

# THE FORENSIC

## ΠΕΙΘΩ ΚΑΛΗ ΔΙΚΑΙΑ

Series 61

January, 1976

No. 2

### PI KAPPA DELTA FIRST LADIES



*Betty Ulrey, wife of the  
current national president*



*Betsy Karl, wife of the past  
president now serving as  
the national secretary-  
treasurer*

**Story on Page 13**



# The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 61

JANUARY, 1976

NO. 2

## Table of Contents

President's Message .....	3
New Council Member .....	4
"Mr. Forensics" .....	4
General Systems and Case Structure .....	5
Voice from the Wilderness .....	9
PKD Visibility and Service .....	10
Secretary's Page .....	11
New Chapter .....	12
PKD First Ladies .....	13
Forensic Forum .....	18
Do You Know That? .....	19
Chapter News .....	21
Chapter Directory .....	25
Editor's Word .....	31
Cover Contest .....	32

EDITOR ..... CAROLYN KEEFE

ASSOCIATE EDITOR ..... ROBERT BEAGLE  
Edinboro State College  
Edinboro, PA 16412.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR ..... ADA MAE HAURY  
Bethel College  
North Newton, KS 67117.

Published four times a year in October, January, March, and May by Pi Kappa Delta. Subscription price is part of the membership dues. For PKD alumni and non-members, the rate is \$2 for one year, \$3 for two years, and \$5 for three years.

Office of publication: West Chester State College, West Chester, PA 19380. Second Class postage paid at West Chester PA 19380.

Printed by Graphics Standard  
West Chester, PA 19380.

## DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL PRESIDENT—Evan Ulrey, Harding College, Searcy, AR 72143.

NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT—James DeMoux, Boise State College, Boise, ID 83725.

NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER—Theodore O. H. Karl, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447.

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS—Phyllis Bosley, Towson State College, Baltimore, MD 21204; Tom Harte, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701; Jack D. Starr, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse, WI 54601.

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT—John E. Baird, California State University, Hayward, CA 94542.

HISTORIAN—Larry Norton, 1010 N. Heading Court, Peoria, IL 61604.

EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC—Carolyn Keefe, West Chester State College, West Chester, PA 19380.

## PROVINCE GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS—Gary Horn, Southwestern College, Winfield, KS 67156.
2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI—Robert Brewer, Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, MO 64093.
3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS—Marie Robinson, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, IL 61701.
4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC—Richard Lucas, California State College, Turlock, CA. 95380
5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX—James Zeman, Northern State College, Aberdeen, SD 57401.
6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI—Ron McCrory, University of Southwest Louisiana, Lafayette, LA 70501.
7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES—Roselyn Freedman, Morris Harvey College, Charleston, WV 25311.
8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI—Jack D. Starr, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse, LaCrosse, WI 54601.
9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST—Marilyn F. Norris, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, MS 39701.
10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST—Virginia Eman, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447.
11. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST—Michael Leiboff, Mansfield State College, Mansfield, PA 16933.
12. PROVINCE OF THE COLONIES—Patrick L. Miller, California State College, California, PA 15419.



# The President's Message...



Evan Ulrey

A traditional duty of the affirmative is the definition of the terms and the analysis of the question in such a manner that the negative who has done its homework has a fair chance of being prepared to debate issues forwarded by the affirmative. This is the essential meaning of *prima facie*. The affirmative is expected to analyze the topic in a manner which "on the face of it" appears to be what the resolution suggests. The rationale in debate appears to have been that two teams having prepared to debate the same general topic can test, and have tested, the evidence that they have accumulated in support of the affirmative or negative side of a proposition. Debate is presumably a thinking contest as well as a contest in the oral expression of ideas.

Where are we today on the national circuit? Often the affirmative that wins is on the razor's edge of the topic, if indeed it is on the topic in any meaningful sense at all. To win has become the be all and end all of debating; to win one must devise the esoteric affirmative. Rather than talking of a "compelling need" for a change in order to justify the proposition, the affirmative finds an area (however minute) which if adopted will accrue a "comparative advantage." Presumably the case can win because the negative will have no evidence cards on the finite esoteric case as

## ESTABLISH PARAMETERS FOR THE NATIONAL DEBATE TOPIC

analyzed by the affirmative. It wins because no negative would ever have guessed that an affirmative would have dared offer "that" case as being related to the topic. Thus debate has become a contest, not of thinking and speaking, but of outwitting or outguessing the negative.

