

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Published since 1915

LIBRARY - OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, KANSAS

V. 83

#2

Articles:

Locating the Pedagogical and Practical in Collegiate
Lincoln-Douglas
JEFFREY D. BRAND

Forensics On-Line: Global Resources on the Internet for
Competitors and Coaches
DEBRA A. GONSHER

Educational Resource Reviews:

Rhetoric and Argumentation by David A. Vancil
Reviewed by: Michael W. Shelton

*Women Public Speakers in the U.S. 1925-1993: A Bio-Critical Source
Book* by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell
Reviewed by: Mabry M. O'Donnell

Editor's Notes



Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society

National Council

JOEL HEFLING, PRESIDENT

*Communication Studies & Theatre, South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007-1197 605-688-4390*

SCOTT JENSEN, PRESIDENT ELECT

*Communication, History, Politics & Law, Webster University
St. Louis, MO 63119 314-909-1337*

ROBERT LITTLEFIELD, SECRETARY TREASURER

*Box 5075, University Station, North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND 58105-5075 701-231-7783*

BILL HILL, Jr, PAST PRESIDENT

*Communication Studies, University of North Carolina-Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223 704-547-4217*

MICHAEL BARTANEN, EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC

*Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, WA 98447 253-535-7764*

GLENDA TREADAWAY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Communication, Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608 704-262-2222*

BOB DERRYBERRY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Communication, Southwest Baptist University
Bolivar, MO 65613 417-326-1697*

SUSAN MILLSAP, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*Speech Communication, Otterbein College
Westerville, OH 43081 614-823-1753*

TAMMY FRISBY, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*PO Box 3744, Concordia College
Moorhead, MN 56562*

TERRY HINNENKAMP, NATIONAL COUNCIL

*1210 10th Street N
Fargo, ND 58102*

R. DAVID RAY, HISTORIAN

*PO Box 2882, University of Arkansas-Monticello
Monticello, AR 71655 501-460-1078*

NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

125 Watson St.
P.O. Box 38
Ripon, WI 54971

Phone: 920-748-7533
Fax: 920-748-9478

The Forensic

of Pi Kappa Delta

Articles:

- 1 Locating the Pedagogical and Practical in Collegiate Lincoln-Douglas
JEFFREY D. BRAND
- 9 Forensics On-Line: Global Resources on the Internet for Competitors and Coaches
DEBRA A. GONSHER

Educational Resource Reviews:

- 17 *Rhetoric and Argumentation by David A. Vancil*
Reviewed by: Michael W. Shelton
- 20 *Women Public Speakers in the U.S. 1925-1993: A Bio-Critical Source Book by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell*
Reviewed by: Mabry M. O'Donnell
- 23 **Editor's Notes**

The *Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* invites authors to submit manuscripts related to scholarship, pedagogy, research, and administration in competitive and non-competitive speech and debate. The Editorial Board will consider manuscripts employing any appropriate methodology and is particularly interested in historical-critical studies in forensics and forensics education. Manuscripts submitted by undergraduate students and previous unpublished scholars will also receive serious consideration.

The journal reflects the values of its supporting organization. *Pi Kappa Delta* is committed to promoting "*the art of persuasion, beautiful and just.*" The journal seeks to promote serious scholarly discussion of issues connected to making competitive and non-competitive debate and individual events a powerful tool for teaching students the skills necessary for becoming articulate citizens. The journal seeks essays reflecting perspectives from all current debate and individual events forms, including, but not limited to: NIDA, CEDA, NEDA, Parliamentary, Lincoln-Douglas debate; and NIET, NFA and non-traditional individual events.

Reviews of books and other educational materials will be published periodically. Potential reviewers are invited to contact the editor regarding the choice of materials for review.

All works must be original and not under review by other publishers. Authors should submit three print copies conforming to APA (4th ed.) guidelines plus a PC-compatible disk version. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references; book and educational material reviews should be between 5 double-spaced pages. Submitted manuscripts will not be returned. The title page should include the title, author(s), corresponding address and telephone number. The second page should include an abstract of 75-100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Authors should self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed double-spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

Manuscripts should be submitted to the editor: Michael Bartanen, Department of Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447. 253-337-7764. BARTANMD@PLU.EDU. Authors will have an editorial decision within three months.

