

## Dr. Tallmon's list of "inarticulisms"

There are certain phrases people use while debating that amount to little more than "filler" or "shorthand," but, on the whole, make one sound inarticulate. We need to figure out better phrasing for the following:

### Don't say this:

"We see that"  
"We will see that"  
"Let's look at . . ." ugh!  
"Let's talk about"

### Say this:

"Studies suggest that," "common sense demonstrates that," "it will become clear that," "\_\_\_\_\_ posits that," etc.  
"Gov. or Opp. will demonstrate that . . ." or "Gov. or Opp. maintains, argues, etc." or "It is our position/contention that . . ."  
"Let's consider, examine, flesh out, tease out, deconstruct, parse, ponder, recall, take note, realize, ANYTHING but "let's look at"!!  
(I realize that lots of people use this phrase. But lots of people also overuse colloquialisms, as well. That's not who we are, friends! ;o)  
Sure, we're talking when we debate, to be sure. But, technically speaking, we're illustrating, exemplifying, expounding, extrapolating, positing, arguing, underscoring, highlighting, etc. Right?  
"Let's talk about \_x\_" is too imprecise. In this case, technical = increased articulateness and eloquence.

Can anyone add to my list? I'd like to make this a long-term project.

**A NEW GAME:** To condition ourselves to no longer utter these inarticulisms, we will employ the "Bell of Wisdom" during practice rounds. Every time you commit one of these sins against wisdom and eloquence, you will be reminded by the bell. When you hear the bell, you will halt, re-phrase, then carry on. Simple, to the point, effective. :o)