

ponent of a rhetorical conscience, as argument inspires thinking. The failure to think can be linked directly to evil. Hannah Arendt in her analysis of Adolph Eichmann found him to be a modern manifestation of evil because he had not thought about his actions. However, she makes another point that is often neglected: no one argued with Eichmann about his actions. Without opposition, he had no reason to think that what he was doing was wrong. The presence and process of argument, Arendt implies, seems to be an essential part of thinking.

Our task of “educating consciences” can be accomplished in two ways. First, by promoting research and critical scrutiny of the knowledge claims made by advocates in the public sphere, and second, by placing human relationships and ethics on par with research and debate victories. Academic debate, by encouraging advocacy that is both informed and moral, can play a major role in the promotion of argument as an alternative to violence and as a vehicle of making good judgments.

Academic debate should be dedicated to the idea of argument and to the notion that issues ought to be subjected to critical scrutiny. At the core of the activity should be a commitment to thinking, research, and argumentative exchange. All claims in academic debate are open to argument. If academic debate is concerned with informed advocacy, then the thinking that we do as we work with students to discover knowledge about debate resolutions should help in the formation of reasoned and well supported judgments. Research should promote deep thinking, as students who read the literature on a topic should learn new things and, perhaps, change their opinions as a result of their reading. The research that academic debate inspires should promote concern for human rights in far off countries, the condition of the environment, and the values used to make policy. Without the incentive to conduct extensive research on a host of topics, I know that many of my debate students would lack the passion they exhibit about the state of the world and not have the opportunity to think hard about the issues we face.

Hannah Arendt believed that the “activity of thinking” was among the “conditions” that make humans “abstain” from evil and that thinking might actually prevent evil (Arendt, 1978, p. 5). Thinking, according to Arendt, is necessary for the existence of conscience. The research our students conduct, the arguments they create and encounter, and the thinking they do in the debate activity should promote the health and the education of their consciences. When our students are well informed on the issues of the day, then they can make better judgments about the quality of information used by advocates in the public sphere and about the moral implications of policies under consideration. In short, research should not be seen as a burden or as the source of problems in the debate culture, rather, research should be promoted as a means of educating the consciences of our students.

While research and thinking are critical to the development of conscience, the moral stance we teach our students to take is of great importance if we are to deal with the insularity we face in the debate culture. Far too often, winning is the only mission of our debate educators and students. In contrast, a focus on the education of conscience would lead us to urge our students to use ethical and moral principles before, during, and after debate rounds.

The first principle I believe ought to be stressed is that debate is an activity of argument that involves humans and human relationships. Argument allows us to disagree and remain in relationship. Students should understand that an opponent is not an enemy, and that those who disagrees with us may not be evil. As an alternative to violence, argument allows us to channel our disagreements into language rather than physical confrontation. When students allow debates to degenerate into verbal insults and ridicule, debate and argument becomes expressions of psychological violence. An educated conscience uses argument, rather than violence, in search of adherence.

Second, our students should be in search of principled debate victories. When students must violate important principles to achieve victory, it may be better to accept defeat. Although there is nothing essentially noble about defeat, students should be educated to accept a debate defeat rather than reading falsified evidence, demeaning an opponent, or using arguments that may be racist. These are choices of conscience, and there are no firm laws and infallible codes we can give our students. We can invite them to think about the choices they make and offer them some guidance as we seek to educate their consciences.

In summary, we can strengthen and cultivate the rhetorical consciences of our students by promoting thinking, research, and moral argument. The moral prism that guides our students in the argumentative choices they make should be at the center of our educational agenda for the next millennium. By placing conscience rather than competitive victory at the top of our agenda, we can claim an important place in higher education.

CONCLUSION

If we are to create a New Forensics for a New Millennium, I believe we will need to get our history right and claim our place in the rhetoric and speech tradition. We will need to join our mission with that of the NCA and the research universities, which a focus on informed advocacy accomplishes. Finally, we should focus our efforts on educating the consciences of our students by encouraging an appreciation of thinking, research, the argumentative process, and the principles should attend argumentative efforts. I see these objectives as interrelated and that all four promote reasoned, informed, and moral advocacy. Forensics and academic debate are precious activities, and they are easily misused and abused. Zarefsky is right that we have

much to teach the NCA and many others about public deliberation and argument, and I believe we will need to get our bearings straight if academic debate is to flourish in the next century.

