

THE FORENSIC

ΠΕΙΘΩ ΚΑΛΗ ΔΙΚΑΙΑ

SERIES 59

JANUARY, 1974

NO. 2

Preferential Ballot — National Contest Events

The following ballot is submitted in accordance with a resolution passed at the National Convention in Omaha, Neb., in March, 1973. Return ballots to Georgia Bowman, Editor, *The Forensic*, William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. 64068, **before** Dec. 1, 1973.

Part I

Vote Yes or No for continuing the events presently conducted at National Pi Kappa Delta Conventions.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Cross-examination debate | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 2. Standard Debate | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 3. Extempore Debate | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 4. Discussion | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 5. Oratory | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 6. Extemporaneous Speaking | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 7. Informative Speaking | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 8. Oral Interpretation | Yes _____ No _____ |

Part II

Vote a preferential ballot on the following additional forensic events, assigning (1) to the most favored event, (2) to the second most favored, down to the 9th most favored event. All other events will receive a ranking of 10. If fewer than 9 events are marked, the ballot will not be counted.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| _____ Challenge Debate | _____ Humorous Impromptu |
| _____ Off-Topic Debate | _____ Impromptu |
| _____ Parliamentary Debate | _____ Serious Interpretation |
| _____ One-on-One Debate | _____ Humorous Interpretation |
| _____ Direct Clash Debate | _____ Reader's Theatre |
| _____ Political Speaking | _____ Radio/Television Broadcasting |
| _____ Parliamentary Procedures | _____ After-Dinner Speaking |
| _____ Speech Criticism | _____ Dramatic Duo |
| _____ Rhetorical Criticism | _____ Humorous Duo |
| _____ Experimental Rhetorical Criticism | _____ Persuasive Speaking |
| _____ Extemporaneous Speech Criticism | _____ Extemporaneous Reading |

The FORENSIC

of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 59

JANUARY, 1974

NO. 2

Table of Contents

President's Message	3
Sunday Competition	4
Competitive Discussion	5
In Memoriam	7
Ballot Results	9
The Status Quo	10
New Members	12
Forensic Studies	13
Secretary's Page	14
Chapter Notes	15
Chapter Directory	18

EDITOR GEORGIA BOWMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

[Features and Province News] . . JOHN BURT
509 1/2 E. Walnut,
Bloomington, Ill. 61701

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

[Active Chapter News]

ROSELYN L. FREEDMAN
110 Hill St., Apt. #3
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104

Published four times a year in October, January, March and May by Pi Kappa Delta. Subscription price is a part of the membership dues.

Office of publication: William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo. 64068. Second Class postage paid at Liberty, Mo. 64068.

Printed by Craftsman Composition
North Kansas City, Missouri 64116

DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL PRESIDENT — John E. Baird,
California State College, Hayward, Ca. 94542.

NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT — Evan Ulrey,
Harding College, Searcy, Ark. 72143.

NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER — Theo.
O. H. Karl, Pacific Lutheran University,
Tacoma, Wash. 98447

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS — Phyllis
Bosley, Towson State College, Baltimore, Md.
21204; Duane Aschenbrenner, University of
Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, Neb. 68131;
James DeMoux, Boise State College, Boise,
Idaho 83725.

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT — Fred B.
Goodwin, Southeast Missouri State University,
Cape Girardeau, Mo. 63701.

HISTORIAN — D. J. Nabors, East Central State
College, Ada, Okla. 74821

EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Georgia B.
Bowman, William Jewell College, Liberty,
Mo. 64068

PROVINCE GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS — Duane
Aschenbrenner, University of Nebraska-
Omaha, Omaha, Neb. 68131
2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI — Tom
Willett, 8 Trails West, Rt. 5, Box 60,
Columbia, Mo. 65201.
3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS — Dan Salden,
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville,
Edwardsville, Ill. 62025
4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC — Mrs.
Penny Byrne, University of Texas-El Paso,
El Paso, Tex. 79900
5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX — Jerry Win-
sor, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D.
57105
6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI
— Mrs. Barbara Norman, Central State
University, Edmond, Okla. 73034
7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES — Dan Millar,
Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant,
Mich. 48858
8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI
— Jack Starr, University of Wisconsin-
LaCrosse, LaCrosse, Wis. 54601
9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST —
Marilyn F. Norris, Mississippi State
College for Women, Columbus, Miss.
39701.
10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST — Larry
S. Richardson, Western Washington State
College, Bellingham, Wash. 98225
11. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST —
Phyllis Bosley, Towson State College, Bal-
timore, Md. 21204

The President's Message

John Baird

"Pi Kappa Delta? Who needs it? We only attend one tournament a year that requires membership. What's the big deal? I have better things to do with my money. If the rest of you want to join, that's your business. It's not for me."

