

THE

# Forensic

PEITHO KALE DIKAIA



JOHN A. SHIELDS, Student Founder

JANUARY 1958

Series 43

Number 2



1958



# The FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA

Editorial Office      California State Polytechnic College  
Pomona, California

EMMETT T. LONG.....*Editor*  
FRANKLIN SHIRLEY.....*Associate Editor*  
MALCOLM SILLARS.....*Associate Editor*  
D. J. NABORS.....*Business Manager*

Published four times a year in October, January, March and May at 1026 North Western Avenue, Hollywood 29, California. Editorial office at California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, California. Entered as second class matter, October, 1957, at the post office at Los Angeles, California, under act of August 24, 1912.

## DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

**National President**—Larry E. Norton, Bradley, University, Peoria, Illinois

**National Vice-President**—Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus Mississippi.

**National Secretary-Treasurer**—D. J. Nabors, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma.

**National Council Members**—Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana; Georgia Bowman, William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri; Charles T. Battin, College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington.

**Immediate Past President**—Theodore F. Nelson, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota

**Editor of THE FORENSIC**—Emmett T. Long, California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, California.

**Associate Editors of THE FORENSIC**—Franklin Shirley, Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Malcolm Sillars, Los Angeles State College, Los Angeles.

## THE PROVINCES AND GOVERNORS

- Province of the Plains**  
Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado. Ray L. DeBoer, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley Colorado.
- Province of Missouri**  
Missouri, Iowa—Central, Simpson, Coe, Drake, William Penn. R. J. Imbs, Rockhurst, Kansas City, Missouri.
- Province of Illinois**  
Illinois, Wisconsin—Ripon, Carroll, Whitewater State. Paul Crawford, Northern Illinois State, DeKalb, Illinois.
- Province of the Pacific**  
Arizona, California. Eugene R. Moulton, University of Redlands, Redlands, California.
- Province of the Sioux**  
Iowa—Morningside, Westmar, North Dakota, South Dakota. Carl L. Wilson, South Dakota State College, Brookings.
- Province of the Lower Mississippi**  
Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas. E. L. Pross, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas.
- Province of the Lakes**  
Maine, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia. Emil Pfister, Central Michigan, Mt. Pleasant.
- Province of the Upper Mississippi**  
Iowa—Luther, Upper Iowa, Dubuque—Minnesota, Wisconsin—Eau Claire State, River Falls State. Grace Walsh, Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.
- Province of the Southeast**  
Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee. Albert Keiser, Lenoir Rhyne, Hickory, North Carolina.
- Province of the Northwest**  
Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington. Theodore Karl, Pacific Lutheran, Parkland, Washington.

# *Pre-Ministerial Students Need Forensic Training*

by DR. HAROLD A. BRACK

*Assistant Professor of Homiletics and Speech*

*Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey*

*Illinois Xi, Pi Kappa Delta*

The preacher probably has to fulfill more demand speech obligations than any other public speaker. Everyone knows that he may be called on by his congregation to conduct Sunday worship services; to conduct the special communion, baptism, marriage and funeral services; to teach classes; to address groups in the church; and to speak at many public functions. To ably fulfill these speech services the preacher needs to use a wide variety of speech skills on demand.

It is the demand nature of the speech services required of a minister that most frequently is the cause of the failure for ministerial students who are serving churches. Even ministerial students who have better than average ability in a variety of speech skills frequently break down in the face of the pressure of a demand schedule of speaking obligations which they must meet. If a ministerial student has a week in which he must teach a class, prepare a sermon, conduct a funeral, present a devotional program over a local radio station and preside at an official board meeting, he is likely to appear for some of these events poorly prepared, frightened, and with a hoarse voice.

However, ministerial students who have participated in forensic activities in their college days, usually fare quite well during a busy week in their church. This is true because their participation in forensic activities has given them training for, and experience in fulfilling demand schedules

of speech activities. In this respect the forensic tournament, conference or festival more nearly approximates the real life speech experience of the minister than does the speech class. These extra-curricular events in which students are representing their schools have demands such as time schedule, amount of speaking, and excellence in performance that are very similar to the working environment of a professional speaker.

Theological schools have no significant counter-part to the extra-curricular forensics programs of colleges and universities where ministerial students can receive this vital training and experience in speaking with scheduled frequency, under critical scrutiny, and with the feeling that one has an important responsibility to fulfill. If the pre-seminary student does not receive this experience and training during his undergraduate career, he will enter the ministry inadequately prepared to deal with the frequent speaking requirements which he must fulfill. Not only will he fail in these particular obligations but the rest of his ministry will suffer because of a haunting sense of inadequacy in speaking skill which is basic to the effective performance of the role of a minister.

Therefore, I strongly urge all directors of collegiate forensic programs to pay particular attention to the recruiting of pre-ministerial students for participation in your forensic activities. You will be doing these students and the church an invaluable service.



# Citizenship - Campus Model

by ELDA PEART

Illinois State Normal University

*The following oration won a rating of Superior at the 1957 Brookings National Tournament. It is of particular merit as a message to college students.*

Last year, during a foreign policy debate in the House of Commons, a labor member challenged Prime Minister Eden on a policy recommendation. He charged the effective head of the British government with inconsistency and supported his charge with a quotation from a speech made by Mr. Eden while debating as a university student. There are two things about this exchange to which I would like to call your attention: First, the fact that a member of Parliament saw nothing incongruous in bringing into this debate statements made in a college speech two decades before. Second, the fact that the Head of Government undertook seriously to answer the charges and to solemnly justify the slight change in his point of view.

