

program. Under this plan an editor may be re-elected for the following year. An associate editor may be elevated to the editorship and serve a year or so.

Member readers of The FORENSIC at this point might wonder about the circulation comparison of these three journals. In fact the number of copies distributed in our own PKD circle is probably known to only a few. Using the 1968-'69 school year as a referral point, and using peak or maximum figures, we note The FORENSIC touched a high of 3,200 copies for an issue, the SPEAKER AND GAVEL 2,500 copies, and The PERSUADER 1,250 copies. Closely related to these circulation counts is the important matter of budgets allotted for these publications. The circulation figures cited suggest that The FORENSIC had the highest printing expenditure. According to figures furnished by Dr. Weiss and Dr. Broder, this was indeed the case. The cost for the 1968-'69 four issues of The FORENSIC was approximately \$4,500, for four issues of SPEAKER and GAVEL approximately \$3,700, and for three issues of The PERSUADER approximately \$1,800. Like everything else, costs since then have gone up.

Going to press is a period of high excitement for an editor. It's the time for another issue of his organization's publication to be born. Teaching and other regular campus duties continue as usual, of course, but intense last minute going to press duties must now be performed, too. Staying on schedule or as close to schedule as possible now becomes important. But, for the writer at least, the usual disappointment then occurs — not all the expected copy has arrived. But go to press we must, reserving space for the important copy yet to come.

Going to press is performed in different ways by the editors of The FORENSIC, SPEAKER and GAVEL and The PERSUADER. For simplicity of operation the procedure employed by editor Weiss merits attention. He reports he simply mails all his copy with instructions to the printer located in another state. Proofs are returned in two to three weeks. It is significant to note here that DSR-TKA has for

years maintained the same continuing printer for its SPEAKER and GAVEL. Each new succeeding editor can thus rely with confidence on an experienced printer who knows the publication thoroughly. Further, this printer is supplied with a mailing list from the executive secretary; labeling and mailing is done by the print shop. The actual time from the submitting of all copy to the time the printer mails an issue is six to eight weeks.

Editor Broder reported a different routine. He begins by submitting over half the copy to his printer who is located a ten minutes drive from the campus. Upon receiving the copy for proof-reading, he measures it, lays out the dummy, and then fits the rest of the copy to the remaining space. His schedule calls for two weeks work on preparation of the dummy, two weeks for printing, with mailing of the issue in the fifth week. Dr. Broder stated he prepared the mailing labels himself before taking them to his nearby printer, an extra burden in itself.

In preparing an issue of The FORENSIC, your editor takes all available copy, usually about ninety percent, in dummy form to the printer located in a town twenty-five miles away. Space is reserved for late copy to come. In general, all copy is in the hands of the printer by the middle of the preceding publication month and the issue is mailed by the end of the third week of the publication month — a five week period. The Secretary-Treasurer mails the labels to the editor in advance who takes them to the printer.

In the selection of printers Pi Kappa Delta and Phi Rho Pi follow the policy of permitting the newly elected editor to submit the choice of a printer from his own city or area based on competitive bidding. The national organization then approves. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, as stated earlier, maintains the same printer located in Kansas. There are various advantages and disadvantages for each arrangement.

The hidden work routine of going to press goes unnoticed for the most part. The editor works alone and under pressure. He

becomes the sole representative of his national organization entrusted with the production of its next official publication. Any errors that occur are admittedly his errors. Any merits of an issue are cheerfully ascribed to others. Editors are a singular breed.

What were the special problems reported by these three editors? All were quick to agree that there was a time problem, that of staying on schedule to produce an issue. Editor Weiss stated his problem succinctly: there is a time problem that affects the quality. When Dr. Weiss stated this he had assumed the chairmanship of his department. Your editor of *The FORENSIC* reported it this way: how to get all the expected copy in on time, and then, by working late hours shape the copy to fit the issue —at the same time carefully observing the contract agreement on size of issue. Editor Broder's chief concern was getting copy per se, enough hoped-for copy on time to fill an issue.

Another special concern of the editors was the lack of sufficient news from the chapters. Chapter activities, news about alumni, special interest stories, and photographs are always welcome. Unless such news is vigorously and repeatedly solicited, the amount coming in dwindles. The writer, when serving as associate editor in charge of chapter news, recalls that when he made intensified attempts to stimulate news, the results were returns of ten percent or less. Reporting for *The FORENSIC* only, schools submitting news are chiefly the newest chapters joining the organization and the same few old chapters that like to do so.