I suppose all of us have heard an argument similar to this one as we talk to new people on the forensics squad about the fraternity. We each have favorite responses ranging all the way from high-pressure salesmanship to a general feeling that the local chapter may be better off without members who have to be persuaded. Probably no argument is half so persuasive as a local chapter that is interesting, growing, and engaged in a wide range of social and fraternal activities. Nevertheless, I would like to offer my reasons for Pi Kappa Delta membership in the hope of giving each of you some food for thought as well as some possible ideas for argument.

All of us determine our affiliations for only two basic reasons. If you belong to any group or society, you belong because you expect to get something from your membership or because you expect to contribute something to the organization. In the case of Pi Kappa Delta membership, I believe that both motives are significant. We belong to the fraternity because of what we expect it to offer us, and we belong because of what we have to offer to the fraternity. Our Editor would be reluctant to give me the space in this issue of *The Forensic* to discuss both of these motives fully. Therefore, let me examine the first, leaving the second for another issue.

First, we belong to Pi Kappa Delta because of what the fraternity has to offer us. I have received rich rewards in my own career, rewards that can be measured in monetary terms. The same is true not only of those in professional forensics but of all areas where the personal contacts made in the fraternity have influence. I don't mean



to imply that "who you know is more important than what you know," although the saying contains more than a germ of truth. Let me explain my meaning more precisely.

Recognize that Pi Kappa Delta has an "image," that it stands for something in professional forensics. I think of terms like "breadth," "perspective," "well-rounded," "balanced," "in proportion," "educational value," and the like. Pi Kappa Delta stands for a reasonable approach to forensics. True enough, we instituted the first national speech tournament in history and we still continue a national tournament tradition, but we avoid the heavy emphasis on national competition. With the exception of championship debate, we don't even crown national "winners" in our tournament except in the sense that all superior speakers are "winners." On the one hand we have emphasized the skills of competitive debate; on the other, we have given significant place in our conventions and in our membership structure to individual speech events, to speaking before community groups, and to events which belong as much to the area of drama as to speech. Those of you who have attended national conventions know the spirit in

which we have carried out the competition, a spirit of fraternity, of fair play, of good sportsmanship all too rare on the average tournament circuit.

Because the fraternity has this reputation or "image," each member gains the same stereotype of this approach to speech competition. Such a stereotype may be very helpful in the declining job market for those seeking positions as forensic coaches. When your application for a job rests on the desk of that department chairman of dean, your membership in Pi Kappa Delta could prove highly significant. I know very few administrators who are interested in filling the speech trophy case. I know a number who are impatient with coaches who seem to have no higher objective. I know many administrators who have the highest regard for a broad, educational program of speech activities. Your membership in Pi Kappa Delta should indicate to them, much better than your accumulation of credits and degrees, that you share this same philosophy.

The social contributions of Pi Kappa Delta membership should not be underestimated. I remember that Sunday morning some years ago when I was vacationing in the Pacific Northwest. I attended church services at a small Protestant church on the Washington coast. The speaker that Sunday was a visiting professor from a nearby college. I didn't notice the key on his watch chain

until I faced him in the coffee hour following the service. Then the two of us became acquainted. We were many miles and many years from our respective almaters, mine a school in California and his in the midwest. Still, we shared the common background of our Pi Kappa Delta membership and our mutual interest in speech activities.

When you join Pi Kappa Delta, you become part of a brotherhood which extends far beyond your campus and your days as an undergraduate. Your fellow members have become leaders in education and business, university presidents, congressmen, television personalities, outstanding lawyers and ministers. I must admit that to the best of my knowledge none has ever achieved the highest political office in our land, but one tried very hard in 1972. Perhaps the one to achieve this status is reading my words right now.

This brief summary makes no pretense of covering all of the benefits of membership in our fraternity. Your coach or some of the older members of your chapter may have more forceful arguments. My plea for the moment is that we evaluate the fraternity in more than local terms. Pi Kappa Delta stretches far beyond the confines of your chapter, whatever may be its strengths and weaknesses. Learn to think of us in terms of our history, our total membership, our national scope. The rest I shall leave for future discussion.

