

Panel: Gina Lane, *William Jewell College*
 Jennifer Morgan, *Southwestern College*
 Richard Leeman, *University of North Carolina, Charlotte*
 Kristine Bartanen, *University of Puget Sound*
 Gary Horn, *Ferris State University*
 Respondent: Glenda J Treadaway, *Appalachian State University*

Panel members will review and critique a taped debate prior to the convention. During this session, they will explain how they resolved arguments about such theoretical issues as parametric topicality and counterstandards. Panel members will focus their discussion on the degree to which they used judge intervention to resolve the issues.

WHERE THE BUFFALO ROAM

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta
 Co-Sponsor: Cross Examination Debate Association
 Chair: Gary Horn, *Ferris State University*

"Who Is In Charge: Can Directors Continue to Lead?" Jeffery Gentry, *Southwestern Oklahoma State University*

"Why Are Programs Leaving CEDA?" Gary Horn, *Ferris State University*

"Tales of Two CEDA's: Preserving Regional Circuit." Larry Underberg, *University of South Dakota*

"Do We Practice What We Preach: Can We Get Back On Track?" Sam Cox, *Central Missouri State University*

"Can CEDA Debate Withstand Public Scrutiny?" Robert Weiss, *DePauw University*

FORENSICS IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY: HOW WILL WE SURVIVE?

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta
 Chair: Don Swanson, *University of Guam*

"The Administrative View of the Educational Perspectives in Forensics Activities for the 21st Century." A.B. Schroeder, *Eastern New Mexico University*

"Forensics Fragmentation and Downsizing: Managing the Small Forensics Program in the 21st Century." Dave Svaldi, *Adams State College*

"Recruitment and Retention of Forensics Educators for the 21st Century." Kristine Bartanen, *University of Puget Sound*

"Recruiting from the Basic Course: Finding Ways to Increase Student Participation in the 21st Century." Susan Balter, *University of Washington*

"Survival of Forensics in the 21st Century: The Inclusion of Nontraditional Students." Kristina Swanson, *University of Wyoming*

Respondent: Don Swanson, *University of Guam*

PERCEPTIONS OF "COMMUNITY" AND THE FORENSICS PROGRAM

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Chair: David C. Gaer, *Hastings College*

"Building Community and the Forensics Program: The Importance of Peer Coaching." R. Caroline Capstick, *North Dakota State University*

"Our Program Promises To...." The Role of Recruiting in Maintaining Forensic Community." Matthew D. Davis, *University of Nebraska, Lincoln*

"Forensics Serving Communities: A Survey of Activities and Issues for Forensics Programs Reaching Out to Other Communities." Joel Iverson, *North Dakota State University*

"Stress Within the Forensics Community: Understanding Competitor Perceptions Metaphorically." Mark A. Meister, *University of Nebraska, Lincoln*

Respondent: Jeffrey D. Brand, *St. Olaf College*

A DEBATE ABOUT DEBATE: "RESOLVED THAT: PARLIAMENTARY, OFFICIATED, AND PUBLIC DEBATE SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED TO RESTORE EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN COLLEGIATE DEBATE"

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Moderator: Michael Bartanen, *Pacific Lutheran University*

Panel: Representing Parliamentary Debate, James A. Johnson, Colorado College, Don Brownlee, *California State University, Northridge*

Representing Officiated Debate, W. Clifton Adams, Central Missouri State University, E. Sam Cox, *Central Missouri State University*

Representing Public Debate, Roxanne Knutson, Appalachian State University, Glenda Treadaway, *Appalachian State University*

There will be three 8-minute constructive speeches, three 6-minute rebuttals, and three 4-minute closing statements. Following the speeches there will be an open forum discussion. Audience participation is encouraged.

GENDER ISSUES IN ACADEMIC DEBATE

Sponsor: Pi Kappa Delta

Co-Sponsor: Cross Examination Debate Association

Chair: Scott Jensen, *McNeese State University*

"Verbal Aggressiveness and Academic Debate: The Role of Gender." Robert Tucker, University of Southern California, Todd Merrell, *University of Southern California*

"Intercollegiate Debate and the Gender Dilemma." Melinda Murphy, *University of Miami, Ohio*

"Motivation and Gender in Intercollegiate Debate." Gregory Simerly, *St. Louis University*

Respondent: Ann Gill, *Colorado State University*

NOMINATIONS NEEDED FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL JAIME MEYER PKD NOMINATING CHAIRMAN

Although letters have already gone out to each Province Governor and to each PKD chapter, we would like to take this opportunity to make you all aware that the Nominating Committee is seeking the names of potential candidates for The National PKD Council.