Still another special problem reported was a lack of enough articles to publish which were of sufficient quality or merit. Your editor of *The FORENSIC* has never had a sufficient number of articles from which to select the past three years. In fact, to be candid and accurate, the number of manuscripts on hand has varied from a dozen downward. Dr. Broder was particularly distressed by the lack of article copy for *The PERSUADER* and employed a practice known to any editor, requesting

known colleagues from other schools with worthwhile contributions to write and submit articles.

A final special problem faced by the three editors was one of judgment, trying to keep in focus what the publication should be or represent. Should there be articles dealing with forensics in each issue? Yes. Should there be included fraternal or house organ news? Yes. Should there be messages, reports, and editorials? Yes. But deciding on the balance of materials for each and every issue continued to be a special problem for the three editors.

The work of the three national intercollegiate forensic organizations continues. A journal or magazine for each remains a necessity. This study has revealed something of the hidden work routines to the reader as the editors of *The FORENSIC*, *SPEAKER* and *GAVEL*, and *The PERSUADER* once more go to press.

IS CONTEMPORARY DEBATE EDUCATIONAL?

(Continued from page 10)

ly-oriented debate programs have, in the past, even won the NDT. It does mean, however, that winning must cease to be the major objective of the program; in its place, the improvement of the individual student must become the guiding philosophy.

Someday, our debaters will look back on their years in intercollegiate debate. When they do, what will they remember? — the tranquilizers, the tension, the pressure of the elimination rounds, the tremendous relief when their debating careers were over? Or, on the other hand, will they reflect upon how debating has helped them in their professional careers, their social contacts, their marriages, and numerous other facets of life? Will they remember a coach who "burned them out", or will they remember him as one of their best teachers?" The choice is ours, and many of us need to reconsider what we are doing.

Convention Preview To Houston

ROBERT TICE, Associate Editor

Like its parent Texas, the City of Houston is KING-SIZED. Its population of two million (growing at the rate of 30,000 people annually) places it sixth in the nation and first in the state.

Sometimes referred to as a gangling teenager who doesn't know where he's going but in a hurry to get there, the super-city sprawls over 453 square miles of flat, near sea-level land in the southeastern part of the state.

Houston leads the Southwest, not only in people, but in oil, gas, per capita income, construction and number of scientists.

Describing this huge, booming metropolis to Pi Kappa Deltans across the country seems a shade more "heavy" than introducing the national forensic fraternity to the City of Houston — site of the 1971 convention-tournament on March 22-26.

This article condenses that bigness into a brief history, a look at four of Houston's outstanding attractions as well as its educational facilities, entertainment suggestions for you visitors and a reminder that behind that imposing exterior lies a warmth in the city's heart.

* * * * *

Houston was started on August 30, 1836, by New York real estate promoters J. K. and A. C. Allen. Their original townsite included 6,642 acres costing them a dollar an acre. They named their bargain for the Texas super-hero General Sam Houston. Earlier that same year he and his 910 volunteers had won the state's independence at San Jacinto just east of the new town.

The Allen brothers accurately prophesied in a New York advertisement: "When the rich lands of this country shall be settled, a trade will flow into Houston, making it the greatest interior commercial emporium of Texas."

Houston became one of the early capitals of the republic. The first railroad in the state operated out of the city, as well as

one of the first newspapers. Oil was discovered nearby in 1901. In 1915 a 50-mile man-made channel brought the first ocean-going ship to Houston, now third largest port in the nation in tonnage handled. Meanwhile people and prosperity flowed into the ever-young city.

* * * * *

Houston has the only covered and air-conditioned stadium in the world, the gigantic Astrodome. (This is a *must* for your visit, even if you're not a tourist-type.)

Masterminded by Judge Roy Hofheinz — a phenomenon even in fabulous Houston — the \$31.6 million entertainment center covers nine and a half acres and is large enough to fit an 18-story building under its roof. The famous plastic bubbletop can withstand hurricane winds up to 135 m.p.h.

The \$2 million scoreboard, largest in the world, supplies spectators ordinary sports data plus a 40-second electronic "fit" when the Houston team scores a home run or another point. It is 474 feet long and four stories high.