Sunday Competition Disavowed

Among the legislative items passed by the 1973 Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha Congress was a resolution opposing Sunday forensics competition.

The supporting sections backing the resolutions included:

1. That Sunday forensics competition curtails the forensic participation of many academic communities.

(A) Sunday forensics competition violates some religious mores.

(B) Due to time in transit to and from forensics tournaments, it

prohibits participation for some academic communities.

2. That DSR-TKA has traditionally recognized the diversity and academic orientation of its membership across the nation.

3. That also the goals of DSR-TKA include the highest ideals in forensics and oratorical activities.

4. That the inability of any college or university to participate in speech or debate tournaments by virtue of Sunday forensics activities hinders the achievement of these goals.

Competitive Discussion: Some New Directions

Dan R. Salden ¹

Of all the competitive events in intercollegiate forensics, the discussion event has to be the most maligned. Indictments have been levied from both those who have participated in the event and from those who have judged it. It is somewhat ironic that the defense for the discussion event has generally been predicated upon its essentiality in the inquiry-advocacy process and upon its predominance in the decision-making process in the "real world." Yet, this has rarely been the "target" of the event's critics. I feel safe in positing the belief that most of us in forensics would readily accept the theoretical and practical value of discussion.² The challenge, however, has been levied against the feasibility of incorporating this event into the competitive context of our tournament structure. In other words, how **does** one compete cooperatively?

A number of responses become apparent. The most obvious is to eliminate the event. But this is neither a very constructive nor sound solution to the problem. It is my personal belief that discussion has as much to offer in terms of the student's forensic education as any of the other events; in fact, it may have even **more** to offer because of its vital role in the democratic decision-making process. Hence, the event's wholesale dismissal is clearly unwarranted. The problem, therefore, is to discover a more practicable procedure for administering the event — particularly within the context of a "multi-event" tournament.

The purpose of this article is to comment upon some of the substantive alterations that I believe are essential for the continued implementation of the discussion event.³ While none of these alterations is capable of eliminating the cooperative-competitive dilemma, which was alluded to above, it is believed that they can improve the quality of competitive discussion.

The Nature of the Problem

The first area of concern is with the substantive dimension of this event — namely, the discussion question. One might paraphrase the problem in this dimension as follows: "Never have the non-motivated attempted to say so much, with so little, in such a short period of time as in a discussion contest." Justification for this overview is predicated on the following observations concerning the scope of discussion topics and the research that goes into them.

My initial reaction is that the scope of the discussion topic is too broad. In fact, the wording of these questions provides much greater latitude in the problem and/or solution areas than is allowed in a properly worded debate proposition. For instance, examine the last two national discussion questions that were used in National Pi Kappa Delta Tournaments:

1968-69: How can we deal with the problems of civil disorders in the United States?

1970-71: How can our society best deal with the problem of pollution?

In each case, the breadth of the topic is beyond belief — especially when it is noted that the discussants are expected to arrive at a comprehensive statement on these questions in just four to five hours (using the time allotment provided in the rules for the discussion event at the Houston National Convention and Tournament). In the 1968-69 question, one might inquire as to which civil disorders? Those that were primarily racially inspired? Poverty inspired? Vietnam inspired? Many other options were available, but the point here is that these forms of disorder cannot be considered collectively in such a short period of time. Yet, it would be equally fallacious to treat them as discrete phenomena. Consequently, this question imposed an impossible burden on the discussants, and this was clearly manifested in the meaningless oversimplifications that were characteristic of discussion efforts five years ago. In the 1970-71 question, one might wonder what is meant by "our society" — the people? The government? If the latter, which level? And, pray tell, which problem of pollution?

To say that this question required a comprehensive view of society and pollution problems (which **was** the intent) guarantees an impossible task. Similar problems evidenced themselves in the topic that was used last year (and to a lesser extent in the 1972-73 topic).

The argument in this overview is not meant to imply that complex questions such as these cannot or should not be undertaken. Rather, the argument is that within the procedural limitations of discussion contests (particularly those of time) these broad, substantive analyses are simply not feasible. Consequently, how can we expect more realistic and meaningful results in discussion when we ask the participants in the event to attempt the impossible? Even if students gave the discussion topic their highest research priority, there would still be a serious question in my mind as to whether or not they could even begin to scratch the surface of these multi-faceted questions. This last statement, however, raises yet another question. What is the state or quality of research on the discussion topic?

