

THE

# Forensic

ΠΕΙΘΩ ΚΑΛΗ ΔΙΚΑΙΑ

SERIES 55

OCTOBER, 1969

NO. 1



THE NEW NATIONAL COUNCIL



# The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 55      OCTOBER, 1969      No. 1

## Table of Contents

A HISTORICAL REVIEW OF DEBATE QUESTION SELECTION .....	3
A PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF NATIONAL DEBATE PROPOSITION .....	8
THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE .....	11
THE SECRETARY'S PAGE .....	12
SYMPOSIUM: ADVICE TO YOUNG COACHES ...	13
FINANCING FORENSICS .....	14
NEW DIRECTIONS IN FORENSICS .....	15
FINANCIAL REPORT .....	17
CHAPTER NOTES .....	18
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR .....	20
NEW MEMBERS OF PI KAPPA DELTA .....	21

EDITOR .....	GIL RAU
ASSOCIATE EDITOR .....	FRANK T. ALUSOW
ASSOCIATE EDITOR .....	JOHN BURT
ASSOCIATE EDITOR .....	MARTHA WOMACK
BUSINESS MANAGER .....	LARRY NORTON

Published four times a year in October, January, March and May by Pi Kappa Delta. Subscription price is a part of the membership dues.

Office of publication: Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan. Second class postage paid at Midland, Michigan 48640.

Printed by -  
Ford Press Inc., Midland, Michigan 48640

### STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

Management and circulation, as required by the Act of October 23, 1962, Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code — for Forensic. Date of filing October 1, 1969; issued four times a year by the Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta. Printed by Ford Press Inc., 1700 James Savage Road, Midland, Michigan; published by Pendell Company, 4212 Concord Street, Midland, Michigan, Gilbert Rau, editor, South Drive, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan; Owned by Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, a non-profit corporation. There are no known bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities. Average number each issue for 12 preceding months — total number copies printed 3151, Paid circulation by subscribers delivered through the mails 2988, free distribution 0. Total number of copies distributed 3151. Single issue nearest to filing date — total number copies printed 3317. Paid circulation by subscribers delivered through mails 3216. Free distribution 0. Total number of copies distributed 3317.

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

RICHARD C. PENDELL

## DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL PRESIDENT — H. Francis Short, Kansas State College, Pittsburg, Kansas 66762

NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT — James Grissinger, Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio 43081

NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER — Larry Norton, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois 61606

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS — Fred B. Goodwin, Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701; L. A. Lawrence, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana 59715; Edna Sorber, Wisconsin State University, White-water, Wisconsin 53190

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT — Theodore O. H. Karl, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington 98447

HISTORIAN — D. J. Nabors, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma 74821

EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Gilbert Rau, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48858

ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Frank T. Alusow, Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481

ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — John Burt, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois 61701

ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Martha Womack, University of Houston, Texas 77000

### PROVINCE GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS — Robert Kunkel, Kearney State College, Nebraska 68847
2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI — Harold P. Sampson, Central Missouri State College 64093
3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS — Edna Sorber, Wisconsin State University, White-water, Wisconsin 53190
4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC — John Baird, California State College, Hayward, California 94542
5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX — Arthur F. Prosper, Black Hills State College, Spearfish, South Dakota 57783
6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI — William R. DeMougeot, N. Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203
7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES — Harold Mikle, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423
8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI — Grace Walsh, Wisconsin State University, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701
9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST — Carroll Ellis, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST — Jean Ward, Lewis & Clark College, Portland, Oregon 97219
11. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST — Seth Hawkins, So. Connecticut State College, New Haven, Connecticut 06511

### COVER PICTURE

H. Francis Short, President Kansas State College; Edna Sorber, member Wisconsin State University; James Grissinger, Vice-President Otterbein College; Theodore O. H. Karl, Past-President Pacific Lutheran University; Larry Norton, Secretary-Treasurer Bradley University; L. A. Lawrence, member Montana State University; Fred Goodwin, member S. E. Missouri State College; Gilbert Rau, Editor Central Michigan University.

### THE NEW NATIONAL COUNCIL



# A Historical Review of Debate Question Selection

By Forrest H. Rose

It is apparently the nature of man to be limited pretty much to the things in his personal experience, with little curiosity as to when or how or why they got that way. Yet, knowledge of the history of a particular custom or practice sometimes furnishes us with somewhat greater respect for the past and with somewhat more adequate guidelines for the future. Accordingly, it has been suggested that perhaps a review dealing historically with the selection of the national debate question might be in order, particularly in view of recent developments intended to change the current selection procedures.

