

THE

Forensic

PEITHO KALE DIKAIA



NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETS — See Page Five

OCTOBER

Series 44

1958

Number 1



October, 1958.

The FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA

Editorial Office California State Polytechnic College
Pomona, California

EMMETT T. LONG.....*Editor*
FRANKLIN SHIRLEY.....*Associate Editor*
MALCOLM SILLARS.....*Associate Editor*
D. J. NABORS.....*Business Manager*

Published four times a year in October, January, March and May at 1110 North Virgil Avenue, Hollywood 29, California. Editorial office at California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, California. Entered as second class matter, October, 1957, at the post office at Los Angeles, California, under act of August 24, 1912.

DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

National President—Larry E. Norton, Bradley, University, Peoria, Illinois

National Vice-President—Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus Mississippi.

National Secretary-Treasurer—D. J. Nabors, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma.

National Council Members—Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana; Georgia Bowman, William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri; Charles T. Battin, College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington.

Immediate Past President—Theodore F. Nelson, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota

Editor of THE FORENSIC—Emmett T. Long, California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, California.

Associate Editors of THE FORENSIC—Franklin Shirley, Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Malcolm Sillars, Los Angeles State College, Los Angeles.

THE PROVINCES AND GOVERNORS

- Province of the Plains**
Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado. Jack Howe, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.
- Province of Missouri**
Missouri, Iowa-Central, Simpson, Coe, Drake, William Penn. R. J. Imbs, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri.
- Province of Illinois**
Illinois, Wisconsin-Ripon, Carroll, Whitewater State. Glenn E. Reddick, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois.
- Province of the Pacific**
Arizona, California. William H. Stites, Arizona State College, Tempe, Arizona.
Iowa-Morningside, Westmar, North Dakota.
- Province of the Sioux**
South Dakota. Kenneth Erickson, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, So. Dak.
- Province of the Lower Mississippi**
Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas. Donald L. Graham, Northwestern Louisiana College, Natchitoches, Louisiana.
- Province of the Lakes**
Maine, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia. Dr. Raymond Yeager, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.
- Province of the Upper Mississippi**
Iowa-Luther, Upper Iowa, Dubuque-Minnesota, Wisconsin-Eau Claire State, River Falls State. James J. McCarthy, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- Province of the Southeast**
Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee. Lane Boutwell, Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.
- Province of the Northwest**
Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington. Paul E. Herbold, Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Washington.

First Annual Shields PKD Scholarship Winner Chosen

William M. Delehanty, senior history major at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, is the first winner of the John A. Shields Pi Kappa Delta Scholarship. The National Council of Pi Kappa Delta received and approved the recommendation of the Scholarship Committee at its summer meeting in Colorado.

An honor student with a 3.8 grade point average, Mr. Delehanty has an excellent record in forensics and debate, extemporaneous speaking and oratory. Recommended by the Province of the Upper Mississippi selection committee, he will receive the monetary award to be used for educational expenses in his senior year at the College of St. Thomas.

His written recommendations included expressions such as "brilliant student who exemplifies the finest moral, intellectual, and social characteristics," "unusually gifted speaker," and "possibly the best balanced and thoroughly educated young man I have met during my years of teaching."

The National Scholarship Committee of Pi Kappa Delta is responsible for final selection of the scholarship winner. Since this is the first year of the award, readers will be interested in the committee's report which follows:

At the last National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta, held at Brookings, South Dakota, the following motion was adopted:

"It is moved that the National Council be empowered to accept and endorse such scholarships as may be established in honor of prominent members of Pi Kappa Delta. That the Council be authorized to assign the task of designating the recipients of such scholarships to an already established committee or to a new committee if no present committee seems proper to the task, and that the Council set up aims and procedures in line with which any such scholarships may be endorsed and administered."

Acting on this motion, President Larry E. Norton in November, 1957 appointed the following members to serve as the National Scholarship Committee: Theodore F. Nelson, chairman, Mr. Roy D. Mahaffey and Mr. Sylvester R. Toussaint.

The first project of this committee was to formulate criteria, bases of selection, and methods and procedures for choosing an awardee of the John A. Shields Pi Kappa Delta Scholarship Fund. This project had been initiated in 1956 on the suggestion of Mr. David W. Stallard, President of the National College Student Foundation, Inc., 122 East 42nd Street, New York City. The chairman of the National Scholarship Committee, during his term as National President of Pi Kappa Delta, had much correspondence and two or three interviews with Mr. Stallard concerning the establishment of this scholarship. This in turn led to the presentation of a proposal that such a scholarship be initiated to the National Convention in Brookings. The motion previously referred to was the response of the Convention to that proposal.

After a preliminary exchange of correspondence among the members of the National Scholarship Committee, the attached "Selection Procedures for the John A. Shields Pi Kappa Delta Scholarship" was adopted by the Committee as the basis for the selection of the first John A. Shields Pi Kappa Delta Scholarship awardee.

The Committee found it impossible to carry out this selection according to the time schedule originally adopted. Delays occurred in setting up the provincial committees, information was delayed in reaching the chapter sponsors, applicants consequently did not submit their applications in time, and the National Committee found the mailing and evaluating of the application materials time consuming. During the last stage of the process, the application materials had been misplaced at the school

of one of the committee members. This delayed the final selection until just a few days before the summer meeting of the National Council here at Estes Park during the days of August 25 to August 27, 1958.