It is rather passé these days to argue topicality, for the ingenious affirmative has the right to present any case at all, however remote to the national topic. It is also passé to argue that the affirmative must show its "comparative advantage" is a significant improvement over the *status quo* and that it is unique, i.e., the advantage can't be, or isn't being, accomplished by *status quo* structures. Indeed, what, then, is the affirmative obligated to do? Among other things, it must reduce the topic to an absurdity in terms of relationships to a presumed "national topic," proceed to muster quotes, and "extend" more quotes in support of the infinitesimal "comparative advantage."

Traditionally the affirmative has the more difficult "burden of proof," and therefore a close debate presumably should "go negative" because the affirmative didn't prove its proposition beyond a reasonable doubt. Why, then, in a recent big tournament's octo-final rounds did every team that won the flip of the coin choose affirmative? I think it is because they felt that the affirmative has a "comparative advantage" over a hapless negative whose imagination is insufficiently fertile to guess a particular affirmative case and who without evidence cards can't win.

Teachers and students of debating must restore sanity to debate in order to justify taking the student's and the faculty's time and spending the money from a college or university budget. Winning should not be the *sine qua non* of debating. Edu-

(Continued on page 8)



# Meet New Council Member

## Jack Starr



Every so often around the forensic circuit, someone speculates that debate coaches are merely frustrated ex-debaters who, like Walter Alston, Joe McCarthy, and Connie Mack of baseball managing fame, never could make it playing the "game."

One coach who is not threatened by that notion is Jack D. Starr, Jr., newly elected member of the National Council. Before Jack started coaching, he had

many debate rounds behind him—three years at Waukegan Township High School (Illinois) and four years at Drake University. From debating he went on to six years of high school coaching. In 1965 he assumed his present position of coach at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

Jack Starr, who holds a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota, also has organizational interest in forensics. He is the permanent executive secretary of the Wisconsin Collegiate Forensic Association and two-term governor of the Province of the Upper Mississippi.

Jack's major avocation is theatre. He has acted in nine productions of the La Crosse Community Theatre, playing such diverse roles as the King in *The King and I*, Jud Fry in *Oklahoma!*, and Harry Berlin in *Luv*. Chess, golf, tennis, and Kiwanis International also compete for Jack's time.

Council Member Starr is quite open about his age—forty-two; his marital status—divorced; and his weight—thirty-five pounds less than it was three years ago.

*The Forensic* congratulates Jack on his election to the National Council where his issue-analysis ability will be applied to significant problems facing the fraternity.

### **"Mr. Forensics": P. Caspar Harvey**

He was "Mr. Forensics" at William Jewell, and the Pi Kappa Delta alumni chapter there is named for him—P. Caspar Harvey.

He was a fixture of the William Jewell campus from 1920 to 1958, when he retired. He died May 28 at the age of 85. Mr. Harvey founded the Missouri Delta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta and was the coach of the first American team to represent the United States in Great Britain in 1939.

Born in Gallatin, Missouri, Professor Harvey was educated at William Jewell (A.B. and M.A.) and did further work at the Kansas City School of Law and the University of Chicago. He first taught at Leavenworth, Kansas High School and then at Fort Hays State College before coming to William Jewell.

As professor of English, he developed a unique and highly successful method of teaching freshman composition through a series of daily

exercises known as "DX's." He published a freshman English text, along with numerous journal articles.

Later he became college director of alumni and public relations. He was a member of the city water board for many years, and after his retirement became manager of the Liberty Chamber of Commerce. In 1965 he was elected to the Liberty City Council, on which he served until the spring of 1975.

A painter, golfer, and conversationalist without peer, he was a member of numerous professional organizations and has been listed in every edition of *Who's Who in America* since 1920. His wife preceded him in death a year ago.

