

45-182

THE

# Forensic

ΠΕΙΘΩ ΚΑΛΗ ΔΙΚΑΙΑ



“SOULMATES”

OCTOBER 1959

LIBRARY  
OTTAWA UNIVERSITY



# *The* FORENSIC

## OF PI KAPPA DELTA

---

SERIES 45      OCTOBER, 1959      No. 1

---

### Contents

This Business of Bestness . . . . .	3
Speech in the Training of a Scientist . . . . .	5
Report of the National Questions Committee . . . . .	7
Private Debate vs. Public Speaking . . . . .	8
The President's Page . . . . .	13
Chapter Notes . . . . .	14
Pi Kappa Delta Winners . . . . .	19
Alumni News . . . . .	21
New Members of Pi Kappa Delta . . . . .	24
Chapter Reports . . . . .	26
Calling All Students . . . . .	30
The Editor Signs Off . . . . .	31

---

EDITOR . . . . . John Randolph

#### ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

ALUMNI NEWS . . . . . Frank T. Alusow  
 CHAPTER NOTES . . . . . John M. Burt  
 STUDENT CONTRIBUTIONS . . . . . L. A. Lawrence  
 BUSINESS MANAGER . . . . . D. J. Nabors

Published four times a year in October, January, March, and May. Application pending for second class mailing privilege at the post office at Fulton, Missouri, under act of August 24, 1912. Office of publication: Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri.

## DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL PRESIDENT—Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi

NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT—Roy Murphy, Southwest Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana

NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER—D. J. Nabors, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS—Georgia Bowman, William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri; Donald L. Sikkink, South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota; Raymond L. Yeager, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT—Larry E. Norton, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois

EDITOR OF *The Forensic*—John Randolph, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri

ASSOCIATE EDITORS OF *The Forensic*—Frank T. Alusow, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio; John M. Burt, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota; L. A. Lawrence, Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana

## THE PROVINCES AND GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS  
Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado. Jack Howe, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas
2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI  
Missouri, Iowa-Central, Simpson, Coe, Drake, William Penn. Fred Goodwin, South East Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri
3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS  
Illinois, Wisconsin-Ripon, Carroll, Whitewater State, Glenn E. Reddick, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois
4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC  
Arizona, California. William H. Stites, Arizona State College, Tempe, Arizona
5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX  
Iowa-Morningside, Westmar, North Dakota, South Dakota. Kenneth Erickson, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, South Dakota
6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI  
Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas. Donald L. Graham, Northwestern Louisiana College, Natchitoches, Louisiana
7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES  
Maine, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia. Raymond Yeager, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio
8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI  
Iowa-Luther, Upper Iowa, Dubuque, Minnesota, Wisconsin-Eau Claire State, River Falls State. Kenneth Wilkins, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota
9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST  
Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee. Lane Boutwell, Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro, Tennessee
10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST  
Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington. Paul E. Herbold, Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Washington



# *This Business of Bestness*

FRED GOODWIN, *Southeast Missouri State College*

I have been intending to write this article for some time, and this would seem to be the propitious time to be about it. The college at which I teach has just returned from the Pi Kappa Delta National Convention in possession of a superior certificate in men's sweepstakes. We have won the right to send a student to the Old Line Oratorical Contest at Michigan State University in a few weeks. We have compiled a squad record in debate this year of about 70 per cent wins. I mention these achievements only because what I am about to say might be interpreted as loser's bleat. It is not. Rather, it is an effort to combat a delusion which periodically invades forensic tourneys. I suppose, like the wild onions in my front yard, this delusion will tend to sprout annually and with increasing frequency until somebody sprays the lawn. Herewith, I hope, will be only the first dose of chlorate solution. Far too many people are insisting that after we identify the superior forensic participants, we continue to apply our wandering micrometers to decide which of the best is the best.

They suggest an impossible task. *In the greatest number of instances, to choose with any degree of reliability the "champion" of the best debate teams cannot be done.* The truth is, and all coaches who are knowledgeable enough and honest enough must admit it, that in forensic contests the maximum differentiation by the most competent of judges is that which separates the superiors from the excellents from the goods from the rest.

