

course, but they are not inconsistent either: it remains possible to argue that debaters should be able to draw from a wider spectrum of argumentative options while at the same time being informed by a greater amount of pedagogical influence from critics and coaches.

The central argument of my essay was that the present national circuit in CEDA constitutes an argument community that limits debaters to a relatively narrow spectrum of acceptable argument. The responses acknowledge and even expand upon this basic problematic. To Swanson, the national circuit is divorced from argumentation and pedagogy. To Bartanen, it is entrenched in group think. To Winebrenner, it maintains its status through the exclusionary force of convention. To each, however, the problems characterizing the national circuit are compounded by an additional problem: a limited degree of pedagogical involvement and influence from critics and coaches.

The chief controversy, then, centers on the solution I advocate, and specifically on my envisioned role for coaches and critics. I argued that as an improvement to the in-round experience, debaters at the level of the national circuit should permit and engage in a wider latitude of argumentative options.¹ Specifically, I argued, that a greater acceptance of arguments which question the conditions or norms of argument ("meta-arguments") would enhance the capacity of the round to regulate itself. While noting that an in-round regulation of the conditions of argument is an idea that is "not inherently bad" (p. 37), Winebrenner notes that my solution is "decidedly superficial" (p. 34) based on the claim that true authority either does or should lie exclusively with the critic. Following suit, Swanson sees my solution as "unsupported" (p. 41), "creatively ambiguous" (p. 43), and as a "a clever, and circuitous justification" (p. 42) for the present level of control by national circuit debaters.

It seems that what is most irksome is not the advocacy of broader argumentative response for debaters but the perceived *substitution* of the norms and attitudes of debaters for those of coaches and critics. The theme which most unites the three responses is the claim that I am excluding from my analysis the educators who have a vital role to play in maintaining the activity. The underlying point is well taken but, for clarification, I do not seek to convey the message that coaches and critics are external to the community, or wish to argue that we must absolutely choose between coach involvement and student involvement. If a criticism of exclusion applies, it applies to my writing style and my terms of choice rather than to my argument as such, since there is no reason offered why affording debaters a wider spectrum of arguments in the round leads to a diminished contribution from coaches and critics. Indeed, encouraging debaters to make the conditions of argument subject to debate could empower coaches by motivating students to seek out additional training in argumentation.

Despite this, it is clear that the label "external" in reference to restraints from coaches and critics touches a nerve. Winebrenner says that I "disenfranchis[e]" and "expatriate" the coach and critic (p. 35). Bartanen notes that she refuses "to be assumed out of my role as judge or defined out of my profession as a forensic educator" (p. 38). Finally, Swanson reacts to the notion of an "external restraint" as an "inappropriate and offensive choice of phrase" (p. 43). Certainly if one interprets the label as excluding coaches and critics from the forensic community then it is indeed both inappropriate and

offensive. I don't, however, mean to make a distinction between forensic professionals and the community, but between forensic professionals and the argumentation offered by debaters in a debate round. As critics, coaches, and teachers, we are evaluating the debate and teaching the debaters. That makes us internal to the community. But we are external to the reason-giving which comprises the debate. We prepare students for the debate. We observe and decide who won the debate. But we do not debate. We are critics and coaches in an educational game, not players. In saying that judges and coaches are distanced or "external" to the argumentative clash of the debate round, I only make a distinction between communication that happens outside of the debate—before and after the debate—and communication that happens inside of the debate. My point is to emphasize the participation of debaters at this later level as self-regulators.

I use the phrase "external restraint" to mean that the *restraint* is not a part of the debate. It is not one of the arguments being debated in a given round; it is not contained in the debaters' advocacy; it is not a part of what the debaters are charged with justifying or dejustifying. When I write of "external regulation of the in-round debate experience" (p. 33) I mean that the regulation is external to the in-round experience, not external to the community. The following statements from my essay should have clarified: "Judges and directors, as active members of the argument community, have a role to play. Debate forums, workshops, textbooks, and articles all have an influence in creating, maintaining, and revising norms in academic debate" (p. 33). Winebrenner's dismissal of these statements as "lip service" (p. 35) merely substitutes his apparently *ad hominem* assumptions about my motives for a more careful response to the arguments I am making and the clarifications I am striving toward.

