

contemporary, and modern sources. He introduces students to original analysis of the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s that were germane to a discussion of the nature and practice of debate. This often makes the material lively in its unique and informatively detailed illustrations and it carries the concomitant benefits of demonstrating the value of employing primary sources in research.

Another unique value of Branham's text is the way that it frames a discussion of values in debate. Branham approaches the subject of values in debate under the rubric of 'moral' argument. He makes it clear that values tend to entail moral choices and that those choices may be either explicitly stated in a proposition for debate or grounded in the inherent balancing of costs and benefits that must occur in the process of resolving a conflict of ideas and proposals. Further, the bulk of Branham's discussion of moral/value positions is framed around the use of argument from analogy. This approach provides the most robust treatment of argument from analogy available in a basic argumentation text and demonstrates the very powerful discursive nature of such language strategies as analogy and metaphor.

Despite the many unique benefits associated with Branham's text, some instructors of argumentation and debate will find the text limited in a number of ways. For example, if an instructor places a heavy reliance on academic debate techniques as a means to facilitate instruction, he or she will probably find Branham's attention to the subject rather 'thin'. In addition, those who are interested in introducing students to some of the more important contemporary and modern argumentation theorists such as Toulmin or Fisher will be very disappointed. Branham fails to provide a clear incorporation of such recent developments as argument fields or the narrative paradigm anywhere in his text. Though these limitations are severe in many ways, they are not sufficient to allow one to discount Branham's text when making a choice as to what book to use in the basic argumentation course. As noted, the text is rich in many ways and it should be given full consideration by instructors of the argumentation and debate course.

BOOK REVIEW

CEDA 1991: 20TH ANNIVERSARY ASSESSMENT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

**ED. DAVID A. THOMAS AND STEVEN C. WOOD.
DUBUQUE, IA: KENDALL-HUNT, 1993**

reviewed by C. Thomas Preston, Jr.

Ever since 1920 when a national debate topic was first offered in the United States, a practical issue has existed in US American debate: Given the wealth of information about the topic and the limited amount of time a debater has to speak, what should the debater do—get in as much information as humanly possible and comprehensible to a debate specialist, or forgo the presentation of information for the sake of effective delivery to a general audience? In this edition about CEDA's 1991 developmental conference, Cox (1993) notes that this dilemma has repeated itself for years, stating "This assessment conference to me, is an attempt to ask ourselves where we are and what can be done to correct ourselves with reference to the other elements in the tournament debating cycle. Also, we should not be afraid of the 'new things' that might come along" (p. 111). Yet as Burtis (1993) adds, "this report does not contain a sense of support for the consensus behind the individual ideas it contains. It was beyond my ability to determine such support" (p. 121). It was also beyond the ability of both rhetoricians and dialecticians of classical antiquity.

And so it goes—intercollegiate debate, after this assessment conference, remained clearly divided into two camps—those who preferred a general audience, persuasive approach to the information quantity/time dilemma (Horn & Underberg, 1993; Frank, 1993; and Cox, 1993), and those who stressed the value of students being able to communicate effectively, efficiently, and quickly to an expert, specialized audience (Stanfield, 1993 and Steinberg, 1993). Although this edition includes five major sections—Introduction to the Proceedings and four task group reports (on Educational Value, The Debate Educator, Debating Policies and Values, and Organizational Structure), the two most pivotal sections at this conference, and thus those of most value to students of the history of debate development in America, are those in Educational Value and Debating Policies and Values. Hence, this review will highlight each section in order, with the greater attention paid to the two pivotal sections.