You may have puzzled yourself while you were in grade school with the query which goes: "Suppose you had a piece of string and kept cutting it in half. How long would it take you to complete the job?" The answer was that you never completed the job, because if you cut away only half of the remaining piece of string, half a piece would always remain. I can remember marveling at that answer. Maybe you can too. But I hope you haven't bothered yourself with nonsense like that recently, because the only reasonable answer to the question is: "You cut until your cutting

instrument becomes too crude to cope with the size of the remaining piece of string. Then you quit." I suggest that after we isolate the superior speakers in debate, oratory, discussion, and extemporaneous speaking, our measuring instruments are, and always will be, too crude to separate them further with any degree of meaning.

The last Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament which named a national debate "champion" was in 1934. The final round pitted Gustavus Adolphus against St. Olaf College. Named as judges in the final round were nine people considered by the contest committee to be capable critic judges. They heard the debate and voted a perfect split, 5-4. People who were upset by the divergent opinion made the naive assumption that a judge or a group of judges reach a decision in debate as they might solve a problem in geometry. This naive reasoning is that judges are supposed to listen to the arguments, and carefully apply axioms and postulates of reasoning, analysis, organization, speaking skill, etc., to see which team's performance squares with those axioms and postulates. It sounds very simple. But there is one big difference. Real students of Euclidean geometry don't assess a problem and split their decision 5-4, 3-2, or 2-1. Let me say it again. After we identify the superior speakers, we have made the last *reliable* measurement possible in competitive public speaking no matter how competent the judging.

I do not necessarily hold that tournaments which purport to cleave the "superiores" from the superior should be abandoned. But when you realize the inherent inadequacy of the yardstick we must use to compute the results in the super tournaments some of us attend, and in the final rounds in the elimination tournaments most of us attend, it's pretty hard to take them as seriously as some people seem to be doing.

Right now I am staring at a trophy on my desk which is supposed to symbolize that an entry of Southeast Missouri State College was "best" in one of the tournaments we attended this year. The student



is happy to get the trophy. The editor of our campus newspaper was delighted to hear about such a newsworthy item. The college publicity director was tickled to death. The college president was reservedly pleased. My colleagues congratulated me. After all, we have a "state champion" at our school. And let me be the first to admit, I like the attention and the publicity. But I know that "state champion" is a kind of fraudulent label. I know, and thank goodness the student knows, that if the whole contest were run again with another set of equally qualified judges, he might not be rated on the top. And this knowledge bothers neither of us one whit. What we aim for is the superior rating. If you consistently earn that, then you have earned the last of the reliably meaningful plaudits in the game of intercollegiate competitive public speaking. You are at the top. A few others are there with you, but it's not too crowded unless you tend toward greediness. However, if you like to be alone in your bestness, if you seek the "champion" label, which admittedly is easier to explain to the local press and your campus committee on proportions, you may be opening the way for trouble. For example, at one tournament we attended this year an obviously superior debate team was not satisfied with recognition as superior. Intent upon protecting its bestness rating, the team deliberately misrepresented some evidence. The opposing team knew it, and fortunately the judge knew it. In the critique he confronted the offending team with his awareness. They openly admitted their tactics claiming, "Everybody quotes out of context when they get in a tight spot." I hope their coach wouldn't hold their claim to be true! But it's tempting to be nefarious when seeking as fickle a sprite as bestness.

I have sometimes wondered too at the academic standards of schools ferreting bestness by sending a few of their better students to far too many tournaments. I recently heard a college director of forensics call these debaters "debate bums—as much as the athletic bums we used to condemn." And he has a point without doubt.

Then there are some institutions hoping to embrace bestness by recruiting debaters with the fervor of two Big Ten football coaches after a 250 pound high school tackle who can run 100 yards in 11 seconds in full equipment. Don't misunderstand

me. There is nothing wrong with trying to get promising high school students to come to your school. If you're normal, you believe you don't have enough of the good ones as it is. But I hope you'll agree that one can go too far in this direction. Some schools have in my opinion.