Hofheinz' marvel can hold 66,000 fans. The Houston Astros, Oilers and University of Houston Cougars play their home games on the Astroturf, a synthetic that looks greener than green.

The Astrodome also draws visitors to see basketball, rodeos, boxing and various shows. In case you miss one of these events, there are daily tours of the world's eighth wonderplace.

* * * * *

Publicized for heart and lung transplants, Texas Medical Center brings in patients, students and researchers from all over the world. Its 20 buildings occupy a 175-acre complex near downtown Houston.

It was here that surgeon Denton A. Cooley successfully implanted an artificial "heart" into a human for the first time. The operation, in which a plastic pump

replaced the function of the left ventricle, was a giant step toward man-made hearts.

The Center is also renowned for medical research, treatment of children's diseases and the invention of biomedical instruments for space exploration.

* * * * *

Occupying a downtown block, the Jesse H. Jones Hall for the Performing Arts is a \$7.4 million cultural palace. What the "dome" is to sports buffs, the "hall" is to the fine arts set in Houston. The Houston Symphony — now minus celebrated Andre Previn due to a dispute — gives regular performances along with the Grand Opera and Civic Ballet companies. Touring Broadway plays and musicals add to the season's playbill.

* * * * *

With Mission Control located 22 miles south, Houston earned another title, Space City. The Mercury, Gemini and Apollo programs have been launched from Cape Kennedy in Florida, but they were planned, guided and reviewed in Houston.

The Manned Spacecraft Center — sitting on a former saltgrass ranch site — employs 2,800 engineers, scientists and medical personnel. They select and train astronauts, design space equipment and manage multitudinous experiments that take place during the dangerous flights.

There astronauts go to class and rehearse jungle, water, desert and Arctic survival exercises — from practice in getting out of a spacecraft to removing experiment packages in a simulated weightless condition.

Since 1962 the space place has been pouring money and talent into Houston. It influenced the starting of the first space science department at Rice University; it also helped Houston's stature in oceanography leap ahead.

* * * * *

Houston is well-endowed too when it comes to education. There are 226 public schools as well as numerous parochial ones. Bellaire High School, belonging to a separate municipality surrounded by Houston, ranks as one of the best in the nation and has a topnotch forensic program.

In addition to the University of Houston — which holds second place in Texas enrollment-wise and first place nationally in debate — there are 21 public and private colleges in the area not including business, technical and trade schools. Advanced students attend one dental, two medical and three law colleges. Also there are several Bible schools.

Pi Kap is represented at two institutions, Houston Baptist College and the University of Houston.

* * * * *

Turning to Food and Fun, Houston ranks high as an entertainment spot, not surprising when you consider its populace averages 27.3 years old.

For dinner, there are hundreds of restaurants to choose from. Menus include dishes from China, Japan, Italy, Mexico, Greece, France, Germany, Sweden, England, India, Syria, Switzerland and, of course, there are always Texas-sized steaks and fresh seafood. Kosher foods are also available.

For the theatre-goer, there is the Alley Theatre featuring its repertory group and several community and educational ensembles. All should be active during March.

For combining a show and dinner, there are two popular dinner theatres in Houston. Both offer a gourmet buffet and Broadway shows every evening except Monday.

If theatre's not your bag, there are concerts, art shows, movies, museums, a planetarium and much more.

For later in the evening, Houston has a super-selection of nightspots, divided into public lounges and "private" clubs. Because Texas' liquor laws prohibit serving mixed drinks in public places, you either have to join a club or carry your own bottle. (This is slowly being changed but not before March!) However, large motels and restaurants frequently have their own private clubs and it's not hard to become a paying member or guest. Nightspots of either type hire top-name and local talent.

Old Market Square in downtown Houston recently became to residents what Old Town is to Chicagoans or North Beach to

San Franciscans. The neighborhood used to host a brewery, warehouses, produce markets and department stores. Now its tenants are bright lights, mod shoppes and hard rock.

In the Square — which boasts its own newspaper — a merrymaker can eat, drink, dance, make his own sandwich or ogle exotic dancers and go go girls at the Pink Pussy Cat.