REFERENCES

- Arendt, Hannah. Life of the Mind. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977-78.
- Bartanen, Michael. Teaching and Directing Forensics. Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, 1993.
- Boyer, Ernest L. Scholarship Reconsidered. Princeton: Carnegie, 1990.
- Cohen, Herman. The History of Speech Communication: the Emergence of a Discipline, 1914-1945. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1994.
- Graham, Hugh Davis, Diamond, Nancy A. The Rise of American Research Universities. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1997.
- Hill, Bill. "'Intercollegiate Debate' Why do Students Bother?" The Southern Communication Journal 48 (1982): 77-88.
- Kimball, Bruce A. Orators & Philosophers. New York: Columbia U P, 1986.
- Nichols, Egbert. "A Historical Sketch of Intercollegiate Debating: II." Quarterly Journal of Speech 22 (1936): 591-602.
- Nichols, Egbert. "A Historical Sketch of Intercollegiate Debating: III." Quarterly Journal of Speech 23 (1937): 259-278.
- Nichols, Egbert Ray. "A Historical Sketch of Inter-Collegiate Debating: I." Quarterly Journal of Speech 22 (1936): 213 - 220.
- Rarig, Frank M., Greaves, Halbert S. "National Speech Organizations and Speech Education." History of Speech Education in America. Ed. Karl Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.
- "Report of the Working Committee From the Quail Roost Conference on Assessment of Professional Activities of Directors of Debate," AFA Policy Debate Caucus," Gopher://debate.uvm.edu..20tenure%20docume. (27 Sept 1997)
- Smith, Donald K. "Origins and Development of Departments of Speech." History of Speech Education in America. Ed. Karl Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954. 447-470.
- Truehart, Charles. "A Wartime Scar Heals; Another Is Reopened." Washington Post 1 Oct 1997 1997: A19.
- "A Study of the Reputations of Doctoral Programs in Communication," Speech Communication Association. <http://www.scassn.org/comProg/reports/repstudy.htm> (28 Sept. 1997)
- Zarefsky, David. "Postmodern Public." Vital Speeches 60 (1994): 308-315.



Forensics in the Twenty-First Century: Uniting to Adapt to a Diverse and Dynamic Society

C. THOMAS PRESTON

The current essay argues that the forensics activities should both shape and be shaped by communication needs as they emerge in our society. Tomorrow's five communication needs include the need for expert communication, and need for communication to a non-specialized audience, the need for mass communication of both the noninteractive and interactive varieties, the need for intercultural communication, and the academic needs for research. After presenting the author's background and biases, the essay argues how the activity can be better organized in order to meet these changing needs, as well as what new events might be considered for addition and what old events might be considered for elimination.

Ever since the Sedalia conference, there have been numerous conferences which have advocated ways of developing forensics in the future. Although some conferences repeat the same themes over and over (most notably our Pi Kappa Delta developmental conferences where scholars repeat ad nauseam the phrase "return persuasion to debate"), others have added some enduring insights into the way we practice forensics. For example, the first individual events developmental conference at Denver noted the need for tournament directors to take concern for the "wellness" of competitors, thus leading to many directors serving more and healthier food at tournaments and redesigning their schedules to attend to the health needs of the competitors. The Quail Roost Conference contributed valuable suggestions for standards of promotion and tenure for directors of forensics. The 1993 and 1995 Pi Kappa Delta developmental conference contributed many ideas concerning adapting to the increasingly multicultural demands of our constituencies.

With this paper, I was asked to develop a vision for the future of forensics in a way that would somehow add to the ideas discussed at these conferences, as well as those discussed in previous "future of forensics" discussions. Having had fifteen years of coaching experience (fourteen of them at the University of Missouri-St. Louis and one previous year at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln), several years of service as a reviewer for forensics journals, and having participated in

hosting at least three national tournaments and having been asked to host two others for which our campus did not have sufficient rooms, I decided to take on this task. Thus, this paper will provide one person's opinion as to what the answer to the question, "What should be the vision of forensics for the twenty-first century?" In order to address the issue, I shall first discuss my own, personal perspective toward the activity, providing some biographical data such that readers may take my biases into account. Then, I shall examine five communication needs most all of us agree that society will face during the coming century, some of which are the same needs we face now, some of which will be new needs. Third, I shall examine how forensics should meet these changing needs, exploring such issues as events offerings and tournament structure. Finally, I shall reiterate how an organizational structure I and my then co-coach at UM-St. Louis Sherry LaBoon offered at the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta developmental conference would help see this vision through to the twenty-first century (Preston and LaBoon, 1995, pp. 33-38).

