

young people. With this, Standing coined the term 'precariat' to describe this new class. The precariat class is composed of millions of people across the globe who are living and working in conditions of uncertainty and insecurity (Kania, 2013; Standing, 2011, 2014). Additionally, precariats are often searching for a place of belonging, which can at times lead to finding that sense of place with dangerous candidates and ideologies (Standing, 2011, 2012, 2014). However, to promote more civic dialogue within classroom spaces it is important to utilize the communication tools available to encourage students to become emotional citizens.

Understanding Emotional Citizenry

As precariats are struggling to find their place in our political society, a push to connect citizens to the political and democratic realm is necessary. Askins (2016) points to a solution called *emotional citizenry*. Emotional citizenry is "embedded in the complexities of places, lives and feelings, beyond claims to and exclusions from nation-statehood" (Askins, 2016, p. 515). The term citizenry itself is usually referred to as a body of people and thus, individual bodies and emotions mutually co-constitute a broader body politic that exceeds the formal political sphere. However, the processes through which these bodies experience and practice citizenry and community has become more complicated. There are greater complexities in migration trends and critical issues of diversity, identity, and social relations at a local level that are becoming more multifaceted (Askins, 2016; Leitner & Ehrkamp, 2006; Linklater, 2010).

Moreover, as transportation and travel options continue to increase, so do interethnic and intercultural encounters across the globe (Askins, 2016; Bauder, 2014; Staeheil, Ehrkamp, Leitner, & Nagel, 2012). Therefore, emotional citizenry requires recognition and inclusion of all, including those that may be different. This step of acceptance is crucial to civic engagement because, as Leitner and Ehrkamp (2006) argue, when individuals fail to recognize cultures, ethnicities, races, sexualities, and genders that are different from themselves, they are actively reinforcing the struggle some individuals have searching for place and space (Askins, 2016).

It is critical to also note that emotional belonging is always political and economic, meaning it is embedded in culture (Ahmed, 2004a). While emotions themselves are socially and culturally constructed, they cannot be reduced to shared understandings of specifically labeled emotions. Furthermore, particular emotions cannot be labeled to constitute a particular form of social relation (Ahmed, 2004a, 2004b; Askins, 2016). However, as we continue to promote emotional citizenry and political engagement especially amongst precariats, it is essential to utilize intercultural praxis to foster dialogue within these spaces of difference.

Encouraging Intercultural Praxis

While political discussions may be difficult, the six dimensions of intercultural praxis outlined by Sorrells and Nakagawa (2008) can help to facilitate civil dialogue with students in the classroom and on forensic teams. According to Nakagawa (2016), "the value of intercultural praxis resides in its capacity to reveal and critique how culture, history, and power align with communication practices that may serve or subvert social justice in everyday events and interactions" (p. 13). This tactic allows multiple "ports of entry" for navigating local and global interactions (Sorrells & Nakagawa, 2008).

The first dimension is *inquiry*. This is where the asking and answering of questions is encouraged. However, in order for this dimension to be successful, there has to be a genuine interest in learning, growing, and understanding. As educators, it is our role to guide the learning processes of our students, whether it is in the introduction of a controversial topic or how we present arguments and evidence. The inquiry dimension is not just for the students, however. We also have to be willing to take risks, suspend judgment, and be changed by the interactions when we ask questions.

The second dimension is *framing*. This point of entry is where standpoint, history, and context intersect. The dominant framing of the U.S. cultural standpoint is characterized by Audre Lorde (1984) as "white, thin, male, young, heterosexual, Christian, and financially secure" (p. 116). Nakagawa (2016) argues that "this normative frame sets boundaries for the construction and regulation of identities and communities, always already racialized, gendered, sexualized, class based, and invested in manifold and contradictory social and cultural interests" (p. 15). This frame extends into forensics in myriad ways. Several scholars point to racism, sexism, and the reinforcement of a dominant value system as being responsible for the lack of women and minorities participating and succeeding in forensics (Hobbs & Hobbs, 1999; Loge, 1991; Rogers et al, 2003; Sowards, 1999). By being aware of the frames of reference that include and exclude individuals, we can enable authentic dialogues amongst our students.

