

# The Forensic

## *of Pi Kappa Delta*

Published since 1915

### Research Essays

McGee, B. R. and McGee, D. S. Announcing the death of the Cross Examination Debate Association: Ideology and the locus of organizational identity.

Greenstreet, R. and Frederick, T. The sounds of silence: The gender-based experiences of women in intercollegiate forensics.

### Editor's Notes



# **Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society**

## **National Council**

---

### **SCOTT JENSEN, PRESIDENT**

*School of Communication, Webster University*  
*St. Louis, MO 63119* 314-968-7439

### **GLENDA TREADAWAY, PRESIDENT ELECT**

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

### **BILL HILL, Jr, SECRETARY-TREASURER**

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

### **JOEL HEFFLING, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT**

*Communication, South Dakota State University*  
*Brooking, SD 57007* 605-688-4390

### **MICHAEL BARTANEN, EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC**

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

### **SUSAN MILLSAP, NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Speech Communication, Otterbein College*  
*Westerville, OH 43081* 614-823-3386

### **MARK HICKMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication Studies, West Chester University*  
*West Chester, PA 19383* 610-436-6942

### **EDDIE SKAGGS, NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication, Cameron University*  
*Lawton, OK 73505* 580-581-2555

### **BROOK SMITH, NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication, Boise State University*  
*Boise, ID 83725*

### **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



Series 85  
Number 3  
Spring 2000

# The Forensic

*of Pi Kappa Delta*

---

## Research Essays:

- 1     Announcing the death of the Cross Examination Debate  
     Association: Ideology and the locus of organizational identity.  
     BRIAN R. MCGEE and DEBORAH SOCHA MCGEE
  
- 25    The sounds of silence: The gender-based experiences of  
     women in intercollegiate forensics.  
     ROBERT GREENSTREET and TRACY FREDERICK

## 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 previously 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: NDT, 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 4-5 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. Avoid 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. 253-535-7764. 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

Jeff Gentry, Southwestern Oklahoma  
Glenn Kuper, University of Puget Sound  
Mabry O'Donnell, Marietta College  
Glenda Treadaway, Appalachian State

---

**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: PKD, 125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. THE FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.



# Announcing the Death of the Cross Examination Debate Association: Ideology and the Locus of Organizational Identity

BRIAN R. MCGEE AND DEBORAH SOCHA MCGEE

---

*The intellectual project that once marked something called "CEDA debate" no longer plays a significant role in the debate practice associated with the organization. As an ideology, a distinct collection of formal pedagogical commitments and practices that distinguishes the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) from other organizations, most notably NDT debate, CEDA died some time ago. This essay attempts an autopsy, which identifies some contributing factors in the death of CEDA. We see little prospect that this state of affairs can somehow be altered in the near future, nor would such an attempt to do so be particularly fruitful.*

---

The provocative character of the title is deliberate. This essay suggests that, whatever the historical accomplishments and continued achievements of the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), the intellectual project that once allegedly marked something called "CEDA debate" no longer plays a significant role in the debate practice associated with the organization. The popular meta-narrative of CEDA, which for well over a decade contrasted the pedagogical values of CEDA with the excesses of the "devil NDT" (National Debate Tournament) style of debating, has essentially disappeared from the lifeworld of CEDA, with the exception of the occasional journal article. In short, as a governing ideology, a distinct collection of formal pedagogical commitments and practices that distinguishes CEDA from other organizations, most notably NDT debate, CEDA died some time ago and is now, as Edwin Black (1965/1978) once worried concerning his own monograph, only a "deceptively twitching corpse" (p. ix). If the old ideology of CEDA exists today at all, it exists in debate sponsored by organizations other than CEDA. We offer here a belated and necessarily incomplete attempt at an autopsy, which relies on a review of forensics scholarship and on our own experiences with and observations of the CEDA community.