PERSONAL BACKGROUND AND BIASES

After having competed in both debating and individual speaking events at R. J. Reynolds High School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina (note the tobacco connotations—my brother and I are the first generation of nonsmokers in our family), I decided to take a year off entirely to adjust to the college life at the University of North Carolina. During my sophomore year at Chapel Hill, I joined a graduate-student coached individual events program and remained on the team for three years. I would summarize my experience in three ways—first, it opened my eyes to the fact that I could compete in several different events before a public audience—more than the one event I was accustomed to entering in high schools. Second, the diverse program was my first true exposure to students of different racial and ethnic groups—and the experience of being a minority on some of the trips provided me with more lessons on communication orientation and perspective than I have learned in all of my anthropology and intercultural communication classes, and even more so than in my more recent experience of publishing my first book on intercultural communication. The ideas and perspectives were new, with the long van rides between Chapel Hill and points such as New Haven, Connecticut, and Monmouth, New Jersey, providing a long time to discuss and digest them. As well, by my senior year, this was my first true experience of being part of a group working toward a goal—goal of becoming, realistically, a second ten program at AFA Nationals in individual events with very limited resources. As it turned out, we were 6th at the AFA NIET my senior year, and the program stayed in the top ten for two more years after I graduated despite changing graduate assistant-coaches each year. Although I was a "journeyman" speaker on the squad (not a star but performing well enough to feel good about my progress), I always felt that I was taken seriously by the program, its director, my teammates, and the gradu-

ate students assigned to coach individual events. It was an program open to any student. I owe much of my career, in fact, to that long-suffering group of colleagues at Carolina. Yet upon graduation, I had no intention of making forensics a career.

After having avoided forensics to focus on studies in order to earn an M. A. from North Carolina in 1981, I left the Southeast for the first time to pursue a Ph.D. in the Midwest. Because of their expressed interest in me and their strong political communication and argumentation curriculum, I chose the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Three things impressed me about this community. First, there was a level of community spirit that permeated the city, the University, and the department, as well as a unity in purpose. Second, the open philosophy of the University reflected what had been instilled in me by the UNC individual events program at the time—"let any student come in and choose his or whole own goals." The difference was that as Nebraska as a state had a much smaller population, the University could apply this openness on a university-wide basis—it was able to admit any person within the state who had obtained a high school degree. This commitment to equal opportunity seemed to work well there. Finally, with most relevance to forensics, the program at the time offered its students a full choice of activities in which to participate, and thus a diverse range of communication skills the students could choose to develop. The debate and individual events programs, although sometimes traveling separately, were united in their purpose, and activities centered around the honorary fraternity DSR-TKA, whose national title Nebraska won twice from 1981-1984. Although I was not a staff member until the third year in the doctoral program there—a year in which the staff was cut from five to three and a year in which the program was to host no fewer than five tournaments—my philosophy of forensics was certainly sharpened during these years. By the end of my career at Nebraska, thanks to the perseverance and patience of the faculty and my colleagues at the time, I could summarize my vision for forensics in three seemingly paradoxical words: "diversity through unity." As well, however unintentionally, I was set firmly on a path towards directing forensics as a career.

Hired ABD as a lecturer at the University of Missouri-St. Louis in 1984 as an interim director of forensics, I was set even more firmly on this path by being told that should I finish the dissertation within a year, I would be able to apply, competitively, for an upgraded, tenure-track Director of Forensics position. After a year that saw UM-St. Louis gain a Pi Kappa Delta charter and win a school record of awards—and little progress on the dissertation—fortuitously, the search was put off for another year. After a second year that saw seven dedicated CEDA debaters attain a 16th place national ranking, some publication, and my finishing the dissertation, I was selected for the permanent Director of Forensics position after a painstaking national search.

Since then, the open philosophy has resulted in the program having many different faces over the years. For example, most of the 115

awards won during the 1987-88 year were in individual events. At the same time, most of the 148 awards of 1994-95 came in debate. This year, the 1997-98 program is fielding four parliamentary debate teams for the first time. Through all of the changes, the unity through diversity theme has been the one that has made the program successful when it was followed. In areas and times when we strayed from this philosophy, the program has failed. For the past ten years, the core of the squad has ranged from 4 to as many as 20 students, and every year, anywhere from 31 to 63 students have competed in intercollegiate tournaments at least once each school year, even if only at our December novice debate tournaments. Thus, many students have competed on many levels. Overall, given that UM-St. Louis has the largest non-Caucasian population of any state school in Missouri, as well as the highest percentage, by far, of the four University of Missouri schools, given my own background, I have felt comfortable in striving for a numerically large and ethnically diverse program. For the purposes of this paper, I also have to consciously avoid imposing all of these biases on programs that are in different circumstances. Hopefully, therefore, the vision of the future below, as well as how to cope with it, will take these into consideration in making applications to as large a community as possible.