Although intercollegiate debating had been on the campus for many years, the necessity for a common or "national" debate proposition did not arise until the coming of the forensic tournament. Previous to that time, competing schools agreed among themselves on a debate proposition, and it was not unusual for a school to debate a number of different propositions with different schools during the year.

The coming of the tournament, however, with a large number of competing schools, necessitated the adoption of a common question for all the participants. *The Forensic* of Pi Kappa Delta for March, 1919, announced preliminary plans for the Third National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta to be held at Morningside College in 1920. Although the convention program did not provide for a debate tournament, many of the colleges were scheduling debates to be held on their way to and from the convention as a means of reducing their expenses, since most host colleges would provide a couple of meals and a night's lodging in the dormitories for the visitors. To

facilitate such debates, Charles A. Marsh (UCLA), a Past National President of Pi Kappa Delta and the National Secretary at the time, urged the adoption of a common debate question. This, apparently, was the first step toward establishing the practice of selecting an official Pi Kappa Delta debate question. (*The Forensic*, May, 1933, p. 152.) At any rate, although debate did not become a convention activity until the 1926 convention at Estes Park, an official question was adopted in 1920 and each year thereafter until 1942.

In the beginning, the selection procedure was managed by the National Secretary. In the spring, the Secretary would request each Pi Kappa Delta chapter to submit to his office one or more propositions which he then compiled into a list and submitted to the chapters for a vote. As might be expected, in any given year the propositions would tend to group themselves into rather definite areas with surprisingly similar phrasings. The Secretary would select the three or four areas most frequently mentioned, with what seemed to be the most satisfactory phrasings, and submit them to a preferential vote of the chapters, the proposition receiving the most support becoming the official Pi Kappa Delta question for the year.

In *The Forensic* for May, 1933, George W. Finley (Colorado State College), National Secretary, wrote:

*"The call for debate questions for next year brought in a wide variety of questions. In accordance with our regular custom I am sending each chapter the entire list and asking for your first and second choices. The responses to this call will narrow the list down to some half dozen topics from which we will make a final selection next fall."*

During the years when the fraternity had few chapters, this plan worked quite well, but the experience of 1933-34 called for a

Dr. Forrest H. Rose, Dean of the College, Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, is a member of both Delta Sigma Rho and Pi Kappa Delta. He was a member of the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta, 1934-42; National President of Pi Kappa Delta, 1938-40; a member of the PKD Committee on Question, 1934-36 and 1940-42; and of the NATS Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion, 1940-46.



change. First, the increase in the number of chapters in Pi Kappa Delta made a corresponding increase in the Secretary's work. Second, the first vote on the 1933-34 debate proposition, taken in the fall, resulted in a tie, necessitating a second vote by the chapters, making additional work for the Secretary, and delaying the selection. Third, the question finally selected — *Resolved, that the powers of the President should be substantially increased* — was ambiguous. If one power were increased, did that mean that the "powers" had been increased or was it necessary to increase each of the powers of the President? If the latter, how would one increase a power that was already 100% the President's? And what constituted a "substantial" increase?

E. Ray Nichols (Redlands University), one of the founders of Pi Kappa Delta and its first National President, wrote from his study in Redlands, California:

*"Because of the widespread difficulty of agreeing upon the meaning of the present Pi Kappa Delta debate question, occasioned by its loose and indefinite phrasing, the writer believes that our system of choosing and phrasing the annual debate proposition should be improved in order to prevent the recurrence of this situation in the future. Accordingly, a motion will be introduced in the business sessions at the Lexington Convention providing for a change . . ."*

(THE FORENSIC, March, 1934, p. 84.)

In his report to the convention at Lexington, Kentucky, April 3, 1934, George W. Finley, National Secretary-treasurer, said:

*"I want to endorse the Nichols' method . . . or some similar method of adopting the Pi Kappa Delta question or questions. The job of getting the question finally selected this fall nearly drove your secretary crazy, and I understand the question itself has been driving the rest of you crazy ever since."* (THE FORENSIC, May, 1934, p. 123.)