It is my conclusion that the state of research on discussion questions is "comparatively" unsatisfactory — both in quantity and quality. By "comparatively" unsatisfactory, I am alluding to a comparison between debate and discussion research. It is obvious to me that debate research is categorically superior. At the same time, however, the broader and often more complex discussion topic would require much more research (assuming that the participants in the two events should be comparably knowledgeable about the issues and evidence concerning the debate and discussion questions). The fact that discussion research does not get this kind of emphasis is readily apparent to anyone who has ever participated in or judged a discussion contest.

I suppose that there are myriad reasons for this research deficiency. I propose to touch upon only two of these interacting factors — namely, faculty and student apathy.⁴ I have chosen these factors because I believe that they are the most crucial determinants of this research deficiency. In regard to faculty apathy, I doubt that discussion has ever received substantial emphasis in forensic programs.

Debate coaches certainly (and understandably) give priority to debate research. I would even venture to say that in programs emphasizing individual events, discussion is still relegated to the role of the perpetual "black sheep" of the forensic family of events. Why? Each coach has his own reasons, but I would suggest that a major factor is that to coach discussion well would take more research and coaching time than the event is worth (at least as it is presently perceived within the tournament structure). Moreover, and I know that this is a sophistic consideration, because of the resultant poor quality of discussion contests, it is not necessary to make an all out effort in order to compete successfully. Consequently, emphasis is given to those events where the quality of competition is greatest and where one must work in order to be successful. These attitudes obviously influence the students who participate in the event. For most of them, debate research is far more important in that it is the "keystone" of most forensic programs — it is the "glamor" event. These students soon realize that because of the parenthetical emphasis given to discussion contests, they do not have to prepare extensively in order to win.⁵ Similar attitudes are exhibited by students whose principal interests are in the other individual events.

The effect of the extensive breadth (scope of discussion questions) with minimal depth (research deficiencies) has been the preemption of the value of discussion — especially for the students. It has also provided the necessary impetus for the perpetuation of these deficiencies in terms of the competitive event in that there is no motivating factor for improvement.

Possible Solutions

Unfortunately, there is no panacea for the above substantive problems. A few alternatives, however, might be suggested for your consideration. Hopefully, some of these might be tried on an experimental basis for next year's Provincial meetings.

The first suggestion is that the national discussion question has outlived its utility — at least insofar as its use under pre-1973 Pi Kappa Delta tournament formats is concerned. The national question concept has assumed a year-round need and motivation to research the topic area. As

has been shown, neither of these factors exists (particularly in regard to the 1972-73 question). Instead, we are left with a topic that is too broad for theoretical and procedural consideration. An additional problem is to be found in the limited flexibility and relevancy of a national topic. Over the course of a year, these topics run the risk of becoming stagnant (in terms of intrinsic merit and student interest). More important is the fact that its use preempts the opportunity of taking advantage of new topic areas that arise during the course of the year; topic areas that would command more student interest. In addition to the criterion of "currency," the use of a national question also preempts the use of regional problem areas for regional tournaments.

My suggestion, therefore, is that each tournament select its own topic for use in the discussion event — a topic that would be designed to take advantage of the most current issues and the particular interests of the students who are likely to participate in the tournament. This topic, which should be announced at least one month prior to the event, ought to

comprise a **specifically worded** question that relates to a **sufficiently narrowed** problem area of **current interest**. An additional criterion for selection might be to select a topic area, such as the one used in the 1973 National Convention, that touches directly upon the student's life and experiences (in order to make the question more meaningful for the student and also to make his experiences and beliefs more relevant to the discussion).

The point of this change is not just to make the substantive content of discussion events more interesting. Of equal concern is the fact that the substantive aspects would be more manageable. There is no guarantee that more research would ensue, but I feel safe in surmising that there would be a greater chance of this happening. If carefully chosen, the student's interest in intense and current issues (and I believe that students in forensics are so inclined) would provide adequate motivation for research. A concomitant factor is that by narrowing the scope of the question, the research requirement would be more consonant with the emphasis accorded the

In Memoriam

Dr. William Schrier, associated with Hope College since 1939, died March 20, 1973 in Holland Hospital after an illness of several months. Born in the Netherlands in 1900, he came to Kalamazoo in 1903 and became a naturalized citizen in 1913. He attended Kalamazoo College and the University of Michigan, distinguishing himself as an orator and debater for four consecutive years. In 1924 he was winner of the University of Michigan Oratorical Contest by unanimous vote of five judges.

