

Parliamentary debate is counted way too much. LD should be on the CEDA topic. One of my teams hit 3 from own province.

I'm disappointed that the word "fraternity" is even used in the survey. This systematically excludes half of the competitors. Please consider re-terming this organization.

Need time for sightseeing and for eating. No time for dinner in the schedule. We had to skip meetings to eat.

Should be able to do two duos.

Showcases are great, but I have been told the purpose of them was for novices to come, watch, and learn. If we have elimination rounds, the novices would still come and watch. See Phi Rho Pi.

We should have elim rounds for IEs, how else are we to know who is the top? Truly they will still serve as showcases. See Phi Rho Pi.

We should take heed of the Phi Rho Pi system for elim rounds and awards.

We should not have the meetings take so much time.

There is never enough time in the schedule for CEDA.

The tournament was wonderful. The level of competition was perfect for a tournament that celebrates the PKD honorary. The convention, however, was disorganized, took not account of Time i and the lack of organization made it boring, exhausting, and a complete disappointment.

I loved the fact that this tournament was not based on cut-throat competition. We have enough of that in the world.

Need to adjust schedule so there is time to eat dinner after a long day of meetings at night.

I am very disappointed that the focus of PKD is leaning more toward competition than education and personal improvement. In HS I was a member of NFL and was pleased that it was not a cutthroat institution. When I reached college, I was happy to find that PKD was also educationally motivated. I was at a province meeting here at NKU last year when I realized that PKD was moving towards a competition base. While at nationals I saw a team with shirts saying "I don't care how I place, just so I beat you." Is this really the attitude we want to promote? This organization should encourage students to perform their personal best and watch other competitors to learn more.

My main hobby horse issue is number of judges in IE rounds—should be more. Our judging loads were too light. The issue of not judging same province students was too influential in both judge load/assignments and in the scheduling of students. We should have at least 5 judges in IE. A judge assignment load of 6 is not excessive. We should absolutely minimize how often students compete against those of same province. Judges should be allowed to, minimally, judge students from own province.

I found the competition/performance tournament aspect of this convention the single most positive speaking experience I have ever had. The removal of 1, 2, 3, etc. place ranks caused this reaction. The convention aspect was a complete waste. I would have liked to have professional speakers (or PKD alum) talk

about speaking. The convention could be exciting if all the bickering about foolish topics were removed to separate optional presentations and conversation venues. We should celebrate being speakers and servants of the community. 1

I was appalled that several judges were late or had to be replaced by volunteers. As supposed leaders of speaking competition, we as students are expected to act at the highest level we are able. The same should be expected of the judges.

Too much time between rounds in IE on Friday especially.

More focus needs to be on the forensics instead of honorary business.

National council elections should have been handled the same way as national president-it took up too much time at the business meeting.

Judges showing up late was a disgrace to the honorary. That never should be allowed to happen.

You can never get rid of all the competition, but you can lessen it with more mixers, relaxer activities with students.

I worry that people are also very concerned with racking up hardware.

Business meetings: lots of unnecessary discussion.

I was very concerned that about the learning that is supposed to take place and the communication at the tournament. Specifically, the forums were very under-advertised and individuals were uninformed as to what they were. Perhaps workshops on specific issues concerning PKD members would be better-such as what's it like to be on a lecture series, what does PKD do for non-forensics majors/minors (like me), getting away from the competition discussion in student caucuses or even interp pieces that are hackneyed.

Please work on parliamentary procedure. Please ask for abstentions.

It was disappointing to see so many mix ups during the tournament. Judges very late and judges being assigned to the same people seemed a bit unorganized. Overall, the convention did not seem very professional.

Need to adjust schedules so people can eat-especially for dinner. There's no time to get from school to hotel to dinner because of the convention meetings.

PKD was a good tournament-outstanding is a strong word.

I don't feel PKD can be compared to either AFA or NFA because of the structural differences of the tournaments as well as the general focus of the tournaments.

It would be nice to be given enough Time to eat in the schedule rather than tournament meetings.

NOTES

¹ minimum alpha levels for all tests are .05.

