve made a point…where’s the beef? What evidence from the text actually supports this idea? You better incorporate a quotation or two along the way so we don’t think you’re pulling it out of your…ear.

**E**xplanation:

So, now that you’ve made a point and have provided proof, it’s time to make clear to your audience the connections that you’ve made. It’s not their job to “fill in the blanks” – it’s yours! Make it painfully obvious why your “proof” supports your point.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| P |  |
| P |  |
| A |  |

As both your side and the other side debates the main ideas, listen carefully to the arguments presented and record major ideas:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Affirmative | Negative |
|  |  |