Following Finley's report, Nichols moved that the National President appoint a committee to draw up a plan for the selection of the official Pi Kappa Delta debate ques-

tion. The motion carried, and President H. Dana Hopkins (Heidelberg University, Ohio), appointed Verton M. Queener (Maryville College, Tennessee); H. R. Pierce, (Rollins College, Florida); John Barnes (Park College, Missouri); Wilbur Moore (Colorado Agriculture College); and Bernard Melland (Central College, Missouri) to carry out the intent of the motion.

At the third business session of the convention the committee made its report which was amended and adopted:

1. That a standing committee of six members, to be known as the Committee on Question, be appointed by the President. At each subsequent biennial convention, two members of the committee shall be retired and in their places two new ones shall be appointed.
2. That the policy of selecting one question only be continued for the present.
3. That the question be made available by September 30.
4. That for a final vote, a maximum of three questions be submitted.
5. That the procedure for selecting the question, then, be as follows:
  - a. The Committee, working through the National Secretary, shall ask the chapters to submit lists of subjects by May 1.
  - b. The committee will consider these subjects and all other available subjects, select three, frame a question on each, and, through the National Secretary, submit them to the chapters for a final vote.

In keeping with this mandate of the convention, George McCarty (South Dakota State, Brookings), the newly-elected National President, appointed a Committee on Question composed of Forrest H. Rose (Southeast Missouri State), Chairman; J. W. Carmichael (Bowling Green State University); C. F. Nesbitt (Millsaps College); Earl Huffor (Sam Houston State College); C. H. Talley (Nebraska Wesleyan University); and Joseph Baccus (University of Redlands). The committee served for two years.



Regarding the new plan, *The Forensic* for October, 1934, editorialized:

*"The official Pi Kappa Delta debate question was selected this year by the new plan adopted at the Lexington convention last spring. Judging from this one experience with it, the plan seems to be a most excellent one. It worked smoothly in all its parts.*

*In the spring the National Secretary sent out a call to all the chapters, asking each one to submit at least one good question to be considered for the coming year. There was a fairly good response to this call and a long list of questions was compiled . . . The whole list of proposed topics was sent to the committee which was to select from the list the three questions considered the best. The committee selected two without difficulty, but tied on the third and, therefore, submitted four instead of three.*

*After selecting the four topics it thought were the best, the committee formed a suitable statement for each. It then sent them to the National Secretary and he submitted them to the local chapters for final action . . .*

*The debate committee deserves great credit for the energetic and efficient way in which it carried out this difficult task. In spite of the fact that practically all the work had to be done during the summer vacation months when the members were widely scattered over the country, they kept right at the job and had the questions selected and worded by the first of September. This enabled the National Secretary to send them to the chapters early in the month."*

The 1936-38 committee was Evan E. Anderson (Gustavus Adolphus College), Chairman; Leroy T. Laase (Hastings College); Upton Palmer (Southeast Missouri State College); Harry T. Wood (Ypsilanti College); Joseph Baccus.

The 1938-40 committee was Leroy T. Laase, Chairman; Upton Palmer (Bowling Green State); Glenn Capp (Baylor University); Warren Keith (Winthrop College); Roy Mahaffey, (Linfield College).

The 1940-42 committee was Glenn Capp, Chairman; Harold M. Jordan (Sioux Falls College); James M. Holm (Kent State College); Roy Mahaffey; Forrest H. Rose.

A committee was appointed for 1942-44: Glenn Capp; Chairman; Roy Mahaffey; Vernon Utzinger (Carroll College); Gale McGee (Nebraska Wesleyan); and Paul Bagwell (Michigan State). However, this committee did not function because of another change in question selection.

For some years, there had been rumblings of dissatisfaction from non-Pi Kappa Delta schools, not without some justification. Pi Kappa Delta had never considered that in selecting an "official" question it was selecting a "national" question. The fact was that in years other than the biennial national convention years the Pi Kappa Delta Province conventions, which met in the "off" years, occasionally debated questions other than the official question for the year. In 1926-27, for example, the official question had to do with modification of the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer. The question was timely and of general interest but an unwise choice. Imagine debaters from some of the church-related colleges arguing in 1926 against prohibition! As a result a majority of the Pi Kappa Delta schools debated the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill. Others debated the abolition of trial by jury.