We need a solid slate of candidates for Shreveport/Bossier City. Potential nominees must be in the Order of Instruction and from an active chapter.

Your nominations could effect the future of Pi Kappa Delta. The nominations committee will consider all names submitted. Please respond as soon as possible in an effort to be fully prepared for next year's national convention.

Send your responses to: Jaime Meyer
Chair PKD Nominating Committee
Dept. of Communication
University of Mary
7500 University Drive
Bismarck, ND 58504

CHAPTERS URGED TO PAY NATIONAL AND PROVINCE DUES; INDUCT NEW MEMBERS EARLY

Chapter sponsors are urged to pay national and province dues and induct new members into the fraternity **prior to arrival** at the National Convention and Tournament scheduled for March 22-25, 1995 in Shreveport/Bossier City, LA. Verification of payment must precede official registration.

PROVINCE OFFICERS SHOULD START PLANNING FOR 1995 NATIONAL CONVENTION AND TOURNAMENT

Province officers are asked to contact all chapters in their provinces to assist with projections about the number of participants to expect at the 1995 National Convention and Tournament in Shreveport/Bossier City, LA. Chapters needing assistance with transportation or other expenses should contact their province officers to see if any group arrangements (charter buses, etc.) are being arranged. The 1995 convention has the potential to be one of the largest in recent years. As such, careful pre-planning is needed to insure that all aspects of the event are designed to create a positive experience for everyone.

Information about the tournament and convention will be forthcoming from the Tournament Director (Ed Inch at Pacific Lutheran University). Questions may be directed to him or to the national office.

LIFETIME INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP FEES INCREASE JULY 1, 1994 UNDERGRADUATE AND ALUMNI CHAPTER DUES TO REMAIN STEADY INTO 1995

By a vote of the National Convention in 1993, the lifetime individual membership fee will increase to \$35.00 beginning July 1st. The Secretary-Treasurer will use discretion when processing memberships that may have been "in process" at the end of the 1993-94 academic year. Chapters are asked

to use **the new application cards** (pink and gray) when applying for individual membership. Undergraduate chapter dues will remain constant at \$50.00 and will be assessed at the beginning of the 1994-95 academic year. Chapter advisers with questions should contact the National Office.

NOMINATIONS SOUGHT FOR PKD AWARDS FOR ACTIVE COACHES

Nominations are sought for the following three awards to be presented at the Speech Communication Association's **1995** convention in San Antonio, TX. Winners of the **1994** awards will be announced in New Orleans, LA, on November 19, 1994.

L.E. Norton Award for Outstanding Scholarship

This award is given to an individual or individuals who made an outstanding scholarly contribution to PKD through a book or article. An article need not be one published in *The Forensic*, but must be one in the field of argumentation or forensics. Nominations may come from any PKD member and will be judged by the Awards Committee (and the *Forensic* Editor as ex-officio member) on the basis of the quality and contribution of the book or article to the further understanding of argumentation or the forensic discipline. Previous winners of this award include: Don Brownlee, 1992; and Bill Hill, Jr., 1993.

John Shields Award for Outstanding Contributions to Pi Kappa Delta

This award is given to an individual or individuals who have made significant service contributions to the fraternity. Nominations may come from any PKD member and will be judged by the Awards Committee (and the National President as ex-officio member) on the basis of both quality and quantity of contributions to the fraternity at either the national, province, or local level. The recipient must be a member of the Order of Instruction. Previous winners of this award include: Kristine Bartanen, 1992; and Harold Widvey, 1993.

E.R. Nichols Award for Outstanding Contributions to Furtherance of the Forensic Discipline

The award is given to an individual or individuals who have made significant contributions to improving intercollegiate forensics in the United States. Nominations may come from any PKD member and will be judged by the Awards Committee on the basis of the nominee's contribution to improving the competitive quality or the intellectual standing of the activity. Such contributions need not be exclusively through the channels of Pi Kappa Delta. Previous winners of this award include: Carolyn Keefe, 1989; Bob Derryberry, 1990; Gary Horn, 1991; Jack Howe, 1992; and Michael Bartanen, 1993.