* * * * *

Getting to convention city should be no problem whether you arrive by plane, train, bus or car. Houston's futuristic Intercontinental Airport — designed for jumbo jets and supersonics — brings passengers within

a few feet of parking facilities. Then it's a short drive via freeway to any part of the city. Interstate highways bring in buses and cars from all four directions. And if you're a rare train buff and very patient, Houston still has train service.

* * * * *

Houston is Big, Booming and in a hurry. But it still has time to be friendly to its visitors. With its mild climate . . . nearby seashore . . . western hospitality . . .

It promises to be a "camp" site for the national.

(Pictures and information courtesy of Houston Chamber of Commerce)

PI KAPPA DELTA CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION PROPOSAL

(to be considered at the Houston Convention)

The following proposed amendment was originated by National Council at their summer meeting in 1970. Its purpose is to clarify wording at the request of the National Secretary-treasurer. It does not modify the present rule in any substantive way.

No other amendment proposals were received from the membership.

AMENDMENT 1

Article IV, Division C, Paragraph 6:

strike the last sentence and substitute the following:

"No combination of degrees in different orders to obtain a higher degree than is held in either order shall be permitted."

JAMES GRISSINGER,
Otterbein College
Westerville, Ohio 43081

JOHN BURT,
Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois 61701

RICHARD CRAWFORD,
University of N. Colorado
Greeley, Colorado 80631

Pi Kappa Delta Convention Program

March 22 - 26, 1971

University of Houston

Monday — March 22

- 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. — Registration
- 4:00 p.m. — Student Meeting
(Royal Coach Inn)
- 8:00 p.m. — Business Meeting:
Memorial Service
Charter Presentation
Announcements

Tuesday — March 23

- 8:00 a.m. — Oratory I - Interp. I
- 9:30 a.m. — Debate I - Discussion I
- 11:00 a.m. — Convention Picture
- 12:00 NOON — Luncheon,
Province Governors
Draw Extemp. I
- 1:00 p.m. — Extemp. I - Oratory II -
Interp. II
- 2:30 p.m. — Debate II - Discussion II
- 4:00 p.m. — Province Meetings
- 7:00 p.m. — Debate III
- 8:30 p.m. — Student Meeting, with
Council (campus)
Coaches Meeting
Committee Meetings

Wednesday — March 24

- 8:00 a.m. — Extemp. Drawing II
- 9:00 a.m. — Extemp. II - Oratory III -
Interp. III
- 10:30 a.m. — Debate IV - Discussion III
- 12:00 NOON — Luncheon, Past Presidents &
National Council
(informal)
Draw Extemp. III

- 1:00 p.m. — Extemp. III
Committee Meetings,
Governors Meeting
- 2:15 p.m. — Debate V
- 3:45 p.m. — Business Meeting - Elect
President, Vice President,
Sec'y.-Treas., Editor,
Convention Speaker
- 7:00 p.m. — Debate VI
- 8:30 p.m. — Province Meetings
- 10:00 p.m. — Student Meeting
(Royal Coach Inn)

Thursday — March 25

- 8:00 a.m. — Debate VII - Discussion IV
- 10:30 a.m. — Business Meeting -
Elect Council
- 2:00 p.m. — SEE HOUSTON AREA

Friday — March 26

- 8:00 a.m. — Debate VIII
- 9:30 a.m. — Student Meetings
Draw Extemp. IV
- 10:30 a.m. — Extemp. IV - Oratory IV -
Interp. IV
- 12:00 NOON — Luncheon, Governors,
Old and New Council
- 1:00 p.m. — Championship Debate
- 3:00 p.m. — Business Meeting
- 7:00 p.m. — Banquet
in Astroworld Ballroom
Installation of Officers
Announcement of Results
Pictures