² All correlations reported are significant at $<.001$

1997 PI KAPPA DELTA NATIONAL CONVENTION AND TOURNAMENT EVALUATION

- What province are you from? _____
2. Are you primarily a DOF? ☐ Asst. DOF? ☐
competitor? ☐ hired judge? ☐
3. Do you or your students participate in (check all that apply):
Individual events ☐ Debate ☐
4. How many PKD national tournaments have you attended?
1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7-10 ☐ 11+ ☐
5. Which of the following national tournaments does your team enter in addition to PKD?
- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| American Forensic Association | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| National Forensic Association | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cross Examination Debate Association | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| National Debate Tournament | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| National Parliamentary Debate Association | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| National Educational Debate Association | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Delta Sigma Rho/Tau Kappa Alpha | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please list) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
6. Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐
7. Race:
- | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| African-American | <input type="checkbox"/> | Caucasian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| American Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Asian-American | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Circle letter which best represents how you feel about each of the issues addressed (SD=strongly disagree, D=disagree, N=neutral, A=agree, SA=strongly agree):

1. I received my invitation well enough in advance.
SD D N A SA
2. The invitation adequately covered tournament information.
SD D N A SA
3. The hotel accommodations are satisfactory.
SD D N A SA
4. Hotel registration was relatively trouble-free.
SD D N A SA
5. Tournament registration went smoothly.
SD D N A SA

6. The tournament sweepstakes formula is equitable.

SD D N A SA

7. I believe the PKD national tournament should focus more on competition and less on convention.

SD D N A SA

8. I believe PKD should discontinue elimination rounds in debate.

SD D N A SA

9. I believe PKD should add elimination rounds in individual events.

SD D N A SA

10. I believe that the fraternal aspects of PKD are more important than competition.

SD D N A SA

11. I attend province meetings.

SD D N A SA

12. I attend PKD business meetings.

SD D N A SA

13. Non-competition related meetings (e.g. business and province) are important.

SD D N A SA

14. PKD is too expensive.

SD D N A SA

15. The PKD experience is worth the expense.

SD D N A SA

16. The tournament staff is courteous.

SD D N A SA

17. The tournament operated efficiently

SD D N A SA

18. This tournament needed a shuttle service.

SD D N A SA

19. Adequate time was allotted for debate rounds.

SD D N A SA

20. Adequate time was allotted for individual events rounds.

SD D N A SA

21. Flight restrictions (ie. students can only enter one event in flight A, and two events in B and C) are satisfactory.

SD D N A SA

22. The individual events showcases are worthwhile.

SD D N A SA

23. The graduate school fair should be continued.

SD D N A SA

24. This tournament is outstanding compared to previous PKD tournaments I've attended.

SD D N A SA

25. This tournament is outstanding compared to other national tournaments I've attended.

SD D N A SA

26. **Please feel free to comment specifically on any of the questions or to address issues not mentioned.**

BOOK REVIEW

THE RHETORICAL ACT, 2ND EDITION **BY KARLYN KOHRS CAMPBELL,** **WADSWORTH PUBLISHING, 1996**

Reviewed by Don R. Swanson
Monmouth University

The title of this exceptional text announces the intent to develop the key elements of discourse from the traditional humanistic approach. In the long awaited second edition, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell has improved upon a classic text that refines students' understanding of rhetorical approaches to the art and practice of rhetoric. This is not a text for beginning public speaking classes, rather it is a text for advanced public speaking courses and other courses where students are expected to be fairly sophisticated analysts, critics and producers of persuasive messages. It is particularly appropriate for courses in speechwriting. On my campus we plan to use this edition in an advanced course that approaches persuasive speaking and writing in equal amounts.

The book is organized with a three part division. The first division is entitled "Rhetorical Action" and includes an overarching perspective, theoretical background, and the key elements of the rhetorical act. The second part of the book focuses on "The Rhetorical Problem" with four chapters examining the obstacles that challenge the rhetor: "Obstacles Arising from the Audience, Obstacles Arising from Subject and Purpose, Obstacles to Source Credibility, and Understanding the Rhetorical Problem: The Resources of Analysis." This substantial 120 page treatment of overcoming "the gap between what you have and what you want," is unique. It challenges the rhetor to find ways to collaborate with the audience in achieving understanding of the message and desired response. The reader feels the sense that successful persuasion involves speaking) and negotiating meaning *with* the audience, rather than speaking *at* the audience. The first edition of *The Rhetorical Act* was an important tool in my effort to get advanced forensic individual events speakers to understand the substantial task of developing a successful manuscript. The second edition extends and amplifies this section. The obstacles chapters force the student to consider a broad based audience and a range of pitfalls. When the obstacles are addressed by the author of the message, a powerful sense of focus results. The rhetor is encouraged to look inside the mind of the listener and consequently, Campbell has added a discussion of the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) of researchers Richard Petty and John Cacioppo. ELM emphasizes the centrality of the audience in all elements of message preparation. The third part of the book lacks uniqueness as it consists of fairly standard public speaking textbook chapters on evidence, argument, organization, language and nonverbal elements. The difference between this text and other public speaking texts is the use of rhetorical, rather than behavioral, terminology to explain the functions of communication. At first glance the reader may ask why the author has waited

until this later portion of the text to develop the pragmatic process of message preparation and presentation. The answer evolves when the text is considered holistically. The first portion develops an appreciation for the art and power of rhetorical theory, the second part challenges the reader to engage in the complexities of successful message targeting, and then the reader is ready for the practical suggestions that evolve in part three.