There were six applicants for the scholarship. Each member of the scholarship committee studied, ranked, and rated the individual application materials. According to procedures agreed upon, the rankings and ratings of each member of the committee were assimilated, and the individual with the lowest total ranking was to be the committee's choice, provided that in case of ties the ratings would be applied to determine the winner. Fortunately, the results of the individual rankings were decisive.

The Committee, accordingly, has selected Mr. William Delehanty, of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, as the first recipient of the John A. Shields Pi Kappa Delta Scholarship.

We believe that the criteria, the methods, and the procedures by which this first selection has been made are largely satisfactory, and that the selection of the next awardee can be carried out more promptly.

SELECTION PROCEDURES

FOR THE

JOHN A. SHIELDS

PI KAPPA DELTA SCHOLARSHIP

1958-59

I. Eligibility:

- A. Any regular full-time undergraduate student of junior classification in a college or university holding in good standing a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta.

II. Bases of selection:

- A. Scholarship.
- B. College and secondary school achievements in forensics.
- C. Character and personality.

- D. Likely future contributions to the fields of forensics and public speaking.

III. Method of applying:

- A. A transcript of academic record.
- B. Letters of recommendations from three persons qualified to judge the applicant's achievements, character, and personality.
- C. A complete record of his forensic achievements.
- D. A brief letter of application stating his future plans and what he considers his qualifications for the award.

IV. Selection procedures:

A. Chapter procedures:

1. Each sponsor will be responsible for submitting one qualified applicant from the local chapter by April 1, 1959.
2. Application and application materials designated by the governor.

B. Provincial Selection Committee:

1. The governor of the province will appoint two other province sponsors to serve on the provincial selection committee.
2. This committee will receive and evaluate all of the applicants from within the province.
3. The provincial committee will select a maximum of three applicants from the province and will forward all applications and materials to the Scholarship Committee by May 1, 1959.

C. National Scholarship Committee:

1. The National Committee will screen all applications from the provincial committees and select the awardee by May 15, 1959.

National Council

Meets In Estes Park

The National Council of Pi Kappa Delta held its annual meeting Wednesday, August 26, 1958, at Estes Park, Colorado. National President Larry Norton presided. The purpose of the business meeting was to review conditions of the organization and to plan the 1959 Pi Kappa Delta Convention scheduled for Bowling Green, Ohio in March of next year.

Meeting for three days at the Estes Park Chalet, morning, afternoon, and evening sessions were held, but the extensive agenda of reports, new and old business called for late hours at night.

Written reports from the standing and special committees were received. Included in these were:

A. Standing Committees

1. Charter and Standards
2. Public Relations and Research
3. Province Coordinator
4. Constitutional Revision
5. Questions Committee

B. Special Committees

1. Scholarship
2. On Study of Recognition Societies
3. Study of Oratory Contest
4. Continued Study of Discussion Contest

National secretary-treasurer D. J. Nabors gave an extensive report on the state of the organization as revealed through his office's financial transactions, membership processing, etc. Forensic Editor Emmett Long reviewed the 1957-58 year of publication of the fraternity magazine and dis-

cussed plans for the coming year. Since Editor Long is beginning the last year of his term, the Council is requesting that suggested nominees for Editorship be sent to President Larry Norton. The major item of business was the planning of the 1959 convention. A complete review of facilities and contest and convention procedures was given. The January Forensic will contain complete information on the Bowling Green, Ohio, conclave.

The eight members of the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta attending the Estes Park meeting were: Charles T. Battin, Director of Forensics and Professor of Economics and Business at the College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington; Georgia Bowman, Director of Forensics and Associate Professor of Journalism at William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri; Theodore F. Nelson, Chairman of the Department of Speech, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota and Immediate Past President of Pi Kappa Delta; Larry E. Norton, Dean of Men and Director of Forensics at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois, and President of Pi Kappa Delta; D. J. Nabors, Director of Forensics, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, and Secretary-Treasurer of Pi Kappa Delta; Harvey Cromwell, Head, Department of Speech, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi, and Vice-President of Pi Kappa Delta; Roy D. Murphy, Head, Department of Speech, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana; Emmett T. Long, Registrar, California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, California, and Editor of *The Forensic* magazine of Pi Kappa Delta.

Our Cover -

The eight members of the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta attending the Estes Park meeting (left to right) Charles T. Battin, Tacoma, Washington; Georgia Bowman, Liberty, Missouri; Theodore F. Nelson, Northfield, Minnesota; Larry E. Norton, Peoria, Illinois; D. J. Nabors, Ada, Oklahoma; Harvey Cromwell, Columbus, Mississippi; Roy D. Murphy, Lafayette, Louisiana, and Emmett T. Long, Pomona, California.

Forensics, Tournaments, and The Pursuit of Trophies

by DR. JACK H. HOWE
Director of Forensics
Southwestern College
Winfield, Kansas

The story of the blind men who examined the elephant is so venerable and familiar as to need no repetition. Familiarity does not necessarily mean, however, that an idea is contemptuous. All of us have our blind spots and, in consequence, objects and ideas frequently become distorted as a result of the prevailing blindness.