Three caveats are required before our thesis is developed. First, we are not suggesting that CEDA has made no historical contributions to intercollegiate debate. On the contrary, its contributions have been



and continue to be substantial.<sup>1</sup> The elected and appointed officers of CEDA have performed and still perform an invaluable service to their immediate constituents and to the larger academic community as advocates of intercollegiate debate. Second, we do not question the good will of CEDA's founders and supporters over the past few decades. They were and are people sincerely interested in promoting an extraordinary educational opportunity for undergraduate students. We wish in no way to devalue the contributions of any past or present forensic educators. Third, the title of this essay is not meant to suggest that CEDA ought or ought not to die. We are making a descriptive claim about what already has happened, in the fashion of cultural anthropologists, rather than announcing the need for a mourning period or celebration. While we openly question the possibility or value of resurrecting the dead in this essay, we have no desire to engage in epideictic where the death of CEDA is concerned.

An autobiographical note concerning the co-authors is relevant here. One author was a debater and assistant debate coach for a well-funded CEDA debate team with a national travel schedule during the mid and late 1980s; he would subsequently coach at a regional debate program. To this day, he does not greatly regret the ideological death of CEDA and perceives that it was inevitable, though he is deeply concerned about the fragmentation of the debate community in the 1990s. The other author debated for a small, regional CEDA program in the early 1980s. She mourns the ideological death of CEDA and bemoans the delivery practices and argumentative choices commonly made by CEDA debaters by the early 1990s. Nevertheless, both agree that CEDA has died in the sense described below.

Despite these caveats and the invaluable services performed by CEDA over the years, it is reasonable, following scholars like Dittus (1991), to proclaim the "death" of CEDA's intellectual rationale at the close of the twentieth century. This essay begins with a highly selective recounting of crucial moments in the organizational history of CEDA, along with the implications of these crucial moments for the renegotiation of CEDA's organizational identity and ideology. Then, we argue that an ideology valorizing the content of argument over the form of argument ultimately replaced the original agenda of CEDA debate. Finally, in light of a recent call to craft a coherent organizational identity for CEDA (Treadaway & Hill, 1999), we close by making a few, brief observations about the future of CEDA as organization following the death of CEDA as ideology. Again, if CEDA as ideology

---

1. Widespread use of the cross-examination format, experimentation with non-policy debate topics, the year-long sweepstakes system, sustained attention to the problems of racism and sexual harassment in intercollegiate forensics, and the celebration of the competitive season's conclusion in an open, year-end tournament are among CEDA's most worthy accomplishments. Also, as an administrative entity, CEDA continues to perform several important tasks, including the sponsorship of the journal Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, selection of the debate topic now used by the majority of students competing in evidence-oriented policy debate, and the annual sanctioning of tournaments in almost every U.S. state.



still lives, that life is outside the organizational framework of CEDA, and we perceive that this state of affairs is unlikely to change. To support our position, we will provide evidence whenever possible, but ours is necessarily a metanarrative that relies in many respects on our own partial and, therefore, potentially idiosyncratic experience.

## THE LIFE CYCLE OF CEDA

This essay is not the place to tell a comprehensive history of CEDA. That history is recounted in bits and pieces in Argumentation and Advocacy (formerly the Journal of the American Forensic Association), Contemporary Argumentation and Debate (formerly the CEDA Yearbook), The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, and the proceedings of the 1991 CEDA Assessment Conference (Thomas & Wood, 1993).<sup>2</sup> Briefly, the received history holds that CEDA was originally founded as a regional debate-sponsoring organization in response to the alleged excesses of National Debate Tournament-style debate. Early CEDA proponents, most notably Jack Howe, maintained that NDT debate had become incomprehensible to all but the most specialized of audiences, as successful debaters responded to competitive pressures by relying on highly developed note-taking skills, the extensive use of quoted evidence taken from expert sources, a rapid rate of speaking, and unusual interpretations of debate propositions. As "good" debate became increasingly defined as consistent with these specific practices in the late 1960s and the 1970s, a substantial portion of the NDT community became disenchanted with debate as performed by many competitively successful students (e.g., Shepard, 1973).<sup>3</sup> Opponents of these recent trends in NDT felt even more marginalized by the rise of new systems for assigning tournament judges that excluded many of them from acting as critics to counteract the new order of things, as well as depriving debaters of the pedagogical advantages of adapting to various audiences. For example, Russell T. Church (1973), a future president of CEDA, complained about "power judging" and expressed his preference for "random judging."<sup>4</sup>