The deadline for receiving nominations is April 1, 1995. **Nominations and supporting documentation (letters of recommendation, background information about the nominee, examples of scholarship or contributions) for the above awards should be sent to Robert S. Littlefield, Chair, PKD Awards Committee, Box 5075, University Station, Fargo, ND 58105-5075.** Current members of the PKD National Council are ineligible for these awards.

STUDENT SCHOLARSHIPS TO BE AWARDED

At the 1993 convention of PKD, members of the junior and senior classes who were present pledged to create a scholarship fund for the benefit of future student members of Pi Kappa Delta. Because sufficient funds were pledged, the National Council will to award eight scholarships (one per province) to student members of the fraternity. With the continued support of student members for the PKD Endowment Fund and its projects, the National Council plans to make these awards on a biennial basis.

At the Summer Council Meeting in July, the National Council finalized the criteria used to determine the scholarship recipients. General categories include academic performance, forensic experience, and campus involvement. Scholarships are limited to undergraduate members of PKD with at least two semesters of school left prior to graduation.

Students wishing application forms or further information should contact the Student Scholarship/Awards Committee, C/O Robert Littlefield, Box 5075, University Station, Fargo, ND 58105.

RALPH H. JOHNSON AND J. ANTHONY BLAIR. LOGICAL SELF-DEFENSE UNITED STATES EDITION.

reviewed by Robert Trapp, Professor of Rhetoric
Willamette University.

Twenty-odd years ago, a group of philosophers, mainly from Canada, began to worry that their logic courses were not suited to the kinds of problems their students faced in everyday life. Among the leaders of this group were University of Windsor Philosophers J. Anthony Blair and Ralph H. Johnson. This group of renegade philosophers, worried about the relevance of formal, deductive logic, was soon joined by like-minded colleagues from the United States. Together they began a "discipline" they called "informal logic." Informal logic was their attempt to bring logic to bear on more than mathematical symbols. They wanted to teach people to use logic as a tool to

analyze arguments that occur in natural language and in the everyday political and social contexts where people live and work. Toward that end, they introduced classes, started a journal, and wrote textbooks. When Johnson and Blair first published *Logical Self-Defense* in 1977, few other informal logic texts existed. Now the number is in excess of fifty.

Logical Self-Defense is now in its third edition. Some of my students have had some difficulty with *Logical Self-Defense* since almost all of the examples were Canadian. In response to the needs of students and teachers from the United States, Johnson and Blair have now produced a "United States Edition" using examples from the United States, Britain, and Canada. I believe my students will find this new edition more "user friendly."

While *Logical Self-Defense* contains sections on identifying, interpreting, constructing, & evaluating arguments, it is primarily a text about evaluating arguments through a set of informal fallacies. Section I, entitled "The Basic Tools," includes three chapters: "Identifying Arguments," "Interpreting Arguments," and "Fundamentals of Argument Construction and Evaluation." Section II of *Logical Self-Defense* is about fallacies. Unlike some other texts which also take fallacies as their centerpiece, *Logical Self-Defense* starts with three basic categories—acceptability, relevance, and sufficiency—into which all fallacies can be grouped. The chapters in this section include "Three Basic Fallacies," "Fallacies of Diversion," "Fallacies of Impersonation," "Fallacies of Language and Meaning," "Fallacies of Intimidation," and "The Causes of Fallacious Reasoning." Section III, "Argumentation and Mass Media," has chapters entitled "Dealing with News Media," and "Advertising: Games People Play." The Final Section, "Advanced Argumentation," has two chapters: "Constructing Arguments," and "Analyzing Extended Arguments."

Several features of *Logical Self-Defense* deserve mention. First, their definition of argument is narrower and more precise than the definitions used by some rhetoricians. For Johnson and Blair, an argument is "a claim, together with one or more sets of reasons offered by someone to support them" (10). According to this definition, argument is but one of several modes of communication. Some of the things that people do that may not be argumentative include the following: "[p]eople complain, crack jokes, express outrage, pontificate, praise, register observations, make snide comments, make requests, make small talk, ask questions, recommend, ridicule, stand on their dignity, pass the time of day, describe situations, tell stories..." (16). I personally appreciate a definition of argument that distinguishes argumentation from other modes of rhetoric such as narration. Others may find this feature too limiting.