In my scale of values forensics can be justified only as an educational endeavor. It is not for the aggrandizement of an institution or its department of speech, though bestness tempts some school administrators to use forensics for those purposes. Debate does not exist for the ego inflation of the debate coach. Most of us stand in no need of that anyway. But bestness can poison a coach's previously sane forensic philosophy. Forensics exist—and I hope your cortex is not beginning to flash the trite signal, because I feel this sincerely—to teach straight thinking and clear talking. Tournaments, decisions, and awards help those of us who work specifically at the job of teaching better thought and speech. But it's time to whittle away at the tournament bestness bogey. He's growing a bit too large. I try to teach this forensic sanity to my students. Will you join me?

---

### CAN YOU TOP IT?

It was at one of the better-known mid-western debate tournaments and the Westminster affirmative team had just engaged in what they thought was not a very close debate. The judge, an elderly lady from the art department, waited until the other team had left the room and then beckoned the Westminster debaters over to her. "Young gentlemen," she said, in a conspiratorial whisper, "I just want you to know how magnificently you debated. I don't think I ever heard sounder and more convincing constructive speeches. And your rebuttals—you simply demolished your opponents' arguments."

She paused and the Westminster debaters glowed with praise and the conviction that they were sure of at least one decision. Then a look of real anguish came over the judge's face. "It's too bad," she continued, "really too bad, that no affirmative can win on this question."

(Your own horrible-humorous anecdotes are solicited for this department. Remember the time that . . . ? Don't just remember, write it down and send it in. In short, CAN YOU TOP IT?)



# *Speech in the Training Of a Scientist*

SAMUEL L. MEYER\*

The ability to make an effective oral presentation of scientific subject matter to colleagues in his own field, to scientists in other fields, and to the general public is a mark of distinction which the man of science should seek.

Though of recognized value in the past, the spoken word is of greater significance to-day as a tool of the scientist than ever before. Such a facility can be achieved best through speech experience in the undergraduate training of the prospective scientist. It is the purpose of this brief article to call to the attention of young people who contemplate scientific careers four of the many reasons why proficiency in speech makes such a significant contribution to the training of a scientist.

First, training in speech helps in the presentation of "papers" at scientific meetings. By "paper" is meant a report of the procedures, observations, and conclusions involved in a scientific experiment. Because not more than ten to fifteen minutes are usually available, such a "paper" often takes the form of a short, oral presentation made without notes, with notes, or, most commonly, from a manuscript which is read. Programs of many societies list "papers to be read." This becomes literally true, and the "reading" is often most ineffective. One of the purposes of such meet-

ings is to provide the audience with the opportunity to hear original research described, in person, in interesting, enthusiastic, and vital fashion by those who have conducted the investigations. By such a presentation the speaker establishes the priority of his work and obtains helpful criticisms from others working in the same or related fields. This can be a thrilling experience for both audience and speakers. On the other hand, it can be a time-consuming, tiring, and boring experience for the audience and a trying ordeal the speaker wishes to forget.

While an effective presentation can never replace carefully planned and conducted research, it can certainly make the results more understandable and more meaningful. The degree of effectiveness of the presentation enhances or lessens the prestige and reputation of the speaker. Though of importance to every person who appears on the program of a scientific meeting, be it that of a state academy or an international congress, the impression made by the young scientist, just starting out on his professional career, is of particular significance. Training in speech will help him to know what to say and how to say it. The ability to communicate on such occasions may influence his professional future for good or ill.

Second, training in speech provides the scientist with an essential tool for effective teaching. The "lecture method," a technique of teaching which in more recent years has fallen into some disrepute, is about to be revived and its importance re-emphasized. Recent reports and studies indicate that in the future classes will be larger. This is the only way many institutions can meet the challenge of increasing enrollments. As a result, the teacher who is at ease before a large group, who knows how to select, organize, and phrase subject matter for oral presentation, to enunciate clearly, to emphasize effectively, to project

---

\* Dr. Meyer was initiated into the Missouri Gamma Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta at Central College, Fayette, Missouri. He holds the Degree of Special Distinction, Orders of Debate, Oratory, and Instruction. He earned the Ph.D. degree in Biology at the University of Virginia and has been Head of the Department of Botany at the University of Tennessee and at the Florida State University. He has served as Executive Director of the American Institute of Biological Sciences and Executive Secretary of the Division of Biology and Agriculture of the National Research Council. In 1954, he was a delegate representing the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council of the United States of America at the VIII International Botanical Congress held in Paris, France. Currently, he is the Academic Vice-President of the College of the Pacific, Stockton, California.



the voice comfortably, to use the vocal cords, lips, and tongue correctly, and to breathe properly, will be sought after by college and university administrators.