One of the "ideas" that I feel currently is being subjected to distortion is the intercollegiate forensic tournament. It is the hope of pointing up a problem and stimulating discussion rather than desire to appear omniscient or suggest a guaranteed solution that prompts this article.

The premise on which this article is based is one on which there can surely be no disagreement: the forensic tournament is part of the learning experience. Anyone who does not agree to this (and who regards forensics as a form of winter sport and the tournament a species of verbal basketball or an oral track meet) need read no further. The whole philosophy upon which my case rests will be unintelligible.

Operating then upon the assumption that tournaments *should* assist the student to learn and to improve, are they open to attack? My reluctant conclusion is that they are. Increasingly, I feel the learning values of a tournament are being shunted aside in favor of the more tangible values of trophies, while winning — at any cost — takes precedence over improving.

Now the trophy is a wonderful bauble. It glitters triumphantly in the showcase. If its ornate design makes the art professor blanch, it nevertheless quickens the pulses of the college administrators who are happy to see their college debate squad

"accomplishing something!" Some schools acquire enough of these gilded representations of success during a season so that the smallest ones can be figuratively "thrown back" and only the most impressive are left on display for succeeding years. Truly, the trophy has become indelibly associated with the debate tournament.

But let us consider this mathematically for a moment. Southwestern College is fortunate in being located in a section of the country where forensic tournaments have proliferated. Nine of the tournaments we regularly attend are within our own state of Kansas. Even then, however, attendance at one of these tournaments cost us \$136 last season. Had we managed to sweep the slate clean of awards, we could probably have taken about sixty dollars worth of trophies home with us. Therefore, if trophies were the true end of forensic competition, then the best we could have hoped for would have been an operational loss of seventy-six dollars, and it would have been better to have stayed at home, saved our money, bought our own trophies, and thus avoided the risk of not getting any!

Having had fun at the expense of trophies, let me now explain my position. We give trophies at our own forensic tournament and shall continue to do so, and I am just as eager as the next coach to have my debaters bring home these metallic symbols of achievement. The possibility of winning a trophy provides an incentive to the student participating in intercollegiate competition; and when one is brought home, it stimulates the interest of the student body in the school's forensic program. My objection is not to trophies, for they are useful as a means

to the end of sparking interest in forensics. It is when they cease being a *means* and become the *end* itself that I become alarmed.

If the student competes in forensics for the sole avowed purpose of bringing home a cup, then the tournament is of questionable value to him. Yet, how many debaters and how many coaches can you call to mind from your own experience who are motivated by this one desire?

Have you detected what appears to me to be a trend toward ever bigger trophies for forensic tournaments? It is as if inflation had finally intruded into the speech field, so that the small cups and awards of a few years ago no longer impress sufficiently and tournament directors vie with one another in the size of the trophies they present, while students and coaches from the competing schools seemingly equate the importance of the victory with the height, weight and glitter of the award. Conversely, have you noticed the adverse effects upon tournaments that do not present awards or that confine themselves to certificates? I do not feel I am overstating the case to say that attendance at them has suffered and that interest has flagged.

What, then, might be advanced as the values of the debate tournament, over and above the rather petty one of proving that your school's debate team is better than any other team in the vicinity? I would like to suggest the following points which come to my mind:

First, one of the obvious advantages is that the debaters are obliged to speak before strangers, and this calls forth greater poise and obliges them to master nervousness better than could possibly be the case in a practice debate before their own coach. Even though, unfortunately, the very nature of the tournament means that seldom will the "audience" consist of more than the judge, the timekeeper, and their two opponents, nevertheless, all these are strangers, and even where the team happens to know some of them in advance, it is usually not the intimate friendship that leaves them completely at ease.

Second, not only is the audience strange, but so are the surroundings. The debaters will be forced to adapt themselves to

different speaking conditions than those to which they are accustomed, and in the course of most tournaments, they will be compelled to re-adapt themselves with every new round. Much grumbling is done by debaters about the sorry arrangements provided for them, and I can remember, as a debater, reacting in the same way myself. Invariably, after a tournament, some team complains that they had to debate in a boiler room or a broom closet where conditions were so cramped they could only use half the speaker's stand because the judge was keeping his notes on the other half; or, the reverse, that they debated in an auditorium designed to seat three thousand people and that they could scarcely *see* the judge he sat so far away. Some debaters cough and gag their way through debates in chemistry laboratories and others find themselves in sorority house living rooms where the sofas are extremely comfortable but not very conducive to efficient debating. Yet, when all is said and done, these same students in future years will not be able to pick and choose the conditions under which they will be obliged to speak. A speaker must learn to adapt to his environment as well as to his audience, and the varied conditions found at a tournament are training in this adaptability.

Third, in debating one should be seeking different points of view. After a few weeks of intra-squad debating, the ideas are rather well raked over and subsequent debates become somewhat stereotyped. Even though each team has developed its own case at the outset of the season, by late October when every team has had an opportunity to debate every other team (probably several times), new arguments become more and more infrequent, and certain key arguments are found in most cases. But while our school has been thinking and developing cases along one line, another school, not far away perhaps, may have arrived at an entirely different interpretation of the question, while southern, eastern or west coast schools will, without doubt, be emphasizing quite different approaches. Encountering, then, the teams from another school in a tournament provides far more of a challenge to the debaters and causes them to think

far more skillfully than when they are meeting members of their own squad with a case already familiar.