Second, *Logical Self-Defense* is amenable to a focus on audience. While the concept of audience is not fully elaborated in *Logical Self-Defense*, the concept is mentioned and is implicit throughout. Their definition of a logically good argument includes an audience of "reasonable persons." They claim that a "logically good argument, as we shall use this term, is one whose premises supply strong grounds for any reasonable person to accept the conclusion" (50). I have supplemented the text with other readings on argument which have produced meaningful discussions. In addition to readings about Perelman's "universal audience," I have used Blair & Johnson's essay from *Argumentation* entitled "Argumentation as Dialectical" where they develop their audience of "model interlocutors." The ability to discuss fallacies without

losing sight of the audience is a quality that not all informal logic books possess and one that makes it particularly amenable to those instructors who take a more rhetorical focus on argument.

Third, although Johnson & Blair's approach to argumentation is not highly theoretical, it contains a sound underlying theoretical basis. Rather than producing an ad hoc list of fallacies, they begin with a conceptually sound foundation—relevance, sufficiency, and acceptability. These three criteria are the necessary and sufficient conditions of a logically good argument. While *Logical Self-Defense* does not produce a theoretical discussion of how an audience decides if these three criteria are met, such a question produces very good classroom discussions.

Clear and plentiful examples are the final aspect of *Logical Self-Defense* that I will mention. Each of the chapters on fallacies contains fifteen to twenty clear examples at the end of the chapter. These examples are excellent for discussions and can, of course, be supplemented by examples found by the instructor.

Many argumentation texts produced in the field of speech communication take intercollegiate debate as their starting point. My own class entitled "Argumentation and Society" does not use debate as a starting point. So for me, *Logical Self-Defense* supplemented by other readings has proven an excellent text and I am looking forward to students' reactions to the "United States Edition."

ARGUMENTS AND ARGUING: THE PRODUCTS AND PROCESS OF HUMAN DECISION MAKING.

by Thomas A. Hollihan and Kevin T. Baaske
reviewed by Arnie Madsen
University of Northern Iowa

Hollihan and Baaske attempt to fill a gap in the existing stockpile of texts for undergraduate courses in argumentation by writing "the first undergraduate text to embrace the narrative or storytelling approach to the study of argumentation" (v). The authors divide the book into two overall sections. Part I has nine chapters devoted to introducing students to basic principles of argumentation, including chapters on argumentation as a symbolic activity, the narrative approach to argument, audiences and fields of argument, the language of argument, critical thinking, types of reasoning, grounds for supporting arguments, the research process, and the refutation of arguments. Part II extends on the foundational discussion by illustrating the application of argumentation principles in five specialized fields. Two of these chapters examine the nature of argumentation in academic debate, and there is a chapter on each of four other fields: political campaigns, the law, business and organizations, and interpersonal relationships.

Each chapter concludes with a listing of key terms, suggested activities, suggested readings, and notes referencing sources referred to in the chapter. Appendices at the end of the text include the Clinton and Bush acceptance addresses at the 1992 Democratic and Republican National Conventions, the transcript of the final round of the 1993 Cross Examination Debate Association national tournament, and a glossary of key terms.

There are several strengths and weaknesses of this book that deserve mention. The first strength is that the book generally succeeds in its effort to link the narrative perspective to the study of argumentation. The chapter on the nature of narrative approaches to communication illustrates the extensive use of narratives and storytelling in human decision making.

However, while the authors indicate that much of human communication is based in narrative, they are less successful in illustrating the connections between the narrative perspective and several of the other topics discussed in the book. For example, the chapter on types of arguments has an extensive discussion of inductive and deductive reasoning, tests for evaluating those modes of reasoning, the requirements of deductive syllogisms, the process of testing syllogisms through Venn diagrams, and the Toulmin model. However, the connection between this chapter and the narrative perspective is never clearly drawn. How, for example, would a person arguing via the narrative perspective utilize a deductive syllogism in their presentation? Why would one test a story through use of a Venn diagram rather than standards specific to the evaluation of narratives? Even the specific standards for judging between strong and weak narratives remain relatively undeveloped aside from the initial discussion of narrative probability and narrative fidelity.