Another source of perceived exclusion is the implication that I force a false dichotomy between student guidance and coach and critic guidance. While Winebrenner seems to accept the dichotomy (and come down on the side of coaches and critics) the other respondents more sensibly critique the dichotomy as a false choice. Indeed, it is artificial to posit an absolute choice between the normative influence of students and educators. The dichotomy I seek to advocate, however, is not between coach *involvement* and a broader range of argumentative options for debaters: it is between external *restriction* and better debate self regulation. Here, I think the dichotomy is valid. The notion of a 'restraint' connotes a regulation, a rule, a limit on debate practice which is supported not by reason-giving in the context of the debate round (as an argument would be) but is instead supported by simple authority. There does seem to be a clear choice between this notion of restraint, and the notion of self regulation.

The restraints that I refer to, in addition to those mentioned in my previous essay (e.g., Frank, 1993; Horn & Underberg, 1993) include all frameworks of rules governing the substantive aspects of the debate which are imposed on the debate round by non-arguers. Examples of such restraints include the National Debate Tournament rules identified by Herbeck and Katsulas (1988), and the regulations on argument content that have been included in the American Debate Association Standing Rules and the more recent National Educational Debate Association's Statement of Objectives and Procedures. Such guidelines are external restraints, not because they extend pedagogical involvement to coaches and critics, but because they "directly

regulate the content of a debate" (Herbeck & Katsulas, 1988, p. 234). Such restraints, in my view, substitute control for education.

Certainly there is middle ground between restraints such as these and the disenfranchisement of coaches and critics that Winebrenner writes of. Indeed, the middle ground is the influence of pedagogy and the force of rhetorical persuasion discussed by Swanson and Bartanen respectively. I would see both as entailing educational opportunities, not constraints. As such, I reject neither pedagogy nor persuasion as "external restraints." Access to knowledge, perspective, and influence expands the options open to debaters, while rules and regulations which take the form of bans on types of argument or styles of argument contract those options by taking issues out of the debate.

I believe that a greater tolerance for meta-debate provides an alternative to these restraints while at the same time providing a forum for argumentative pedagogy and rhetorical influence. At this level, I share common cause with Bartanen and Swanson. Aided by the eloquence of James Boyd White, Bartanen seeks a setting of engagement, rather than commandment: A setting which features a broader range of voices from both coach and student, exerting power over the community through rhetorical advocacy. Similarly, Swanson calls for an expanded understanding of and respect for "the historical, philosophical, and pragmatic theory and technique that underlies the practice of debate in a democratic society" (p. 44-45). It is precisely because we need a greater variety of student voices and a greater understanding of debate theory and practice that I advocate a greater latitude for debaters to engage issues of argumentation in the debate forum. I do not decry a system in which influence from critics and coaches, exercised through pedagogy or persuasion, is present. Rather, I decry a system in which influence from debaters in the debate round, exercised through advocacy, is potentially absent. Both pedagogy and student involvement may be facilitated by permitting, if not encouraging, student debates on argumentative norms.

Thus, it is not the existence of a norm generating function for coaches that I object to, it is the argument that this function should be *exclusively* performed by forensic professionals. Winebrenner, however, seems to make such an argument, stating that the power to establish norms should be vested in "educators rather than debaters" (p. 36), in "teachers rather than students" (p. 36). Winebrenner's central argument is that the cure I advocate is superficial precisely because it envisions the use of the national circuit debaters themselves. "Only critics" he writes "are empowered to dispense the rewards and sanctions by which success is measured" (p. 36). It seems decidedly more superficial to argue that judges are the *only* source of authority than to say that debaters also have a role to play. As McKerrow (1990) points out, communities may follow commonly held rules for three reasons: choice, conditioning, or commands by authorities. Socialization to commonly held norms within the context of the round must play a role in influencing choice and conditioning. As McKerrow further notes, "Discourse-language aimed at members or at outsiders - constitutes the community by presenting it with those symbols by which it identifies itself" and further that "argument is a central vehicle for the creation of those symbols which sustain a community." (p. 29). My claim is that the discourses of the debate itself - the eight speeches and four cross-examinations that take place - act as powerful regulators of norms. Judges may have sole authority to say what arguments win rounds but

debaters have authority to say what arguments are accorded respect, and that in turn has an influence on judges' attitudes toward arguments.

Certainly, authority in argumentative communities can't be reduced to a judge's privilege in casting a ballot. Noting a distinction between privilege and authority, Lynne Tirrell (1993) notes the dependence of authority on community recognition: "Such a power to inspire belief is importantly social, for it is gained through deft use of a shared system of beliefs and norms. To have authority is to have a say that others listen to and generally believe" (p. 17). National circuit debaters establish norms that other debaters (both inside and outside of the national circuit) listen to and believe. Mature communities of arguers can effectively narrow the range of argument through consensus and the management of credibility.