He took graduate work at Michigan, obtaining an M.A. in 1945. He was an instructor at St. Louis University, University of Colorado and the University of North Dakota before coming to Hope as chairman of the Speech Department in 1939.

During his career at Hope, Dr. Schrier had the distinction of producing more oratory winners than any other college in the region, some becoming national winners. He was also associated with the Michigan Speech Association, the Central States Speech Association, was a member of Pi Kappa Delta with the degree of special distinction; and of Delta Sigma Rho, and the Speech Association of America.

He was the author of many articles and published three books, *Mr. Gerrit J. Diekema, Orator* in 1950, *Winning Hope College Orations* in 1966 and *Contest Oratory* in 1971. Known as "Mr. Oratory of Michigan," he retired from active coaching oratory and extemporaneous speaking in 1967 but continued with the Department of Speech at Hope. He was a member of Hope Church and the Holland Rotary Club.

— — —

Long time coaches and alumni will regret to learn of the death of Mattie Cromwell, wife of former national president and editor Harvey Cromwell of Mississippi State College for Women.

Mrs. Cromwell was hospitalized for many months, and died Sunday, Sept. 23, 1973. Services were held in Columbus, Miss.

event. We have nothing to lose by attempting this "minor repair," and the event might stand to benefit from it. For as some students begin to improve the quality of their competition, others will be forced out of necessity to respond in kind. Once this trend is established, I believe the image of the event will improve immeasurably.

One further consideration that I wish to offer here is that we try to make the whole event meaningful by treating it as a **means to an end** rather than as an **end** in itself. As things now stand, the end sought in the event is individual recognition for superiority in the discussion process (whatever that is). In order to attain this "end," the group must talk about something. Yet no one **really** cares about what was said in the group (in the sense that it has any ultimate impact on society); in fact, since the abolition of the group report, no one even **hears** about what was said.⁶ Is there any wonder, then, that student motivation to come up with something worthwhile is at a serious ebb? It would best serve our educational objectives, therefore, to make the competitive angle somewhat subservient to the final product of the group. One way in which this could be accomplished would be to assign more weight to group evaluation (especially on substantive matters). A complementary method would involve the selection of topic areas in which the "substantive products" of discussion **could be implemented** — or at least considered for implementation. This would make the event far more realistic and meaningful — thus increasing the student's motivation to arrive at a worthwhile end product. During last year's Bi-Provincial Tournament (Provinces of Illinois and Upper Mississippi), an initial step was taken in this direction with the addition of legislative decision-making. In this event, students explored alternatives for developing more relevant convention/tournament programs for Pi Kappa Delta. The modification of the discussion event at this year's National Convention and Tournament grew out of this experiment. Both of these events were well received by the students and faculty involved, and a major reason for this response was found in the fact that "some-

thing" **was** done in regard to student recommendations.

Summary

We all stand to gain by improving our forensic contests — not just discussion but in all events. Conversely, by doing nothing, we all stand to lose. The discussion event needs help. The ideas advanced in this article are not panaceas. They are merely suggestions for a start. But we cannot "start" by just talking about it; we need to **act**; we need to **innovate**. My ultimate purpose here is to stimulate you, the members of Pi Kappa Delta, to confront these deficiencies in the discussion event and to solicit from you other alternatives — alternatives that are both more original and more constructive for the betterment of the discussion event. It is our event; let us serve it well.

Footnotes

1 Dan R. Salden is an Assistant Professor of Speech Communication and Director of Speech Communication at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Edwardsville, Illinois. He was chairman of the discussion contest committee at the last two National Conventions and Tournaments. He is also the Governor of the Province of Illinois.

2 By "theoretical" value, I am referring to the role of discussion in the inquiry-advocacy process. This is the role that is highlighted in our educational objectives. "Practical" value, on the other hand, is used in reference to the role of discussion in the decision-making processes of business, government, and similar organizations.

3 I have always maintained that the most desirable procedure for discussion contests involves "team" rather than individual entries. This would provide for **intergroup** rather than **intragroup** competition, which would be more consistent with the principles of discussion theory.

4 I realize that there are some students and faculty members in our fraternity who do not treat the discussion event in such a condescending and/or parenthetical manner. I do believe, however, that the following comments are applicable to the vast majority of student and faculty participants in discussion.