Positioning is the third dimension. Here issues of power and place determine perceptions. Aiding students in the understanding of how socially constructed categories of diversity position us, in terms of power, is imperative within this dimension because our positioning impacts how we make sense of and act in the world. It is our responsibility to help students recognize who can speak and whose knowledge is privileged and to help them work through the discomfort. According to Wehbi and Turcotte (2007), "challenging students to reflect on their positionality and subjectivity is a crucial pedagogical practice for creating holistic and socially responsible practitioners" (p. 7). The exploration of positionality must be approached as a starting point, not an endpoint, however. Therefore, our goal is to make "values, judgements and decision-making explicit, rather than to claim that they are not there," (Gibbons & Gray, 2004, p. 37) because "one

cannot discuss the self (the personal) without considering society (political); nor can one discuss society (political) without considering the self (personal)" (Campbell & Baikie, 2013, p. 462).

Dialogue is the fourth dimension. With dialogue, we can converse, meanings flow and new understanding can emerge. According to Bohm (2013) "[dialogue] is a place where there is not authority, no hierarchy, where this is no special place—sort of an empty place, where we can let anything be talked about (p. 49) and where it is possible to open up judgments and assumptions" (p. 53). Wierbicka (2006) further contends "[dialogue] implies that each party makes a step in the direction of the other" (p. 692). In this perspective, dialogue requires connection, empathy and respect. Our encouragement and engagement with our students that foster dialogue is imperative to stretching across the political boundaries and having difficult conversations in productive ways.

The fifth dimension is *reflection*. In this dimension, we think before we speak and encourage our students to do the same. Reflective inquiry has been conceptualized as the fundamental process through which human beings gain knowledge from their experiences (Fenwick, 2001; Illeris, 2007). Inherent in this reflection is the ability to observe and alter our perceptions and actions. By structuring reflection activities, we help students to learn from their experiences (Eyler et al, 1996; Guthrie & Betrand Jones, 2012). In order for meaningful reflection to occur, however, we must secure intellectual and emotional spaces that promote a high level of connectedness.

Action is the final dimension where we call for the linking of intercultural understanding with responsible actions to make a difference. Here we challenge stereotypes, prejudice, and systemic inequities, and promote to the use of positionality and power to generate alternative solutions to create a more socially just, equitable, and peaceful world. The temptation in this dimension is to try to erase or overcome stereotypes. Nakagawa (2016) reasons that this is futile, because "all interaction is always already mediated by historical, cultural, and political frames (including stereotypes) enabling us to communicate formally, informally, or intimately, or to decide to interact at all" (p. 21). But it is not about eliminating these frames; rather, we should encourage the engagement in critical conversations about how everyday practices sustain power and knowledge that perpetuate these representations and to find ways to advance social justice.

Conclusion and Future Implications

The pull of unrest continues to shape our country's political atmosphere and serves as a reflection of a collective response. With the necessity to become and remain an informed citizen, pressure builds upon the civic duties of educators; simple class and team conversations can lead to dramatic changes in perspective and open students to ideas beyond their range of privilege. While students have adapted a precarious approach to formulating an opinion in regard to politics,

varying views have the ability to shift and become drastically altered through discourse. Forensics proves to serve as an effective avenue for dialogue, discussion, and educational debate. It is crucial that students are able to engage in informed conversation as well as be advocates for reformation. Forensics allows for students to not only reap the benefits of the activity, but also allows them to be active participants in discourse with their peers and as students in a classroom setting. Simultaneously, it is essential for educators to promote involvement and have the ability to facilitate these conversations. With this, the necessity for a shift in pedagogical practices applied by educators is the tool for change and must be used with an actively participating group. Applying tactics such as decolonizing power and privilege, debunking dominant value systems, and encouraging intercultural praxis inevitably leads to curating well-informed citizens with the ability to confidently articulate their political ideologies.