Hopefully, these communities can also be persuaded to broaden the range of argument for the common good. On this issue, Swanson and Bartanen are skeptical. Bartanen questions whether the national circuit really is thriving in an argumentative sense, and Swanson asks, "Isn't the argument community of national circuit CEDA debate so crippled by its vision of community standards that it is incapable of interfacing successfully with argument scholars, students of argumentation, and listeners interested in the process of advocacy?" (p. 44) My experience convinces me that the answer is no. The national circuit, in its various manifestations across time and debate cultures, has shown that it can be at the forefront of efforts in the debate community to disturb the consensus on issues such as the likelihood of environmental or military disaster, and the sanctity of capitalism, economic growth, democracy, and individual rights. At times national circuit debaters have also questioned central tenets of debate theory such as inherency, conditionality, and the function of the resolution. I believe that the national circuit currently does not permit a broad range of response, particularly regarding the subject of argumentation itself, but I see a strong distinction between "does not" and "can not." As Swanson notes, "If more debaters become learned in the principles of argument, the conditioning might be modified" (p. 45). I am arguing that the debate experience itself should be used as an incentive for debaters to become more learned in the principles of argument: If the conditions of debate are themselves researched, and subjected to attack and defense, then I believe debaters will become more knowledgeable practitioners of argument.

Conclusion

In our desire to ensure a positive role for coach and critic, we should be careful not to equate this desire with a wish to limit the participation of our students. When confronted with debaters desiring an active role in the development of their own norms, we should be careful not to give in to defensive reactions toward the metaphorical "animals in control of the zoo," or "lunatics in charge of the asylum."² While I share with my respondents a resentment toward the idea that debaters should *exclusively* guide the activity, I feel that the resentment toward debaters playing *any* role in constructing or challenging argumentative norms, a resentment which seems apparent in Winebrenner's response, embodies a view of a passive student: a student willing to listen to the guidance of others, but not charged with any guidance herself. "Much significant learning is acquired through doing," notes educational philosopher Carl Rogers, "placing the student in direct experiential confrontation with

practical problems, social problems, ethical and philosophical problems, personal issues, and research problems is one of the most effective modes of promoting learning" (1969, p. 162). As believers in the educational laboratory of debate, we feel that it is best for students to grapple with complex social issues by engaging in advocacy themselves, not by hearing the solutions from someone else. This preference should extend to the realm of theory as well. As educational facilitators, forensic coaches and critics need to ensure that the answers to questions of argumentative practice and theory are not just taught to students through simple transference, but are acquired through exploration as well. My argument has been that one way to promote such exploration is to relax the norms in national circuit CEDA debate which prevent student argument on the conventions and practices of debate.

Works Cited

- Bartanen, K. (1994). Imagining otherwise: A response to Broda-Bahm. *The Forensics* 79(4), 38-40
- Broda-Bahm, K. (1994). Community concepts of argumentative legitimacy: Challenging norms in national-circuit CEDA debate. *The Forensics* 79(3), 26-35.
- Frank, D. (1993). Debating as rhetorical scholarship: Changing delivery practices in CEDA. In D.A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th anniversary assessment conference proceedings* (75-95). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.
- Herbeck, D. A. & Katsulas, J. P. (1988). Rules on the substance of debate: A critique of the charter of the National Debate Tournament. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 24, 233-245.
- Horn, G. & Underberg, L. (1993). Educational debate: An unfulfilled promise? In D. A. Thomas & S. C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th anniversary assessment conference proceedings* (37-75). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.
- McKerrow, R. E. (1990). Argument communities. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation: Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (27-40). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn: A view of what education might become*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.
- Swanson, D. R. (1994). Community concepts of argumentative legitimacy: An inauspicious application by Broda-Bahm to national circuit CEDA debate. *The Forensics* 79(4), 41-46.
- Tirrell, L. (1993). Definition and power: Toward authority without privilege. *Hypatia* 8:4. 1-34.
- Toulmin, S. E. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winebrenner, T. C. (1994). Reclaiming citizenship in a community of arguers: A reply to Broda-Bahm. *The Forensics* 79(4), 34-37.

- 1 Bartanen argues that a broader range of responses would conflict with the goal of a narrower definition for argument. She writes that while I urge "that the national circuit permit a *broader* spectrum of argumentative response, other educators might concurrently ask for a traditional but *narrower* definition of argument (e.g., a claim with reasons)" (p. 38). There is, however, a clear difference between the concept of a *definition* of argument and the concept of the *spectrum* of arguments open. If argument is defined narrowly (for example using Toulmin's (1958) concepts of claim, data, and warrant) we could still say that a broader *range* of argumentative possibilities should be open in the sense that debaters should be consensually permitted to make arguments (i.e., put forth claims, data, and warrants) regarding a larger number of subjects, including arguments challenging community norms.
- 2 According to my recollection, both metaphors were used in meetings at the CEDA Assessment Conference in 1991.