Review Editors

Sandra Alspach, Ferris State University
David Frank, University of Oregon
Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College
Jaime Meyer, University of Mary
C. Thomas Preston, Missouri-St. Louis
Glenda Treadaway, Appalachian State

Donna Beran, University of Dayton
Jeff Gentry, Southwestern Oklahoma
Glenn Kuper, University of Puget Sound
Mabry O'Donnell, Marietta College
Larry Schnoor, St. Olaf College
Nigel Barron, Editorial Assistant

THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA (ISSN: 0015-735X) is published four times yearly: Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$30.00 for one year, \$60.00 for two years and \$75.00 for three years. Second class postage paid at Ripon, WI. Postmaster and subscribers: please send all changes of address requests to: PDK, 125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. Telephone: 920-748-7533 Fax: 920-748-9478. The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, and 100 mm microfilm through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Locating the Pedagogical and Practical in Collegiate Lincoln-Douglas Debate

JEFFREY D. BRAND

The emergence of Lincoln-Douglas debate as a common collegiate forensics activity creates special challenges for participants and programs. Lincoln-Douglas debate emerged as a response to the perceived excesses of other debate forms and it's advocates believe this form of debate better meets the educational values asserted for debate. The challenges of growing interest in Lincoln-Douglas are several fold: how Lincoln-Douglas can be integrated into programs who offer other individual events activities; and how practitioners and teachers can keep the activity from becoming overly specialized. The essay concludes by considering the future of Lincoln-Douglas in forensics.

Forensics is an activity that has been constantly evolving since the early literary societies and campus debating clubs. Most of the changes that have occurred over the years have been motivated by two concerns. The primary reason for the creation of new speech and debate activities or formats has been educational. Forensics is an activity that has been connected to the mission of colleges and universities, and it has grown and evolved with the student's education in mind. The "laboratory" metaphor, so often used to discuss forensics activities, reflects our willingness to experiment and change our practices.¹ The evolution of any aspect of forensics should be examined for its pedagogical contributions.

The second motivation behind change in forensic activities has been competitive. The educational mission of forensics is accomplished in a unique way. A competitive environment provides many of the incentives and motivations necessary to promote student participation and learning. The demands placed on forensics because of competitive pressures force certain compromises and limits to the educational value of the activity. This tension is not inherently destructive, but it requires creative thought to find methods for addressing both issues simultaneously. These practical concerns will also be addressed in this paper.

Collegiate Lincoln-Douglas debate, as created by the National Forensic Association, is a relatively new event with little history, literature, or prior experience for many members of the forensic community.² The event is offered at tournaments throughout the country. National level competition in the event is available for students

attending tournaments hosted by the National Forensic Association, Phi Rho Pi, DSR-TKA, the National Novice Individual Events Tournament, and, of course, the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament. Now that Lincoln-Douglas debate has been offered at these national tournaments for a number of years, it is time to consider some of its pedagogical and practical aspects and to examine its future contributions to the speech and debate community. The goal of this paper is to suggest ways to improve the practice of Lincoln-Douglas debate as an educational and competitive activity.

PEDAGOGICAL JUSTIFICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEBATE

Academic debate has a long history, much more extensive than most individual events. Although the format and rules for NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate are relatively recent, academic debate as an activity has an established tradition and reputation. Debate is usually credited with developing a number of skills for competitors. Robert C. Rowland describes academic debate as an activity "designed to train students in argumentation and critical thinking, public advocacy, and research."³ The empirical evidence to support these assumptions is limited, but most contemporary debate texts and resources make these claims about the academic debate experience.⁴

Historically, academic debate has tried to preserve the educational foundation of the activity in response to competitive practices. There are a wide variety of debate formats available to collegiate forensics programs. Although all debate formats are not available in every part of the nation, college students have quite a few options.⁵ Many of the changes in the debate community over the past decades have occurred due to disputes over the pedagogical contributions of one form of debate over another.

CEDA debate was developed in 1971 in reaction to debate practices evident in the NDT debate of that era. Jack H. Howe explained, "CEDA debate is at variance with NDT debate in three major aspects: (1) in its attitude toward evidence; (2) in delivery techniques; and (3) in its emphasis on an audience-oriented approach to debate."⁶ These objections pointed to concerns that debate was not centered in a practical, educational domain; instead it was an objection based on the competitive, closed system of academic debate. Although CEDA was proposed as an alternative to the NDT format and style, it too has been targeted for its failure to live up to its educational aspirations.