An enticing feature of most chapters is the inclusion of stimulating specimens of rhetoric as "material for analysis." These are carefully selected to exhibit messages addressed to important cultural issues that face today's audiences. It is encouraging to read and critique quality contemporary rhetoric, developed by recognized rhetors, who reach out to explicate and compel attention to significant issues. For example speeches by Governor Bill Clinton, Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and Chief Justice Rose Bird, are included with essays on Israeli-PLO negotiations, feminism, nonverbal rhetoric of flag burning, and the Statue of Liberty. Testimony from the Anita Hill - Clarence Thomas hearings and a model sermon are also included. It is interesting to note that the most prosaic topics of picking and researching a subject, organizing and delivering a speech, are included in a thirty page appendix. The appendix serves as a reference for those who need to look back to their learnings in a previous public speaking class to recall preparation procedures. Overall this text provides a rich resource for serious study of the process of producing quality rhetoric.

HATE SPEECH

**rita kay whillock, and david slayden, eds.
sage publications, 1994.**

reviewed by Don R. Swanson
Monmouth University

Contemporaneous narratives that describe the carnage at Oklahoma City, or the arguments regarding the Waco siege take on an aura of unreality. The behaviors and events are difficult to envision because they are so far removed from mainstream experience. Yet as consumers of the daily news we may ask the basic question: why? A response discussed by some who teach argumentation is that too many publics in our society have been desensitized to the rhetoric of hate. This answer assumes that hate purveyors are aberrants who are out of touch with the conventional values of our culture. But that is a simplistic rationale that may preclude other rhetorical possibilities. Is it possible that the hate rhetors are skillfully targeting their appeals to the reality and ingrained values of a sizable number of listeners? This question is inevitable when the reader confronts the diverse essays included in *Hate Speech*.

Hate Speech is reminiscent of the 1971 text, *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*, that was used in classes like one I taught on the rhetoric of social protest during the tumultuous early 1970's. Those earlier authors, Bowers and Ochs, posit a paradigmatic continuum of rhetorical behavior focused on influence social change and the consequent parallel reactions of the establishment. Historical reference tends to validate the pattern they observe of protesters exhausting normal discursive means of persuasion before moving to direct action and revolutionary violence. Although this text is valuable in examining the rhetoric of social change, Bowers and Ochs' treatment of protest and establishment rhetoric avoids the label hate or concept of hate rhetoric. Their terms "derogatory jargon" and "verbal obscene deprecation" fail to capture the social phenomena of hate and its expression. In *Hate Speech*, Rita Kirk Willock and David Slayden have edited a text that provokes consideration of the cultural roots, complexity, and expression of hate rhetoric in America. This volume may be an estimable resource for upper division courses that deal with contemporary rhetoric and culture. The essays illustrate that hate can be considered from a rhetorical perspective rather than the usual theological or socio-psychological approaches.

Willock and Slayden's introduction provides a useful summary of the most important ideas expressed by the various authors in nine distinct chapters. The essays are diverse in examining both general case studies and principles. The reader may find a lack of unified perspective, yet it is striking to note that the "polarization" function of extreme rhetoric plays a major role in this analysis as it does in *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*. Each chapter provokes a unique focus of study, as the following chapter numbered summary indicates.

(1) The linguistic dominance of majority white rhetors over other ethnic groups is compelling in Van Dijk's research reported in his "Elite Discourse and the Reproduction of Racism." (2) Hate appeals in political rhetoric play upon public prejudices and stereotypes to influence action at the ballot box. Willock argues and illustrates that "hate appeals are used consciously to inflame the emotions of followers, denigrate the out-class, inflict permanent and irreparable harm on the opposition, and ultimately to conquer" (pp. 35-36). (3) Moritz argues that some clever groups are able to rhetorically frame and define the societal and media debate over an issue in a manner that "leads to mainstream endorsement of hate as targeted groups are stereotyped and marginalized" (p. 56). Her case study analysis focuses on the success of the Far Right and its wedge issue of gay rights. (4) Work-hate narratives can serve a valuable purpose in helping restore some balance in workplaces where mismanaged organizational transitions take place. Perhaps Goodall's analysis helps explain the phenomenal success of the "Dilbert" cartoon. (5) Willock argues that symbols can talk and visual cues can produce discourse of hate. Increasingly many audiences tend to react and think in images and the power of the visual image should not be underestimated. (6) A study of rape narratives by Kellett concludes that hate narratives can, to the narrator/perpetrator of rape, justify the hateful act as reasonable because it is resistance to those in power. (7) In the essay "Hating for Life," Muir relates what common sense indicates, that "people often believe they hate for good, moral reasons" and in the case of absolute values the opportunity for rhetoric and compromise to work for resolution is practically nil. Loving a value can lead to hate rhetoric toward an opposing value. (8) Slayden considers the "Holy