This unexpected nature of what the opposition may say (in fact, it's unpredictable nature), leads me to my fourth point: the debaters at a tournament are under an emotional and intellectual strain which in itself is a valuable experience to them. They learn to keep calm even though there is every temptation to be otherwise. They learn (as the military would say), "to hold together under fire." Again, there is a value here to the tournament (as it moves the contestants from round to round, and perhaps concludes with elimination rounds) which cannot be reproduced by intra-squad debating or by a non-decision debate with a visiting team. And when the tournament is over, the debaters should be learning how to accept either victory or defeat in a graceful manner.

It is a fifth point of value in tournament debating about which I would like to make a particular suggestion, however. To me this is perhaps the most important point of all and, again, is a unique opportunity which only the tournament can provide for us. This is the chance for my teams to be judged by fellow debate coaches and to be criticized by them. Personally, I place a high value on giving my teams a chance to debate before debate coaches from other schools so that my debaters may have the benefit of their advice and suggestions. Even if the protest is made that all too frequently judges are not trained speech teachers, but rather lawyers, housewives, ministers, or anyone else willing to fulfill a judging assignment, I still protest that their opinions can be extremely valuable. Let us never forget that the prime duty of the debater is to persuade. I am unimpressed when a debater tells me he lost because his judge was a music professor who knew nothing about debate technique. Assuming that the professor listened to the debate with an open mind, then it was the debater's task to persuade him by his speech, his arguments, and his evidence, and not to rely upon winning on some minor technicality. So, I would still like for my debaters to know why they won or lost de-

bates even though the judges do not happen to be trained in the field of debate. If there are no criticisms given after a debate, if the teams leave the tournament not knowing what they did well that enabled them to win, or what they did wrong that caused them to lose, then the value of that debate is relatively slight.

And yet, what has happened? More and more, judges refuse to give oral criticisms, dodging the request by saying that the criticisms are written on the ballot. And when the ballot is finally seen, what does it reveal? Perhaps nothing but a series of "x's" marked in various boxes which indicate the judge's opinion of the debater in particular categories. Yet, does the debater who received a "good" in "analysis" know exactly what he failed to do, or does one who received an "excellent" in "bodily movement and gestures" know what he should have done to have received a "superior"? Perhaps, the ballot will not even contain a "box-score" but merely a one-word decision for one side or the other with the space meant for criticisms (probably skimpy enough to begin with) left untouched. Or, maybe, to ease his conscience, the judge will have written a cryptic comment or two that proves unintelligible to the team.

No matter how carefully the judge has written his comments, however, he can still make his points more meaningful and far more clear by a brief oral statement of criticisms to the teams immediately following the debate. Then, if they do not understand the criticism that is being made, they will have an opportunity to discuss it with him. This does not mean that the decision to the debate must be revealed, and I am sure a competent judge will have an opportunity to discuss it with him. This does not mean that the decision to the debate must be revealed, and I am sure a competent judge will find enough to comment about to both teams in a debate so that they will both go away convinced that they have lost! I do believe the debaters are entitled to these oral criticisms that the judge has a responsibility for giving them.

While these comments thus far have been directed toward the coach, the debaters themselves likewise have a duty

in this matter of oral criticism. Perhaps I am eccentric, but when, at the end of the debate, a team hastily tosses its materials into brief cases and stalks from the room without requesting criticism, I experience a tremendous emotional let-down. It becomes overpoweringly apparent that for that team the debate was a vocal exercise and not part of the learning process. They have so lost touch with the basic purpose of debate that they are not even curious as to the audience response which their debating has evoked. To them the duty of the judge is reduced to stark simplicity: vote for the Affirmative or the Negative and sign his name!

When one of two teams acts in this fashion, my instinct frequently makes me want to vote for the team which remains and asks how they can improve. When both teams act in this fashion, I often wish I could give two losses in the same debate!

Lest confusion as to my meaning arise, however, let me hasten to emphasize that asking for criticism, listening to it, and subsequently adopting it, are different things. Without question, the debater who tried to incorporate into his style or into his case all the suggestions offered him during a tournament would be as confused

and frantic as the proverbial chameleon on the plaid spread. What I am urging is that criticism should be sought and should be listened to, and if the criticisms make sense they should be adopted, or if the same criticism is offered by several different people perhaps it should be adopted even if it does not seem to make sense. We grow by admitting to ourselves that there is room for improvement, and then by taking advantage of opportunities to improve.

Here at Southwestern I feel particularly close to the debate tournament — not only because of the several high school and college tournaments we sponsor during the year, but because Southwestern College during the early 1920's was the birthplace of tournament debating. Convinced as I am of the values of the tournament to forensics, I regret anything which detracts from it or mars its effectiveness. If the trend I think I perceive actually exists, and tournaments are coming to be utilized only as sports events and not for their learning value, then intercollegiate forensics has indeed developed a "blind spot." It will take the combined efforts of coaches and students to insure a worthwhile future existence for the forensics tournament.