*Prepared by Georgia Bowman, immediate past-editor of The Forensic, past-president, and long-time member of the National Council.*



# A RESPONSE TO GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY AS A POSSIBLE CASE STRUCTURE

Penny Ricchio

Raymond K. Tucker has suggested the use of general systems theory as an alternative approach to more traditional models of persuasive discourse. He believes that through the process of component selection, assessment of system objectives, recommendation of system inputs, and extrapolation of system outputs, a more practical approach to advocacy in general can be achieved.<sup>1</sup> Since it has long been maintained that one of the values of training in academic debate should be the discovery of proper analytic methods for discovering the major issues and, in turn, selecting the proper strategy for dealing with controversy, the question arises as to whether general systems theory should be utilized as an affirmative case structure.

Tucker bases his position on a presumed search for truth about the reality of present conditions and the best possible solutions for current problems. His audience-centered, truth-oriented position is best summed up when he states:

... the advocate calling for a change is dedicated to the idea that the most scientific attack on the problem is in the best interests of his audience. If his goal is anything less, then he need not concern himself with systems analysis. Should he feel he must resort to some kind of manipulation of his audience, then the use of general systems theory will be self-defeating. In short, effective use of systems principles presupposes a search for truth.<sup>2</sup>

Application of such a position to academic debate leads to unnecessary changes in traditional burdens of proof. The purpose of this article is to evaluate Professor Tucker's "alternative" in an attempt to demonstrate the inapplicability of the systems approach to affirmative case-construction.

Traditionally the affirmative has had four major responsibilities in establishing a *prima facie* case. First, it must prove that there is some significant harm in the present system that provides a reason to change. Second, it must demonstrate that

the harm is an inherent part of the present system and that certain barriers preclude solution of the problem. Third, a plan that changes the system while fitting into the parameter provided by the resolution must be presented. Fourth, it must show that the plan will solve the problem.<sup>3</sup>

Traditional cases assume a need for the affirmative to demonstrate a significant reason for change. A general systems approach does not; it merely asks the affirmative to analyze a system and evaluate the degree to which it is working in relationship to its goals. The systems theory advocates do not necessarily need to demonstrate a qualitative or quantitative harm, although this may be the result of their analysis. With this theory either position, depending on what the affirmative team determines to be the truth, can be justifiably defended. A tangible level of significance need not be a major concern for the affirmative team.

Much the same kind of analysis can be applied to the inherency issue. Traditional cases assume a need for the affirmative to show an inherent reason for change. Although with general systems the affirmative can demonstrate inherency if their analysis of the system so warrants, they can also defend a position of modifications within the present system or minor repairs, a position most often used by the negative. The notion of inherency depends, then, on the conclusion of the affirmative as to what exactly is wrong with the system after full, objective analysis of its components and their various relationships to the system's goal. Since Tucker believes "nothing is to be gained by a careful selection of details that support only the advocate's position,"<sup>4</sup> this system allows the affirmative to take either the traditional affirmative position

Penny Ricchio is a master of arts candidate in rhetoric-communication at the University of Pittsburgh. She was a 1975 graduate of Augustana College where Robert Swanson is sponsor of the Illinois Xi chapter.



or a traditionally negative position. Indeed, the affirmative can even take the position that the present system is working adequately and thus eliminate the need for a debate at all.<sup>5</sup>

The affirmative team traditionally presents a feasible proposal that falls within the scope of the resolution. With systems theory, this would not necessarily be true. The affirmative team, in their quest for the best possible solution, could decide on a proposal that did not fulfill the resolution. For example, if the resolution calls for the affirmative proposal to be administered by the Federal government, traditionally the affirmative team would present a plan that is administered on a national level. With systems theory, if the affirmative decides a system of state control would be most effective and efficient, they presumably should be allowed to argue for state control.

Finally, the affirmative must demonstrate, as conclusively as possible, that the plan will meet the need. The systems approach does not require such a firm position. Writes Tucker:

The systems advocate operates with appropriate restraint . . . he is sensitive to the fact that any input may have a deleterious effect on the system-as-a-whole. And since he can at best offer a prediction—in effect an extrapolation—he realizes that any projected state (output) should at best be stated in tentative terms.<sup>6</sup>

Instead of being required to demonstrate the plan will meet the need and defend that position throughout the debate, the affirmative team needs merely to indicate that it might meet its burdens and should be implemented. If the negative team presents significant plan attacks precluding achievement of the system's goals, the affirmative team, instead of defending their original position, can presumably agree to the objections and present modifications to the plan that will alleviate the problems. Systems theory's philosophy towards a plan is that it should be tried and changed later if not proven adequate.