Third, speech training greatly expands the potential of the scientist for a contribution to higher education. There is an increasing tendency to call scientists to fill such academic posts as deans of graduate schools, institutional directors of research, and presidents of colleges and universities. In all such assignments, effective oral communication with colleagues and the public is essential to success.

The time for the young scientist to prepare himself for such roles is in his undergraduate years. At this time he must acquire the fundamentals of knowledge in his own and related fields, facility in foreign languages, and develop an independent and inquiring mind. But this is the time also for him to gain yet another tool that will add much to his resources—effectiveness in oral expression. When opportunities come to hold high level administrative positions, it is usually too late to fill gaps in one's training. The candidates who are ready at the moment of selection, from the standpoint of total preparation, are those who are favorably considered.

Fourth, training in speech provides the scientist with the means to put scientific knowledge in a form that will both interest and instruct the public. He must recognize his community responsibilities. He is no longer a man apart, "a man in a white coat," residing in his "ivory tower." He is a member of the society in which he lives, and he must assume his social responsibilities. Today, as never before, the scientist is the spokesman for, and the interpreter of, his science. He must be able to convey through oral expression the meaning and significance of his field of specialization to those who are not similarly trained. Whether he likes it or not, he now finds himself with the responsibility for making science make sense to those whose lives are so intimately affected by it. Without adequate training in speech, he must shirk this responsibility or accept it with discredit both to himself and his science.

As one who has been privileged to present "papers" at scientific meetings in this country and abroad, who has had the satisfying experience of teaching lecture sections of more than two hundred stu-

dents, who has enjoyed opportunities for scientific and educational administration, and who has been called upon to communicate with the public on scientific subjects, the writer is thoroughly convinced that his undergraduate training in speech is one of his most valuable assets. It is his earnest hope that many other young people who contemplate careers in science will have the pleasure and satisfaction that results from participation in "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just."

---

## THE COVER PHOTO: "SOULMATES"

Since there may be a few new members of Pi Kappa Delta who cannot immediately identify the personalities pictured on the cover, an identification may be needed. On the left is Roy D. Mahaffey, past national president of Pi Kappa Delta, chairman of the speech department and director of forensics at Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon. On the right is "Rosy," mascot of Sigma Nu fraternity at the College of Puget Sound. The picture was taken last February at the C. P. S. annual Tyro Tournament by John Keliher, a senior C. P. S. debater.

Professor Mahaffey is known throughout the West Coast as "Happy." He came by the name naturally because of his never lagging good will and cheerful hope that everything is all right, really, and is going to come out all right. Next after the late Egbert Ray Nichols, "Happy" has probably done more for the promotion of clean, hard competitive forensics than any other single force on the West Coast. His basic philosophy of forensics is that they constitute the best device, known to date, whereby young men and young women may toughen their intellectual fiber, develop their power of discrimination between real and vested interest, and learn how to win modestly and to lose gracefully.

As for "Rosy," his fame has not spread quite as wide nationally as has "Hap's," but he is one of the better known personalities of the Pacific Northwest. "Rosy" attends all C. P. S. functions and participates directly not only in the activities themselves but also in the auxiliary social amenities.



# Report of the National Questions Committee

**HARVEY CROMWELL, Mississippi State College for Women**

One hundred and thirty-eight Pi Kappa Delta chapters voted on the national questions this year. One chapter failed to rank the questions, five sent in their votes after the ballots had been tabulated and two did not vote for the discussion questions. There were thus one hundred and thirty-two valid ballots for the debate propositions and one hundred and thirty valid ballots for the discussion questions. The results of the vote on the National Debate and Discussion Topics for 1959-60 are listed below as announced on August 7, 1959. In tabulating the votes, each first-place vote was scored five points; each second-place, four points; each third-place, three points; each fourth-place, two points; and each fifth-place one point. The topic in each list receiving the highest total was chosen as the official question.