With an active response and proper techniques, political discourse can flourish. If students are unwilling to engage, especially due to interferences such as emotional citizenry, lack of identity, and lack of cultural intersections, the process becomes null. Forensics becomes a backbone in changing the political atmosphere more than ever. While political engagement on college campuses is often mixed with participants who are informed and others who are not, forensics quickly forces its contributors to expand their mindset. The simple fact that forensics does not tolerate exclusion by any means regarding race, gender, age, disability, or any other minority status, allows for a range of thought to prosper within the space. In all, for civic engagement to increase within the current political climate, it is essential for educators to promote discourse through a shift in inclusive pedagogy, and for students to be willing to openly and actively participate in discussion beyond their realm of insight.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2004a). *The cultural politics of emotions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2004b). Collective feelings: Or the impressions left by others. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21, 25-42.
- Askins, K. (2016). Emotional citizenry: Everyday geographies of befriending, belonging and intercultural encounter. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 41, 515-527. doi: 10.1111/tran.12135
- Astin, A., Vogelgesang, L., Ikeda, E., & Yee, J. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Bakardjieva, M. (2010). "The Internet and Subactivism. Cultivating Young Citizenship in Everyday Life," in T. Olsson & P. Dahlgren (eds.) *Young People, ICTs and Democracy* (pp. 129-146). Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Batchelder, T. & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17(4), 341-355.
- Bauder, H. (2014). Domicile citizenship, human mobility and territoriality. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38, 91-106.
- Bohm, D. (2013). The structure and agency dilemma in identity and intercultural communication research. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(2), 126-147.
- Burch, S. (2013). Strategies for service-learning assessment in dental hygiene education. *The Journal of Dental Hygiene*, 87(5), 265-270.

- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, C., & Baikie, G. (2013). Teaching critically reflective analysis in the context of a social justice course. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 14, 452-464.
- Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and political engagement: Citizens, communication, and democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2009). *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Eveland, W. P., Jr. (2004). The effect of political discussion in producing informed citizens: The roles of information, motivation, and elaboration. *Political Communication*, 21, 177-193. doi: 10.1080=10584600490443877
- Eyler, J., Giles, D., & Schmeide, A. (1996). *A practitioner's guide to reflection in service-learning: Student voices and reflections*. A Technical Assistance Project funded by the Corporation for National Service. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Fenwick, T. (2001). *Experiential learning: A theoretical critique from five perspectives*. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Grace, K. (2010). Assessment in forensics: It's a dirty job but we need to do it! Bloomington, MN. National Development Conference on Individual Events.
- Gibbons, J. & Gray, M. (2004). Critical thinking as integral to social work practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 24, 19-38.
- Giles, D.E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 77-85.
- Guthrie, K. & McCracken, H. (2010). Promoting reflective discourse through connectivity: Conversations around service-learning experiences. In L. Shedlesky & K. Aitken (Eds.), *Cases on online discussion and interaction: Experiences and outcome* (pp. 66-87). Hersey, PA: IGI Global Publishers.
- Hesser, G. (1995). Faculty assessment of student learning: Outcomes attributed to service-learning and evidence of changes in faculty attitudes about experiential education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 33-42.
- Hinck, E. A., & Hinck, S. S. (1998). Service-learning and forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 16, 1-26.
- Hobbs, J. & Hobbs, J. (1999). The world is too much with us: Sexism in IPDA sponsored debate. *The International Journal of Forensics*, 2, 1-14.
- Howard, J. (1997). *Praxis I: A faculty casebook on community service learning*. Ann Arbor, MI: OCSL Press.
- Illeris, K. (2007). What do we actually mean by experiential learning? *Human Resource Development Review*, 6(1), 84-95.
- Kania, E. (2013). Join together, demand change, and risk: An interview with Guy Standing. *Revolutions, global trends & regional issues: The precariat, between revolution, temporary protest or a message for change*, 1(1), pp. 44-53.
- Leitner, H., & Ehrkamp, P. (2006). Rethinking immigration and citizenship: New spaces of migrant transnationalism and belonging. *Environment and Planning*, A38, 1591-1597.
- Lemke, J., & Chala, E. (2016). Tweeting democracy: An ethnographic content analysis of social media use in the differing politics of Senegal and Ethiopia's newspapers. *Journal of African Media Studies*, 8(2), 167-185.
- Lerner, R.M. & Simon, L.A. (1998). The new American outreach university: Challenges and options. *University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century: Outreach scholarship for youth and families*, 3-23.
- Li, M. & Frieze, I. (2016). Developing civic engagement in university education: Predicting current and future engagement in community services. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(4), 775-792.
- Linklater, A. (2010). Global civilizing processes and the ambiguities of interconnectedness. *European Journal of International Relations*, 16, 155-178.
- Loge, P. (1991). Black participation in CEDA debate: A quantification and analysis. *CEDA Yearbook*, 12, 79-87.
- Lorde, A. (1984). Eye to eye: Black women, hatred, and anger. *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*, 145-75.
- Milner, H. (2010). *The internet generation: Engaged citizens or political dropouts*. Medford: Tufts University Press.