At the risk of oversimplification, then, CEDA's founding genesis was a response to frequent criticism of the alleged excesses in NDT debate as NDT was practiced by the 1970s. CEDA's creation was an answer to what we call the content thesis, which CEDA founding

2. On the history of CEDA, see such sources as Howe (1981) for descriptions of CEDA by the early 1980s. Schiappa and Keehner (1990) sketch CEDA's history to the end of the 1980s and provide a justification for participation in CEDA. Both essays now are obviously out of date.

3. There is some dispute about when rapid delivery rates and the "spread" became a source of concern in the NDT community. One article addressing this concern was published in 1968 (Swinney, 1968), and, by 1974, a significant number of printed judging philosophies at the National Debate Tournament addressed problems with the spread in one form or another (Cox, 1974). Cirlin (1998) claims that "when I debated in the early 1970's NDT debate was already inaccessible to everyday listeners" (p. 341).



members perceived as NDT's preoccupation with evaluation of argument content (e.g., evidence quantity and quality, analysis) over an approach that still valued analysis and use of evidence, while simultaneously demanding that delivery practices be reasonably intelligible to lay audiences and consistent with conventional public speaking pedagogy. CEDA's founders would never claim to value form over content, as they would have seen such a position as sophistic or Ramistic. Instead, they advocated what we will call a balance thesis, where research and evidence were balanced against the needs of audience-friendly oral advocacy.<sup>5</sup> The CEDA Constitution has now stated for decades that the "purpose of the Association is to promote competitive practices which ensure the growth and survival of intercollegiate debate by encouraging a form of debate striking a balance among analysis, delivery and evidence" (Cross Examination, 1998, p. 1). The solution of the early CEDA organizers was to break off from NDT by selecting an alternative national topic and creating different divisions of debate, with the effect of separating CEDA and NDT debaters from regular contact with one another for the next two decades. Among many CEDA participants, the perception that NDT and CEDA were ideologically, argumentatively, and stylistically distinct was central to their understanding of the two organizations. For example, McGee (1993) commented in the early 1990s that "I personally have heard it said that some team was 'NDT' or that a debater should 'go back to NDT' at least once in every semester since I became a CEDA debater in the 1985 Fall Term" (p. 142). Today, as we suggest below, such a comment would be nonsensical.

- 
4. For years, the use of random judging assignment was perceived to be a core commitment of CEDA, and the CEDA Constitution and Bylaws insisted until recently that "judge assignment insofar as possible should be random" (Cross Examination, 1998, p. 42). As Treadaway and Hill (1999) note, the majority of CEDA tournaments in 1999 now seem to use some variation on mutual preference judging systems, though mutual preference advocates insist that mutual preference assignment is still random within the rating category assigned by the two debate teams to the relevant judges. We intuit that opponents of power judging would prefer mutual preference systems to the whims of the tournament tabulation staff where judge assignment is concerned, but the original sense of "random" judging referred to totally random judge assignment, perhaps with the possibility of a few judge "strikes." The CEDA Constitution and Bylaws have now been amended to have the word "random" replaced with the phrase "systematic, based upon a predefined process," which presumably makes the use of mutual preference systems less incompatible with the Constitution and Bylaws (p. 42).
  5. Colbert and King (1987) would summarize the CEDA-NDT division of the 1970s and 1980s as akin to the distinction between Plato's system of dialectic (NDT) and the pedagogical principles described in Aristotle's lectures on rhetoric (CEDA). We suspect that many past and present members of the NDT and CEDA communities would be uncomfortable with Colbert and King's position, as these educators and students would typically maintain that they are interested in the development of critical thinking abilities and oral communication competencies. Both of these concerns are well represented in the rhetorical tradition, though individuals might have various ideas about how to enact critical thinking and oral communication skills in debate practice. See Frank (1993) for a distinction between "Rhetors" and "Critical Thinkers" in the CEDA of the early 1990s that resembles our discussion of the content and balance theses.