Although the introductory section includes some interesting demographic data about CEDA even if containing the typographical errors one sometimes finds in Kendall-Hunt work, an interesting keynote address by W. Scott Nobles, coach of Macalester College and Champion of the first NDT, highlights the preview. Nobles (1993) previews the key issues of the conference well in stating that "The entire debate community faces problems which are both clear and serious as we proceed through the 1990s" (p. 7) and in asking, "To what extent should student learning be limited to their dialectic skills to the

possible neglect of their rhetorical skills? How closely should we try to make our laboratories resemble real-world public argumentation?" (p. 9). At the same time, Nobles (1993) saw at least two clear areas of the organization's success, stating, "cross examination debating is firmly entrenched in the entire debate community, and it has made an hour or so of debate more interesting for debaters and their auditors" (p. 6), and "I think few would disagree that our CEDA sweepstakes system has shifted emphasis toward school and squad achievement and lessened emphasis on single team achievements" (p. 7). He also expressed hope for the future, noting, "In the end we may not quite create a 'Spirit of St. Paul' which fully matches the 'Spirit of Sedalia,' but we can examine problems, resolve differences, rededicate ourselves the present goals and commit ourselves to new goals" (p. 9).

Unfortunately, after reading the Educational Value section, one might view the Spirit of St. Paul as a spirit of dissension and splintering, rather than any attempt to resolve differences. After an arguably stereotypical characterization of the conflict being the old guard, rhetorical scholars versus the critical thinkers and young Turks (Thomas, 1993a), Horn and Underberg (1993) present an excellent study and rationale for the notion that educational debate, as they see it, is an unfulfilled promise. To demonstrate this claim, they present results of a survey of what students felt they got out of debate, and noted that the lower rankings of some items such as social skills point to a weakness in debate as practiced in CEDA at the time. They also present their argument well that the competitive nature of debate, as then practiced in CEDA, has prompted some educators to take shortcuts. As Thomas points out in his introduction, Frank (1993) takes a more argumentative approach. In his paper, Frank points out how debate has "emasculated rhetoric" (p. 79). In the three responses to these papers, Cox (1993) generally applauds the positions of the authors, and calls for action to correct the abuses in debate noted in these papers, even if it means splintering into another debate form or group. This discussion provided a particularly interesting prelude to the 1990s experiment in Officialized Debate, developed by Cox, and the subsequent 1994 formation and exclusionism of the National Educational Debate Association, developed and led by Horn and Underberg. In any event, all three papers do a good job of supporting their viewpoints with sources and history, and deserve to be read by proponents and opponents alike.

Yet the task group could not reach a consensus and instead presented two opposing proposals, one based on the notion that CEDA did have a delivery crisis, and one based on the notion that it did not. (Burtis, 1993). Steinberg (1993) and Stanfield (1993) present sound arguments for CEDA debate as it had developed as of 1991—into an evidence-centered, and by that time at the very least, quasipolicy debate form. Both papers are well developed and positive about the CEDA debate activity as is. Stanfield (1993) went so far as to note that in an age of the sound bite where students will go into technical fields and have to process, evaluate, and communicate information more rapidly, to claim debate should be based on an older, "rhetorical" model was "downright irresponsible" (p. 104). Disappointingly to the proponents of evidence- and expert-oriented debate, neither paper grounds its arguments in past theory, nor do they offer a single source from among the plethora of literature available from past proponents of creative argumentation and quick, research oriented debate. However, the stories told by each article make good sense, and should, again, be read by opponents and proponents alike.

The second section shifts focus from the educational value derived by students from debate to the role of the educator. McGee (1993) presents a well-documented argument that when a debate community becomes diverse, it faces challenges when it comes to a consensus among educators about what constitutes the best debate education. Hunt (1993) argues most effectively and with strong support that in order to avoid burnout, coaches needed to meet certain qualifications including training in what to expect, and that tournaments and working conditions must be made more "humane." The consensus of this task force, based on these less controversial ideas, seemed more unified than the Educational Value task force, and is presented well at the end of the section (Glenn, 1993).