The comparison of traditional burdens of proof with those of systems theory leads one to several conclusions about the potential effectiveness of general systems as a possible case structure. The primary problem in the systems approach stems

from the fact that the theory's purpose appears to be contrary to that of academic debate. Freeley writes: "Debate consists of arguments for and against a given proposition."<sup>7</sup> Systems theory requires only one side: the truth, as it is determined by the honest and objective efforts of the advocate. Thus systems theory philosophically denies the laboratory-like structure of academic debate by moving it into the realm of actuality, instead of probability. It should be remembered that academic debate revolves around the term "should" and not "will."

Some controversy has arisen over a trend to make debate, at least theoretically, more closely allied to "real world" decision-making. There is a continuing discussion on whether debaters are being realistic enough in their analysis and solution of problems, since debaters tend not to examine their proposals for political, social, and financial implications beyond the scope of their specific case.<sup>8</sup> In defense of traditional debate practices one can argue that participants in an educational debate usually have only an academic interest in the subject. Neither the debaters nor the judge have any direct power to make or implement actual policy decisions. There are even those who feel the merits of the proposition itself should be disregarded and the debate judged solely on the basis of who did the better job of debating. Educational debates are not held to decide on a policy to be implemented but rather to learn about the decision-making process and to gain the skills that practice in argumentation provides.<sup>9</sup> Thus, although the Klumpp, *et al* position may have value in an actual legislative decision-making situation,<sup>10</sup> it does not take the specialized nature of academic debate into account.

To achieve this educational goal of debate, several characteristics that are unique to this particular decision-making process have evolved to give the activity a standard format for the development of skills. These provide ground rules for the activity, distinguishing it both from the legislative and judicial processes.<sup>11</sup> One such characteristic is the four burdens of proof that have already been discussed. Another is the existence of a particular proposition where each of the two teams is assigned a particular side and is ex-



pected to maintain that position throughout the debate. In an actual legislative situation where a policy must be selected, a compromise may be necessary to find a mutually acceptable position. This cannot happen in a traditional debate where a choice between two alternate courses is forced. However, with systems theory, compromise and shifts of opinion would ethically have to be allowed, since both teams are presumably selecting the best possible policy.

Klumpp, *et al* have argued that to make debate more realistic the notion of single causation must be rejected, and causal analysis should consist of an examination of a series of interrelationships. This would force debaters to consider multiple causation, multiple policy alternatives, and multiple effects, as well as rely increasingly on probability arguments which, in turn, would force the selection of a new point of judgment.<sup>12</sup> In relation to the use of alternative-justification cases, a current example of one possible result of the utilization of systems analysis, Robert V. Seltzer has argued that the complexity of this process and the multiplicity of issues it requires, reduce the quality of analysis, one of the skills that is being taught.<sup>13</sup> There is not an unlimited amount of time available to consider all aspects of the proposal and all the other systems that will be effected, since an academic debate usually has a specific time limit, at the end of which a decision must be made. Although these things should certainly be considered in analyzing the proposition and in constructing the case,<sup>14</sup> it is impossible to discuss all of them in the actual debate round.

The systems approach rejects the traditional burdens of proof for the affirmative team. The burden it puts on the negative is somewhat nebulous. Systems theory requires the affirmative team select the most truthful position, regardless of whether that is a traditionally affirmative position, a negative position, i.e., repairs or counterplan,<sup>15</sup> or a complete acceptance of the present system without modification. Since the affirmative is supposed to have isolated the truth, it leaves the negative with the options of not debating at all or of doing their own general systems analysis to find a second

version of the "truth." Carried to an extreme, this could result in the ludicrous position of the affirmative defending the status quo with the negative calling for the adoption of the resolution. General systems theory, for this reason alone, would not be a viable alternative to traditional case structure.

Furthermore, general systems theory cannot be modified to fit traditional burdens without defeating the purpose of the theory. For Tucker the purpose is to find the truth and persuade the audience that a particular solution should be adopted because it is the best possible solution. In doing this he denies the idea of a simulated decision-making experience. In expecting the advocate to be true to what he honestly believes, he denies the purpose of academic debate. If such a philosophy towards case-building were accepted, the educational value of switch-side debating would be lost. Since Tucker himself writes that the theory should not be used if the advocate does not intend to find the complete truth,<sup>16</sup> the theory could not be modified for use as a case structure.