Every attempt to reform competitive debate practice has been at least partially motivated by the desire to preserve the pedagogical functions of academic debate. Early reasons for establishing NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate reflect the same concerns vocalized by CEDA and NEDA proponents. In a paper that articulated some of the reasons for establishing NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate, Roger C. Aden explains: "Debate has become an activity for specialists. Specifically, reformers point out that debate relies too much on research, producing delivery that is too rapid, which is not checked by any type of 'lay'

audience.”⁷

The style and format used in competition by collegiate Lincoln-Douglas debaters should not be considered a solution to the pedagogical problems facing contemporary academic debate. It was created with an interest in addressing some of the issues raised in Aden’s article. An absence of scholarship identifying its weaknesses is responsible for the illusion that collegiate Lincoln-Douglas provides pedagogical advantages over other debate activities. It is only a matter of time before many of the same complaints are directed toward Lincoln-Douglas debate.⁸

The history and experience of academic debate organizations and formats should suggest that the forensic community needs to continually reinforce the educational contributions of Lincoln-Douglas debating. This reinforcement cannot be accomplished by having the National Forensic Association or other organizations simply write new rules for the practice of Lincoln-Douglas debate. Everyone who participates in this activity must contribute to its improvement. If past critiques of academic debate practices can serve as a practical guide to the future assessment of collegiate Lincoln-Douglas, there are three areas where proactive measures should be taken to safeguard the educational value of this activity. The use of evidence and the development of critical thinking skills should be the first area of concern to forensic educators. The second concern should be with methods of delivery and the third with Lincoln-Douglas debates’ conception of audience. If each area is addressed, Lincoln-Douglas debate can be managed effectively and continue to contribute to the educational benefits of our students.

Traditional critiques of debate have focused on how evidence is used in competition. In all types of academic debate, conceptions of evidence continue to evolve. Many factors have changed the way debaters access and use information. The use of computer data bases has been one of the most influential changes. The explosion of electronic sites for evidence collection has made it possible to engage in extensive searches for specific documentation. Evidence in academic debate has become, in some ways, like a game of hide and seek. Robert Rowland expresses this problem when he points out that “academic debaters are much more adept at finding counter-evidence to deny a claim than they are at applying field-invariant standards to test the quality of evidence and reasoning cited in support of a claim.”⁹ Any permanent solution to this problem has been elusive to all debate organizations and types of policy debate. Some teams will invariably have superior access to research materials, depending on the topic and their technological and financial resources.

A practical educational response to evidence access issues is the sharing of case lists. CEDA, NDT, and even some national level high school programs regularly post lists of cases heard at recent tournaments on the Internet. A call for such cooperation was issued to teams on the PKD-L prior to the 1997 Pi Kappa Delta tournament. Negative

strategies are also frequently posted. Using these lists, debaters, regardless of experience, can orient their research to relevant and specific evidence. This technique can force affirmative cases to consist of the best evidence in support of their plan not the most obscure or unfamiliar topic to other debaters. Affirmatives can also evaluate negative strategies. This approach would encourage evidence evaluation by all debaters. The debate would be more focused and off case arguments would be less likely because specific argumentation could be offered. The integrity of evidence could also be held to a higher standard since critical evidence could be discovered by all parties involved in a debate.

Some rounds at the NFA National Tournament have witnessed evidentiary challenges over the questionable presentation of evidence in debate rounds. This type of misrepresentation of evidence would be less likely when all teams have had a chance to collect relevant evidence. The NFA Lincoln-Douglas rules do reiterate support for full documentation of evidence and a procedure for challenges based on this ethical standard.¹⁰ The dissemination of case lists and primary evidence sources would augment this policy and helps protect the integrity of evidence being used at all debate tournaments.