- Nakagawa, G. (2016). Praxis what you breach: Intercultural praxis, impersonation, and stereotyping. In K. Sorrells & S. Sekimoto (Eds.) *Globalizing Intercultural Communication: A Reader* (pp.13-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Overton, B. J., & Burkhardt, J. C. (1999). Drucker could be right, but...: New leadership models for institutional-community partnerships. *Applied Developmental Science*, 3(4), 217-227.
- Pew Research Center for People and Press. (2009). Public evaluations of the news media: 1985-2009 press accuracy rating hits two decade low. Retrieved from <http://people-press.org/2009/09/13/press-accuracy-rating-hits-two-decade-low/>
- Ponder, J. D., & Haridakis, P. (2015). Selectively social politics: The differing roles of media use on political discussion. *Mass Communication and Society*, 18, 281-302. doi: 10.1080/15205436.2014.940977
- Preston, C.T. Jr., & Jensen, S.L. (1995). Community service and recruiting in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic*, 80, 1-9.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Roberts, K. G. (2014). *The limits of Cosmopolis: Ethics and provinciality in the dialogue of cultures*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Robinson, T. M., & Clemens, C. M. (2014). Service-learning and forensics: A systematic literature review. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 99, 35-49.
- Rogers, J. E., Rennels, A., Lockhart, C., McMillan, C., Soluade, A., & Ukabam, O. (2003). Interrogating the Myth of the "ISM": An Analysis of Dominant and Subdominant Culturally Linked Perceptions and Engendered Motivations for Continued Participation in Intercollegiate Competitive Debate. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 88(2), 1-26.
- Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Mahoney, K. M. (2000). *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2000*. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Education and Information, 3005 Moore Hall, Mailbox 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521.
- Skocpol, T. & Fiorina, M.P. (1999). How Americans became civic. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, 27-80.
- Sorrells, K., & Nakagawa, G. (2008). Intercultural communication praxis and the struggle for social responsibility and social justice. *Transformative Communication Studies: Culture, Hierarchy, and the Human Condition*, 17-43.
- Sowards, S. (1999). Implications of racism toward Hispanic debaters in policy debate. *International Journal of Forensics*, 2, 14-49.
- Staeheil, L., Ehrkamp, P., Leitner, H., & Nagel, C. (2012). Dreaming the ordinary: Daily life and the complex geographies of citizenship. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36, 628-644.
- Standing, G. (2014). *A precariat charter: From denizens to citizens*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Standing, G. (2012). The precariat: From denizens to citizens?. *Polity*, 44(4), 588-608.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New and Dangerous Class*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Storsul, T. (2014). Deliberation or self-presentation? Young people, politics and social media. *Nordicom Review*, 35(2), 17-28.
- Wehbi, S. & Turcotte, P. (2007). Social work education: Neoliberalism's willing victim? *Critical Social Work*, 8(1), 1-10.
- Wierbicka, A. (2006). The concept of 'dialogue' in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse Studies*, 8(5), 675-703.
- Wuthnow, R. (1999). Mobilizing civic engagement: The changing impact of religious involvement. *Civic engagement in American democracy*, 331-363.