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to analyze the value of general systems theory outside the realm of academic debate, such a construct is recommended in situations possessing some degree of reality. However, due to the conflict between the goals of general systems theory and those of educational debate, Professor Tucker's suggestions are not recommended as a case structure.

---

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup>For a full development of his position, see Raymond K. Tucker, "General Systems Theory: A Logical and Ethical Model for Persuasion," *JAF*, 8, No. 1 (Summer 1971), 29-35.

<sup>2</sup>Tucker, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, Wayne N. Thompson, *Modern Argumentation and Debate* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 52.

<sup>4</sup>Tucker, p. 35. "A general systems theory of advocacy operates under the assumption that a proposal ought to be capable of standing on its own merits. . . . The systems approach invites the audience to join with the advocate in an objective exploration. It recognizes the fallibility of the advocate's judgment, objectivity, and logical abilities—which is precisely the reason for its existence."



<sup>5</sup>Debaters traditionally propose the best possible solution within the scope of the resolution, while Tucker believes that the advocate should present the policy that is in the best total interests of his audience. Thus, the affirmative could, theoretically, determine that the present system best meets this qualification, putting the affirmative in the position of defending the status quo. If the negative team then defends their traditional position, the status quo, both teams agree and there is no need for a debate.

<sup>6</sup>Tucker, p. 35.

<sup>7</sup>Austin J. Freeley, *Argumentation and Debate*, 3rd ed. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1971), p. 2.

<sup>8</sup>For development of this controversy on one level, see James F. Klumpp, Bernard L. Brock, James W. Chesebro, and John F. Cragan, "Implications of a Systems Model of Analysis on Argumentation Theory," *JAF*, 11, No. 1 (Summer 1974), 1-7. Also Arthur N. Kruger, "On Systems Analysis in Debate: A Comment," *JAF*, 11, No. 4 (Spring 1975), 222-23, and Charles W. Kneupper, "On Systems Analysis: A Comment on a Comment," *JAF*, 12, No. 1 (Summer 1975), 56-57.

<sup>9</sup>See Freeley, pp. 15-26.

<sup>10</sup>Note that both Kruger and Kneupper claim the

Klumpp, et al position is primarily applicable to "real life" decision-making situations.

<sup>11</sup>For a more complete analysis of field dependent characteristics and the rationale behind them, see Richard D. Rieke and Malcolm O. Sillars, *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1975), pp. 282-90.

<sup>12</sup>Klumpp, et al, pp. 3-6.

<sup>13</sup>See Robert V. Seltzer, "The Alternative-Justification Affirmative: Practical and Theoretical Implications," *JAF*, 11, No. 3 (Winter 1975), 131-36.

<sup>14</sup>It has been suggested that systems theory can be utilized for analysis of the resolution and the results of this analysis applied to any of the currently accepted case structures. This use of systems analysis leaves most of the traditional rules of debate within the actual round intact and is not being argued by this writer. See, for example, Rieke and Sillars, pp. 179-81.

<sup>15</sup>A counterplan is defined as one that "is inconsistent with the resolution." See Freeley, pp. 236-39. Since in general systems theory the affirmative can decide that the best way to solve the problem is one not specified in the resolution, the affirmative proposal could be considered to be the position that would be taken in a negative counterplan.

<sup>16</sup>See footnote 2.

---

## The President's Message *(Continued from page 3)*

cational growth of all involved should be its justification. We are not athletes striving for that mythical "first place" in the entire nation. We all know that any winning debate, engaged in at another time, judged by different judges, might lose.

Give us parameters for debate topics on

which we vote. If necessary, go beyond parameters to limit the topic areas. We shouldn't have to have them, but the situation demands our action if we are to be able to continue the debate tournament as an educational activity rather than as an exercise in sophistic nit-picking.