TOMORROW'S COMMUNICATION NEEDS

Especially since a vast majority of forensics programs are tied to communication departments, through the lens described above I believe that meeting tomorrow's communication needs will become the paramount consideration in developing forensics events which can continue to attract large numbers of students to compete. Certainly forensics, being a limited activity, will be unable to meet all of the communication needs of society—but it can better prepare its own participants to contribute their share to meeting those needs. Five needs exist—the need for expert communication, and need for communication to a non-specialized audience, the need for mass communication of both the noninteractive and interactive varieties, the need for intercultural communication, and the academic needs for research.

Although there has, from time to time, and especially among Pi Kappa Delta colleagues including myself (Jensen & Preston, 1991), an uproar over "the lack of persuasion" in policy debate, the need for rapid, expert communication exists, and it will only increase in the future. No activity better teaches this communication skill than good, hard, policy debate. Critics (e.g., Rodgers, 1993; Beattie, 1996) often quote parts of policy debates neither they nor inexperienced audiences cannot understand in order to hold policy debate up to ridicule. My response to the complaint "A lay audience (or I) cannot understand this"—precisely! That's part of the beauty of specialized debate. As Madrid (1996) stated, the use of debate jargon is "a sign of being further inculcated within a culture" (p. 113). As Stanfield (1993) notes in the following passage:

While many have decried the decline of oratory in society today, it is unlikely that a "golden age of eloquence" will ever return. The day of the Chautauqua had passed and now the thirty second sound bite reigns supreme. Thus the desire to bring debate back to its roots is perhaps unfair. As the needs of society evolve, so too must the goals of academic debate. While twenty-five years ago when the goals of competitive debate were more limited, a primary focus upon delivery was acceptable. Now, however, such an approach is downright irresponsible. People are bombarded with information, often high technical and often in large quantities. We must train our students to process that information, to evaluate it thoroughly, and to learn to choose between competing claims. The average person seeking to make a decision does not lack information, but instead tends to lack the tools necessary to decode the information provided. Debate prepares students for complex decision making. The variety of affirmative cases demonstrates a multitude of ways to interpret a given problem. Various negative positions show how decision in one part of the world sends tremors throughout the rest of the globe. When debaters are faced with competing evidence, they learn that all experts are not created "equal" and devise criteria for determining the "true" position. No other extracurricular activity can provide this kind of training. Even the closely related events at forensics tournaments cannot teach similar thinking skills (p. 104).

Although Stanfield's minor reference to other forms of forensics should be taken in light of her leadership of a debate-only part of a larger forensics program, she later goes on to note that other events offer other values. She also makes a case for policy debate that will hold increasingly true as time goes by. Each day, the language of the science, legal, medical, social science, and business fields, both in academia and in the real world, takes on new terminology. Thanks to the internet and on-line resources—actually the Great Equalizers (Adams, 1996; Collier, 1996; Gerhke, 1996) when it comes to smaller programs doing debate research—there will be even more information for not only members of these fields, but everyday people, to digest. To survive in a community, it will be increasingly important to know the jargon of the field one chooses—in fact, in order to choose a field effectively, one must come to grips with its jargon and its unique ways of thinking. The attack is made that "lay" people cannot understand policy debate—yet that would hold true of non-lawyers attending a bar association convention, non-doctors attending a medical convention, and non-computer specialists attending a technical convention of computer engineers. The basic process of becoming an expert in any field is uniquely taught with the process of becoming an expert in debate. Therefore, forensics will need to continue to offer opportunities parallel to becoming involved in the communication patterns

intrinsic to a specialized field such as any of those our students attend college to join.