BOOK REVIEW

Kiewe, A., & Houck, D. W. (2015). *The effects of rhetoric and the rhetoric of effects: past, present, future*. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press.

Reviewed by DAVID BAILEY, SOUTHWEST BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Forensic educators devote considerable time teaching students to be effective rhetorical practitioners. We do this because rhetoric (in its various forms) holds a strong suasive power over audiences from contest judges to potential employers. The assumption that rhetoric does (or at least can) have a powerful effect is, thus, at the heart of the forensics educational enterprise. Yet, for about two decades now, scholars of rhetorical theory and criticism have devoted much attention to responding to a challenging counter-claim—the idea that rhetoric's effects (in the American Presidency at least) are far more limited than one might think. This counter-claim comes partially courtesy of political scientist George C. Edwards III who throughout his career has argued that presidential rhetorical efforts to sway public opinion seldom work. In his 2003 book *On Deaf Ears: The Limits of the Bully Pulpit* Edwards argues that American presidents are usually unable to use the rhetorical powers of the bully pulpit to secure public support for their policy initiatives. Edwards' arguments over the years have sparked a series of responses in book chapters and articles from rhetorical critics pointing out either clear instances of presidential rhetorical influence (Zarefsky, 2004) or endeavoring to argue that moving the public opinion needle is not all that there is to understanding the concept of rhetorical effect (Medhurst, 1996).

This ongoing controversy gives rise to an intriguing thirteen-chapter volume *The Effects of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Effects: Past, Present, Future* edited by Amos Kiewe and Davis W. Houck. The book is conveniently divided into three parts including: a theoretical exploration of the concept of effects in rhetoric, case studies of rhetorical effects within the field of public address, and a consideration of new ways of understanding the concept of effects. "After some eighty-five years of arguing its merits and pitfalls, it is easy to dismiss any new discussion on rhetoric's effects as a tired endeavor" Kiewe and Houck explain in the introduction (p. 2). "Rather, we come at this discussion with a serious concern—that we have relegated the study of effects largely to disciplinary oblivion, and yet the importance of rhetoric, we believe, cannot stand on firm scholarly grounds without acknowledging that the primary instrumental function of rhetoric is to influence others . . ." (p. 2). The authors of the various chapters each provide insightful and noteworthy contributions to the discussion. The first section carefully establishes the need for additional work in

this area and provides some useful touchstones that help students of rhetoric understand the issues involved. Carole Blair's contribution in part one is both entertaining and instructive. Blair problematizes the rhetorical discipline's search for an articulation of effects by comparing it to *the Eagle's* classic rock song "Hotel California." "The beast of effect is still very much alive" she notes in homage to the lyric "they stab it with their steely knives but they just can't kill the beast" (p. 46). These and the other contributions in part one establish the problems and opportunities created by past and present attempts to articulate the effects of rhetorical texts.

Part two features a series of intriguing case studies of rhetorical efficacy. The artifacts chosen for analysis by the various authors run the gambit from often-analyzed texts (Paine's *Common Sense*, Washington's *Farewell Address*, the *Declaration of Independence*, and Roosevelt's *Fireside Chats*) to those that have received less scholarly attention such as activist Larry Kramer's polemical writings and speeches. Each case study provides an opportunity to better understand rhetorical effects. For instance, Erin Rand's chapter on Larry Kramer's rhetoric is not just an analysis of his discourse but an invitation to theorize about the forms of polemical rhetoric. Rand's work challenges rhetorical critics to deepen their understanding of publics and agency—topics which are key to reconceiving the effects of rhetoric.

Part three endeavors to push the boundaries of our understanding of rhetoric. For instance, Greg Dorchak's contribution considers the potential for music to be a subject of rhetorical analysis. In this sense, Dorchak's essay is not news. However, his approach is novel in that it offers a departure from the traditional methods of rhetorical criticism. Featured heavily in Dorchak's analysis are concepts such as community, virtuosity, and evolution. The other chapters in this part of the volume, such as Aaron Hess' combination of extant critical methods with ethnography, try to chart similarly innovative approaches.