Wars" over politics and art, and illustrates the lesson of political controversy that "those involved can, should, must be allowed to speak on their own behalf" (p. 223). His conclusion that: "Certainly what is said may be ugly, offensive, and disturbing but not to allow it is equally ugly, offensive, and disturbing" leads to (9) Smith's conclusion in the final chapter that hate speech must see the light of day in order to foster dialogue and "critical reception of ideas." His concluding remarks reflect the values of forensic education:

To make speech more valuable we should work to foster a society in which more people have the ability to analyze information and opinion critically, where minority groups and the minority have the self-confidence that comes from being respected and accepted, where tolerance is a general virtue, where people can reflect and argue, speaking rather than shouting(p. 262).

Because it is tempting for mainstream society to employ its establishment power to prohibit or limit the dissemination of pernicious expression the various authors of this volume discuss the ills of prohibiting speech. But more significant is their universal position that conducting dialogue and rhetorical analysis of hate speech is a powerful remedy. Introducing the essays editors Whillock and Slayden state that "Once we engage in dialogue, then we have taken a step toward addressing the problems that stimulate hate speech. And, in doing so, we have compromised its power or, to continue the disease metaphor, applied an antidote and begun the healing process"(p. xvi). However, it seems the various authors have committed a serious oversight with their shared assumption of the efficacy of the remedy. That omission is best typified by the questions: who or how many in our culture are attending to the analyses of hate rhetoric, or who or how many are engaging in dialogue analyzing hate rhetoric? If these questions are not being significantly addressed, the answers should temper the optimism of the authors. Regardless of the extent of critical analysis in the culture at large, one locus of the analytic dialogue could or ought to be the forensic community. Does forensic practice include a recognition and critique of hate rhetoric? If critics fail to critique, and opponents fail to challenge pernicious rhetoric there is a consequent failure of forensic practice to truly conduct dialogue, to live up to a dominant purpose of forensic rhetoric, i.e., to challenge and test the validity and viability of claims.

LIBERALISM AND THE PROBLEM OF KNOWLEDGE: A NEW RHETORIC FOR MODERN DEMOCRACY

**CHARLES ARTHUR WILLARD, CHICAGO:
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1996**

Reviewed by James R. Pickett
Department of Communication
Monmouth University

Texts that one must struggle with are more important than those gently read. Charles Arthur Willard's *Liberalism and the Problem of Knowledge* is such a book. What must be contended with is not the writing, it is easily his most accessible work, but his ideas. These concepts challenge some of the central traditions in argument and rhetorical theory.

That Willard would produce a controversial work should little surprise the readers of this journal. Throughout his career, Willard questioned much of what had been argument theory: the use of Toulmin's layout diagram, the role of historically grounded analysis in rhetorical/argument criticism, and the tendency for argumentation to embrace a humanism based on rhetorical theory. Willard advocated a theory of argument based on Toulmin's work on fields and a University of Illinois version of George Kelly's constructivism. Here Willard takes that theory, now termed epistemics, and applies it to social criticism.

The way into social criticism is the Lippmann-Dewey debate over the public sphere, taken up by figures ranging from James Carey to the late Christopher Lasch. Rhetoricians and students of argument tend to enshrine John Dewey's quest for community. Willard to the contrary, finds merit in Lippmann's position, the one articulated in *Public Opinion*. He seeks to defend it not as Lippmann did, but through epistemics.

Lippman argued that, as the public was afflicted by stereotypes and other forms of pseudo-reality, experts – political scientists – should attend to the governance of the state. Willard argues, in a similar way, that citizens cannot be "omnicompetent" and thus are dependent on experts. But Willard, perhaps because of the quagmire that engulfed the "best and the brightest," values disagreement among experts.

Along that route, Willard throws rocks at the house of argument. In particular, he attacks the group he terms "mourners," those who insist that educating ordinary folk in critical thinking and argument will better the health of the polity. Willard reasons that since judgment and subject matter are inseparable, teaching public decision making to "heavy-breathing college sophomores" is irrelevant, except in their major subjects.

Whether Willard's projectiles originate from a glass domicile depends upon one's reading of epistemics. Those familiar with his argument theory will quickly recognize epistemics as the progeny of that development. Willard gives a clear exposition of argument fields and discusses how that notion can be used to interpret organizations. He accomplishes all of this against the background of a cogent critique of Michel Foucault's work.