National Convention To Be in Ohio

The event: 1959 convention and tournament of Pi Kappa Delta. The place: Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio. The time: March 22-27, 1959. Eight hundred delegates, coaches, and contestants will converge on this state-supported, co-educational institution of higher learning located in northwest Ohio for a week of traditional fraternity activities. It will be the twenty-first biennial convention.

Bowling Green State University is located 23 miles south of Toledo. It has a beautiful 240-acre campus, 52 permanent buildings, with more under construction, and modern equipment and facilities necessary for carrying on a broad, well-rounded program of University education in the highest American tradition. The University lies at the northeast edge of Bowling Green, a city of 12,000 in the heart of a region of rich agricultural lands,

extensive industry, and varied business enterprises. Quiet, clean, and attractive, the city provides an ideal environment for a university.

Through its three colleges and Graduate School, the University provides basic education for practically all professional careers and complete preparation for a number of professions.

The pattern of events for the convention will be similar to the 1957 convention at South Dakota. Distinguished speakers will add glamour to the event. The contest events and time schedule will follow the 1957 pattern. Social festivities and entertainment will, as usual, be highlights of the week.

All delegates will be housed and fed on campus. We are assured of the very best in contest and convention facilities. Watch for complete details of the twenty-first convention in the January *Forensic*.

Some time ago, the editors asked for this type of article. Mr. Krips is to be congratulated, not only for being the first to respond, but also for the excellent quality of his material. Others should now be stimulated to write. Perhaps it will help your budget.

Forensics at a Land-Grant Institution

by LESLIE R. KREPS

Oklahoma State University

Philosophizing about forensics is good for the soul. But the trouble is, most of it is ephemeral. It goes on over a cup of coffee among members of the clan. This makes us feel good inside, since quite obviously we in forensics are accomplishing great things. But all too often the only ones who hear our excellent arguments for more and bigger forensic programs are those who are already convinced.

So occasionally it is a good idea to get something down on paper. Why have an active forensics program at your college? Your administrators would like to know. Though most of us are quite idealistic, and not really interested in such practical things, a formal statement of purpose may even bring about a healthy increase in your forensics budget.

We at Oklahoma State faced a budget problem last year. When we talked to the administration about requesting an increase, we were encouraged to include a statement concerning the place of forensics at a land-grant university. The following is a part of that statement.

The request for a doubled budget was granted. But before I am accused of the fallacy *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, I must hasten to add that a propitious time should be chosen to submit a statement of purpose. At Oklahoma State an excellent time was chosen. A few months before the statement was prepared Jim Powers and Jerry Karam had returned from the PKD National Tournament at Brookings with an undefeated debate record. And a few weeks before the budget committee approved the increase Gail Kimes had

won the Interstate Oratorical Contest. Such performances by Oklahoma Alpha squad members might have been sufficient basis alone for a substantial budget increase.

EXCERPTS FROM THE STATEMENT

The debate coach would summarize his justification for an increased forensics budget as follows: an increased appropriation for forensics will make possible a beneficial increase in the most favorable type of public relations and service activity, and an expanded program in forensics is in line with the current interest of the administration in expanding the opportunities for the superior student.

Forensics and the Service Program Of a Land-Grant Institution

A land-grant institution, by the very nature and basis of its establishment, is more interested than are other colleges in the service it can and must render to the people of the state. A forensics program which is patterned to the specific needs of such an institution must allow for a greater emphasis on service. Significant contributions have been made in this area by recent debate squads. It is proposed to expand such services. With an adequate budget, a squad of between 15 and 30 members — all of exceptional scholastic and speaking ability — could be maintained. A student speaker's bureau, ready to offer a variety of services, could then be formed. Individual speakers on a number of current subjects would be available to community clubs and high school assemblies. Discussion panels could present informed student views on issues of in-

terest to various groups. In preparation for competition, forensic participants do detailed research on several current issues. No group is more capable of expressing itself in a manner which would reflect credit upon Oklahoma State University. With a squad of adequate size — and only a small budget is holding down the size at present — squad members could perform such service without taking too much time from their classes. If the squad is limited to less than 10 members, such service would be impossible.

All educational institutions are interested in good public relations; certainly it is a matter of paramount importance to land-grant universities. To have members of the student body excel in any field of endeavor is a part of good public relations. Winning football teams are a prime example. If students excel in activities emphasizing superior research, reasoning, logic, and effective communication — all essentials of sound intellectual effort — a higher type of publicity is received. Such achievements show that the university is effectively encouraging excellence in those very areas which are basic to its existence.

In 1951, Oklahoma State was host to the National Convention of the Pi Kappa Delta Forensic Fraternity. Representatives of the world's largest public speaking society liked the way they were treated here, and returned to their homes in all parts of the country to tell others about our school. A strengthened forensics program would place us in a position to extend another invitation. Such conventions bring the finest type of national publicity to Oklahoma State.

Forensics and the Superior Student

It is understood that the administration is concerned with making opportunities available to the superior student for maximum development of his potentialities. The development of an adequate program of co-curricular forensic participation is a step in this direction which can be made immediately without major readjustments.

In May, 1957, the late Dr. John W. Headley, President of South Dakota State College, wrote a congratulatory letter to President Willham. Dr. Headley stated that his college had been privileged to host the National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta, and that Oklahoma State had every reason to be proud of its delegation. He

then made a statement with which all those responsible for forensic activities are in agreement: "Of course, you and I know that forensic activity brings out the best students and brings out the best in those students."