The introduction to the third section concerning the value/policy controversy in CEDA again provides pivotal historical as well as theoretical information, given the clear shift that CEDA has subsequently taken back to policy debating. Here, Thomas (1993b) gives a much more cogent introduction to the participants' positions, and prepares the reader well to read both essays with an open mind. In the essays, Brey (1993) notes the transition taking place in CEDA away from pure value argumentation, and suggests that the organization go away from the notion of "quasipolicy-non-policy" debating and back to resolutions that clearly fit within the traditional categories of fact, value, or policy. Since his essay, CEDA clearly has chosen the policy track although topics of each three types generally may appear on a topic ballot. The one disappointment in the Brey essay is its failure to use sample resolutions as vehicles to illustrate more clearly what he means by "quasipolicy-non-policy", value, fact, or policy resolutions, or hybrids. In fact, his notion of quasipolicy is questionable—for example, most scholars see the resolution, "Resolved: That increased United States space exploration would be justified" as a quasipolicy version of the policy resolution, "Resolved: that the United States should increase space exploration." By 1991, quasipolicy often gave debaters license to utilize plans for the resolutions like the former, as well as treat them as the latter. Thus, to many minds, the more accurate term would be quasipolicy-policy rather than quasipolicy-non policy. At any rate, Brey gives an interesting rationale for the choice of CEDA resolutions, and his suggestions that prospective topics both fit into clear categories and be adjudged metatheoretically (in this case, by Littlejohn's five criteria for effective communication theory) proved to be well-argued.

The Sommers and Roper (1993) piece should be a must for students to read, even with the official switchover to policy resolutions that has become embedded in CEDA since 1995. In fact, NEDA, NFA, and parliamentary debaters can profit from this article, which notes philosophical means of argumentation as well as the possibility of opening up a world of theory that can be used, in debate, outside of what the forensics journals publish. Although, again, the authors would have been more informative had they provided a more extensive list of philosophical readings students could use to back criteria in debate, they provide good support for all points they made. Thomas noted, their conception of a plan not being able to prove the truth of a resolution provides keen insight into the pivotal value-policy controversy. In their persuasive dissent to this paper, Berube and Snider (1993) criticized Sommers and Roper's alleged misunderstanding of gaming. Although Berube and Snider's discussion was strongly written and presented sound evidence, as well as making a persuasive case for their positions, it doesn't necessarily deny

the value of the Sommers and Ropers perspective as at least a viable alternative. Students should carefully read both sides and thoughtfully consider their implications for debating.

The fourth section concerning organizational structure rehashes some of the arguments in previous sections, as well as some recurring issues in CEDA debating. Since this conference, the organizational structure has not seemed to have been affected as much by this task force as much as debate itself was affected by the other task forces. At the same time, two of the papers in this section should interest students, if for no other purpose than to understand recent debate history. First, one finds one of Jack Howe's last statements on the original purposes of CEDA debate and how they transpired—a must for a student of the recent history of CEDA, or intercollegiate US debate in general (Howe & Brownlee, 1993). Next, one finds a short but interesting article by Trapp (1993), which rehashes the dialectician versus rhetorician dispute within CEDA, clearly takes the rhetorician side, and says that as of 1991, the time for a revolution had yet to come. Yet it was Trapp who has been president and one of the leading forces behind the National Parliamentary Debate Association, an organization of faculty-supported, non-evidentiary extemporaneous debate programs. Interestingly, its membership has skyrocketed in the Western section, while at the same time, CEDA has plummeted there in light of CEDA'S further lurch into policy debate.

Overall, despite some careless editing on the part of the publishers, this book summarizes a pivotal conference that, arguably, had one of two outcomes. In a sense, the proceedings can be viewed as exemplifying as well as foretelling a disastrous splintering of debate—a splintering that weakens debate as the activity has balkanized into at least seven competing and, for the most part, mutually hostile groups (NEDA, NDA, CEDA/NDT, NFA, NPDA, APDA, and ADA), vastly increasing the membership dues of programs that want to keep abreast of each, and restricting students from critiques from scholars of different perspectives.¹ Alternatively, these proceedings can be viewed a revolution in debate education, pointing to an eventual topic merger between the dialecticians of CEDA and NDT and the discovery of other alternatives for the CEDA rhetoricians, hence making pedagogy a clearer endeavor once a scholar and/or team chooses one of these narrower groups, thereby demarcating debate into alternatives in which students will at least clearly know the criteria over which they might be judged. Whether we view the Spirit of St. Paul as an Angel or a Demon, this volume should be required reading for anybody who coaches debate today and must consider the alternatives best for a debate program. Like it or not, its seeds have shaped the intercollegiate debate activity and the debating opportunities afforded our students today.