## DEBATE

RANK		VOTE
1st	Resolved: That Congress should be given the power to reverse decisions of the Supreme Court	1230
2nd	Resolved: That federal price supports for agriculture should be abolished	1213
3rd	Resolved: That the federal government should establish a system of compulsory health insurance	1128
4th	Resolved: That East and West Germany should be unified as a sovereign state	1071
5th	Resolved: That Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations	1058

## DISCUSSION

RANK		VOTE
1st	What should be the role of government in regulating organized labor?	1270

2nd	What should be the place of the humanities in American higher education?	1135
3rd	How can the United States best meet foreign economic competition?	1108
4th	What should be the role of the federal government in regulating our economy?	1007
5th	What should be the policy of the United States toward the problems of Africa?	910

The national questions committee is governed by the following procedures:

- (1) The Speech Association of America Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion is composed of one member from each of the four cooperating forensic societies—Delta Sigma Rho, Phi Rho Pi, Pi Kappa Delta, and Tau Kappa Alpha—one member appointed by the president of the American Forensic Association, and one member appointed by the president of the Speech Association of America. The chairmanship of the committee rotates among the four forensic societies and the AFA and SAA appointees.
  - (2) Each committee member is responsible for polling the chapters or members of the organization which he represents. All suggestions for topics must be submitted to committee members not later than the May date set by the committee.
  - (3) The committee members must meet during the months of May or June to decide on topics and phrase the questions for discussion and the propositions for debate.
  - (4) The debate propositions and discussion questions are submitted for preferential vote not later than August 1 to all chapters of the four forensic organizations and to a representative number of the non-affiliated schools.
  - (5) If circumstances require a change
- (Continued on page 23)



# Private Debate vs. Public Speaking

DONALD L. GRAHAM

*“. . . The use of persuasive speech is to lead to decisions. This is so even if one is addressing a single person and urging him to do or not to do something . . . the single person is as much your 'judge' as if he were one of many; we may say, without qualification, that any one is your judge whom you have to persuade.”* The Rhetoric of Aristotle, Book II, Chapter 18, 1391<sup>b</sup>, 5-12. (Becker edition). Trans. by W. Rhys Roberts.

Forty years ago, in the March issue of *THE FORENSIC*, there appeared an article by Alfred Westfall,<sup>1</sup> then National Historian of Pi Kappa Delta, entitled, “The Judges, the Honorable Judges, If You Please.” In the March issue of *THE FORENSIC*, 1959, there appeared an article by Roy Baker<sup>2</sup> entitled, “Shall Provide Qualified Judges.” Lest anyone think that Pi Kappa Delta has come full circle in her historical destiny, let me hasten to add that there is no subject that has so consistently occupied the concern of speech teachers and of speakers as that of judging. With the desire to win such an integral feature of debate, it is not surprising that the decision element should provoke continuing critical attention. To subject the immediate present to the scrutiny of the immediate past, Mr. Baker suggests that the lack of “qualified” judges at tournaments creates a situation in which “the ‘power of persuasion’ becomes a more valuable tool than

the ‘art of debate.’” Mr. Baker defines “qualified” as “including a knowledge of the rules of debate.” Mr. Westfall contended that, “A debate should not be judged upon the technical principles laid down in treatises on argumentation, such as steps in analysis, definitions, and technical points in delivery. A debate should be judged as to its power to convince and persuade. . . .” Strangely, while the two authors disagree as to the basis for judging and, collaterally, what constitutes a “qualified” judge, they both proceed from the same premise: debate is an essential part of the training of students for professional and public life.

The first main point, whether the debater convinces or persuades, may be considered from two points of view: first, whether he has a real choice; second, if he has a choice, which is more likely to win debates.