Nevertheless, the official Pi Kappa Delta debate question became in reality a "national" question. More and more tournaments were being held, and most of them were hosted by Pi Kappa Delta schools. As a consequence, if a non-PKD school wanted to participate in such tournaments it was forced to debate the Pi Kappa Delta question. If a non-PKD school wished to hold a tournament and expected participation by Pi Kappa Delta schools, the tournament used the Pi Kappa Delta question. Some schools went on barn-storming trips, debating a different school every night but having to use the Pi Kappa Delta question at least part of the time on the trip.

At its convention in 1931, Phi Rho Pi voted to use the official Pi Kappa Delta question as its official question. (*The Forensic*, October, 1932, p. 44.)



A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa, wrote the National Secretary of Pi Kappa Delta:

*"Many of the junior colleges of Iowa are awaiting the announcement of the Pi Kappa Delta question. I hope you can let us have it at once." (The Forensic, October, 1931, p. 43.)*

Alfred Westfall (Colorado Agricultural College), Editor of *The Forensic*, stated in the October, 1932, issue:

*"Each year the selection of an official question is becoming of more importance. Not only does it concern an increasing number of member institutions, but there are also more colleges outside the society and more forensic organizations writing in to learn what the official question is. It usually becomes the most popular question of the year.\*"*

*While all this is fine, the editor wishes to call attention to some of the problems growing out of the selection of an official question.*

*In the first place, it was never intended that any institution should feel obliged to use the official question. Its selection is a convenience which enables colleges and universities to arrange debates more easily."*

The crux of the matter, the cause of the rumblings, was not that the questions were unsatisfactory but that non-PKD schools were having to debate questions year after year without having any voice in the selection or framing of those questions. This, they did not like, which is an understandable reaction. At the same time, Pi Kappa Delta had been selecting an official question for years and was far from enthusiastic about surrendering its prerogative to continue to do as it had been doing.

*The Gavel* of Delta Sigma Rho for November, 1937, carried as an editorial a report of the Mid-West Debate Coaches' Association conference at Evanston, Illinois. This report proposed that all forensic organizations unite under the chairmanship of someone selected by the National Association of Teachers of Speech (now the

Speech Association of America) to select a question for nationwide use. It also suggested that the question be selected in the spring to give the institutions more time to prepare and to make possible the production of better handbooks. (Pi Kappa Delta had tried and discarded the spring announcement of its question and at various times had fulminated editorially in *The Forensic* against the use of handbooks.) The report also stated that the Pi Kappa Delta question had gained such influence that all institutions found their programs affected by it.

*The Forensic* for January, 1938, editorialized regarding the report in *The Gavel*:

*"Pi Kappa Delta could tell other organizations much from what it has learned in its eighteen years of selecting official debate questions . . . Forensic associations the nation over use the Pi Kappa Delta question, await its announcement eagerly, and commend the type of proposition selected and the service the society does in making it possible for many colleges to unite in discussing one subject.*

*Selecting an official question, however, is not all beer and skittles. It means a lot of work and requires a lot of machinery. Under our system every chapter is invited to suggest questions. A committee then selects the most popular questions, words them carefully, and as soon as possible after the opening of school in the fall sends a list to each chapter for a final vote. Many individuals and organizations, with axes to grind, handbooks to sell, and advantages to gain, try to influence the selection of the question.*

*At one time the question was selected in the spring . . . The chapters themselves voted to delay the selection of the question until fall . . .*

*The official question is Pi Kappa Delta's baby. As the society reared the child from infancy to its present maturity, it naturally has some parental pride in its lusty offspring. It has learned a lot in its years of responsibility. There have been heartaches as well as pleasures. Those who have not had the experience of rearing a baby*

\*Annual studies by E. Ray Nichols supported this observation.



*of their own would do well to try it. They will miss a lot if they try to take a short-cut and adopt a full-grown child, especially when that child has a home of its own."*

The attitude implied in the final paragraph of this editorial was the general attitude, but it was not shared by everyone in Pi Kappa Delta. When E. R. Nichols made his original proposal for a Committee on Question, he suggested that the Presidents of Delta Sigma Rho, Tau Kappa Alpha, and Phi Rho Pi be members of the committee to select an annual debate proposition. (*The Forensic*, March, 1934, p. 84.)

The action of the delegates to the 1938 Pi Kappa Delta National Convention, however, left no doubt regarding where the majority stood. In the second business meeting, April 19, it was moved and carried that a special committee be appointed to consider joining with other forensic societies in the selection of a national question and also to consider whether or not an official interpretation of a question should be issued. (*The Forensic*, May, 1938, p. 117.)