Notes

NEDA, arguably one ultimate outgrowth of this conference, discourages members from competing in alternative forms of policy debate, and severely limits the arguments debaters can posit in a round by allowing judges to threaten double-losses.

References

- Berube, D. M. & Snider, A. C. (1993). Ambush of a straw man: A criticism of "criterial considerations in sorting resolutions: Is CEDA debate a game?" by Sommers and Roper. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 239-243.
- Brey, J. R. (1993). The use and abuse of criteria in CEDA debate rounds: Criteria misconceptions and confused propositional analysis. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 199-220.
- Cox, E. S. (1993). A reaction to Frank, Horn, and Underberg: An assessment on assessments. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 109-119.
- Frank, D. (1993). Debating as rhetorical scholarship. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 75-95.
- Glenn, R. (1993). Debate educator task force 1991 CEDA assessment conference. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 183-191.
- Horn, G. & Underberg, L. (1993). Educational debate: An unfulfilled promise. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 37-74.
- Howe, J. & Brownlee, D. (1993). The founding principles of CEDA. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 249-262.
- Hunt, S. (1993). Avoiding the burnout of CEDA educators. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 169-182.
- McGee, B. (1993). The next generation of CEDA educators. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 139-168.
- Nobles, W. S. (1993). Keynote address: Assessing CEDA: Achievements and challenges. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 5-10.
- Sommers, T. W. & Roper, J. E. (1993). Criterial considerations in sorting resolutions: Is CEDA debate a game? In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 221-238.
- Stanfield, S. J. (1993). Response to Frank, Horn, and Underberg. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 103-108.
- Steinberg, D. (1993). Some thoughts on debate in the 90's. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 119-124.

ceedings. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 97-102.

Thomas, D. A. (1993a). Introduction to educational value. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 31-36.

Thomas, D. A. (1993b). Introduction to the debating policies and values task group. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 193-198.

Trapp, R. (1993). Some reflections on the development of CEDA. In Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, pp. 287-290.

BOOK REVIEW

ARGUMENT IN CONTROVERSY: PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTH SCA/AFA CONFERENCE ON ARGUMENTATION

DONN W. PARSON, EDITOR

**ANNANDALE, VA: SPEECH COMMUNICATION
ASSOCIATION, 1991**

reviewed by C. Thomas Preston, Jr.

In this lengthy, 462-page volume, Donn W. Parson and his review team of Rebecca S. Bjork, Dennis Gouran, Raymie E. McKerrow, and Malcolm O. Sillars have produced a thorough and representative body of thought on argumentation from the leading scholars in America. As an attendee of the conference, this reviewer was impressed with the attention to the detail in which these ideas were presented. Just as the University of Utah was a successful host of this conference, so was the editor and his staff in preparing this extensive proceedings book. Unlike the condensed proceedings of the St. Paul (Thomas & Woods, 1993) argumentation conference sponsored by CEDA that same year, an article by article account within the page limits of this journal is impossible. Instead, this review will examine the proceedings on a more macro level, especially as they focused more on applications of argumentation, dialectical, and rhetorical theory in the real world more than the intercollegiate activity itself. Undoubtedly, different readers will see different articles as their main area of interest, and would, if reviewing this lengthy volume, highlight different examples. Yet to present as succinct an

over view as possible, this essay will first summarize the content of the proceedings, and then analyze the choice of materials.