MUSIC OF OUR VOICES: THEN AND NOW

Sally A. Roden
PKD President

This message varies from many of those previously included in *The Forensic's* "President's Pen," but it is a message I want to share. My sincere hope is that what we say now and what we leave behind in PKD will be as meaningful to future members as are the words spoken in 1936 by Harold Chamberlain to a national convention of college speech teachers. Mr. Chamberlain, who taught music and speech at Ripon College where the permanent PKD Hall of Fame is located and where PKD history began, spoke on the relation between music and speech. Current PKD members who take the PKD pledge test for initiation will be familiar with E. R. Nichols, one of the founders of PKD, but they might not realize that Nichols also taught at Ripon where Chamberlain taught. Nichols organized the Ripon men into a local honorary society, and was instrumental in writing a Ripon document that served as a model for the later ratified PKD constitution. According to Larry Norton in *The History of Pi Kappa Delta* (1987), Nichols was responsible for forming a committee at Ripon to suggest names for the newly created organization. It was the Ripon committee who recommended the name Pi Kappa Delta, as well as the design of the present key recognizing orators, debaters, and instructors. Although Nichols and the Ripon men had been active participants in the founding of Pi Kappa Delta, it took some time for the group to be accepted as an official organization on the Ripon College campus

because the college authorities at Ripon at first vetoed approval of any "Greek letter fraternity." Finally, in 1913, Ripon trustees granted permission for Ripon College to become a chapter of the very organization it had previously named, Pi Kappa Delta. (The above references, to Nichols and the beginnings of PKD are cited in Norton's *History*. If chapters do not possess this history, I strongly urge them to obtain a copy.)

Twenty-three years after the Ripon PKD chapter was chartered, Chamberlain presented his speech to the National Convention of College Speech Teachers which was held that year in Cleveland. Last month, fifty-eight years after the speech was initially delivered, it came into my hands through Chamberlain's daughter, my good friend Ruth Chamberlain Floyd, who in turn had just received it in the mail only a week before from her sister. The following excerpts are taken from the actual manuscript of the speech entitled, "The Dual Entente: Music and Speech Natural Allies." These are the words which still hold our interest and ring true across the years:

My topic, "The Dual Entente—Music and Speech," suggests that there is an understanding between the domains of music and speech—a support given by each to the other.... Twenty-five years ago almost all the public performing in schools, outside of athletics, was done by the music students. True, there was intercollegiate debating, and oratory, too, in some sections.... Also, in debate, and particularly in some of the new speech fields, such as speech correction, and psychology of speech, it has been easier for modern speech teachers to prove to school administrators that they were doing constructive work. In many schools, therefore, music has lost ground academically, while speech has gained prestige.... Too long have speech and music been considered frills by many educators. On the basis of self-preservation, and continued growth in academic prestige, music and speech have much to give to each other, and to the general scheme of things academic. Both of these subjects stem from man's common desire to know and to express the good, the true, and the beautiful; both are normal expressions of man's deepest spiritual nature....

What can the speech teacher learn from the vocalist? Let us consider two things only, the things that seem to be the most important: first, a wider, more flexible vocal range, from an octave and a half to two octaves; second, a much more varied palette of vocal colors, based on the tonal colors of the orchestra.

Concerning vocal pitch range, it is a well known fact that a very large percentage of people, including many fairly good speakers, use a very narrow pitch range. This obviously handicaps them in expressiveness. Even the mediocre singer uses constantly a range of more than an octave, and from that point up to a range of considerably over two octaves is fairly

common. Any speaker can easily acquire command of more than an octave, and when a range of an octave and a half is at the speaker's command, and wisely used, the effects are much greater. Almost any of the standard exercises for singers will serve, but I strongly recommend informal exercises, such as imitating the fire whistle, the noonday whistle, church bells, and the like, as by this method most students can reach notes that they thought were entirely out of their range.

Regarding more vocal color and a wider variety of colors, there is so much to be said. First: It has been said always that the human voice was the most beautiful musical instrument; that the violin was the most beautiful man-made instrument, and that its greatest beauty lay in the fact that it most closely resembled the human voice. Does that seem to you to be true today? How many voices do you hear that are more beautiful than a violin in the hands, not of an artist of the first rank, but of a competent player?

Second: Please consider carefully with me the orchestra, the most beautiful combination of tonal colors in the world. Now is it apparent to you that great voices are great because they combine in one instrument some of the finest tonal qualities of the orchestra?