A second issue frequently mentioned in critiques of contemporary debate is delivery. Rapid fire speed, verbal shorthand, and other habits that would justify a failing grade in a public speaking course during the week, are rewarded on weekends by debate judges. Although this problem has been singled out in the "Rules of Competition for NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate," it still manifests itself in rounds, particularly when debaters know the judge is able and sometimes willing to listen to a faster delivery rate. The NFA Lincoln-Douglas rules pamphlet states, "Rapid fire delivery, commonly called 'spread delivery,' is considered antithetical to the purpose and intent of this event."¹¹ This issue reflects a long standing problem with any competitive, academic debate format; it becomes specialized. Judges and competitors develop debate in such a way that speaking standards and practices common in everyday situations are ignored and replaced by specialized language and tactics. This issue also reflects a practical problem associated with a competitive activity. Time constraints, the large ground to be covered, and the desire to succeed can accelerate the pace of any debate. This problem may find some additional solutions when combined with the third area of concern for most academic debate, the notion of audience.

General audiences rarely view academic debates. They do not have the access or experience to view what speakers are doing on weekends. Most debates are for an audience of one critic. If debate is to develop its educational role, it needs to be accessible to audiences other than debate judges. Because of current specialization we are not even very attractive to the people we rely on for academic and financial support. "[A]cademic debate has become an activity that those of us involved in it value, but which cannot be celebrated in the presence of our fac-

ulty colleagues, university administrators, community leaders, or even alumni."¹² Since judges are often the only audience for a debate, they need to become more effective at controlling and monitoring contest behaviors in areas such as evidence integrity, delivery rate, and audience analysis.

Academic debate is supported by many organizations and individuals as positive educational tool for students. Collegiate Lincoln-Douglas debate will continue to require careful monitoring if it is avoid the same critiques of past debate formats and organizational sponsors. Some of the suggestions made so far could contribute to the educational enhancement of Lincoln-Douglas debate. These can only occur, however, if they are approached with the competitive forensic environment in mind.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COLLEGIATE LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

No matter how valuable an educational tool Lincoln-Douglas debate might become, it will not survive unless it can make some practical contributions to the health and well-being of forensics for participating schools. The competitive environment faced by teams across the country has significant impacts on the practice of Lincoln-Douglas debate. There are critical "practical" issues facing Lincoln-Douglas to make it a viable activity. These issues include team program management, tournament management, and participation growth.

One trend becoming more and more evident in forensics today is specialization between individual events and debate. There are few programs committed to fielding both debate and individual events teams. There are many reasons for this trend. Many programs do not have the financial resources to send out competitive teams in debate and individual events. Decisions made by departments and administrators have also limited program options. Coaches are also becoming more specialized or no longer have the support staff to field a comprehensive speech and debate program. Many programs are being run by individual Directors of Forensics without additional faculty or graduate student assistance. For example, Pettus and Danielson have reported that although the number of programs in individual events has expanded, many programs which did once offer debate no longer do so.¹³

This division between speech and debate programs can be harmful. Roger Aden points out that "few programs provide a strong commitment to both activities and even fewer students participate in both."¹⁴ The loss of one type of activity to another limits the contributions each can make for students. This kind of situation is not educationally productive. Glenda Treadaway points out that, "both individual events and debate offer students different skills and experiences and a program, even if on a small level, which offers to students these varied activities is more pedagogically sound."¹⁵

If Lincoln-Douglas is to be a practical activity within forensics programs, it must be practiced in ways that can make it a reality for existing forensic teams. If this debate format becomes too specialized, it will not be a coachable activity for many of the directors of forensics who currently offer individual events. The pedagogical complaints leveled against other debate formats will serve as the justification for the exclusion of Lincoln-Douglas debate by teams. It will not grow and develop.

Directors of forensics and coaches should also realize that adding debate to speech programs might strengthen its position as an academic activity. The pedagogical assumptions made about debate are more widely accepted or assumed by administrators than ones concerning individual events. Contemporary research on debate has shown that debate is supported by many administrators. Forensic programs need to see the rewards that can accompany a debate program.

A second practical challenge of collegiate Lincoln-Douglas debate is how it influences the operation and running of tournaments. Lincoln-Douglas debate is designed to be run along with an IE tournament, thus saving programs the cost of attending separate contests. The current incorporation of Lincoln-Douglas into tournaments is not uniform or consistent. Some tournaments make Lincoln-Douglas an exclusive event. Other tournaments allow students to compete in IE and debate, giving them the opportunity to develop skills in both areas. Tournament directors need to explore how they want to integrate this debate into their schedules because it requires more judges, time, and effort.