In terms of content, part I is aptly entitled, "Controversy as Argument," beginning first with a keynote address by Goodnight (1991), and then followed by four keynote responses. The second section, entitled "Theoretical Issues in Argument," contains seven articles that elucidate how rhetorical theories of various sorts can be applied to artifacts of argumentation. The third section, "Dimensions of Political Argument" is subdivided into three subsections. In the first subsection, Nelson (1991) examines the tropes of political argument in the United States. In the second subsection entitled "Historical Cases," the reader discovers four political movement criticisms of past cases. The third subsection, entitled "Contemporary Cases," includes seven contemporary studies of argumentative studies in political discourse.

A fourth section, entitled "Argument in Interpersonal and Group Contexts," contains three subsections as well. The first subsection contains seven articles on "Theoretical Issues;" the second includes six articles "Strategic Uses and Outcomes of Argument;" and the third presents four articles on "Argument in Group Interaction." The fifth section, "Spheres of Argument," contains six rather loosely connected articles. The sixth section, "Argument in Specialized Disciplines," includes four subsections: one with three articles on "Science," one with seven articles on "Environment," one with four articles on "Law," and one with three articles on "Aesthetics."

The seventh, and final section, involves four subsections concerning "Forensics," or, in this case, intercollegiate competition in debate and the value thereof. It contains four sections, each which reflected the central controversies that occurred at the St. Paul conference the same year. The first subsection contains four articles concerning Forensics Pedagogy; the second contains three articles about Format and Forum Innovations in Forensics; the third contains four articles on "NDT and CEDA: Prospects and Problems;" and the fourth involves three articles about "Intersections Between Academic Debate and Argumentation Theory." All told, the volume contains 5 speeches and 73 papers by a total of 104 authors, representing some of the most outstanding scholarship and scholars within the US American field of argumentation.

For the readers, two key elements of this volume testify to its value for Pi Kappa Delta members in particular, and perhaps argumentation scholars in general. First, in the first six sections, the volume takes the reader through a variety of perspectives on argumentation as not only a theoretical concept, but how it applies to every aspect of life. Goodnight (1991) sets the tone of the conference in stating, "Controversies permeate contemporary life, enveloping consumer culture, public discourse, social institutions, interest groups, and specialized disciplines" (p. 2). In outlining how controversies affect our lives, Goodnight's keynote address previews well the content of the proceedings which, as outlined above, involve controversies surrounding just about every conceivable angle of our private and public lives. No matter what one's specialty in the communication field, one can, for the most part, find some article of interest within the first six sections of this volume. These articles contain a wealth and breadth of theory as well; by reading these chapters, we are introduced to post modernism, cultural criticism, conflict management theory, constructivism, Burkean dramatic theory, Marxist theory, aesthetic theory, and feminism. As one skims through the titles and articles, one does discover one weakness, a weakness more in conference planning more than

editing. Although some participants offered lip service to multiculturalism, voices from cultures other than the Caucasian American culture are utterly muted in these proceedings—even in terms of male-female participation, of the planners, three were female, and out of the 119 attendees listed on p. xii, 28 were female. Almost no non-Caucasian voices were heard, and Afrocentric and Latino perspectives were either absent or reported second-hand. In an increasingly multicultural age where the United States population alone will likely include a majority of persons of color within the lifetimes of many of the conference attendees, the conference lost a key chance to learn different ways of arguing and advocating, and hence, different ways of understanding.

Second, in terms of the seventh section on forensics, again, traditionally underrepresented voices remain not represented. Nonetheless, there are some new ideas introduced that could potentially make argumentation activities more accessible for a diversity of participants. Some papers, in fact, have already affected debate practices. As of 1991, for example, the norm at most debate tournaments was that judges would not reveal decisions or offer immediate oral feedback. At this conference, Rhodes (1991) advocated that, "there are three important benefits to disclosure that outweigh any disadvantages thus far articulated: (1) immediacy of the critique of the round; (2) opportunity to ask questions of the critic; and (3) opportunity to correct problems perceived by the critic as the student proceeds to subsequent rounds" (p. 404). Since this conference, such feedback has evolved into the norm at most policy debate tournaments. Although isolated examples of incivility have occurred (Biles, 1996) and the practice can delay the tournament, most participants have enjoyed the additional educational benefits of this direct interaction.