5 Of the participants with whom I have come into contact, the most prominent reasons given for their "liking" the event are that it is "easy" and relaxing. As for faculty responses, you should see the "arm twisting" and "coercion" that is necessary in order to get most of them to judge the event.

6 It is an interesting paradox that knowledge about the topic is a major factor in the evaluative process. Actually, however, this is a measure of the **demonstration** of personal knowledge and not of the knowledgeable insight of the group in regard to the contribution to the solution of the problems inherent in the discussion question.

CONTEST EVENTS BALLOT RESULTS

The time limits have expired for the Great Debate on Pi Kappa Delta national tournament events, but the debate itself may not be over.

Of 2375 copies of the October *Forensic* mailed out, approximately 2350 of them to members, 45 ballots on contest events were returned (and we allowed three days beyond the deadline before counting). Three of these were incorrectly marked and were therefore invalidated — and one was from a former Province Governor who should have known better. This scarcely seems to be an overwhelming mandate from the membership.

Perhaps the poor return can be traced to four causes: 1. Great contentment with the organization. 2. Such tremendous chapter activity that nobody had time to vote. 3. Deep apathy about the whole business. 4. Nobody reads *The Forensic*. (But we had plenty of complaints about the upside down page.)

Whatever the reason, if as citizens we members of Pi Kappa Delta respond with comparable enthusiasm to democratic participation in the affairs of our communities, states, and nation, it is not surprising that we have Watergates, and democracy itself may be going down the drain.

With that slap of the wrist out of the way, let us evaluate the results of the balloting.

In Part I, retention of present events, few negative votes appeared.

Cross Examination		
Debate	39 Yes	3 no
Standard Debate	41 yes	1 no
Extempore. Debate	29 yes	13 no
Discussion	29 yes	13 no
Oratory	40 yes	2 no
Extemporaneous		
Speaking	41 yes	1 no
Informative Speaking	31 yes	11 no
Oral Interpretation	38 yes	4 no

In Part II a rank order method of voting was used, with 9 events ranked and all

others marked 10. The totals (lowest numbers most favored):

Challenge Debate	297
Off-Topic Debate	318
Parliamentary Debate	389
One-on-One Debate	317
Direct Clash Debate	365
Political Speaking	330
Parliamentary Procedures	386
Speech Criticism	354
Rhetorical Criticism	302
Experimental Speech	
Criticism	411
Extemporaneous Speech	
Criticism	378
Humorous Impromptu	345
Impromptu	271
Serious Interpretation	339
Humorous Interpretation	308
Reader's Theatre	296
Radio/Television	
Broadcasting	344
After-Dinner Speaking	238
Dramatic Duo	304
Humorous Duo	377
Persuasive Speaking	289
Extemporaneous Reading	356

The only proposal which received a markedly low score was After-Dinner speaking (238), and there was some tendency toward Impromptu Speaking (271).

It should be noted that the ballot was prepared in exact accordance with the motion passed at the March Convention. Several of those voting made the valid observation that the ballot contained overlapping events; for example, "Serious and Humorous Interpretation are already offered as Oral Interpretation" . . . "Persuasive Speaking — isn't that Oratory?"

All in all, these miniscule returns will be hard to interpret, but you may be sure your Council and Contest chairman will give them full consideration at the Convention-Tournament planning meeting of the Council next August.

The Status Quo of Pi Kappa Delta

D. J. Nabors, National Historian

A debater once attacked the status quo by comparing it to a stagnant pool that remained the same year after year. Never being revitalized by receiving new ideas, like the stagnant pool, in time it was completely dead.

His opponent defended the status quo by comparing it to a stream that flowed over beds of sand, through eddies, and rippled through small waterfalls, moving slowly but constantly, and renewing itself as it moved.

From time to time Pi Kappa Delta has been criticized for not making changes rapidly with the implication that the first description of the status quo would be the more descriptive one. At almost every National Convention critics have appeared with suggestions for changes in the structure and program of Pi Kappa Delta, complaining long and loud when the suggestions are not adopted immediately.

Constructive suggestions are always in order, and the National Council works consistently to evaluate the recommendations for changes that are proposed. At the August planning session they work overtime, going over the report of the Evaluation Committee, recommendations from the Contest Committees, student meetings, and Province Governors. The interests and needs of the forensic programs in several different types of schools must be taken into consideration, as Pi Kappa Delta is a composite of state colleges, land grant institutions, teacher training institutions, technical schools, and church related schools.