The following day, Martin J. Holcomb (Augustana College, Illinois), Chairman, presented the recommendations of the committee (*The Forensic*, May, 1938, p. 126.):

1. That the method we now use for selecting the debate question be continued during the next biennium.
2. That the matter of cooperating with the NATS in the selection of a national debate question be referred to the National Council.
3. That there be no official interpretation of the question."

These recommendations were adopted overwhelmingly by the convention. (In order to be fair, and if the writer's memory is accurate, it should be stated that the proposed "articles of agreement" growing out of the Mid-West Debate Coaches' Association were far too vague and indefinite for Pi Kappa Delta to relinquish a procedure it knew would work.)

During the 1938-40 period, the members of the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta were under considerable pressure, particularly from the President of Tau

Kappa Alpha who was also Chairman of the NATS Committee on Inter-Association Relations and an influential member of the Mid-West Debate Coaches' Association. Unfortunately, the correspondence has been lost, but some of it bordered on the emotional. It was difficult to make others understand that although policies and procedures, such as cooperating with the NATS, might be referred to the National Council, the Council was still responsible to the National Convention, a condition that did not then obtain in the other societies, and that the Council would not commit itself even to making a recommendation until satisfactory orderly procedures for debate question selection were worked out. Further, under the mandate of the 1938 convention, Pi Kappa Delta could enter no agreement until 1940 at the earliest.

In the first business meeting of the Knoxville convention, May 25, 1940, a motion was adopted that the President appoint a committee on the selection of the official Pi Kappa Delta debate question. Actually, since there was already a Committee on Question, this motion involved an *ad hoc* committee, established to consider, again, uniting with the other organizations in selecting a national question. The President appointed the 1938-40 Committee on Question as the *ad hoc* committee. Glenn Capp, Chairman of the Committee, presented a report which in its essentials recommended a continuation of the previously adopted procedures for selecting an official Pi Kappa Delta question. The report was adopted. (*The Forensic*, May, 1940, p. 122.)

On Tuesday, December 31, 1940, Professor Charles Layton recommended to the Executive Committee of the NATS

*"That a cooperative committee be appointed on Intercollegiate and Discussion Activities to have among its duties the selection of propositions and topics for national use; that this committee be composed of a chairman appointed by the President of the NATS and six additional members, of whom two would be appointed by Pi Kappa Delta, two by Delta Sigma Rho, and two by Tau Kappa Alpha; that these fraternities, insofar as permitted*

(Continued on page 24)



# A Proposal To Improve The Quality Of National Debate Propositions

By Austin J. Freeley

Dr. Austin J. Freeley, Director of Forensics, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, is a founder and past president of the American Forensic Association and is currently Vice President of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

At the 1968 Business Meeting of the American Forensic Association a motion was introduced calling for the AFA to "assume the responsibility of selecting the national intercollegiate debate proposition."<sup>1</sup>

This proposal was rejected by the Speech Association of America at its Spring Executive Committee meeting. When the proposal was presented at the national meetings of the various forensic fraternities during the spring of 1969 it evoked some highly critical — even bitter — responses. A proposal so potentially divisive should be considered only if a clear and urgent need could be established and only following a searching examination of a detailed plan and a convincing demonstration that it would produce advantages outweighing possible breeches in the until-now cordial relationships that exist among the organizations interested in forensics.

Let us consider for a moment the structure of the committee which is responsible for determining the national debate proposition. The committee consists of one representative each from Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, Phi Rho Pi, the Speech Association of America and the American Forensic Association. Thus every group interested in forensics is represented in the committee structure. In its call for suggestions and in its balloting the committee contacts virtually every college in the country which has a debate program. (There are approximately 1,000 names on the committee's mailing list; because of job turnover some few people cannot be contacted in any given year, but the vast majority of the nation's directors of forensics are reached each year.)