Two other articles in this section strongly invite participation by a wider and more diverse group of contestants: McKiernan and Edleman (1991) offer mock trial as an alternative argumentation event, and in an information technology age, Cox, Jensen, Wheeler, and Fulton (1991) note how audience participation in a debate can be gauged mechanically by having members react, with a device, while the debate is occurring, so that their aggregate reaction can appear on a television monitor!

The remainder of this section stands out not so much as the innovations of the three articles highlighted, but for how it exemplified key conflicts that ultimately led to several debate experiments, a topic merger between CEDA and NDT, and the formation of splinter groups as persons resolved these conflicts differently. By reading about controversies in debating values and policies, controversies surrounding delivery versus information processing in debate, controversies over whether debate should be for specialized or public audiences, and controversies concerning critic attitudes and attitudes toward critics, argumentation scholars gain a keener understanding of the issues that sometimes recur in debate over what constitutes the best advocacy, as well as the roots of how the activity became structured as it exists today.

Thus, the conference ended on the note in which it began, on controversy as the volume comes to its conclusion. The well-edited volume may contain weaknesses in its non-inclusiveness of a diversity of voices, yet it does an excellent job of presenting a breadth and wealth of the many, rich perspectives offered by those who did participate in this conference. In terms of forensics practitioners, its articles provided a good summary of the state of the art and controversies therein. Because of the generally constructive atmosphere of this

conference reflected in its proceedings, these proceedings come as highly recommended reading to students, teachers, and practitioners of argumentation—and that involves virtually everybody!

References

- Biles, R. (1996). If this is so much fun why aren't we smiling?: A modest proposal to address incivility in intercollegiate debate. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 1: 2, 86-91.
- Cox, E. S., Jensen, S. C., Wheeler, C. & Fulton, M. (1991). An objective analysis of one audience debate. In Parson, D.W., Ed., *Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, pp. 1-13.
- Goodnight, G. T. (1991). Keynote address, "controversy." In Parson, D.W., Ed., *Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, pp. 1-13.
- McKiernan, J. & Edleman, P. (1991). Intercollegiate mock trial as an alternative argumentation event. In Parson, D.W., Ed., *Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, pp. 413-417.
- Nelson, J. (1991). Tropes of political argument in America. In Parson, D.W., Ed., *Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, pp. 73-79.
- Rhodes, J. (1991). Judge disclosure and argument pedagogy. In Parson, D.W., Ed., *Argument in Controversy: Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, pp. 404-405.
- Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C., eds. (1993). *CEDA 1991: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt.

BOOK REVIEW/VIDEO AND SOFTWARE CRITIQUES NEEDED FOR *THE FORENSIC*

The editor is seeking book reviews and video and software critiques for *The Forensic*. Reviews should be submitted with a camera ready hard copy and a 3½ inch disk with the review in Microsoft Word or Word Perfect Mac or DOS in Modern Language Association Style, 4th edition.

See reviews from previous issues of *The Forensic* for models. Reviews can be of anything relevant to rhetoric, public address, and forensics including any of the following subject areas: rhetoric, public address, argumentation, debate, forensics, public speaking, reasoning, values, tournaments or tournament management, forensics competition, rhetorical theory, rhetorical criticism, public speaking, persuasion, expository speaking, oral interpretation, parliamentary debate, forensics pedagogy, etc.

Suggestions for review include but are not limited to the following:

James Andrews, ed. *Colonial Rhetoric and the Sources of American Identity* Michigan St. University Press.

Michael Bartanen and David Frank *Nonpolicy Debate* 2nd ed. Scottsdale, AZ.: Gorsuch Scarisbrick 1994.