From beginning to end the volume delivers on what it promises—a discussion about the importance of developing a deeper understanding and a more elaborate scholarly vocabulary for articulating the efficacy of rhetoric. Along the way, the reader is treated to an in-depth consideration of the efficacy conundrum. If rhetoric is often efficacious, why are there many instances where an effect is difficult (or impossible) to ascertain? Part of the answer to the question is that effects are not always what we believe they are or should be. This volume does not promise to forever settle the matter of the difficulty of articulating the effects of rhetoric. What it does promise (and ultimately delivers on) is an intelligent discussion of this basic question and a challenging reconceptualization of what we mean by effects.

As is the case in any such ambitious work, there are places where the discussion is either limited by the type of rhetoric the author has in mind or it simply does not go far enough. As previously noted, most of the authors (especially Kiewe and Houck) use George Edwards'

critique of public address scholars as the primary rationale for the exploration. While Edwards' argument merits response—working so hard to refute his critique tends to limit the inquiry to mostly public address (often presidential) and political writings. In the concluding chapter authored by Davis Houck one may notice a similar limitation. Houck argues that rhetorical critics need to do a better job of determining the audience's reception or reaction to a message. To prove his point he references his own work of diligently reading letters written to President Franklin Roosevelt from citizens in response to his first inaugural address. Apparently, this process made Houck's analysis of Roosevelt's speech better. "I went back to the drafts of the address. I read them with a new set of lenses—those who'd actually heard or seen FDR speak on March 4, 1933. . . . I came away a bit humbled by the process. Maybe these folks knew some things a trained rhetorical critic didn't" (p. 287). Certainly, this type of archival research improved Houck's project and altered (probably for the better) his analysis of FDR's iconic speech. However, this approach would not work universally when and where more diverse rhetorical artifacts are involved. If no response archive is available, are rhetorical critics unable to do thoughtful analysis or assess effects? Houck does not (because he cannot) answer this question.

Putting aside these minor difficulties (which would be involved in any such project) the work contained within this volume is excellent. Rhetorical texts of almost any variety do not lend themselves to easy formulaic answers. Thankfully, this book does not offer easy formulaic answers to the efficacy conundrum. What it offers is a thoughtful discussion and (more importantly) a challenge and an invitation to participate in the discussion. This is a good thing. After all, what more can we expect of any good piece of scholarship?

REFERENCES

- Edwards, G.C. (2003). *On deaf ears: The limits of the bully pulpit*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kiewe, A., & Houck, D. W. (Eds). (2015). *The effects of rhetoric and the rhetoric of effects: past, present, future*. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press.
- Medhurst, M.J. (Ed). (1996). Afterword: The ways of rhetoric. In *Beyond the rhetorical presidency*, (pp. 218-226). College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press.
- Zarefsky, D. (2004). Presidential rhetoric and the power of definition. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 34, 607-619.



The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta

LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

(Copy and forward to your library acquisition officer)

Name _____

Department _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Please enter a subscription to **The Forensic** at the subscriber rate of \$20.00 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription is for a complete series, which begins July 1st of each year. At the time of subscription, you will receive all previous issues that have been published during the subscription year.

Check One:

_____ One Year \$20 _____ Two Years \$40 _____ Three Years \$60

On subscriptions made outside of the United States, add \$15 per year for foreign postage.

Make checks and money orders payable to Pi Kappa Delta National
Order from your subscriptions agent or directly from:

Pi Kappa Delta National Headquarters

401 Railroad Place

West Des Moines, IA 50265-4730

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through the National Headquarters:

The History of Pi Kappa Delta, by Larry Norton

_____ copies @ \$7.50/each

The Proceedings of the 1998 Developmental Conference, Robert S. Littlefield, Ed.

_____ copies @ \$5.00/each

The Proceedings of the 1995 Developmental Conference, Scott Jensen, Ed.

_____ copies @ \$5.00/each

Articles from past issues of *THE FORENSIC* are available upon request.