In retrospect, the rapid growth of CEDA in the late 1970s and 1980s was a remarkable organizational success story. By the late 1980s, CEDA could boast almost three times as many members as the far older NDT organization, and some former NDT schools switched to CEDA in the 1980s in part because they could not afford to travel to distant NDT tournaments when nearby tournaments exclusively catered to CEDA debate (see Ludlum, 1991). Presumably in response to the decline in participation in NDT-style debating, the NDT Committee and another, smaller policy debate organization using the NDT debate topic (the American Debate Association) enacted rules with the aim of curbing the alleged excesses of intercollegiate policy debate. The ADA rules were much more restrictive than NDT's rules, but the aim of these rules in both organizations was to empower judges to halt the decline of interest in the NDT model of debate. While the effectiveness of these rules was disputed at the time (Herbeck & Katsulas, 1988; Morello & Soenksen, 1989) and is still unclear, the desperate tone of some NDT coaches and judges helps to explain the motivation for their enactment. For example, Rowland and Deatherage (1988) summarized the decline of attendance at NDT tournaments in the late 1980s and worried that "at both the regional and national levels, NDT debate is very sick, perhaps dying" (p. 247). Rowland and Deatherage's essay seemed to mark the coming fulfillment of Charles Arthur Willard's (1985) half-serious prediction three years earlier that the "National Debate Tournament will pass away . . . [and] CEDA tournaments will continue to flourish" (p. 2).

Ironically, by the time Rowland and Deatherage (1988) were worrying in print about the death of NDT, many of the same argumentation and delivery practices that had driven coaches and students to leave NDT for the younger CEDA organization and debate format were reportedly beginning to emerge in CEDA. Rowland and Deatherage themselves noted this trend, as did some other NDT coaches (e.g., Hollihan, Baaske, & Riley, 1987). While McGee could assert as late as 1992 that "CEDA debates rarely mirror the policy debates heard in . . . [NDT or ADA] debates," that statement now seems to have been out of date almost from the moment that it appeared in print, at least where "national circuit" CEDA debate was concerned (McGee, 1992, p. 26). Elsewhere, observations about the emergence of NDT-style debate practices in CEDA, whether desirable or undesirable, were legion (e.g., Jensen & Preston, 1991; Wood, 1992).<sup>6</sup> Steinfatt (1990), for example, a communication professor returning to college debate after a twenty-five year absence, complained among other things of "total unintelligibility and hostility in delivery," and poor quality of argumentation in which a rapid delivery rate was substituted for careful thought and analysis (p. 66). That Steinfatt made these complaints about CEDA debaters, rather than their NDT counterparts, was surely a cause for concern among those

6. Preston's (1997; Preston & LaBoon, 1995) position on the merits of rapid delivery would change by the mid 1990s.



who remained committed to CEDA's founding ideology.<sup>7</sup> By 1991, Dittus would publish a "requiem" for the idea of CEDA, since he concluded that the "grand idea of CEDA" in its original form had essentially disappeared in current debate practice (Dittus, 1991, p. 436). While we disagree with Dittus's timeline-the debate practice of many regional CEDA debate circuits still looked much different from typical NDT debates until well into the 1990s-we cannot disagree with his conclusions about the ideological death of CEDA.

The moment at which the contrast between the founding ideology of CEDA, the balance thesis, and the competing content thesis became most obvious-though it had long since been widely recognized-was at the 1991 CEDA Assessment Conference, held in St. Paul, Minnesota. Those conference proceedings, which eventually were published (Thomas & Wood, 1993), exemplified the fragmentation of the CEDA community over the same issues that had facilitated CEDA's creation and initial growth. In an introductory commentary on the conference, for example, Michael D. Bartanen (1993), then the Executive Secretary of CEDA, wondered whether CEDA was entering an "adolescent," "adult," or "middle age" stage of life as the organization celebrated its twentieth birthday:

Perhaps the answer depends upon who asks the question. CEDA, to some, is still a new experience. These people chafe under an organizational system that does not seem responsive to their needs. They believe the organization is overly restrictive and rule-bound. They view change as an opportunity to loosen restrictions, and all allow greater freedom for members. A second group views CEDA as a mature organization. . . . They see change coming in the form of "fine tuning" structures and policies while keeping intact the basic structure and philosophy. The third group believes CEDA has strayed from its founding principles and ventured down paths that have not worked well for other forensics associations. They view change radically, as an opportunity to reassert educational values through changes which would likely restrict the free activity of some members in favor of emphasizing larger social values. (p. 12)

While Bartanen asserted that each group he described was "prominently represented" at the conference, the voices of dissatisfaction are easier to find in the conference proceedings than are the voices of those who were pleased with extant CEDA organizational and debate practice. Among those who defended CEDA's ideology, the balance thesis of the CEDA Constitution was implicit in much of their discourse. Jack Howe and Don Brownlee (1993), both prominent figures

7. While "ideology" has been defined in various ways, we use ideology in this essay to refer to "a system of political or social ideas, framed and propounded for an ulterior purpose. In this new usage, 'ideology' is obviously but a kind of rhetoric (since the ideas are so related that they have in them, either explicitly or implicitly, inducements to some social and political choices rather than others)" (Burke, 1950/1969, p. 88).



in the early development of CEDA, decried the tendency to argumentation and delivery practices associated with NDT and suggested that losing CEDA membership would be a good thing: "We should no longer fear losing membership; we should encourage it. A smaller national membership, but one dedicated to the founding principles of CEDA, better serves our interests than the polyglot we have become. We need to return to being a community with a shared vision of what we are about and what we value" (Howe & Brownlee, 1993, p. 258). To encourage a return to those founding principles, Howe and Brownlee suggested a shift to a "few novel rules" that might discourage NDT-style approaches, including the use of weight classifications, in which participation in tournament divisions would depend on how much evidence one carried; an increase in the use of lay judges explicitly drawn from outside the debate community; and a procedure for allowing any given judge to award a double loss to two underserving teams. Also, Don R. Swanson (1993) bluntly claimed at the conference that "more experienced, more rhetorically educated, career forensic educators" (presumably like himself) should control the "the vision and the controls" in returning CEDA to its original mission (p. 273). Swanson suggested that those who seemed NDTish should be strongly encouraged to leave CEDA for NDT. While not always as explicitly exclusionary in tone or suggestion, other essays presented at the conference strongly endorsed some version of the balance thesis (Frank, 1993; Horn & Underberg, 1993).<sup>8</sup>

Those who favored the content thesis over the balance thesis were also represented at the 1991 Assessment Conference. While professing an affection for CEDA, some conference participants resisted the criticism of evolving argumentation and delivery practices and criticized the senior leadership of CEDA as overly conservative and reactionary. For example, Susan J. Stanfield (1993) argued that, while "the ability to be an effective speaker is a nice benefit of debate, I do not believe that it should be the primary goal" (p. 103). For Stanfield, life in the information age required an approach to debate that teaches students how to deal with and analyze large quantities of information, even if platform speaking skills are slighted in the process.<sup>9</sup> A rapid rate of delivery, for example, encourages depth of analysis, rather than shallow, superficial debating. David L. Steinberg (1993, pp. 97-98) also argued that development of delivery skills "is not a primary educa-

8. Placing different scholars in the "balance" or "content" category is not always an easy task, as neither balance nor content proponents are identical in all respects. One reviewer of an earlier draft of this essay, for example, argues that Horn and Underberg (1993) endorsed a "styles" or "skills" approach rather than advocating the balance thesis. However, we read Horn and Underberg (1993) as offering reforms that they believe will improve the delivery skills and the critical thinking skills of undergraduate debaters. Given their dual emphasis on these concerns, we would describe them as adhering to some version of the balance thesis.