CONVENTION AND CONTEST COMMITTEES

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

1. CONVENTION COMMITTEE
Convention Chairman: Theodore O. H. Karl Pacific Lutheran University
Convention Officer: William B. English University of Houston
Trans. & Housing Martha Haun University of Houston
2. PROVINCE COORDINATOR:
Les Lawrence Montana State University
3. PARLIAMENTARIAN:
John Baird California State - Hayward
4. NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Chairman: Theodore Nelson St. Olaf's College
Member: Grace Walsh Wisconsin State - Eau Claire
Member: John Randolph Westminster College
Member: Phyllis Bosley Towson State College
5. RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:
Chairman: James Fletcher Westmar College
Member: Michael Minchew Mississippi St. Col. for Women
Member: Randy Klein (Student) Stetson University
6. CONVENTION EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Chairman: Ted Johnson Western Colorado
Member: John Mendiola University of Akron
Member: Hazel Scott Moorhead State College
Member: Lee Greer (Student) Middle Tennessee State
7. CONVENTION INVITATION COMMITTEE
Chairman: William DeMougeot North Texas State University
Member: Seth Hawkins Southern Connecticut
Member: Wayne Wall Marietta College
8. CONVENTION PUBLICITY COMMITTEE
Chairman: Gilbert Rau Central Michigan University
Member: Frank T. Aluson Wis. State - Steven's Point
Member: Robert Tice Kingsville, Texas
Member: John Burt Illinois Wesleyan University
Member: John Cliff (Student) University of Houston
Member: Karen Marshall (Student) Oklahoma State University
9. CONSTITUTION REVISION COMMITTEE
Chairman: James Grissinger Otterbein College
Member: John Burt Illinois Wesleyan University
Member: R. S. Crawford Northern Colorado
10. CHARTER AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Chairman: Fred Goodwin Southeast Missouri St. College
Member: E. R. Minchew Mississippi St. Col. for Women
Member: Roger Hufford Clarion State College
Member: William Robertz Gustavus Adolphus College
Member: Donald Cameron San Fernando Valley St. Col.

11. PUBLIC RELATIONS AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Chairman: Jerry Winsor
Member: Robert Brewer

Augustana College
Central Missouri St. College

CONTEST COMMITTEES

1. CONTEST CHAIRMAN

Edna Sorber Wisconsin State University

2. CROSS X DEBATE

Chairman: William Fulcherson
Member: Ben Dillow

Fresno State
University of Redlands

3. TRADITIONAL DEBATE

Chairman: David Matheny
Member: Gary Peterson

K.S.T.C. - Emporia
University of Puget Sound

4. EXPERIMENTAL DEBATE

Chairman: Jerry Winsor
Member: Tim Browning

Augustana College
University of Arizona

5. EXTEMPORANEOUS

Chairman: Charles Fulcher
Member: Marilyn Woods

Washburn University
Mississippi St. Col. for Women

6. ORATORY

Chairman: Jerry Carsten
Member: Thomas Willett

Wisconsin State University
William Jewell College

7. DISCUSSION

Chairman: Don Enholm
Member: Dan Salden

Southwestern College
Southern Illinois University

8. INTERPRETATION

Chairman: Ed Hollatz
Member: Larry Hannah

Wheaton College
Eastern Montana College

9. JUDGING

Chairman: R. D. Mahaffey
Member: Martha Haun

Portland State University
University of Houston

The Art of Persuasion

Beautiful and Just

CONVENTION AND CONTEST RULES

GENERAL

1. Each student and one faculty director of forensics from each college attending the convention must pay the \$9.15 registration fee, the meal and lodging fees. Extra judges and wives or husbands of faculty members will not be charged the registration fee.
2. Each student delegate to the convention and each participant in the tournament must be a bona fide undergraduate student who has not already had four years of forensic participation, and who is carrying a minimum of twelve hours of college work with passing grades at the time of the convention. He must be a member of Pi Kappa Delta or must have filed a membership application with the National Secretary and sent in his initiation fee.
3. All tournament entries must be sent to the National Secretary so as to show a postmark not later than February 20, 1971.
4. All questions regarding tournament events not covered by the rules will be decided by the individual contest committees and the Contest Chairman. Questions concerning interpretation of tournament rules should be directed to Edna C. Sorber, Wisconsin State University-Whitewater, Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190.

JUDGES

1. All competing chapters must provide at least one faculty member who is a qualified judge, and who will judge at least 10 rounds of competitive events. Chapters entering discussion and three debate teams must provide at least two qualified judges who will each judge at least 10 rounds of competition. Schools whose judges fail to fulfill assignments will be charged \$2 for each round missed, and will be ineligible for individual or group awards.

2. The only exception to the above rule provides for those colleges whose entire delegation is limited to one student representative.
3. No student member of a delegation will be permitted to serve as a judge.