Yet even as expert communication and efficient communication between experts gains importance in our society, so will be the ability of experts to communicate with lay persons, and vice versa. Here is where our events can help in the translation process—and sometimes, the translation of a jargon can be as challenging as the translation of a foreign language. In a litigious society, attorneys will have to translate the legalese to the clients, and clients will have to be able to communicate both specialized and generalized concerns to their attorneys. Communication between computer help desks and clients, and vice versa, will become increasingly important as our computers take on more and more complex practical applications. And although many speeches and messages today are mediated, there is still something about the sense of “being there”—whether being there is at a sporting event or a political speech. For example, despite universal television coverage here in St. Louis, the losing St. Louis Rams will continue to have a sellout crowd at the cavernous Trans World Dome throughout the season, and a recent trip to St. Louis by Mikhail Gorbachev filled up the convention center with listeners. Hence, although Stanfield and her position’s advocates are certainly correct on the value of policy debate, they shouldn’t give up on a “golden age of oratory” just yet! As will be noted later, neither should their individual events colleagues.

Both lay and expert communication needs will be encompassed by our third communication need of the twenty-first century—the need for effective mass communication. Certainly, television and its choices will increase. As well, the number of ways in which everyday persons can gain access will increase. Right now, most of that access comes from the ability to utilize remote stations for community access programming. Soon, perhaps, there will be means of “producing” television programs of television grade quality at home. Thus, whether or not our students seek careers in the electronic media, mediated communication of the traditional, non-interactive type will continue to be important into the next century.

As well, there will be an interim period in which the current way of interactive mass communication—email—will be important. Email communication, I would argue, has special requirements—requirements that might be folded in to the forensics experience. The five requirements of email communication, I would argue, are:

1. One has to make a point without vocal inflection or facial expression.
2. One has to argue especially politely, as readers may and often do assume the worst in the above without the benefit of seeing that no harm was intended.
3. Immediate feedback is impossible, so writing must be especially clear such that erroneous ideas are not interpreted and

placed on a list serve for all to see; and

4. Argumentation must be precise, as immediate explanation is not possible as in a conversation; and
5. Argumentation must be succinct, as to not "waste band space."

I see email as continuing for a few years, but at some point, it may be replaced by more sophisticated forms of interactive, computer communication. For example, even today, I can receive delayed signals in a picture on my own computer. Live conversations over the computer, I believe, cannot be too far away.

The possibilities for interactive communication via the mass media are boundless. Already, video links exist between campuses, and live conferencing is becoming commonplace to the point that travel to conferences within business has become less frequent and less necessary. In the future, it may become entirely possible to teach classes from ones own apartment both live and interactively—a screen next to a chair or bed might have as many cells as there are persons in the class, and each student—from whatever location, even their own homes—can see the professor and buzz in every time there is a question. Whether the mediated communication type is of the traditional noninteractive nature, email, or of the type that used to be science fiction but is now science fact, it will gain more and more significance in our daily communication, and thus should affect the types of forensics events we offer to our students if a communication model is to be taken seriously.

A fourth communication need that will continue to increase as the century turns is that of intercultural communication. As Klopff (1995) notes, our society is becoming more and more multicultural (pp. 1-14). Not only does each and every person have at their fingertips via cable television networks representing a variety of cultures, but travel as well as innovations such as the fax makes communication with persons all over the globe more and more accessible. Certainly, many academicians note the need for cultures to maintain an identity, and some espouse an outright separatism that discourages cultural groups from interacting with each other. At the same time, as I noted in my intercultural communication book (Preston, 1997), "Today's ease in mobility makes it easier for U.S. residents of different cultural backgrounds to meet, do business together, play together, and, in an increasing number of cases, intermarry" (p. 18). I add that, "As various mixtures occur, one of three trends are distinctly possible: (1) that the resulting offspring will be confused in a society concerned with cultural differences over cultural similarities, (2) that the offspring will assimilate even more into a U.S. culture that increasingly incorporates elements of all of . . . its groups, and/or (3) that the offspring will develop new cultures" (p. 18). Regardless of the outcome of the increasing need for intercultural communication, the forensics and debate community should promote inclusion in its design of events

and their conventions such that all in the circuit as a whole can likely have the opportunities that I fortunately had when I competed at the University of North Carolina. Back then, my opportunity for intercultural interaction was a novelty in a relatively recently integrated campus; in the next century, such opportunities will be imperative for all of our students regardless of their ethnic and racial background.

A fifth communication need our activity should strive to help fulfill relates to a question we as forensic educators not only are asked, but must ask of ourselves: "what is the educational value of our activity?" Given the notion that we perform our duties on university campuses, the question should be answered in three parts: 1) What is the research mission of the program? 2) What is the teaching (pedagogical) mission of the program? 3) What is the service mission of the program? The importance of each question, of course, should relate to the importance placed on each mission by the university as a whole which houses the particular forensics program.