William Benoit, Dale Hample, and Pam Benoit, eds. *Readings in Argumentation*. N.Y.: Foris Publishers, 1992.

Thomas Benson, ed. *Landmark Essays on Rhetorical Criticism*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 1993.

David Berube *Nonpolicy Debating*. University Press of America, 1993.

Edwin Black. *Rhetorical Questions: Studies of Public Discourse*. University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Steve Brydon and Michael Scott. *Between One and Many: The Art and Science of Public Speaking*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing, 1994

Carolyn Calloway Thomas and John Lucaites *Martin Luther King and His Sermonic Power of Public Discourse*. University of Alabama Press, 1993.

Karlynn Kohrs Campbell. *The Rhetorical Act*. 2nd ed. Wadsworth, 1996.

_____. *Women Public Speakers in the US 1925-1993*. Greenwood Press, 1994.

Diana Carlin and Mitchell McKinney eds *The 1992 Presidential Debates in Focus* Greenwood (Praeger), 1994.

CEA Yearbook 1991, 1992, 1993 editions

Championship Debate and Speeches SCA 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994 editions

Martha Cooper and William Nothstine *Power Persuasion: Moving an Ancient Art into the Modern Age* Alistair Press, 1992.

Theresa Enos and Stuart Brown. *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1994.

- Flood, Royce and Cripe, Nicholas M. *Scholastic Debater*. Greenwood, IN: Alastair Press, 1990.
- Douglas Fraleigh and Joe Tuman. *Freedom of Speech in the Marketplace of Ideas*. St Martin's Press, 1997.
- David Frank. *Creative Speaking*. 2nd ed. Lincolnwood, IL.: National Textbook, 1995.
- Robert V. Friedenberg, ed. *Rhetorical Studies of National Presidential Debates 1960-1992*. 2nd ed. Praeger, 1993.
- Dirk Gibson. *The Role of Communication in the Practice of Law*. University Press of America, 1991.
- Eugene Garver. *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An Art of Character*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Ann Gill. *Rhetoric and Human Understanding*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1994.
- C.T. Hanson et al. *The Practice of Public Speaking: A Practical Guide for Beginning Speakers*. 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co., 1992.
- Seth Hawkins Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results 1992 or 1993
- Dale A Herbeck, ed. *Free Speech Yearbook*, Vol. 32, 1994. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1995.
- James Herrick. *Argumentation: Analyzing and Shaping Arguments*. Scottsdale, AZ.: Gorsuch Publishers, 1995.
- _____. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Publishers, 1997.
- Bill Hill and Richard Leeman. *The Art and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*. Mayfield Publishing, 1997.
- Ed Hinck. *Enacting the Presidency: Political Argument, Presidential Debates, and Presidential Character*. Greenwood, 1993.
- Ed Inch, ed. *Proceedings of PKD Third Development Conference*.
- Sally Jackson, ed. *Argumentation and Values: Proceedings of the Ninth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale, VA.: SCA, 1995.
- George Kennedy. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Donald Klopf and Ron Cambra. *Personal and Public Speaking*. 4th ed. Morton Publishing, 1993.
- D. Leith and G. Myerson. *Rhetoric, Reason, and Argument: The Power of Public Address Explorations in Rhetoric*
- L.H. LaRue. *Constitutional Law as Fiction: Narrative in The Rhetoric of Authority*. Pennsylvania St. University Press
- Mieczyslaw Maneli. *Perelman's New Rhetoric As Philosophy and Methodology for the Next Century*. Kluwer Academic, 1993.