The value of this process was clearly demonstrated in 1954-1955. That year the proposition was, "Resolved: That the United States should extend diplomatic recognition of the communist government of China." Those in forensics at that time will remember that some colleges refused to debate this "controversial" proposition, others, such as the military and naval academies, were forbidden to debate it by higher authority; the debate about debate was front page news for many days, it was a subject in Presidential press conferences, and Edward R. Murrow did a television special about it. Great damage might have been done to debate had not the speech and forensic community been united. When they were contacted by the press — and some reporters, of course, were hunting for a "communist conspiracy" behind this "controversial" proposition — the leaders of the various speech and forensic organizations were all able to point out that their organizations had been represented in the process of selecting the national debate proposition and that virtually every director of forensics in the nation had received an open-ended questionnaire on which he was invited to suggest propositions. The whole process was open, democratic and fair. All interested organizations and individuals had been consulted and given an opportunity to make their views known. In the face of so obviously fair and democratic proceedings opposition faded. Debate was not harmed by the great McCarthy era "debate about debate"; rather it came out the winner and the critics of debate were exposed as hysterical and uninformed.

Two elements stand out in the history of this incident: 1) the proposition was controversial and 2) the forensic community was united.

1. "Official Business, Executive Council Meeting," p. 36 *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, Vol. VI, No. 1, Winter, 1969.



As we all know, debate propositions are necessarily controversial. We may safely assume that at some future time — next year or in five years — we will again have a “controversial” debate proposition — one that some group passionately believes should not be debated. If the forensic community is united we can probably ride out any storm of know-nothingism and anti-intellectualism that may arise. If the forensic community is divided — if some national organizations are forced to admit “we were not represented in the process,” if significant numbers of debate directors can say, “I was not given a chance to vote, and I certainly wouldn’t have voted for that proposition” we would be exposing the forensic community and the whole program of educational debate to serious potential damage.

In this day and age when we hear talk of “participatory democracy” and when leaders are urged to “consult their constituencies” the proposal advanced at the AFA Business Meeting must be judged to be sadly out of tune with the times.

All of us in the forensic community are willing to consider any proposal which might lead to an improvement in the quality of national debate propositions.

I would now like to make such a proposal:

1) Retain the structure of the committee to which each national organization actively interested in educational debate names a representative. Thus we will retain all the safeguards and advantages which are provided by the present system.

2) Assess each organization a sum of money — for example one hundred or perhaps five hundred dollars — which may be used at the discretion of the committee to contract for research on potential debate propositions.

Let us review the present system of committee operations — *with no funds for research* — and then contrast it with how the committee would be able to operate *with funds for research*.

Under its present policy the committee meets in March or April concurrently with the convention of the Central States Speech Association to select certain areas and po-

tential propositions for further study on the basis of suggestions received from its nationwide poll of forensic directors. Each member of the committee then undertakes to do research in one or two areas or propositions to determine if they really are suitable as national debate propositions and to search out the most desirable phrasing. The committee then meets again in May or June. The members report their research findings and the committee then makes a decision on what propositions will be placed on the ballot that will be submitted to the nation’s directors of forensics for their decision.

The committee has, I believe, worked to the maximum of its present capabilities in doing research. They have, I believe, consulted all possible sources of free information to the maximum extent feasible.

Let me cite just three examples as evidence of this. One committee member charged with the responsibility of doing research in the area of disarmament and arms control consulted then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. Mr. Johnson was at that time specifically charged by President Kennedy with the responsibility of co-ordinating all federal programs in the area of disarmament and arms control. The Vice President answered the committee member with a detailed personal letter in which he set out five specific propositions for the committee’s consideration.

One committee member charged with the responsibility of doing research in the area of international monetary policy obtained detailed appraisals from, among others, the Director of the International Finance Division of the Department of Commerce, the Deputy Undersecretary for Monetary Affairs of the Treasury Department, the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, a world famous economist who was the author of one of the five major proposals then under consideration in international monetary circles, the Vice Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, the President of the Foreign Policy Association and a special Assistant to the President of the United States.

One committee member doing research in the area of domestic legal problems con-



sulted some former debaters who are now successful attorneys. They had been very active as undergraduates and were thoroughly at home on the tournament circuit. They willingly gave considerable amounts of time to consultation on the subject and wrote detailed letters and supplied extensive bibliographies for the consideration of the committee.

Many committee members have had similar experiences and the list of examples could be extended indefinitely. Many have consulted high government officials and secured thoughtful replies. Many have had extensive conversations with faculty colleagues in the areas of economics, political science and other relevant disciplines.

There is, of course, a sharp limit to the amount of time a committee member can hope to have a Vice President or a world renown authority spend in thinking about debate propositions.

Less famous figures, faculty colleagues, or former debaters who have now attained some expertise, are more interested and can be pressed further. The committee has, I submit, pressed these sources to the maximum extent possible in their quest for free advice.