AWARDS

1. Gold medals will be awarded to winners of *Superior* ratings in each event. Certificates will be awarded to winners of *Excellent* ratings. Certificates will be awarded to the school for each student who receives a rating of *Superior* or *Excellent*.
2. Sweepstakes points will be awarded to each chapter participating according to the following formula:

<i>In debate:</i>	Superior rating	10 points
	Excellent	8 points
	Good	6 points
	Participation	2 points

In individual events:

- | | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Superior rating | 5 points |
| Excellent | 4 points |
| Good | 3 points |
| Participation | 1 point |
3. Superior sweepstakes awards will be made to the 10 percent of the chapters accumulating the highest number of sweepstakes points. Excellent sweepstakes awards will be made to the 20 percent of the chapters ranking next in number of sweepstakes points.

INDIVIDUAL EVENTS GENERAL

I. Entries:

1. Each chapter may enter two contestants in each event.
2. Contestants must be present at the beginning of each round (except in extemporaneous speaking: see specific rules) and remain until the round has been concluded. This rule precludes

scheduling individual contestants in events that are held simultaneously.

3. Failure to meet either the general rules, or the rules specified below for each event, will result in a contestant's being ineligible for any final rating.

II. Rounds:

1. There will be four rounds of competition in each event. Each contestant will participate in four rounds.
2. All sections of each event will be scheduled simultaneously according to the published convention schedule. The number of sections will be determined by the number of contestants entered in each event.

III. Judging:

1. Judging for oratory, extemporaneous speaking and oral interpretation will be done by two judges in each section in each round. The judges will rank only the three highest ranking speakers, indicating first, second and third place. All others in each section will be ranked fourth. Judges will include written comments on the ballot. Judges will not reveal rankings or decisions to the contestants.
2. Specific rules for judging discussants are listed under the specific rules for *Discussion*.

IV. Awards:

1. SUPERIOR ratings will be awarded to the top 10 percent of contestants in each event.
2. EXCELLENT ratings will be awarded to the next 20 percent.
3. GOOD ratings will be awarded to the next 30 percent.

SPECIFIC

I. Oratory

1. Orations must not exceed 1,300 words in length, of which not more than 150 words may be quoted material.
2. Orations must be memorized and delivered without notes or manuscript.

3. A typed copy of the oration must be submitted at the beginning of the first round in order for the contestant to be permitted to compete. The official cover-sheet for the oration must include the signature of the student attesting to the originality of the oration, the number of words and the number of quoted words. The copy submitted will not be returned and may be used for comparison with the oration as delivered. The oration delivered must conform to the manuscript.

II. Extemporaneous Speaking:

1. The general area shall be *Bill of Rights* and the sub-divisions for each round shall be as follows: Round I – Freedom of expression; Round II – Sanctity of property; Round III – The legal process (or rights of the accused); Round IV – States rights and related issues. Specific topics for each round are determined by the contest committee.
2. Speeches must not exceed six minutes in length. An additional maximum two minutes will be allowed for an impromptu answer to the question asked by the judge at the close of the original speech. Time cards will be available for this event.
3. Topics for extemporaneous speeches will be posted in designated room at five minute intervals. Speakers will choose from posted topics, reporting their choice to the committee chairman. Speakers will report to specific section listed one hour after this posting.
4. Each contestant must remain in the contest room at the conclusion of his speech until the end of the round.

III. Oral Interpretation:

1. The program of each contestant for each round must not exceed eight minutes in length. This must include material read from manuscript with an extemporaneous introduction.
2. The content of each program must include the work of at least two authors, with the arrangement centered in an integrated theme. Each contestant may

offer a different theme in each round, or he may use the same theme in more than one round. He must, however, present three different programs.

In Round I, he must present poetry.

In Round II, he must present prose.

In Round III, he must present dramatic literature.

In Round IV, he must repeat one of the above rounds.

IV. Discussion:

1. The national subject, How Can Our Society Best Deal with the Problem of Pollution?, will be used.
2. Each round will last a maximum of an hour and a half.
3. The leader for Round I will be appointed by the contest committee; a leader will be elected from the group at the conclusion of Rounds I, II and III.
4. The pattern of discussion for each round should be as follows:

Round I. Definition and delineation stage (What is the nature, extent, and significance of the problem? What terms of the discussion question need defining?)

Round II. Problem-analysis stage. (What are the probable causes of the problem? By what criteria should probable solutions be measured?)