At national tournaments, some additional changes might be made. One way to improve perceptions that Lincoln-Douglas is audience-centered and responsive is to use more lay judges at nationals. Instead of relying on specialized judges to judge the entire tournament, a round or two could be scheduled where IE judges with little to no debate background would judge.

National tournaments, as well as larger regional tournaments should also consider their scheduling and tabulation procedures. The National Forensic Association has adopted some guidelines for the scheduling and tabulation of the tournament. These can be strengthened. The Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament also lacks a standard tournament handbook or rules for determining issues for their debate events including pairing procedures, tabbing guidelines, and sweepstakes formulas. These are under development by the National Council and will help to solidify the position of debate once approved.

A final issue that needs to be addressed is how to expand the level of participation in Lincoln-Douglas debate. The number of teams competing at national tournaments is slowly increasing, but Lincoln-Douglas debate is still regionally oriented. Much of the activity in Lincoln-Douglas is in the area surrounding Ohio, where many NFA

member schools exist. To the west, the number of programs competing in Lincoln-Douglas is still limited. Efforts must be made to encourage programs that want to incorporate both speech and debate activities. One practical suggestion would be to help train coaches. There are no textbooks providing suggestions on how to coach or teach Lincoln-Douglas debate. Tapes of the NFA final rounds do exist, but are not well known. Coaches with limited debate experience may be intimidated by an event they do not feel prepared to coach and direct. This also influences coaches' attitudes about judging the event and helping to broaden the judging pool. Future articles and papers, teaching aides, and lesson plans need to be developed to make this debate format teachable and practical to coaches. Tournaments need to offer Lincoln-Douglas debate regularly so there are sufficient competitive opportunities. The IE-L listserve has helped generate some discussion about Lincoln-Douglas strategies and practices, but more dialogue is necessary.

THE FUTURE FOR COLLEGIATE LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

There is a rich potential for Lincoln-Douglas debate as a competitive and educational communication event. Protection of its pedagogical potential can lead to the practice of a form of academic debate that is compatible with individual events. Helping forensic teams become active in both speech and debate will make those programs more effective for and beneficial to everyone. As forensics programs acquire more experience and understanding of Lincoln-Douglas, this debate format has the potential to grow and develop into an important part of local, regional, and national forensic tournaments.

As a competitive activity, Lincoln-Douglas debate can be integrated into individual event tournament schedules. It presents challenges to tournament administration, but it can also help enhance students' experiences at tournaments. If practical and competitive practices can be established, many of the perceived failings of CEDA and NDT debate will be avoided.

There is still work to be done on Lincoln-Douglas debate. It has the potential to contribute what is unique about debate to a much larger individual events audience. Without needing to attend different tournaments or splitting teams, this activity can enrich a forensic program's educational and practical needs. The more we learn about and value Lincoln-Douglas debate, the better we can adjust it to its practice.

NOTES

¹ See James H. McBath, Forensics as Communication (Skokie, IL: NationalTextbook Co., 1975). A Special Topic Section also featured the "laboratory" metaphor in the National Forensic Journal 10 (Spring 1992): 49-82.

² This paper is concerned with Lincoln-Douglas debate as practiced by collegiate competitors following the model set out by the National Forensic Association. It as a one-person team, policy-based debate format. The format and resolution of the NFA event have been picked up and used at other national tournaments. This is

not related to a form of Lincoln-Douglas debate held at CEDA tournaments based on the CEDA/NDT resolution. This form of Lincoln-Douglas debate is also distinct from the high school, value-based debate format practices in the National Forensic League.