Second, the book provides a good survey of the field of argumentation. The authors introduce readers to Aristotle, Richard Whately, Chaim Perelman, and several other argument theorists, including those from earlier periods as well as contemporary writers. Similarly, the authors introduce several theorists that are not traditionally linked to the field of argumentation. For example, Kenneth Burke's writings appear prominently in several chapters of the book.

However, while the authors introduce several theories and authors in the book, more often they leave major elements of those theories out of the discussion. For example, while the authors use Burke's perspective on human symbol use as a starting point for their analysis of argumentative principles, many of Burke's most useful theoretical comments remain unmentioned. Thus, when the authors discuss the language used in good stories, and the characters, scene and events of stories, it would seem logical to point to Burke's pentad as a construct illustrating the centrality of such concepts in human symbol use. Yet, no mention of the pentad ever appears in the book. The treatment of Perelman's idea of presence, or Hermagoras's stasis theory, are other representative examples of relatively underdeveloped concepts.

As a result, many concepts introduced in the book would require extensive discussion in the classroom before the concepts became clear to students. For example, the opening three sentences of the first chapter draw the distinction between symbols, signs, and significances. Beyond that brief mention, no real discussion of signs and significances occurs, no examples are provided, and students are likely to become confused by those opening remarks. Extensive discussion in the classroom would need to occur before many of the book's concepts would become clear.

A third strength is that the book makes extensive use of contemporary examples to help illustrate the authors' discussion of argumentative principles. Readers thus encounter discussion of Desert Shield/Desert Storm, the Los Angeles Riots, the AIDS crisis, the Branch Davidian situation in Waco, Texas, and numerous other contemporary examples of real world argumentation. All of these make reading the book enjoyable, as the concepts of the book are related to our contemporary situation.

That strength, however, sometimes makes the book appear to contain disconnected chapters without coherent links to each other. Thus, while the authors provide several useful examples of various forms of reasoning in one chapter, those concepts and examples are not then built on in later chapters. Instead, each chapter is treated as a separate unit of study. The book could be improved by having a common example serve as the basis for the discussion in each chapter. For example, the authors develop the hypothetical case of creating a program to increase childhood immunizations for illustrating their critical thinking chapter. Extending that same example to other chapters could demonstrate the interconnectedness of the concepts in the chapters, drawing the various aspects of the study of argumentation into a more unified overall perspective.

The chapters in Part II would seem ideal for this effort, as the authors could examine each of the specific fields from the perspective of the argumentative lens developed in earlier chapters. However, the authors continue to add new theoretical material to those later chapters instead of synthesizing the material from the earlier chapters. The chapter on the law, for example, spends more time discussing the nature of the legal process, and the unique constraints of that forum, than it does illustrating how the narrative perspective, types of reasoning, the research process, etc. are used in the legal setting.

Fourth, the book draws important conclusions that help to clarify our understanding of some elements of argumentation theory. For example, the authors indicate that discussion of values and policies are intertwined in most real-world applications. Similarly, the authors emphasize the importance of audience analysis to the argumentation process, in particular illustrating that each member of an audience may react differently to an individual's argumentative utterances. The authors provide a useful discussion of the grounds of argument, including often ignored categories of support such as personal and public knowledge, rituals, and so on.

However, the book unfortunately perpetuates some undesirable misconceptions about the field of argumentation. When discussing the stock issue of blame, for example, the authors refer to the traditional and outdated notion that structural or attitudinal inherency is the cause that results in some societal ill. More productive, of course, is the sense that inherency is what will allow a problem to continue to exist in the unaltered present system. The underlying cause of AIDS, for example, is exposure to the HIV virus. The question of inherency would ask not what causes AIDS, rather what allows the AIDS epidemic to remain unchecked in the present system.

Similarly, the authors perpetuate the idea that the various debate paradigms are useful merely for judges evaluating an academic debate. Thus, policy making, stock issues, hypothesis testing, tabula rasa, and the narrative perspective are all treated as judging paradigms. More productive would be to