9. Not all content-thesis defenders would concede that a rapid rate of delivery is inconsistent with public speaking pedagogy. Voth (1997), a career NDT coach, describes the rapid delivery style excoriated by balance-thesis devotees as "useful preparation for the information deluge confronting all of us" in the new century (p. 398).



tional objective of competitive tournament debate" and that the very practices objected to by defenders of the founding CEDA ideology facilitate the development of important critical thinking abilities. More bluntly, an anonymous, younger debate educator interviewed by McGee was quoted as saying that debate "is not a public speaking activity. And if CEDA was founded with those things [in mind], then it's probably wrong." The same young educator maintained that those debaters who wished to emphasize public speaking and persuasion in debate practice were members of "whiny little teams" (qtd. in McGee, 1993, pp. 157-158). That rapid delivery and complex argumentation meant CEDA judges sometimes had to reconstruct debates by reading evidence after rounds for extended periods, as Brooks (1984) and Rowland and Deatherage (1988) had complained earlier concerning their NDT counterparts, presumably did not bother the most ardent defenders of the content thesis in either organization.

At the Assessment Conference, the division between defenders of a catholic, CEDA faith in the old-time religion and the pagans who were trying to break down the cathedral doors was often described as generational, with the CEDA faithful disparaged as the "Neanderthals," the "dinosaurs," or the "buffaloes," while the allegedly youthful critics of CEDA dogma were derisively labeled the "brat pack." The generational division was and is an obvious oversimplification, since age neither was nor is a sufficient predictor of ideological commitments about debate pedagogy. That the generational narrative had narrative fidelity for some in the CEDA community was noteworthy, however, because it suggested that the very students in whom the elders had tried to instill the faith of the fathers (and mothers) were now guilty of apostasy in their betrayal of all that the elders held sacred.

Religious metaphors aside, there were other developments suggesting that debate practice was becoming more and more divorced from the founding ideology of CEDA. For example, judges and debaters alike became more and more hostile to theoretical argumentation or to any other kind of patently "generic" positions that negative teams could argue against a wide range of affirmative cases. The consequence of this hostility was that research burdens would rise for all debaters who wished to remain competitive.<sup>10</sup> (New generic argument forms, most notably the "critique," would emerge over time, but the demand for recent, plentiful, and on-point evidence nevertheless

<sup>10</sup>In the judging philosophy booklet distributed at the 1992 CEDA National Tournament, James Brey implored debaters to "do the research[,] people. Think. Don't scum by with some generic procedural mumbo-jumbo," while Timothy Mahoney described procedural argumentation as used by people "who didn't go to the library." Not to be outdone, Joe P. Peabody, Jr. exhorted students to "be smart. The library is of great assistance in this regard. I appreciate and reward developed strategies, but not [procedural] positions that avoid clash." Finally, Steve Woods told debaters who advanced various theoretical or procedural arguments to "see a psychologist and get a library card." While three of these four judges then worked at one nationally prominent debate program, their sentiments then and now are not uncommon.



remains in place.) These research burdens were further aggravated by the CEDA community's rejection of the "whole resolution" argument and its variations, which suggested that the burden of the affirmative debaters was to demonstrate the general truth of the resolution, rather than having to demonstrate only the merits of a very specific example of the resolution (e.g., Bartanen, 1997b; Berube, 1984; Bile, 1987; Madsen & Chandler, 1988; McGee, 1988). As whole resolutional argumentation disappeared in CEDA, negative debaters struggled to keep up with the research demands, with a resultant heavy dependence on the emerging electronic information technology of the 1990s (e.g., Edwards, 1997).