*What's worse than running a provincial convention and not having PKD medals? See "The Secretary's Page" on page 11 to learn how to avoid this faux pas.*



# A VOICE CRYING OUT FROM THE WILDERNESS

Dale E. Black

Having just returned to the forensic foray after a year's sabbatical to work on a doctorate, I questioned whether my reluctance to "get back on the debate trail" came from: 1) past memories of hours spent in the stimulating surroundings of college classrooms, such as McCrumlik Hall 07A, a cubicle of elevator-size dimensions with institutional green walls and four steam registers that are connected to Auditorium B on the floor above causing the registers to function at 250° F. at *all* times while hissing like 300 rattlesnakes in heat, 2) listening to Team AX97B, The-Leaping-Pointing-Fingered-Screamers from Montezooma U., vs. Team BY79A, We're-Lost-in-a-Paper-Bag from Pleasehave-mercy Seminary, or 3) the Returning-to-Homeground-Letdown-Syndrome experienced by so many who return from graduate study. All of the previously mentioned situations were involved in my reluctance to again "hit the trail," but having now participated in several tournaments, I remember quite clearly why I was so happy to have a year away from the debate circuit. Once again we are into a proposition which provides the setting for small nut-gathering creatures to proliferate. Every debate seems to hinge on significance and/or inherency. And this year, in order for a case to have inherency, there must be a significant harm which can *only* result if proof is given that at least 8,000,000 people died when the sewage plants of Benign, Pennsylvania (covering 420 acres) backed up, and there wasn't a plumber's friend large enough to unstop the system before it overflowed! Why in a *land use* question do the *only* acceptable harms have to result in injury or death?

Repeatedly our squad receives ballots where the squirrel-case has won out for one of two reasons: either it's just like the case the judge-coach has for his squad, or the judge has debated the teams through-

out the ballot, and the loss is given to the team that he out-debated!

The purpose, then, for this article's being written is not to play "Look out, they're doing it to us again!" but rather to make a plea to tournament directors to use that opening meeting to remind judges-coaches to make every effort to provide decisions which reflect what the teams are doing and have done, not what they should have done but did not do. As a respected Kansas coach told me at a recent tournament, he looks at the bottom of the ballot where it is written: "The better debating was done by \_\_\_\_\_." It seems to me that if we are going to accept the side-issues cases, which in some instances may have some validity, then we, as judges, have to be doubly sure that our decisions are the result of the debates that occur in front of us and not the debates that we participate in within our minds.

This "voice from the debate wilderness" is certainly not crying out for anything new or different from what has been a debate issue since the inception of competition; however, it appears that each year it becomes progressively more difficult for me to justify to my debaters some of the decisions which indicate that the judge debated the teams or which indicate the acceptance of an off-beat case, even though the lack of significance had been pointed out in detail. It is disheartening to me to see young debaters eventually get exasperated to the level of refusing to participate further. It is at this point that I question the educational value of competitive debate and the relevancy of hours spent in preparation, revision, travel, and judging. The question now remains: "Will the voice be heard, or will it just be lost in the howl of the fast-paced winds of delivery?"

Dale E. Black is an assistant professor of speech at Hastings College and the sponsor of the Nebraska Delta chapter.



# PI KAPPA DELTA VISIBILITY AND SERVICE ON CAMPUS

Maryann Hartman

An area of concern for each Pi Kappa Delta chapter is visibility on its own campus. In the following paragraphs I will share with you some of the methods and activities I have used to promote visibility to students who are interested in forensics and to the university campus in general. The Public Relations and Research Committee of Pi Kappa Delta hopes that this report will be the springboard for the exchange of ideas among chapters. Please send you ideas to the Committee or to the editor of *The Forensic*.

Of primary importance to Maine Beta chapter has been making students who have some interest in forensics aware of Pi Kappa Delta. The department of speech under Wofford Gardner as chairman has been very willing to list Pi Kappa Delta as one of the sponsors of the high school debate tournaments and workshops. PKD members have helped with registration, chairing sessions, judging, and tabulating. Many of the high school participants will later attend Maine and through these events become aware of Pi Kappa Delta. We have set up a display during freshman orientation and also have prepared a script and slides to be used for the same group. When we held early fall recruitment get-togethers, the president of Pi Kappa Delta explained the honorary.

Also important to our chapter is our image in the university community. Each year the debate team and Pi Kappa Delta members ask the faculty with expertise on the debate topic to share with us their thoughts about the topic, and we, in turn, offer to hold debates for their classes. We have debated for beginning economics and political science classes. After the debates there are always a lot of questions and interest in debate at the university. In both courses students elected to use debate in the classroom as a way to fulfill

term project assignments. We supplied them with help and books and materials.