Many changes have been made in the structure of Pi Kappa Delta during its sixty years of existence. A comparison of these changes, decade by decade, reveals that Pi Kappa Delta has never been a stagnant pool, but has made changes time after time to adjust to the changing social and economic situation.

THE FIRST DECADE

1913-1923

The first decade saw the idea of a democratic forensic society for all four year colleges become a reality. The first

national conventions consisted of 20-30 delegates who gave their attention primarily to developing the ritual, the insignia, and making adjustments in the constitution.

The introduction of contests at the national conventions resulted in an increase in the attendance of student members. Oratory was introduced, first as a demonstration event, and later as a contest. In time, demonstration debates were added, and debate teams were encouraged to work their way to the national convention by arranging for tours which would terminate at the convention.

These tours and demonstration debates resulted in the selection of one basic question for use which would make it possible to debate teams anywhere in the nation.

The contests and debates at the national convention resulted in an increase in student attendance at the conventions, and to the growth of Pi Kappa Delta as there was a strong increase in applications for chapters as the decade ended.

THE SECOND DECADE

1923-1933

As Pi Kappa Delta entered its second decade, it began to grow at a rapid rate, and the number of chapters more than doubled. The system of Provinces was established with its series of "Little Nationals" that were held in the off-year of the national convention year. Extemporaneous speaking was added as a second individual event to the national contests. However, the greatest impetus came from the inauguration of the first national debate tournament as a feature at the national conventions.

Experiments were conducted with the contest procedure. At first the tournaments were single elimination events which were replaced by the double elimination tournament. Later additional preliminary rounds were added and from time to time, four, five, six, and eight preliminary rounds were used. Separate contests were held for men and women, and in debate a different question for women was adopted.

The increased activity of the growing society made it necessary to centralize much of its business activity in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

THE THIRD DECADE

1933-1943

The contests at the national convention continued to increase in popularity. Changes were made in the format of the debate tournament as elimination rounds following the eight preliminary rounds were dropped, and awards made on the basis of the number of debates won. Changes were made in the system of awards with the upper 10% in each event being given a rating of Superior, the next 20% Excellent and the next 20% Good. A Student Congress was added as a contest event. This was a two-house legislative body similar to the Congress of the United States.

The business session at the 1936 convention, held in Houston, was more hectic than usual. Demands were made for changes in the structure of the national organization. Objections were raised to the automatic advancement of members on the National Council until everyone had served as National President. Major changes consisted of adding two student members to the National Council, a requirement that the nominating committee should submit at least three names of members not serving on the National Council, and that any member of the National Council would be eligible for election as National President.

As the decade ended, it was necessary to make adjustments to another period of major social and economic change in the nation with the advent of World War II. This resulted in a period of five years in which the national convention was not held, and the business of Pi Kappa Delta was conducted by mail.

THE FOURTH DECADE

1943-1953

Pi Kappa Delta quickly adjusted to the war time situation. Restricted travel and reduced enrollments in the schools resulted in many of the tournaments being dropped for the duration. Speakers' bureaus and individual speaking in behalf of the war effort came into existence. The Lincoln-Douglas or one-speaker debate teams replaced two speaker teams. The national constitution of Pi Kappa Delta

was amended to provide membership by individual non-contest speaking. A referendum of chapters changed the constitution to remove the clause that denied membership to "members of the African race."

The national convention and tournament was restored after the war ended, and attendance soon equalled and surpassed the pre-war conventions. Group discussion was introduced as an event to replace the Student Congress. Changes in the constitution placed limits on the terms for the Editor of the *Forensic* and the National Secretary to provide for a greater turnover in those offices.

THE FIFTH DECADE

1953-1963

Experiments were made with the discussion event. Attempts were made to minimize the contest aspect by requiring judges to rate the panel instead of individuals. Each panel wrote a report that was judged by experts in the field who did not meet the members of the panel. At one national, credit was given for participation with no ratings.

At the Redlands convention in 1955 a proposal was made to replace the Order of Oratory with the Order of Individual Speaking. The measure was defeated at the time, but was adopted ten years later.

During this period the policy of making a Distinguished Alumnus Award was inaugurated. The presentation of the award was followed by an address from the one receiving the honor.

A championship flight division of debate was established which permitted the use of mixed teams for the first time in the national contests.

The approach of the golden anniversary convention brought a renewed interest in the history of Pi Kappa Delta, and a special effort was made to locate outstanding alumni and select a "Famous Fifty" or one for each year of history. Many of these were in attendance at the golden anniversary convention.