From these points it would seem to follow that a speech teacher's vocal job is to help a student to find out where he belongs in the orchestral scheme of things, that is, whether his voice seems to be essentially a wood-wind, a string, or a brass type of tone. Having found where the student belongs, the teacher should work to make the voice as flexible as possible, and to acquire as many other vocal colors as possible. If the speech teacher will make a careful study of the records of the greatest singers, and also of the instruments of the orchestra, it will soon become apparent how close are some of the relations I have mentioned. One of the most important jobs for the speech teacher is to find out by repeated experiment whether the tone a student is using is his normal pitch level, and if not, help him find it, for only when this is successfully determined can the matter of widening the pitch range, and working for more expressive tonal qualities, be satisfactorily accomplished.

Chamberlain closes by reminding us that, "We have spoken of a study of the text" and find that a word from the heart is the "last word in sincerity and directness." He concludes that those who have great physical ease while singing are able to "use a wide range, and their voices are wonderfully colorful. In short, they epitomize the best attributes of speech and song, and our well known speech phrases, 'totality of voice and action' finds its full meaning..."

These words are as powerful today as when spoken almost sixty years ago. As President of PKD, I concur with Chamberlain's ideas about the beauty and power of the human voice. Let us all strive to use our voices wisely and import this power to our students. As we move into the twenty-first century, the human voice is still the most beautiful instrument—for music, for learning, and for achieving goals. Let us strive in PKD to always use our voices, our minds, and our actions to attain what is truly beautiful, and just.

1994 SCA PANELS ANNOUNCED

Bill Hill
1994 SCA Program Planner

Pi Kappa Delta will sponsor/co-sponsor ten panels at the 1994 SCA conention in New Orleans. Six panels will be sponsored by Pi Kappa Delta, 3 panels will be sponsored jointly by Pi Kappa Delta and the Cross Examination Debate Association, and 1 panel will be jointly sponsored by Pi Kappa Delta and the National Forensics Association. The panels cover a diverse range of significant issues in forensics and promise to make a meaningful contribution to forensic scholarship. Please support our SCA panels and the hard work of the individuals involved in them.

THE ROLE OF SUPPORTING MATERIAL IN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Chair: Joel Hefling, *South Dakota State University*

"Why Are All Those Dates in That Speech?": A Critique of Source Citations in Forensics Speeches." Jay G. VerLinden, *Humboldt State University*

"Types and Use of Support Material in Persuasive Speaking." David Warne, *St. Cloud State University*, Douglas Binsfeld, *South Dakota State University*

"Changing Types of Sources for Extemporaneous Speaking." Audra Colvert, *James Madison University*

"ADS: Do You Really Need Proof?" Todd Holm, *Prince Georges Community College*

Respondent: Jaime Meyer, *University of Mary*

GUILD OF AMERICAN FORENSIC EDUCATORS: OPEN MEETING AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES IN AMERICAN FORENSICS

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Chair: Michael Bartanen, *Pacific Lutheran University*

Annual business meeting of the Guild and discussion of current issues in forensics. This is an open meeting for both members and persons interested in improving forensics education.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SMALL SCHOOL/LOW BUDGET FORENSICS PROGRAM: HOW TO TEACH, COMPETE, AND SURVIVE

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Co-Sponsor: National Forensics Association

Chair: Vonne Meussling, *Indiana State University*

Panel: Tom Hall, *York College*

Mabry M. O'Donnell, *Marietta College*

Barbara Smith, *Wingate College*

Jan Younger, *Heidelberg College*

Margaret Greynolds, *Georgetown College*

Respondent: Leanne O. Wolff, *Heidelberg College*

Five forensics coaches from small colleges will draw upon their experiences to explain how they have managed to keep their programs alive in the face of dwindling staffs and resources. They will discuss the importance of viewing forensics as an integral component of the liberal arts tradition of learning.

INTERPERSONAL ISSUES IN INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Chair: Susan Millsap, *Otterbein College*

"The Effect of Gender on Interpersonal Relationships Among Debate Partners." Gary Deaton, *Transylvania University*

"Interpersonal Dimension of Logical Critical Cultures." Stephen Koch, *Capital University*

"A Descriptive Study of Interpersonal Relationships Among Coaches." Scott Millsap, *Otterbein College*, Susan P. Millsap, *Otterbein College*

Respondent: Glen Clatterbuck, *Illinois College*

TO INTERVENE OR NOT TO INTERVENE: THAT IS THE QUESTION

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Co-Sponsor: Cross examination Debate Association

Chair: Roxann Knutson, *Appalachian State University*