- ³Robert C. Rowland, "The Practical Pedagogical Function of Academic Debate," Contemporary Argumentation and Debate 16 (1995): 98.
- ⁴For a review of these assumptions, see Robert Greenstreet, "Academic Debate and Critical Thinking: A Look at the Evidence," National Forensic Journal 11 (Summer 1993): 13-28.
- ⁵Students today compete in American Forensic Association National Debate Topic (NDT) debate, the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) format, various parliamentary debate organizations, National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), and the National Forensic Association Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Various experimental debate formats have also come and gone over the years.
- ⁶Jack H. Howe, "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget," CEDA Yearbook (1981): 1.
- ⁷Roger C. Aden, "Solving the Forensic Dilemma: Events Teaching Debate and Individual Events Skills," Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events ed. Larry Schnoor and Vicki Karns (Mankato, MN: Mankato State University, 15 February 1989): 10.
- ⁸A special issue on Lincoln-Douglas debate was recently published by the National Forensic Journal. Most of the articles were concerned with judging standards and revisions of the rules for both pedagogical and competitive reasons. See the National Forensic Journal 14 (Fall 1996): 1-68.
- ⁹Rowland 100.
- ¹⁰The NFA Lincoln-Douglas Committee printed a two page document designed to serve as a guide to NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate. This has been the only real "official" guidelines prepared for this activity. As a form of academic debate, NFA Lincoln-Douglas is currently one of the least documented or researched. This has been a continuing problem for coaches new to debate but interested in adding Lincoln-Douglas to their programs. There is little information available to help coaches teach students about the activity.
- ¹¹"NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate," pamphlet published by the National Forensic Association, page 2. No author, date, or publisher provided.
- ¹²Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley quoted in: Dale Herbeck, "Debate Scholarship: A Needs Assessment," National Forensic Journal 8 (Spring, 1990): 11.
- ¹³Ann Burnett Pettus and Mary Ann Danielson, "Analysis of Forensics Program Administration: What Will the 1990's Bring?" National Forensic Journal 10 (Spring 1992): 16.
- ¹⁴Aden 10.
- ¹⁵Glenda Treadaway, "A Pedagogical Rationale for Re-Establishing Complimentary Debate and Individual Events Programs," Constructing the Deconstruction: Re-Formulating Forensics for the New Century: Proceedings from the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference ed. Scott Jensen (Lake Charles, LA: McNeese State University, 1995): 17.



Forensics On-Line: Global Resources on the Internet for Competitors and Coaches

DEBRA A. GONSHER

The Internet offers enormous potential as a resource for both forensic competitors and coaches. Three specific areas are examined: 1) the Internet as a vehicle for obtaining reference material bearing a multicultural and/or international viewpoint; 2) the Internet as a resource for material for performance from a global perspective; and 3) the Internet as a forum for conversation with forensic teams and coaches throughout the world. Internet sites that link hundreds of English speaking magazines and newspapers as well as sites that offer the interpretation competitor access to poetry readings are explored. List of forensic resources and addresses included.

It is difficult to think of a more touted innovation in the latter part of the twentieth century than the Internet. With a click of a mouse, one can enter chat rooms, participate in fantasy games, send jokes, argue the ethical issues involved in cloning, read columns from selected magazines, all without leaving one's chair. One can converse with a friend in the same city or around the world, talk to people involved in your hobby or even the person who popularized it...all without setting foot on a plane or, declaring bankruptcy due to transatlantic phone charges. A recent perusal of the possibilities available on this still infant communication highway yields seemingly everything On-Line: from a Japanese temple opening a cemetery, ("Japanese Temple") to college courses, from cooking lessons and recipes to international periodicals, from patenting ideas through the Internet to chat groups devoted to everything and everyone from Kierkegaard to Howard Stern. With the multitude of possibilities available, one is compelled to wonder how the Internet can be of use to the forensic competitor and coach.

Before we examine some of the specific resources available to both the competitor and coach, we must first acknowledge the benefit of the Internet in opening us up to a global perspective. Through the Internet, the world of the forensic student and coach can be broadened internationally. The importance of global connections is apparent to anyone involved in education at the end of the twentieth century. Students need to be prepared for citizenship in the globalized society of today and tomorrow (Becker, 1991). Issues that effect the world at large — economic, human rights, environmental awareness

for example, are no longer the purview of any one nation but the responsibility of all. Global connections aid in opening up students' awareness to viewing issues from the perspectives of others and in doing so, becoming a responsible participant in the global village. And the Internet is an instrument that can aid this crucial endeavor.

At the present time, an examination of the Internet reveals a cornucopia of riches for the coach and competitor. This paper will focus on three specific areas in particular: first, the Internet as a vehicle for obtaining reference material bearing a multicultural and/or international viewpoint; second, the Internet as a resource for material for performance from a global perspective; and third, the Internet as a forum for conversation with forensic teams and coaches throughout the world. In addition we will examine one of the potential areas of development and interest to the forensic community, courses on-line and the on-line university.