The very powers that make for excellence in forensics are also key attributes of most superior students. A debater must have the ability to gather facts efficiently, to reason nicely, and to communicate ideas effectively. Each of these capabilities is possessed, at least in incipient form, by the superior student, and is in need of development. Not all superior students will be interested in forensic participation, but all those who will be successful in forensics will have to be superior students.

The debate coach would be hard pressed to defend an active program in an institution whose program must be geared to the lowest common student denominator. Forensics is not an activity for the below-average student. But in a university which is striving to make special opportunities available to its special students, forensics should have an important place.

Forensics Serve the Whole Campus

Although the forensics squad is under the administration of the College of Arts and Sciences, its members come from all colleges on the campus. The championship men's debate team of 1957 was composed of a poultry major from the College of Agriculture and an accounting major from the Business College. Most of the new members on this year's squad are from the College of Engineering.

Sound administrative responsibility seems to demand that the funds made available for forensics come through the department of which the debate coach is a member. This places an unnatural strain upon a single departmental budget. The present debate coach is appreciative of the efforts which have been made by his department and college administrators to meet the needs of his program. He is aware that only with the support of administrators in other departments and colleges — colleges whose students will be directly benefited — will it be possible to make any substantial increase in the budget for forensics. It is hoped that this statement has presented the cogent reasons for requesting this support.

The Potential Killer

MARGARET BUFORD

University of Redlands

Man, the height of creation — conqueror, explorer, inventor, builder, teacher. Man, who, possessing the power of knowledge, has circumnavigated the globe in a matter of hours, fought the enemies of his flesh, subjected nature to serve his needs, and to satisfy his wants, harnessed the awesome forces that may spell his own doom. Man, who has realized the might of the universe around him but neglected the overwhelming, frightening powers inside him. Forces more wonderful than anything he can imagine, more deadly than anything he can create.

Within each one of us in this room there exists a potential killer. A force so powerful that it can dissect reason from our minds, tear conscience from our souls, squeeze love from our hearts. An unseen killer that every man knows until death stops that knowledge. A killer called prejudice.

Are you prejudiced? Have you ever discriminated against anyone because of his color, religion, economic status? Or have you been the victim of such biased attitudes? I have experienced both sides of this problem, being discriminated against and at the same time prejudiced in my feelings towards others, as undoubtedly all of us in this room have been at one time or another.

Who among us here can honestly say that he is not prejudiced? Sociologists and psychologists claim that the power of this emotion is universal. Wherever there are minority groups with different features, clothes, or actions, they are looked upon as outsiders. The Jewish-Arab strife, the caste system in India, even the tribal wars in Africa all testify to this fact.

The effects of prejudice can also be felt in our country. Yet this problem facing America is, in many ways, unique to the situation of other nations. We have a dream — democracy. Not the proclama-

tion of a political system, but an expression of faith in the dignity and growth of men regardless of differences. A concord of belief in the common man's uncommon soul, regardless of race, color or creed; a dream that makes all men human. But prejudice based upon fear, ignorance, and hatred thrives on our distrust of others and threatens to destroy this noble dream.

Our newspapers are filled with incidents describing and indicating the workings of this killer within our society. We have read about the group of white teen-agers who picked out a Negro and killed him just for the thrill of doing so; the young Japanese student who was refused membership in a fraternity on the campus of one of our leading universities. Many of us attend colleges that do not give scholarships to Catholic students. Some of us have heard about the so-called low class family of Baltimore who inherited property in an exclusive section of town only to be forced to move by the indignant, wealthier inhabitants.

The right or wrong of these incidents is not the issue at hand. For the detrimental effects of prejudice are quite evident to each of us and have firmly established it as a problem in American society. What we have failed to do is analyze and act upon the factors which contribute to this basic problem of human relations. Today, let us consider one of the underlying causes of this killer of men and nations.

FEAR

Fear is an inescapable emotion of thoughtful people. It takes various forms in our lives. We attempt to drown it in alcohol, flaunt it as delinquency habits, or conceal it in the guise of a physical ailment. In prejudice, we convert this fear into hatred. And this is perhaps the most dangerous of its forms. For in this state,

we can make life a living death for ourselves as well as others.

But what is this fear that converts a quiet citizenry into a seething mob of race diotists; that can change a Christian love into a bitter hatred of the Jewish religion? Where lies the source?

Psychologists agree that one of our most insistent needs is that to belong. Here in America it is most apparent. Four of our children are trapped in the whirlpool of industrialization; a mass production society in which the individual is rapidly losing his identity. To be a part of the group is an innate goal and indeed our security. For examples of this, consider the "fads" of our teen-agers, and the many organizations to which each of us belong. A trait that has given Americans the nickname — "joiners."

Often the only way we find to secure ourselves, and consequently our particular group is to tear others down, to find a scapegoat upon whom we may vent the frustrations of our insecurity. Thus we make distinctions, draw lines among different groups so that we may feel superior. People very different from ourselves in color and features represent one group that we may distinguish. Thus racial prejudice. To be stronger in our own religion, we persecute other faiths and their followers. Thus religious discrimination. To justify our economic status, we stereotype members of other so-called "classes", be them higher or lower than our own. Thus, class distinction.