My bias and justification of forensics tends to be biased toward the research function mainly because my only experience has been at research universities. Indeed, forensics has, and will continue to, provide a valuable research laboratory for testing what is effective speaking in the various events. As society has changing needs, so will the needs of the academy. The explosion of information alone, when added to the increasingly multicultural society and communication therein, will provide fertile ground for research into the cultural, social, political, scientific, art, and music areas. With events ranging from hard argumentation to interp performances and media productions including music, forensics has the opportunity to provide a laboratory for studying "what works" in each of these areas. To the extent that communication patterns in forensics sometimes mirror patterns in other parts of communication and society at large, the activity, as it was in my case, can literally become the cradle of future communication researchers.

Nonetheless, the activity's teaching and service notions will continue to be important, even at research universities such as mine. My efforts in researching the individual events, I would argue, may not make me a better coach than most of my colleagues—but it has made me a much better coach and teacher than I was before I did the research. I would argue that the same would be true of other forensics researchers. The research does no good, to my mind, unless we can share that knowledge in a way that will help our undergraduate students. Taken as an aggregate, forensics better than any other activity, save perhaps internships, offers our students practical experience in learning how to communicate through various means effectively. In terms of service, such service is necessary if forensics is to continue to reach out to a larger and larger community. In summary, forensics must act to meet the three academic demands that will only become greater as the traditional classroom will compete with other means of

learning in the twenty-first century, and as research becomes more intensive as the means of producing it become more rapid and information-intensive.

MEETING THE NEEDS: FORENSICS IN THE NEXT CENTURY

I believe that in order to meet the needs of the next century, fraternities such as Pi Kappa Delta must continue to take the lead in the types of events offered. I shall address each of the five needs, therefore, not only in terms of what Pi Kappa Delta has done and can do, but in terms of what types of events/behaviors can be promoted by the entire forensics community. After discussing how these five needs can be served if not met, I shall turn to the way the forensics as a community can best serve these ends.

First, Pi Kappa Delta can begin to promote the idea that to teach specialized communication is a good thing. Given the past tendency of some members to beg the question of whether persuasion is lacking in debate and demand that the organization lead the way in bringing debate into a "public arena," (e.g., Cox & Adams, 1993; Daley, 1993; Lawson, 1993; Carroll & Harris, 1993; Adams & Cox, 1993), promoting specialized policy debate might be a bitter pill to swallow for some of the current members—but nonetheless, it's a pill that must be swallowed if the organization is to truly lead the way into the twenty-first century. Note that this by no means states that other, public forms of debate should be eliminated, or to deny the points that the above make well for debating geared toward the public arena—rather, what it does say is that both in Pi Kappa Delta and in the larger community, policy debate must remain as an option, with the judging done mainly by critics who are qualified and inculcated into the policy debate community. In this area, the merger of NDT and CEDA has been a healthy step toward recognizing that splintering among the debate community has been futile, and that tolerance for alternative forms would be a better direction for the debate activity. The NFL in high school recognized long ago that the conflict between time limit and delivery skills would prove an unresolvable problem—thus, ahead of its times, it offered within its own organization Lincoln-Douglas debate, but also maintained the policy debate format for those desirous of learning specialized communication skills, how to process large amounts of information, and how to make logical, complex decisions as will be necessary in future careers. Looking back on the NFL and CEDA/NDT experience and evolution and how both forms maintained in the tolerant atmosphere of NFL, college educators perhaps should look back to see their future in recognizing the need for a form of debate that stresses specialized skills.

As noted earlier, however, specialized communication skills must be complimented by the skills necessary to communicate with a general audience. And although Pi Kappa Delta has sometimes lagged in its support of policy debate, it has led the way in promoting forms of forensics beneficial to a larger, public arena. As well, those claiming

the policy debate is "the debate" should also consider the notion that at some point, the specialized language must be explained to a generalized audience, whether that audience constitutes legislators voting to appropriate funds for medical research or a nuclear plant, a dean deciding on whether to sign off on a graduate program in a field with which she is not familiar, a general audience for a real after dinner speech, or a legal, medical, or architectural client. Certainly, presentation and the need for "golden age" oratorical skills can certainly become important in these areas, and, in some fields, can sway the allocation of millions of dollars, or, in the case of doctor-to-patient communication, become a matter of life or death. Pi Kappa Delta, therefore, must continue to be a leader in its promotion of audience-oriented forensic activities, even while recognizing the value of specialized communication too.