Round III. Solutions stage. (What possible solutions are there? What is the best solution for the problem? Use criteria for evaluating and eliminating solutions.)

Round IV. Solutions stage. (Continue evaluation of solutions.)

5. Judging for discussion differs from that of other individual events in that one of the two judges in each round will be a "traveling judge." In each round each contestant will be evaluated by a total of five traveling judges. An average of

these evaluations for each round will be computed for each section. At the end of Round IV, each discussant will evaluate each other member of his section. The final rating of these evaluations will be based two-thirds on the evaluations of the regular judge and one-third divided equally between the averages of the traveling judges, and those of the other discussants. Regular judges will use a different scale for rating leaders from that used for rating other participants.

DEBATE — GENERAL

I. Divisions:

1. There will be three divisions, an Experimental Extempore, a Championship, and a Traditional.

II. Entries:

1. Each chapter may enter a maximum of three debate teams in this tournament, in any combination not to exceed the maximums listed for each division.
 - a) A maximum of one team in the Experimental Extempore Division.
 - b) A maximum of one team in the Championship Division.
 - c) A maximum of two teams in the Traditional Division.
2. Experience and expertise are criteria for entries only in the Championship Division. In this division each member of the team entered must have won 60 percent of his tournament debates during the 1970-71 season, with his record having a minimum of 10 debates.
3. Substitutions may be made in the Traditional Division only. No substitutions may be made in the Experimental or Championship Divisions.

III. Rounds:

1. There will be eight rounds for all teams in each division. In the Championship Division two teams will participate in a final ninth round.
2. Each team entered will participate in

four affirmative and four negative debates during the eight rounds.

IV. Judging:

1. For all rounds except the finals in the Championship Division one judge will be used. Five judges will be used in the final (ninth) round of the Championship Division.
2. Judges may make comments to debaters but will not reveal decisions.

V. Awards:

1. Both team ratings and decisions will be taken into account in determining awards.
2. All teams winning all or seven of the eight rounds will be declared *Superior* teams regardless of their proficiency ratings. All teams with a rating of from 4.5 to 5.0 will also be declared *Superior* teams provided they have won at least four debates.
3. All teams with ratings below 4.5 winning six of the eight rounds will be declared *Excellent*. All teams with a rating of from 4.0 to 4.49 will also be declared *Excellent* teams even though they may have won fewer than six debates.
4. All teams with ratings below 4.0 winning five of the eight rounds will be declared *Good*. All teams with a rating of from 3.5 to 3.99 will also be declared *Good* teams even though they have won fewer than five debates.

VI. Scheduling:

1. Where the division is large enough to permit, every fourth team will be seeded on the basis of performance earlier in the year, so that every team will meet only two seeded teams during the course of the eight rounds. Exceptions to this rule are noted in specific rules for the Championship Division, and will also be made as necessary in the Experimental Division. Seedings will be determined by the appropriate committee with the assistance of the Province Governors and qualified Pi Kappa Delta members in the respective areas.

SPECIFIC

I. Experimental extempore:

1. SUBJECT: The general area from which specific subjects will be selected is: Mass Communication — Electronic Media.

Specific topics will be chosen by the committee and announced several hours prior to the rounds at which they are to be debated. In each round all teams participating will debate the same subject.

2. FORMAT: Two man teams. Traditional format regarding time limits, order of speeches, etc., will be used.
3. INTERPRETATION OF RULES: Inasmuch as this is the first time this division has been included, no precedent for interpretations of rules exists. Therefore, any necessary interpretations will be made by the committee. The committee will furnish whatever specific rules are needed to implement this division at the time of registration, so long as the specific rules are not in conflict with the information included here.

II. Championship:

1. SUBJECT: The national topic Resolved: That the Federal Government should adopt a program of compulsory wage and price controls.
2. SCHEDULING: In this division scheduling will follow the general form outlined in VI under "General Debate Rules" up to and including the 6th round. In the 7th round hidden quarterfinals will be held. In the 8th round hidden semi-finals will be held. In this manner each team participating will debate 8 rounds, with the finalists not announced until after 8 rounds have been completed. A final round (9th) will be held between the two winners of the semi-final round. This debate will be held at a time when there are no other events scheduled, so that it will be possible for all delegates to attend.
3. FORMAT: A cross-examination style of debate will be observed in this division.