A 1994 exchange in the pages of *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* would demonstrate the popular feeling by the mid 1990s that CEDA had been lost to those hostile to CEDA's founding ideology. In an article primarily concerned with the near-universal consensus on argumentative norms in CEDA's national circuit, Ken Broda-Bahm (1994) argued for more tolerance of a range of argumentative practices among debaters while rejecting a rule-governed approach to the regulation of debate practice. In response, three senior educators complained with varying degrees of frustration that Broda-Bahm left little or no role for debate coaches and judges in refashioning the norms of a community that was increasingly devoted to unsound educational practices (Bartanen, 1994; Swanson, 1994; Winebrenner, 1994b). For these senior scholars, the community's failure to adhere to the balance thesis could only be addressed by its senior academic leadership, but the prospects for success in addressing CEDA's problems does not appear to have been regarded with great optimism in these three essays. Swanson (1994), who only three years earlier at the CEDA Assessment Conference had hoped to urge those adhering to the content thesis to leave CEDA, would now dismiss national-circuit CEDA debate as "crippled" (p. 44) by its impoverished community norms and describe its younger judges as "sycophants" (p. 45) rather than as educators. Instead of trying to persuade CEDA's corrupters to leave CEDA for NDT, Swanson confessed that he was now "dispirited" by these developments and had left CEDA coaching and judging altogether to teach public-forum debate (Swanson, 1994, p. 45).

Still other events suggest a further drift for CEDA away from its roots. By 1997, after a few years in which CEDA experimented for a second time with policy debate topics, CEDA and the NDT circuit agreed to share a similar, year-long debate problem area, to be selected by CEDA. As long as CEDA picked a policy debate topic, the resolution used in CEDA and NDT debate would be identical, which would facilitate "cross over" between tournaments. While CEDA, beginning in 1999, will have both policy and non-policy debate topics using the shared problem area, our expectation is that the bulk of CEDA teams will continue to use the policy debate proposition. For many years considered the home of "value debate" despite its use of policy topics in the mid 1970s, CEDA now is scarcely less associated with evidence-oriented policy debate than is the NDT circuit, and the



1999 issue of Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, the academic journal sponsored by CEDA, is exclusively focused on questions of policy debate theory. Perhaps most tellingly, academic position announcements for debate coaches increasingly are likely to indicate that the prospective employer is home to a "CEDA-NDT debate program," while recent articles refer to the "CEDA/NDT union" as if that union were a given (Hicks, 1998, p. 357; see also, e.g., Bartanen & Frank, 1999; Cirlin, 1998; Williams, 1998). Like the pigs who led the rebellion against humans in Orwell's (1946) Animal Farm and eventually became indistinguishable from those humans, CEDA and NDT have moved from being locked in an ideological cold war to becoming partners with, in all important respects, a common vision of what should count as "good" debate. Willard's (1985) prediction of NDT's demise was premature. While the NDT community shrank to an alarming extent in the 1980s, it is once again vital and healthy, thanks to the infusion of tournament opportunities and students that was the consequence of the CEDA-NDT topic merger. Ultimately, despite the size of its current membership roster, it was CEDA that finally, decisively died in this merger, as it was not the NDT community that redefined itself and its ideology in any meaningful way. Instead, the topic merger was the final, concrete indicator of an ideological merger that had been long in coming.

So, what happened to those who wished to remain faithful to CEDA's founding principles? We perceive that some of them are still involved in CEDA, having resigned themselves to life in a community whose dominant ideology they find distasteful in many respects, while still recognizing that student participation in CEDA has value. More of them, however, appear to have left CEDA by (a) retiring from college teaching, (b) leaving positions in which they have primary responsibility for day-to-day coaching and traveling, or (c) moving their forensics programs out of CEDA. Those choosing this latter option now have an array of options for debate participation, thanks to the proliferation of debate-sponsoring organizations and alternative debate formats, including the National Educational Debate Association (NEDA), the National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), the International Public Debate Association (IPDA), and the National Forensic Association's Lincoln-Douglas Division. NEDA was explicitly founded by those who wished to react against the alleged excesses of CEDA, and the other alternative organizations are also home to many CEDA refugees. A comparison of national tournament judging booklets from CEDA circa 1990 and NPDA circa 1999, for example, will find many of the same names in those booklets. In hallway conversations at tournaments using these new debate formats, one often hears the same disparaging remarks directed at CEDA that were once directed towards NDT among CEDA coaches and debaters. Willard's (1985) prediction that one day CEDA would become the new NDT and be railed against by the founders of a new debate-sponsoring organization now seems eerily prescient. While Dittus (1991) warned that the death of CEDA's founding ideology could lead to the