

in his listeners' minds his vision of a better America. (It has become known as the 'I have a dream' speech.) In a speech on the motion, 'This house would make the use of homophobic language illegal' you might begin several sentences with 'Gay people walk in fear because ...', each time giving a different example of homophobic violence.

Antithesis (balanced contrast)

Comparing one thing with another in balanced clauses. In debating, you would normally use this to compare what you are advocating with what your opponents are advocating, making it clear by the comparison that your version is better. For example, in the debate on making homophobic speech illegal, 'Do we want a world in which gay people walk in fear, or a world in which they walk in freedom?'

Argumentum ad populum (appeal to the people; actually a Latin phrase).

A direct appeal to the audience. A good way to make an emotional connection with your listeners. It can be in the form of a question ('Is there anyone in this room who would keep silent when they heard a gay person being abused?') or a statement ('I know that no one in this room would keep silent when they heard a gay person being abused.') Can be a high risk strategy if the audience is not on your side; they might not give you the answer you want.

Asyndeton (a list without conjunctions)

A good way to give the impression that the evidence is piling up on your side of the argument. 'Persecuted, reviled, insulted, humiliated, rejected; who can deny that gay people need the protection of this law?'

Chiasmus (balancing two inverted clauses)

A more sophisticated form of antithesis, in which you repeat a clause while reversing its terms, making it clear by the contrast, as in antithesis, that your version is better than your opponents'. Probably the most famous example is from President Kennedy's inauguration speech in 1961: 'Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.' To take our banning homophobic speech debate, you could say (for the opposition): 'Let us not seek to protect tolerance through the practice of intolerance; rather, let us fight intolerance through the practice of tolerance.'

Dialysis (setting out two equally unacceptable alternatives)

This device seeks to show that whatever follows from your opponent's proposal, it will not be good, by giving two possible outcomes, both of which are bad. For example: 'If we make homophobic speech illegal, either homophobes will continue to abuse gay people openly, presenting themselves as martyrs for free speech, or they will do so anonymously on social media, with even greater venom; either way, homophobia will thrive.'

Enargia (painting a picture)

This is when you describe a place or situation, either imagined or real, so vividly that the audience can see it. It can be very emotionally powerful. 'Harry comes home, goes up to his bedroom, and switches on his phone. On it are forty-seven messages, each one insulting him for being gay. He looks out of the window. He can see his brother playing football in the garden with a gang of other boys. He can hear his sister in the next room laughing on the phone to her best friend. They have friends, they are happy, but everyone hates Harry, because he is gay. Tears come into his eyes. He picks up his old, battered teddy bear, whose ear is nearly falling off, and clutches it to him for comfort. The phone beeps. He knows it will be another abusive message, but still he reaches for the phone, his hand shaking ...'

Epiplexis (a series of rhetorical questions)

This is when you ask several rhetorical questions (see **erotema** below), usually to express anger or indignation. 'Are we going to stand by as gay teenagers are bullied? Will we do nothing as they self-harm? Will we remain silent as the suicide rate mounts? Will we be able to sleep at night if we do nothing? Are we really that unfeeling?'

Epistrophe (repeated endings)

This is a kind of opposite version of **anaphora**, in which the same word or phrase is repeated at the end of phrases or sentences. 'Controlling what people write in newspapers is oppressive; saying what they can't write online is oppressive; monitoring what they message or say on phones is oppressive; censoring what they say to each other is oppressive; intervening, perhaps, even in what they think, is nothing but oppressive.'