Within these situations lies the core of America's problem. For the heterogeneity of our society lends itself very easily to these discriminations. We have Japanese, Chinese, Caucasians, Negroes, Mexicans, Jewish, Protestants, Catholics, upper class, lower class and countless others of which we are all too aware. In a country teeming with differences the nameless and pervasive fear of those "unlike ourselves" has a greater chance to flourish. Yet we fail to realize that our uniqueness lies in this fact that we are composed of various cultures and beliefs. Reconciling these differences into a workable living arrangement

of mutual respect and admiration forms the basis for our greatness and indeed our challenge.

What then can we do to combat this killer that threatens our nation as well as our own personal well-being?

Selma Hirsch, author of the pamphlet *Fear And Prejudice* offers one solution: Accept the unalterable and then change the changeable.

There is no way we can or necessarily wish to eliminate the various groups within our society. But we can channel the attitudes of future generations. Strengthen the power of love in the parent-child relationship, help our young people to respect themselves as well as others, teach them to find security on their own merits. All of these ways may be employed to combat prejudice in our young, while educational and legislative programs may challenge the killer on the adult level.

Yet there remains still another point at which prejudice must be attacked — within our own personal lives. Let those of us so-called northerners be cautious when referring to the racial prejudice of our southern neighbors, for the same element often controls our lives, though usually in various other forms. True enough, few of our laws are biased, but we have racial, religious and economic conflict in our schools, restrictive covenants in our communities, discriminations in employment. This fear and hatred exists in every race, every religion, in you as well as in me. Therefore, religious tension cannot be termed the Catholic problem, nor racial tension the White or Negro problem. It is man's problem, your concern and mine. For the killer would not even exist if we did not nourish it in our own hearts.

Yes, prejudice, the destroyer of human ideals, the author of man's inhumanity to man, the threat to the dream of our nation. The evils of persecution and discrimination stem from its roots. Fear, hatred and guilt fan its flames. But you and I give it reality, power, force. We are the only ones who can destroy its influence. And this must be done, not only for minority

groups, majority groups or even for democracy. But for ourselves as well. So that the hatred that twists our ideals, the guilt that bolts out our reason, the fear that prods us on to destruction may no longer be the killer within us. Rather let us heed the voice calling us to love, to forgive,

to understand, to fulfill our dream of democracy.

Man — the height of creation, who has realized the might of the universe around him, but neglected the frightening powers within him. Forces more wonderful than anything he can imagine, but, potentially, more deadly than anything he can create.

Do you attend tournament, single-judge debates to hear your own debate teams?

Question Asked 182 Chapters

by GILBERT RAU

Central Michigan College

This question was asked each Pi Kappa Delta debate coach early last winter. Answers in the form of a one-page questionnaire were received from 112 of the 182 chapters contacted. The tabulations and solicited comments shed some interesting light on this debate practice.

Offhand, why shouldn't a debate coach — free from judging duties in a given round — hear one of his own teams? Perhaps this specific debate practice appears to the reader to be an inoffensive dog; let it lie. This investigator hastens to confess he began as an advocate of the con position, later trying the pro position. Upon questioning debate colleagues informally in Michigan and around the country, unexpected diversity of opinion, attitude, and practice were found. This sampling of Pi Kappa Delta debate coaches from coast to coast is an attempt to collect current information on this specific practice.

The first of five questions asked on the questionnaire was: 1) Have you attended a tournament, single-judge debate this past 1956-57 debate season to hear one of your debate teams?

Of 109 responses, 28 or 25.6 percent reported Yes; 81 or 74 percent reported NO.

Three did not respond to this question.

The second question asked: 2) About how many times have you attended such a debate last year?

The range was from 1 time to a maximum of 6 times. Of the 28 coaches involved, 2 reported 6 occasions where they heard their own teams in action. Only 1

coach reported 4 occasions. All others (25) reported 3 occasions or fewer.

The third question asked: 3) Do you give unqualified support to such a practice?

Of 99 responses, 30 or 30 percent stated Yes; 69 or 69 percent stated No. A number of coaches stated that the wording of this question bothered them — particularly the word "unqualified" — and so conditioned their replies.

The fourth question dealt with four statements *justifying* the practice of hearing your own teams in a tournament. The statements together with the responses were as follows:

4) Check each of the following statements which, in your opinion, *justifies* hearing your own debate team in a tournament, single-judge debate:

40 or 36% a) In general, it is an educationally sound practice in tournaments.

----- b) Allows debate coach to hear his debaters at their best in competition.

68 or 61% c) Allows debate coach to evaluate the progress of his students.

73 or 65% d) Helps the debate coach to determine where his students need further instruction.

The fifth question dealt with four statements *questioning* the practice of hearing your own teams in a tournament. The statements together with the responses were as follows:

5) Check each of the following statements which, in your opinion, makes such a debate practice *questionable* or *unjustified*:

40 or 36% a) The single-judge is bothered by the presence of the debate coach.

34 or 30% b) The opposing debate team is disturbed by the "morale" presence of the opposing coach.

54 or 48% c) The opposing debate team feels his presence unwelcome, should this debate coach judge them in a later round.

54 or 48% d) The students of the debate coach feel they want to be on their own.