Such activities would be not only the individual events and parliamentary debate, but continued experimentation in other audience-related persuasive areas such as student congress. As well, the discussion and mediation events at some regional Pi Kappa Delta tournaments in the past could prove to be useful tools at the national tournament—after all, not all of discourse is of an advocacy nature, nor is all of discourse confrontative. As well, forensics organizations must continue to look into whether it offers events whose conventions have abandoned the public models for which they were intended explicitly. For example, there is some question as to whether after dinner speaking has abandoned humor in favor of poor sourcing and over sourcing, hence becoming a "poor person's" informative or persuasive speech instead of the original, audience-oriented for it was intended to be. As well, in the future, those who forget the past are doomed to repeat it. Therefore, Pi Kappa Delta and other organizations can lead the way away from such conventions as "clocking" students for performing "overdone" literature, thus denying many the opportunity to share the learning experiences others have learned through performance. As well, "new" literature is in the ear of the listener—although there is certainly a need for the originality and creativity this discussion is about, this need should not be met by taking the pedagogical shortcut of denying students the right to perform certain literature new to the student but old to a judge, say, at Pittsburg State who happened to hear the same selection performed at a tournament in western Texas, or the like. "Overdone on the circuit" rarely applies to real life—yet means of performing at all levels do.

At our department, for years, many of the faculty who focused on mass communication questioned why in the age of mass communication, forensics did not offer more mediated events. Today, their questions become more relevant than ever with the increasing means noted above of communicating to a mass audience, or interactively through electronic media. Although very few tournaments try these events (The radio events at the old Southern Connecticut and Bradley tournaments come to mind, as well as the mediated events offered

this fall at the University of Missouri-St. Louis and Webster University), they may eventually become the fastest growth area in forensics, particularly if they become standardized and offered from tournament to tournament. At UM-St. Louis, the radio event, which involves a news broadcast or editorial over a here-and-now event, has attracted over 50 contestants each year. Best yet, the tapes are sectioned off and listened to before the tournament—and they count for sweeps yet don't have to be performed at the tournament itself! Given the increased access to television as well as the need to involve the entire department in our activity, organizations should begin to promote mediated events on the national level as they teach different communication skills than the current competitive events. Creative events of both the noninteractive and interactive nature should be offered, and while email continues to be a popular means of communication, certainly, some type of an email event would be of much practical value to participants in forensics.

Just as the nature of how we communicate and exchange information is dynamic, so is the cultural environment in which we live. Although there are very few African American head policy debate coaches on the policy debate circuit (I believe they can be counted on one hand as I write), and although the Pi Kappa Delta Hall of Fame looks like a Caucasian men's gallery, I believe positive steps are being made to make forensics as a whole accessible to the entire society as we near the next century. For example, the Soros Foundation has promoted remarkable strides in the urban debate leagues established in Atlanta, New York, Detroit, and Chicago—areas of the nation in which policy debate continues to grow even as parliamentary debate becomes a good alternative. If the proposed national urban debate league (Huber & Plantageonette, 1993; Wade, 1994, 1995, 1996; Wade, Edmonds, Rorie & Huber, 1995) comes into fruition, the impact on college programs of hard, policy debate can be enormously, eventually affecting its coaching pool. As well, the two recent Pi Kappa Delta conferences have stressed the need for intercultural sensitivity within our own community, including constructive ways to promoted more diverse activities such a Model United Nations and Mock Trial (Adamo, 1995, p. 114), attract more inner-city youth of all racial and ethnic groups (Jensen, 1993; Brown, 1995; Rogers, 1995), adapt our activity to non-Advocacy cultures such as many in the far east (Swanson, 1993), and how to become more sensitive to the needs of bilingual students (Schroeder, 1993; Guajardo, 1995). In the areas of parliamentary debate and individual events, many programs led by persons of non-Caucasian groups are arising, thus increasingly rendering the adage "You have to adapt your selection to a primarily white, inbred forensics audience" obsolete. In light of our increasingly diverse society, we as an activity should embrace the leadership of directors such as Melissa Wade at Emory and the Soros Foundation, as well as the suggestions by our own, Pi Kappa Delta membership of how to move from the Eurocentric model to the Multicultural model in both the events we offer and how we assess them. That way, not

only do more gain the benefits of our activity—but those already in the activity can gain from the activity in general some of the same type experiences I was fortunate to have in what was then my rather unique situation at Carolina. I by no means claim that our activity is free of cultural or racial bias—but I do have to celebrate the positive trends that are there, and that deserve promotion by all of us who would propose that the activity adapt to our increasingly multicultural world.