- Bon Matlon. *Opening Statements and Closing Arguments*. Stuart Allen, 1992.
- Brian MacArthur, ed. *The Penguin Book of Twentieth-Century Speeches*.
- Donna McKersy, ed. *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge: Proceedings of the 8th SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. SCA, 1993.
- Martin Medhurst, ed. *Landmark Essays on American Public Address*. Herma Press, 1995.
- Michel Meyer. *Rhetoric, Language, and Reason*. Pennsylvania St. University Press, 1994.
- Charles Mudd and Malcolm Sillars. *Public Speaking: Content and Communication*. 6th ed. Waveland, 1991.
- Robert Pinto and John Anthony Blair. *Reasoning: A Practical Guide*, 1993.
- Ronald Reid. *American Rhetorical Discourse*. 2nd ed. Prospect Heights, IL.: Waveland Press, 1995.
- John Reinard. *Foundations of Argument: Effective Communication for Critical Thinking*. Brown and Benchmark, 1991
- _____. *Introduction to Communication Research*. Brown and Benchmark, 1994.
- Halford Ryan. *U.S. Presidents as Orators*. Greenwood Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Inaugural Addresses of Twentieth-Century American Presidents*. Greenwood Press, 1993.
- Edward Schiappa, ed. *Warranting Assent: Case Studies in Argument Evaluation*. SUNY Press, 1995.
- Sharon Shavitt and Tom Brock. *Persuasion*. Allyn and Bacon, 1994.
- J. Michael Sproule. *Speechmaking: Rhetorical Competence in A Post Modern World*. Brown and Benchmark, 1997.
- David Thomas and J. Hart, eds. *Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice and Teaching*. 4th ed. National Textbook, 1992.
- Carolyn Calloway Thomas and John Lucaites, eds. *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Sermonic Power of Public Discourse*. University of Alabama Press, 1993
- Marlene Vallin. *Mark Twain: Protagonist for the Popular Culture*. Greenwood, 1992 (#18 in Great American Orators Series)
- David Vancil. *Rhetoric and Argumentation*. Allyn, 1992.
- Erasmus van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst. *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragmadiialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992.
- _____. + J. Anthony Blair, and Charles A. Willard. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Argumentation*. University of Amsterdam, 1990.

Ralph Verderber. *Essentials of Informative Speaking: Theory and Contexts*. Wadsworth, 1991.

Douglas N. Walton. *Plausible Argument in Everyday Conversation*. SUNY Press, 1992.

_____. *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. Pennsylvania St. University Press, 1992.

_____. *A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy*. University of Alabama Press, 1995.

Robert O Weiss *Public Argument*. University Press of America, 1995.

Roy Wood and Lynn Goodnight. *Strategic Debate*. 5th ed Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Publishing Co, 1994.

Judy Yordon. *Roles in Interpretation*. Brown and Benchmark, 1993.

David Zarefsky, ed. *Rhetorical Movement: Essays in Honor of Leland M Griffin*. Northwestern University Press, 1993.

_____. *Public Speaking: Strategies for Success*. Allyn and Bacon, 1996.

Raymond Zeuschner. *Communicating Today*. Allyn, 1992.

The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta

LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

(By and forward to your librarian)

Name _____

Department _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please enter a subscription to **The Forensic** at the subscriber rate of \$30 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription will begin with the current issue.

One year ☐ \$30 Two years ☐ \$60 Three years ☐ \$75

On subscriptions outside the U.S. add \$12 per year for foreign postage.

Prices effective through December 31, 1997

Make check payable to **The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta**

Order from your subscription agent or directly from:

Robert Littlefield

National Secretary-Treasurer PKD

Box 5075 University Station

North Dakota State University

Fargo, ND 58105-5075

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through Secretary-Treasurer Littlefield's Office include:

The History of Pi Kappa Delta by Larry Norton

_____ copies @ \$10/each \$ _____

The Proceedings of the 1989 PKD Developmental Conference

ed. by Dr. Robert S. Littlefield _____ copies @ \$5/each \$ _____

The Proceedings of the 1995 PKD Developmental Conference

ed. by Scott Jensen _____ copies @ \$5/each \$ _____

Past issues of *The Forensic* (specify year/issue)

_____ copies @ \$5/each \$ _____