In recent literature in our field, the conviction-persuasion dualism controversy seems to have been resolved as “conviction and persuasion, now and forever, one and inseparable.”<sup>3</sup> The dualism retains some validity, more in terms of providing a basis for analyzing speech elements and for determining specific audience responses than in terms of discrete psychological faculties. To argue that reason is not involved in action determination or that emotion is not involved in determining belief is, I believe, unrealistic, unsound, and in reference to debate, inapplicable.<sup>4</sup>

Aside from the conviction-persuasion controversy, both articles raise a question of purpose, both in regard to debate training

Donald L. Graham is Director of Forensics at Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana. He is Governor of the Province of the Lower Mississippi, and Secretary-Treasurer and member of the Executive Council of the Southern Region American Forensic Association. He holds the degree of Special Distinction in debate, oratory, and coaching.

<sup>1</sup> “The Judges, the Honorable Judges, If You Please,” by Alfred Westfall. *THE FORENSIC*, Series 5, Number 1 (March-April, 1919), pp. 3-6.

<sup>2</sup> “. . . Shall Provide Qualified Judges,” by Roy T. Baker. *THE FORENSIC*, March, 1959, pp. 67-68.

<sup>3</sup> *General Speech*, by A. Craig Baird and Franklin H. Knower. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1957 (Second Edition), pp. 270-73.

<sup>4</sup> *The Art of Good Speech*, by James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wraga. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1953, pp. 299-300.

<sup>5</sup> *Persuasion, A Means of Social Control*, by Winston Lamont Brembeck and William Smiley Howell. Prentice Hall, Inc., New York, 1952, pp. 411-420. Particularly the footnote concerning the Knower study, in which emotional and factual-logical speeches were found to be equally effective in securing attitude shift.



and debate tournaments—a question which deserves some sober reflection.

Every tournament yields its tales concerning experiences with judges—those judges who are prejudiced on the question (including some coaches who discount arguments and cases not in use in their particular section of the country); those who have never heard a contest debate; those who vote against a team which did not answer the judge's unspoken objections, or did not employ the judge's unspoken refutation (which was much better than that used by the debaters); judges who sleep through the debate (perhaps with good reason), *ad infinitum*, *ad tedium*. Such criticisms are heard with sufficient frequency as to cause some twentieth century Mark Antonys to cry, "Oh judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason!" Strangely, very few criticisms are heard concerning the judges' lack of expert status on the subject matter debated.

It seems to be a relatively simple matter to label certain judges as unqualified. So far no one, in my experience, has been able to describe, in terms unmistakably clear, just what constitutes a qualified judge, to tell how and where he may be discovered, and to determine who shall pass the judgment concerning the judge's qualifications.

Upon what bases can we say that the judgment of any particular individual is not competent? The answer to this question depends, in large part, upon what we assign as the purpose of tournament debating.

If a debate tournament is conceived as a test of expertise in the technical formulation of a case, a test of whether debaters are familiar with the processes of organization, analysis, discovery and evaluation of evidence and argument, and of skill in speaking and in the Latin fallacies—then, of course, only someone similarly trained would be capable of judging the relative attainments of the debaters. Under such conditions, with experts judging the degree of expertness of students, the tournament becomes, in almost absolute terms, the anathema of public speaking.

Consider, for a moment, the tournament-debate situation: four debaters, usually alternating affirmative and negative; a room which is usually empty except for the debaters and one lonely judge who, although

he has no influence over the actual outcome of the proposition, and the debaters realize it (art of persuasion?), is the object of the most convincing efforts the debaters can muster; a proposition which is carefully selected because it cannot be solved and will not be resolved during the season, and one concerning which the really significant information is usually not even available to the debaters. Here we have an ivory-tower situation which would satisfy even the Medieval academicians. When hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars, extracted for education, are being expended annually upon this activity, and the argument is submitted that this artificial situation, because of its artificiality, requires that only a qualified expert can judge it, then debate, as an academic adjunct, becomes virtually impossible to justify. Paradoxically, even the artificial situation described has not resulted in artificially consistent bases for decisions. Even debate coaches seem to convict themselves of being unqualified every time they participate in split decisions. Who is to determine, in such cases, which debate coaches are not qualified? For this is the point: to complain about a lack of qualified judges is to imply that there are qualified people who, because of their qualifications, will be consistent with one another in any given debate.<sup>5</sup> Such is so seldom the case in the elimination rounds of any tournament, even when only experienced coaches are judging, that the problem of qualifying a judge becomes, at best, an imposing one.