Finally, the activity should remain sensitive to our academic needs. We need to promote our forensics research as mainstream research—just as an interpersonal communication scholar should not be chastised for publishing in his or her area of specialty, neither should we be chastised for publishing articles concerning argumentation, in argumentation journals or not. Clearly, debate and speech research needs to be promoted as the research central to our discipline. Certainly, the rhetorical applications of speeches as well as various sorts of communication studies should also receive the attention of forensics scholars. Certainly, forensics scholars can contribute to the book literature concerning great speakers, great speeches, and persuasive campaigns of the sorts which parallel the events we teach our students to do. Debate studies should continue to appear in disciplinary as well as trans-disciplinary journals. At the same time, scholars should not neglect, or be punished for, articles that appear in forensic or argumentation journals. In fact, the more that can be submitted to these journals—and there are a plethora of pertinent papers presented at conventions on the national, regional, and state levels—the more prestigious they become. The initiative taken by Jack Rogers with the Southern Journal of Forensics, under the auspices of the Southern Communication Association, represents a positive step toward meeting the needs of the forensic activity to serve in part as a laboratory for excellence in communication of all sorts in our changing society.

But what of the institutions where research takes a back seat to teaching and service? In terms of teaching various sorts of communication, nowhere is such teaching done more intensely than in forensics and debate. Certainly there are holes to be filled—for example, mediated communication might prove more attractive to more of a diversity of gendered participation. Although women can and have competed successfully in policy debate, some studies have shown that mediation provides a higher comfort zone for women (e. g, Beattie, 1996). As noted above, mediated events could prove helpful, as well as streamlining the performance events and perhaps bringing humor and originality back to after dinner speaking. Yet even as is, students who feel I am too strict in my public speaking or debate class will offer the backhand compliment on the teaching evaluations that “He expects the same level of excellence from me as he does his debaters,” indicating that the forensics activity requires the most of our communication students at various levels of competition.

The service dimension of forensics is usually quite obvious. Speakers from our squads often perform public debates, public speaking demonstrations, and demonstrate effective speaking for our classes for free. Most professionals are already involved more than any other in the discipline in bridging the gap between the high school and college debate and speech activities, although, as noted earlier, much more needs to be done along these lines, especially with the diverse and dynamic communication needs noted for the twenty-first century. Certainly, community service and cooperation with other campus organization can enhance a program's image. At the same time, given increasing demands on all in an information needs, these service activities must be limited such that enhance, rather than distract from, the central mission of a forensics program—to teach effective communication skills of various sorts.

A STRUCTURE FOR ACHIEVING THESE GOALS

The position on restructuring forensics LaBoon and I (1995) offered three years ago caused quite a stir at the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta convention, we are told. Before I go further, let me repeat the following long passage from our paper which is probably more true today than it was at that convention, and then add a couple of minor revisions other ideas for adapting forensics to the new communication age:

Although we do not want to eliminate healthy discussion and dissent within our subjective activities, we do want to discourage the type of disruptive criticism that has sidestepped effective problem-solution in favor of factionalism and unfriendly sponsoring. Differences in such things as adapting to time restraints in debate ("do I read all of my research or deliver a slower, more "persuasive speech?"), what constitutes "quality literature (should I utilize literature with obscenity, or which is better—John Donne or the Cavalier Poets?), and the nature of competition (Is NFA better by being inclusive in its sweepstakes formula or is AFA better by awarding only excellence?) have been around since classical antiquity—and have existed or evolved for centuries on every continent of the globe humankind has inhabited. If these differences cannot be resolved by the world in this period of time, they will not be resolved at a Forensics conference—or by forming splinter organizations. The tolerance for diversity can best be achieved by realizing the strengths of each activity, and promoting those strengths within one organization.

Since the fraternities and Interstate Oratory serve distinct purposes and complement rather than rival the national organization, they should continue to exist. However, their tournaments, along with all other tournaments, should be sanctioned by the American Forensic Association for member schools to be allowed to attend. The American Forensic Association would continue to sanction the National Debate Tournament, and the National Individual Events Tournament, with their current qualifying procedures. As well, the AFA could sponsor a division of debate—complete with districts and