Now let's bring money into the picture. I submit that our organizations have now attained a modest level of affluence which makes it reasonable for each of them to approve the expenditure of a few hundred dollars a year in the search for better debate propositions.

Now let's see how the committee would be able to operate with funds available for research.

The committee would still consult major public officials and world famous authorities and would continue to get some help from these sources.

The committee would still consult the less well-known experts, faculty colleagues and former debaters.

But money would make possible a new depth and thus, hopefully, a new quality of research.

After preliminary research the committee would be in a position to go to a good, if

not world famous, economist for example. The committee could explain the problem they were interested in and ask, in effect - -

Will you prepare a paper for the committee on this problem? Will you indicate what the major issues are as an economist sees them? Would you indicate the major affirmative and negative arguments as this subject is debated at your professional meetings? Will you suggest possible phrasings for the proposition? What language do economists use when they debate this problem? Here are some specific problems we are concerned about, how would you answer these questions? Will you suggest further sources of information and provide a bibliography? We realize we're asking you to do some significant scholarly work and we're prepared to pay for it. Take a month to work on this project and we'll pay you  $x$  dollars as a consultant's fee.

I suggest that the quality of the recommendations the committee receives will escalate enormously under this process. If one asks an economist for free advice over coffee at the faculty club the economist will probably be quite willing to chat with one for an hour or two and give his very best "off the cuff" thinking. If, however, one asked that same economist to prepare a serious scholarly work and offered enough money to make the effort reasonably worth while there will be, I submit, a significant qualitative change in the recommendations one receives. This, of course, is the whole purpose of the plan: to improve the quality of the recommendations reaching the committee.

It is recognized, of course, that the advice of the subject matter experts must be taken judiciously. Subject matter experts rarely have any expertise in the field of educational debate; they may tend to overvalue their own special interest as a timely and significant subject for student debate; and their own indepth studies may lead them to attach too much weight to a particular position. The selection and phrasing of the propositions to appear on the ballot must rest with men chosen by the various national forensic organizations for their knowledge of argumentation theory and

(Continued on page 16)



# The President's Message



H. Francis Short

To be named President of Pi Kappa Delta is a great honor plus a grave responsibility. I feel somewhat uncomfortable in this position. Thank you for your vote of confidence. I pledge to do everything in my power the next two years to maintain the high standards of Pi Kappa Delta that those who have preceded me have built. This will not be possible without the support of each local chapter. The real strength of our organization is in the local chapter. I ask your support by making yours an active chapter by taking part in the activities of your province as well as the national organization. Get your members to work on projects that you have decided at regular meetings. Make Pi Kappa Delta known on your campus. Be responsible by seeing that all reports are mailed on time; send your chapter notes to the FORENSIC, we would all like to know what you are doing.

Your choice of council members was wise — I thank you! My congratulations to Edna Sorber on being elected to her first term on the council. She has hosted a national convention and has served Pi Kappa Delta in many ways. Her experience will be invaluable to the council.

*These are the appointments of the National Council to Committee chairmanships:*

- THEODORE O. H. KARL . *Committee on Convention Arrangements and Program*
- JAMES GRISSINGER ..... *Constitution Revisions Committee*
- FRED GOODWIN ..... *Charter and Standards Committee*
- LES LAWRENCE ..... *Coordinator of Governors*
- EDNA SORBER ..... *Committee on Convention Tournaments*

Larry Norton will remain as our Secretary-Treasurer, Gil Rau as editor of the FORENSIC, and D. J. Nabors as our Historian. Your president also appointed Martha Womack and Robert Tice as associate editors of the FORENSIC.

For your information Robert Kunkel, Kearney State College, has been appointed governor of the Province of the Plains to replace D. L. Miller who has moved to St. Cloud, Minnesota. Harold Sampson has been named governor of the Province of the Missouri to replace Jerry Winsor who has moved to Augustana College in South Dakota. This is the year of the province, know your province governor and make plans to attend the province convention in the spring.

It is impossible for me to pay sufficient tribute to my predecessor, Ted Karl. He is an outstanding leader and his contribution to Pi Kappa Delta will long be remembered. His presence on the council for the next two years will be a great comfort to me. We will use his experience wisely.

By the time you read this, if you do, the new semester will have started. My best wishes to you for a successful and profitable year. Don't forget the province convention.