On the other hand, if the tournament situation is conceived largely as a test of those skills which are inherent in debate and which influence decisions, then the problem is somewhat less imposing.

Let us approach the problem of assigning purpose to debate training and tournament experience from two points of

<sup>5</sup> According to the statistical summary of the past two West Point tournaments, slightly above 60 per cent of the decisions in the preliminary rounds would have been reversed by a single vote—that is three-fifths of the decisions were split, 2-1. In both years, the winning and runner-up teams could have been eliminated in two of the four elimination rounds by the change of a single vote.

For a refreshing study, and a delightfully written article, see "If Judges Can't Agree, Make Them Debate," by Merrill G. Christopherson of the University of South Carolina, *THE FORENSIC*, May, 1954, pp. 99-100. Prof. Christopherson directed a West Point District qualifying tournament using two judges on each debate. Only one judge was not a coach, and he was an ex-debater. Every coach participated in at least one split decision; only the ex-debater did not.



view: that of the debate coach and debater, and that of the tournament director.

If the tournament is the testing ground of decision-influencing skills, skills which are developed under expert guidance, then the more skillful team should win the decisions—other factors being equal—whether the judge is an expert in the art of debate or not. The coach of debate has, presumably, ample opportunity to guide the development of his debaters through individual sessions, practice debates, and post-mortems following tournaments.<sup>6</sup> The coach seldom has the opportunity to hear all his debaters under tournament conditions; throughout the season, however, the coach and the debater receive expert help from other coaches, for at least some of the judges in almost every tournament are coaches. When, in addition to this supplementary guidance of other coaches, the debater can test his development and skill before non-coaches, he is speaking under conditions which closely approximate the ultimate, and lifelong, professional and public speaking situations he will meet after he graduates from college and from tournaments. I believe that the variety of judging is rather to be sought than avoided, if for no other reason than to give the coach a check on his coaching, for if a team consistently loses decisions before non-expert judges, it is suggestive that the coaching is not helping the student much in terms of the ultimate applications of that training.

Are the non-expert judges in reality less accurate than the experts? In seven years of operating tournaments, and twelve years of attending them, I have found that the layman tends to acknowledge the superior teams with about the same regularity as do coaches; and in elimination rounds, at my tournaments, I find as many coaches as laymen splitting on decisions. Frequently, to mention but one other advantage of having layman judges, the layman actually gives a better analysis of his decision than the coach who has become too familiar with the arguments and evidence to be, relatively, as objective about a particular debate.

Now let us consider the problem of

judging from the other point of view, that of the individual responsible for the tournament—the director who asks visiting schools to help provide judges. In most tournaments the so-called ideal of securing debate coaches and ex-debaters familiar with debate skills and procedures (I refuse to use the word “rules”) is simply not attainable.<sup>7</sup> And the situation is more critical in the elimination rounds, when the need for attaining the ideal would seem even more necessary, for that is the time the defeated teams with their coaches, decide to go home—and no visiting school is ever required to provide three to five judges for each team reaching the elimination rounds. While the qualified experts are driving away from the tournament, rather than toward it, the director finds it difficult to find a place to assign the coaches who remain, for their teams are involved and the debates are relatively few. Collaterally, note that if the visiting colleges are unable to provide one qualified expert judges for every two teams entered, as the number of schools and teams entering the tournament increases, the host school finds it increasingly difficult to fill the need for judges from its own resources. Moreover, even when visiting schools do provide the requisite judges, those judges, overworked at many tournaments, devise means of absentsing themselves at the time the ballots are being distributed, or manage to arrive after the tournament director, desperately trying to get the round started on schedule, has been forced to replace the visiting judge with someone who, while less of an expert on the techniques of debate, is at least available. (Ask any tournament director, particularly toward the end of the season, how frequent this practice is.) Visiting coaches and their debaters, under these circumstances, are hardly in a position to complain about the judging. (At the Southern Speech Association recently, I read a letter to the tournament director complaining about the use of high school debate coaches to judge college debates, suggesting that many were hardly qualified. It is a matter of record that the author of this complaint judged few, if any, debates but sent substitutes to meet his judg-

<sup>6</sup> Opportunity as, possibly, opposed to practice. The recent study by Eugene Vasilew of Lehigh University, published in the spring issue, 1959, of *The Register*, pp. 20-34, suggests that most debaters feel they learn more from their experience in debate than from their coach, and that the more talented the debater, the less coaching they receive.