Pi Kappa Delta has helped to sponsor the British debate team on campus, and Pi Kappa Delta membership was part of the introductions of the Maine debaters. The debates drew about one hundred people, so this helped visibility.

The energy problem was of great interest on campus and within the state. Pi Kappa Delta members participated in an educational debate on the energy problem. Other participants were the president of the Dead River Gas and Oil Company and the editor of the *Maine Times*, a strict environmentalist publication. We tried to adapt to a broad audience during the debate. The PKD debaters were also asked to serve on campus panels on the energy problem.

I have used reenactments of famous debates as a part of my beginning class in debate and think that Pi Kappa Delta could sponsor such reenactments as part of the Bicentennial. Professor Murrish, chairman of the Public Relations and Research Committee, mentioned that some years ago he had done this type of thing in a program featuring the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

I sum up these activities with some general rules: use every opportunity to have Pi Kappa Delta listed as sponsor of debate activities; make sure that PKD members point to their membership when they participate in activities; and, whenever possible, Pi Kappa Delta should extend itself to help the speech department and university.

Maryann Hartman is a member of the Public Relations and Research Committee and the sponsor of Maine Beta chapter at the University of Maine in Orono.



# The Secretary's Page. . . Theodore O. H. Karl

As I sit in the National Office looking at the gray Washington sky in a part of the country that did not have much of an Indian summer this year, the question comes to mind as to what could come out of this office that will be most important to Pi Kappa Delta. Suddenly I remember that yesterday many parts of the country received their first snow fall, and in some cases a blizzard, and immediately the sky becomes blue! I am conscious of some of the things I should be talking to the membership about, especially the fact that this is a province convention year. We have already been in contact with the governors asking for information as to the time and place of the province conventions. Before you know it, it will be spring.

The province is a most important link between the local chapter and the national organization, and we assume that every chapter has practically completed its plans to attend the provincial convention in 1976. As has been said before, the local chapter is the heart and soul of the organization, but without successful provincial activities and participation, the national organization can do little. My experience has been that the province conventions are very nearly as exciting as the nationals. They are smaller, and many of the provincials are at resort areas which give a degree of informality and an opportunity for fraternal companionship. It is a time for exchange of ideas with those we see most often. It certainly should provide a surcease from the hard driving, win-at-all-costs kind of competition and make a serious business of the organization in deliberative meetings. The province convention should provide recreation and fellowship for all. The National Office stands ready to supply the awards in the form of certificates and medals as the requests from the provinces come in, but we beg you to send your orders early enough for us to complete them in time. When making your convention plans, keep in mind that it takes approximately eight weeks for medals and four to five weeks for certificates.

We wish to thank the governors for their renewed efforts in getting the Fall

Reports in, and it is such a pleasure to tell you that there was approximately a 20% increase in the number returned over last year. This does not mean that we have been entirely successful, since although 110 chapters reported last year and 137 reported this year, we still have only about a 50% return. It is not too late to send the Fall Report for mailings in the spring and for correct addresses and numbers of *Forensics* to be mailed to each chapter. If you did not receive a Fall Report form or did not hear from your governor, please advise this office, and a form will be sent to you. We ask you to return it, postage free, to bring our records up to date. In this issue will be found the directory included by rule of the Constitution. You will get an idea of the non-reporting schools or those which did not report early enough to meet the deadline for *The Forensic*.

Now is the time of the year to concentrate on your new members drive, since a delegate to the province convention must be a member of Pi Kappa Delta prior to his or her attendance. By the middle of February, most students will have qualified for membership according to the Constitution. Do not delay sending in these memberships, since if they come to this office from the chapters all at one time, there may well be a delay in returning membership cards to the schools. These will be processed as rapidly as is humanly possible, for we want as many people as possible to be a part of the organization and take part in the province conventions.

This year instead of making up a completely new price list which at best is tenuous due to the almost daily change in gold prices and general inflation, we simply added to the pink attachment on the green price list a handwritten statement adding \$2.00 across the board to all keys. This increase is based on the new prices from Balfour. The fraternity does not make, nor have any desire to make, a profit on the keys but hopes that as many members as possible will wear proudly the key of the fraternity. If you do not have

(Continued on page 31)