The last item on the questionnaire was an invitation to coaches to add a statement of their own on this debate practice. The responses were many. Indeed, while the responses to the specific questions did yield informative data, the numerous frank comments volunteered are also of considerable value and shed much light on the prevailing attitudes of our Pi Kap coaches.

Here are some representative comments received. The first list contains 26 Pro comments; the second list contains 26 Con comments:

Twenty Six Selected Comments — PRO

1. There are definite values in hearing your own teams; however, the practice of requiring the coaches to judge makes it difficult to hear them.

2. Anyone who takes winning this seriously (I think that would be the motivating force dominant) is welcome to it as far as I am concerned.

3. One's teams should be on their own part of the time, but a coach should be able to listen in once or twice without any harmful effects.

4. Students gain confidence; students gain security.

5. I like to hear my people debate against other teams, and there are a few of us in this section of the country who make a practice of listening to one another's teams and our own by mutual agreement beforehand.

6. As a judge I prefer to have the

coaches hear the debate. There is then less chance for misunderstanding the decision.

7. I make it a practice to hear them only when my team specifically invites me. (This is very rare.)

8. I don't audit their debates except when I am checking for something particular.

9. A coach if interested in seeing his debate teams perform in a single-judge tournament should request permission of both debate teams and judge.

10. I have been a judge when another coach is in the room and while I admit it makes me tend to be more alert (that's good), I can't say that I in any way resented his presence.

11. I heartily approve of the practice, provided the debates are judged by experts. (Too often the real judge is a substitute for the coach, and the judging is inferior.)

12. I think the practice is justified in spite of the objection that the single judge is bothered by the presence of the debate coach.

13. I have never seen any signs of causing anyone discomfort and it does give you a view of your teams in action.

14. Students who want to be on their own have of course no need for a coach.

15. If purpose of listening is understood by all parties I see no reason for objecting to the practice. As a judge it certainly never bothers me.

16. I usually try once or twice a season to get one or two rounds 'freed' so that I can hear my people in competition.

17. Check on students' attitudes toward winning.

18. Basically I think it is a sound practice, but each debate coach should decide each instance on the conditions involved.

19. I feel the coach should hear his people once in a while at their best.

20. Certain teams only for particular purposes, and usually only experienced teams.

21. I rarely do hear my teams, but I feel it is perfectly valid for the coach who wishes to.

22. Anyone else, judge or no, who will listen to any debate along with the single judge should be welcome.

23. Fears and notions of some about such matters appear to be unfounded.

24. I usually try to sit in one round in a tournament when it is possible, even if my debaters sometimes prefer that I do not come.

25. Some debate teams may actually want their coach to hear them so as to evaluate and to be in position to help them.

26. Without hearing his team in action the coach would be in an untenable position to make applicable constructive criticism.

Twenty Six Selected Comments — CON

1. I don't do it and object to those that do.

2. The single judge may even "lean over backward" against the visiting coach's team if the debate is close.

3. Students of debate coach do a better job when by themselves.

4. In my opinion, the coach who wants to sit in on his own debaters is in reality more concerned with getting a decision than in developing debaters. One of the privileges of free men is the privilege of making their own mistakes and learning from them.

5. My students indicate that presence makes them more fearful and anxious.

6. Tendency for debaters to check their coach for "feedback" may result in poorer performances.

7. I have found that it is too painful to listen to one of my own teams in competition.

8. Many coaches use this as a method of "scouting", also deliberately distract the opposing team.

9. The big question is this: Do I want to listen to the team to see how my debaters are doing or primarily to find out how we can meet this case of Siwash in the next round?

10. The critic-judge might be less critical than if the coach were not present.

11. Having your coach as a member of an audience is one thing; having him as almost your only audience is something else.

12. In the past my better debaters have complained that my presence is disconcerting, i.e., their most severe critic.

13. Appears you do not trust your team.

14. It increases strain and tension in all concerned.

15. It would tend to cause a loss of respect for debate judges if the coach didn't agree with the judge's decision and so informed his students.

16. I have found that most of my debaters get the jitters when their coach is in the room either in practice or in a tournament. Why bother them at a tournament?

17. At times I have listened outside the door to one of my teams in a tournament. I think this is of some help.

18. The opposition may feel the coach is attempting to "pick up" a case.

19. I would never listen to one of my teams in a crucial debate, because I feel that my debaters would be too much aware of my presence. I'm afraid they would be too keyed up to do an effective job.

20. Coach may indicate disapproval of a particular statement or point made by his debaters, thereby making them nervous by his presence.

21. In the debate I want them to be on their own. This to me is one of the most important parts of the learning process.

22. My presence has tended to disturb my students even when I have reluctantly attended at their urging in the past.

23. My students say they are more tense when I listen to them, and the help I can give them later outweighs this.

24. Probably a good judge "sitting it out."

25. The students of the debate coach prefer that he not attend a debate in which they participated at a tournament. I have never violated this request.

26. I never hear them because I do feel that it is a pressure device employed by some coaches.

Some of the comments received from coaches were neither Pro nor Con, but were equally interesting and revealing. Here are 12 selected general comments:

Twelve Selected General Comments

1. My failure to attend a greater number of single judge, tournament debates can be attributed to 1) my having to judge every round and 2) pure laziness.