<sup>7</sup> At the 24th Annual Louisiana Speech Tournament in March, 1959, 40 per cent of the judging was accounted for by faculty and townspeople. The tournament restricts entries to a maximum of four teams per school. Although not all of the entering schools entered the maximum number of teams, the visiting coaches got very little relief.



ing assignments. As a footnote to this: his senior team won five of the six debates, so perhaps he was correct in his evaluation of the high school coaches.)

There are some answers for those who demand only coaches as judges. (I refuse to consider the diplomatic niceties involved in not assigning the neophyte coach.) Teams could debate, in a festival tournament, each third round, thus ensuring three coaches on each debate—provided the tournament restricted entries to two teams per coach. It might also ensure a week-long tournament. Or tournament directors could require that each participating school provide three coaches for each team it expects to be eligible for the elimination rounds. If this condition were met, it would result in a surfeit of judges—but it could never happen. Another alternative, but one designed to give the public relations man a nervous collapse, would be to require all coaches to remain until the completion of the final round of the tournament. Or the director could make the judging fees high enough to employ coaches in the area for two or three days—an expense which would obviously restrict entries or impoverish the host school. However, since these alternatives are not particularly desirable, if attainable, the tournament situation will not, because it cannot, satisfy those who insist upon having only judges who are trained and/or experienced in debate. The best that the director can do is to select judges as carefully as possible from among the faculty members and townspeople, and offer briefing sessions and/or printed material outlining the criteria for judging. The criteria will, of course, vary from tournament to tournament, and the application of the criteria will vary from judge to judge. In speech, as in every activity of life, the human element has not yet been objectified. Sorry.

The greater share of the judging at most tournaments is borne by coaches, and the coach who wants only coaches for judges should derive some satisfaction from the fact that directors usually try to arrange the schedule so that each team has the same number of coaches' decisions, or that the laymen will be concentrated in the junior divisions. (I realize that this latter practice is not only discouraging to the beginning debater, without real justification, but the tournament director finds it diffi-

cult to obtain the services of the laymen judges who have been so assigned in previous tournaments.) In either case, the laymen's judgments will probably be submerged in the total number of decisions to which the team is exposed; and deviate decisions, whether they are from the coaches or the laymen, will probably not prevent a good team from reaching the elimination rounds or from achieving the rating it is accustomed to receiving. It is not rationalizing to say that without the laymen, many debates would not be judged or many tournaments would run later than they already do, and the coach and the debater would not have the practical test of the skills taught and learned. Nor is it a rationalization to point out that, the exigencies of tournaments being what they are, laymen judges must be regarded as a fact of tournament life—they deserve our pity and our deepest appreciation, not unjustified condemnation. Nor is it likely that tournament directors will make any serious effort to eliminate laymen judges until the teams *winning* laymen's decisions complain about those judges; after all, both teams have the same judge in a debate, whether he or she be a laymen or coach.

My point is simply this: a reasonable adult, though not possessed of expert knowledge of procedures and techniques of debate, can recognize superior skill in the debate situation precisely because the coach has trained the debater for that exact purpose. And if coaches fear that their teams will face other teams who tend to rely on non-logical appeals, those coaches should train their debaters to persuade the judges that such appeals cannot be decisive on a proposition that calls for rational judgment. As Alfred Westfall wrote, "Instead of complaining of the stupidity of the judges, the debater should learn by what means men's convictions are formed. If he is certain of the logic and the power of his argument, he should endeavor to discover why he failed to make his hearers appreciate it." After all, one of the objectives of speech training, which, I believe, includes debate, is that of audience adaptation. It seems somewhat of a travesty to require a speech situation in which the audience is adapted to the speakers.

When the college debater has given his last debate at his last tournament before a debate coach and three other debaters, or an audience of the same level, it will be, in