

raises. (pp. 51-52).

Suffice it to say, because of the social aspect of argumentation, there is a need for self-reflexivity in argumentative contexts. This is heightened in competitive NPDA debate, given that debaters and judges have no access to written evidence in chambers. Hence, the possibility of error on the part of debaters is quite possibly greater in this extemporaneous form of debate than in CEDA/NDT. Coaches, therefore, must train their debaters to take responsibility for the arguments they are advancing in rounds.

The second theoretical implication for debaters and directors of forensics is obligation to the other. Coaches are obviously obligated to their teams because of their job; however, they are in a unique position because they have so much interpersonal contact with their team in a variety of contexts. Likewise, debaters have an ethical obligation to their partner on a personal, professional, and practical level. Herrick (2007) supported this position by explaining that argument virtue is concerned with "honesty," "[c]ourage in argument," "cooperation," "respect for persons," and "regard for contexts" (pp. 52-54). These concerns contained in Herrick's argumentation text reveal the necessity to take advice from the Levinasian notion that the heart of ethics is centered on concern for the Other. Being Other- or audience-centered encourages NPDA debaters to uphold the utmost integrity.

The third theoretical implication for debaters and directors of forensics is authenticity. Though debaters do not have to personally agree with every position they are forced to debate, they must be honest in the arguments they present in support of those positions. Directors of forensics can train this behavior best by modeling honesty at all times. The very nature of rhetorical argumentation requires authenticity. As described by Johnson (2000):

Genuine dialogue requires not merely the presence of the Other, or speech between the two, but the real possibility that that the logos of the Other will influence one's own logos. An exchange is dialectical when, as a result of the intervention of the Other, one's own logos (discourse, reasoning, or thinking) has the potential of being affected in some way. Specifically, the arguer agrees to let the feedback from the Other affect the product. The arguer consents to take criticism and take it seriously. (p. 161)

By agreeing to compete in NPDA debate, debaters are consenting to the argumentation that the Other (in this case, the opposing team) will provide. The fact that cross-examination occurs during constructive speeches forces an unmasked authenticity perhaps not as prevalent in other formats of debate.

Pragmatically speaking, it seems quite clear that both debaters and directors of forensics are charged with critical thought, action in process, and balance. The first pragmatic implication for debaters and directors of forensics is critical thought. The entire idea behind debate is to train students in critical thinking. Directors of forensics can do

this training at least partially through modeling this process when they make decisions with ethical implications.

The second pragmatic implication for debaters and directors of forensics is action in process. Ethics is a complex, fluid thing with no clear answer or application at any given moment. Dewey supports that process as important, but at the same time, coaches are required to continually make judgments and take action. Hence, coaches and debaters should continue to learn through the process of doing, making necessary revisions as they progress and learn. NPDA provides a particularly unique opportunity for action in process, because all decisions made regarding strategy by debaters must be made in the moment, and modified while the argumentation is taking place. "An interest in assumptions and beliefs of audiences leads us to consider the environments in which audiences assess and make their judgments" (Tindale, 2004, p. 22). Because judges tend to reveal a judging paradigm prior to the round, and debaters do not have fully prepared cases prior to the preparation time allowed by the tournament, NPDA debaters have the opportunity to actually engage in audience analysis and adaptation.

The third pragmatic implication for debaters and directors of forensics is balance.

Whenever a piece of work becomes drudgery, the process of doing loses all value for the doer; he cares solely for what is to be had at the end of it . . . To be playful and serious at the same time is possible, and it defines the ideal mental condition. (Dewey, 1997, p. 218)

In order to avoid drudgery, there must be a balance of fun and work. Dewey continued:

A final exemplification of the required balance between near and far is found in the relation that obtains between the narrower field of experience realized in an individual's own contact with persons and things, and the wider experience of the race that may become his through communication. (p. 224)

The sentiment expressed by Dewey here makes it clear that forensics is on to something of the utmost importance. By developing communication skills through forensics, coaches are fostering the balanced democratic leaders of tomorrow, who are the debaters of today.

REFERENCES

- Derrida, J. (1995). *The gift of death*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (2001). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. & Dufourmantelle, A. (2000). *Of hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *How we think*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and time* (trans: Joan Stambaugh). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Herrick, J. A. (2007). *Argumentation: Understanding and shaping arguments*. (3rd Ed., R.S. Iltis, Consulting Ed.) State College, PA: Strata Publishing.

- Johnson, R. H. (2000). *Manifest rationality: A pragmatic theory of argument*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Entre nous: Thinking of the other*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Levinas, E. (2001). *Is it righteous to be?* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1977). *A Nietzsche reader* (trans: R. J. Hollingdale). New York, NY: Penguin Classics.
- Nietzsche, F. (1997). *Twilight of the idols* (trans: Richard Polt). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Tindale, C. W. (2004). *Rhetorical argumentation: Principles of theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.



Missing

The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta

LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

(Copy and forward to your library acquisition officer)

Name _____

Department _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Please enter a subscription to ***The Forensic*** at the subscriber rate of \$20.00 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription is for a complete series, which begins July 1st of each year. At the time of subscription, you will receive all previous issues that have been published during the subscription year.

Check one:

____ One Year \$20 ____ Two Years \$40 ____ Three Years \$60

On subscriptions made outside of the United States, add \$15 per year for foreign postage.

Prices are effective through June 30, 2009

Make Checks and money orders payable to Pi Kappa Delta National

Order from your subscriptions agent or directly from:

Pi Kappa Delta National Headquarters

125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38

Ripon, WI 54971

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through the National Headquarters:

The History of Pi Kappa Delta, by Larry Norton

____ copies @ \$7.50/each

The Proceedings of the 1998 Developmental Conference, Robert S. Littlefield, Ed.

____ copies @ \$5.00/each

The Proceedings of the 1995 Developmental Conference, Scott Jensen, Ed.

____ copies @ \$5.00/each

Articles from past issues of *THE FORENSIC* are available upon request.