The term cyberspace has become a catchword for the interactive computing and communication available through the Internet. Coined by science fiction writer William Gibson in his novel Neuromancer, and defined there as a "consensual hallucination" (Cartwright, 1997), the term was seen by many in the eighties as a metaphor for the way people working for universities, corporations and governments interacted with each other through the Internet (Benedikt, 1991). In present vernacular, cyberspace has become synonymous with the Internet.

One of the most beguiling aspects of the Internet for the forensic competitor is the availability of resource material. With a couple of clicks, a myriad of source materials for debate as well as extemporaneous speaking files and individual prepared events is available. An abundance of well-respected citeable periodicals are available on-line including The New York Times and Chicago Tribune, though some require a fee. They are accessed quite easily from a simple search. In addition, for those competitors in extemporaneous speaking, sites that offer easy access to the government, e.g. the Senate Appropriations Committee (<http://www.Senate.gov/~appropriations>) to the often needed statistics (<http://fedstats.gov> -listing of the minutiae of daily life including the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Federal Bureau of Prisons and 68 others) are of extraordinary usefulness.

However, periodicals of a global nature, that do not come quite so easily to mind, are also available. A number of excellent forensic Web pages have been designed, that list both the common as well as the International and obscure on one page, with links for easy access, e.g. The James Madison page, URL:<http://falcon.jmu.edu:80/~goodwitd/sscaf/resources.html> and Mike's Truck Stop. URL:<http://www.geocities.com/collegpark/9463/index/extemp-sources.html>. There, a wide range of policy networks and international resources including newspapers, e.g. The Hindu, The Hong Kong Standard, The Irish Times, The Korea

Herald and The Japan Times can be accessed. In addition, sites are available that offer the competitor a customized newspaper, with articles pulled from newspapers and magazines from around the world and across the spectrum of interests. Two such sites, Crayon (<http://www.crayon.net/using/links.html>) and Ecola Newspaper (<http://www.ecola.com>) offer links to a staggering array of newspapers. On the Crayon site, one can access a myriad of national papers, local papers, (averaging five per state), over thirty newspapers and magazines from Canada and over hundred from around the world including those from Iceland, Ghana and South Africa. The Ecola site has an even more complete array of foreign newspaper and periodical links including the obscure: from Kyrgyzstan- The Central Asian Post which can offer such insights as to both petrochemical complexes and jeans factories completed in Turkmenistan. A click on Southeast Asia Newsmedia on the Web (<http://www.lehigh.edu/injrl/public/www-data/news/asianews.html>) continues to supply links with SouthEast Asian source material, difficult to locate, including Gomantak Times and The Afternoon Dispatch and Courier from respectively, the provinces of Goa and Mumbai in India.

The benefits for the competitor are extensive. Newspapers and magazines from another country or by another cultural group, offer a viewpoint that aids in both the awareness of that culture as well as a perspective of a problem that might not be identified in the standard periodicals of the competitor's country.

In addition to various international and multicultural periodicals, journals and other such reference materials, the Internet provides the competitor with the ability to move from a document in one location to a corroborating document in another (December, 1997), to a relevant commentary in a third, and even a chat with someone associated with the topic in question, in a chat room devoted to the area. All these areas may be scattered around the globe, but the material can be accessed from one's computer, in less than an hour.

The myriad of resources available to the forensic competitor is not limited to debate or prepared speeches. Competitors in oral interpretation events will also be introduced to a world of literature on a vastly different level than perhaps hitherto available. In addition to The Competitive Speech(Forensics) Site, URL <http://www.vsi.com/~vyborne/index.html>, a Web page that actually suggests material, are searches involving search engines like infoseek. (Easy access through the jmu page.) Infoseek will link one to resources for everything for the interpretation competitor from humor and short stories, to poetry and plays. Further exploration reveals a world of global resources.

To elaborate further, we might examine the resources available for two interpretation areas, Poetry and Drama. A search using infoseek yields a multitude of poetry sites, categorizing the poetry into American, English, French, German, Haiku, Italian, Polish and Spanish. Without even delving into one of these subcategories, a cur-