THE SIXTH DECADE

1963-1973

Pi Kappa Delta continued to update its constitution with more than thirty changes being made at two conventions. A change was made in the method of electing members of the National Council. The office of National Historian was created.

More emphasis was placed on student meetings at the conventions.

The Order of Oratory was replaced by the Order of Individual Speaking. A new degree, that of Highest Distinction, was created. A major change was made in the national contest rules by eliminating the special divisions for men and women. Two events were added to the contest schedule: interpretation, and a division of experimental debate which consisted of a variation of the 24-hour debate in which a different question is used in each round.

Just as Pi Kappa Delta has made ad-

justments in the past as they became necessary, it will continue to do so in the future. We must remember that change is not always necessarily improvement, and changes should be made following study by committees that take into consideration the wishes of the membership.

Every chapter should study the preferential ballot on the last page of the October *Forensic* even though the deadline for returning it has passed. Out of a study of the returns may come decisions that will direct Pi Kappa Delta into new areas of forensic activity:

New Members of Pi Kappa Delta

CARROLL COLLEGE

47401 Mark A. Judkins

WHITMAN COLLEGE

47402 Steve S. Cover
47403 Anna L. Medairy
47404 John Stewart Milnor
47405 Marjorie Ruth Schaar

LINFIELD COLLEGE

47406 Rebecca Dean
47407 Howard D. Werth
47408 Karen L. Wilson

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE

47409 Kenneth Jablon

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE

47410 Negash Abdurahman
47411 Deborah J. Bens
47412 Kerry D. Bolognese
47413 Russell Holmes
47414 Mary Kraynack
47415 Ronald Krepps
47416 Patricia Kundar
47417 Craig Lutes

UPPER IOWA COLLEGE

47418 David Hoppe
47419 Kathy Krewer
47420 Mary Oberbroeckling
47421 Elaine Pickett
47422 Steven J. Ryan

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT MONTICELLO

47423 Robert L. Kirchman
47424 Teresa Ellen Carver
47425 Joette Furlough
47426 Pridgett Inez Hargis
47427 Carolyn Rose Holley
47428 Linda Johnston
47429 Jo Carol McFalls
47430 Martha Morphis
47431 Ronald David Ray

47432 Ronnie B. Tucker

47433 David Lynn Williams

RIO GRANDE COLLEGE

47434 Pauli Graham
47463 John W. Godinsky
47464 Nancy J. Thompson

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

47435 Kenneth Ellsworth Aubens
47436 Barbara J. Azari
47437 Robert L. Corn
47438 Susan Diane Farwell
47439 Viki Mari Henneberry
47440 Rory Kevin McGinty
47441 Priscilla Palmer
47442 Christy Reed
47443 Kent Richards
47444 Kevin Owen Sandefur

PLATTSBURGH STATE UNIVERSITY

47445 Mark Barre
47446 Melvin Donaho
47447 Sharon Downs
47448 Wanda Durgan
47449 Phillip English
47450 Linda Fischer
47451 Diane Gangloff
47452 Edward Harris
47453 David Kalet
47454 Sussy Komala
47455 John L. Meyer
47456 A. R. Montanaro, Jr.
47457 Saundra Montanaro
47458 Bruce Steadman
47459 Sandra Wigtil

SIOUX FALLS COLLEGE

47460 Kathie Kaufman
47461 Michal Rice

OTTERBEIN COLLEGE

47462 William Brewer

HOPE COLLEGE

47465 Thomas Spencer Doerr

GEORGETOWN COLLEGE

47466 Margaret Thornton Greynolds
47467 Steven William May

STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE

47468 Tom R. Hines
47469 Timothy B. Rien

OUACHITA BAPTIST UNIV.

47470 William H. Elder, III

ITHACA COLLEGE

47471 Judith M. McCoy

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

47472 Judith M. Buckingham
47473 Duncan Davidson
47474 Robert K. MacLaughlin

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

47475 Rudolph A. Serra

MONMOUTH COLLEGE

47476 David Kall
47477 Robert Ritthaler

PANHANDLE STATE COLLEGE

47478 Carmen Gilbert
47479 Audrey Lewis

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

47480 Walter R. Campanella
47481 William Thornton Hudson
47482 Dick Mahoney
47483 Linda Pimperton
47484 Roanna R. Violett

MARYVILLE COLLEGE

47485 Mary Kay Sanders
47486 William Michael Johnston