A few weeks ago, the Russian authorities in Eastern Germany urged the puppet government of that state to be on the alert against demonstrations by university students. The Russians warned the authorities that students must be watched very closely lest they bring to Germany a repetition of what had already happened in Poland and Hungary. Once again I call attention to two things: First, the Communists were afraid that a bid for liberty by Germans in the Eastern Zone would begin among the college students. Second, the German collaborators viewed this fear very seriously and took immediate steps to police the universities.

These two events, one in democratic England and another in communistic Germany are quite characteristic of Europe, much of Asia, and Latin America. College students, in most of the countries of the world, enter into the political calculations of government. What college students think and feel is of the utmost importance to leaders all around the world. I should like to consider with you today, the dis-

turbing fact that college students in the United States of America are not dignified by such attention. I can put it even more strongly — in our great stronghold of freedom and democracy, leaders don't worry for one minute about what college and university students think. Indeed, they could scarcely care less . . . and why should they care? Rarely, if ever, do the people on our campuses show any particular interest in the vital questions of the day. Yet, these are the people on whom we must depend for leadership in solving our problems both international and domestic. At times, indeed, it almost seems as if our college students are practicing indifference to public issues and cultivating a kind of separation from matters of current concern.

In our community, during the recent political campaign, the congressional district announced proudly that seventy-five per cent of the electors voted. Not much above ten per cent of the college students on our campus even bothered to participate in a straw ballot poll. Only a handful of these same students, from the agricultural center of America, could be persuaded even to listen to a discussion of the Soil Bank Proposal. During the fateful days of the Middle Eastern crisis, with everything in their future involved, students could scarcely be brought to consider the issue, although their lives literally depended upon it. I'm sure that similar conditions prevail on your campus.

Recently representatives of our Student Council attended a regional meeting of student leaders. They went with high hopes of finding suggestions for solving the problem of student indifference on our campus. They didn't get much help. Everyone else came with the same problem and nobody came with the answer.

What accounts for this remarkable lack



of enthusiasm on the part of American college people? There are undoubtedly several explanations. The first one we may identify as a tradition of "coddling". From the very beginning of our nation, the elders have insisted on the right of youth to an unimpeded education. Parents have insisted that their children should not have as hard a time as they had. We have taken pride as a nation in the fact that grade school, high school, and college provides a kind of greased slide to formal training. By an inevitable extension of this doctrine of coddling, the protection of the youth has carried well beyond insurance against financial and physical hardships. Naturally enough, it has included an effort to keep us from the agonies of worry over affairs of state and the other pains of mature and responsible citizenship. Contributing also to our intellectual delinquency are the progressive educators. With the best intentions in the world, these people leave us ill-equipped to face things realistically and well equipped to conceal our deficiencies behind a cloak of indifference. Something in the way of political virility seems still to be lacking in the 1957 model of the "whole child."

A third contributing factor has been the paternalistic attitude of college administrations. Spoon feeding is the rule on American college campuses; a kind of "father knows best" approach. It is not my purpose here to dip too deeply into the motives which actuate teachers and administrators in our colleges. Partly, of course, they are carrying out the general philosophy which demands protection and closely supervised guidance for young people. Undoubtedly, too, this is the path of least resistance. After all, spoon feeding not only makes it easy for the fed, but greatly simplifies the task of feeding. There is some merit in letting sleeping college students' lie. With disturbing accuracy, many a college dean is heard to say, "Our students give us no trouble." Too often, I am afraid, this is the grim and ugly truth.

But how much of the responsibility must the college student himself bear? He has been provided with a set of social and personal attitudes over a long period of indoctrination; and having conformed

to this pattern of docility, he has been guaranteed a nice quiet atmosphere in which he can pursue his uneventful existence far from the disrupting influence of social, economic, and political reality. Does this mean, then, that the victim of all this kindness and solicitude can no longer help himself? I think not. There is still plenty of life in the American undergraduate. It may be true that he doesn't run ahead of the mass in political rallies and social demonstrations and economic protests. He might not gather in large numbers to dispute the vital issues of the day, but he is not dead. Show him a sorority house or a women's residence hall and sound the cry of "panty raid," and he appears by the hundreds and shows enthusiasm unsurpassed by any Latin American campus revolutionary. He gathers in large crowds to hang the football coach in effigy and braves the authorities most commendably to see the job through. He will march himself flatfooted any weekend in snake dances before the game, and stand half frozen in chill stadium winds to cheer the team. I say it is simply a matter of directing this energy to problems of real significance. If it seemed important enough to the American college student to get out and present a united front on what action we should take on the Suez crisis, what should be done about highway construction, or how to solve the issue of racial inequality, he would do it.

But not only does the energy to act remain unimpaired within us; realization of the importance of world and national problems is not completely gone on every campus. There remain a few students who worry about serious matters, and who dare to speak out on the issues. The necessity is simply this: America's future leaders will have to force themselves to become practicing citizens while still on the campus. Life doesn't anymore begin at twenty-one than it does at forty. We must make our present felt on the national scene. We must practice effective participation and enter the struggle for leadership in ideas. We must not wait for the pattern which has trapped us to dissolve and set us free. We must work at the job of securing recognition. We must act as though we recognize our own importance in public



affairs. Some day, it must be true in the United States of America, that government will not even think of acting without consulting the opinions of its college people.

The time must come when a Senator in the United States can be seriously challenged on opinions he expressed in college. Some day, full scale, responsible citizenship must be a commonplace of American college life.

## Discussion at Brookings -

## A Questionnaire

by THOMAS H. OLBRIGHT  
Dubuque University

Last spring at the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament in Brookings, South Dakota, the author discussed with Harvey Cromwell, chairman of the study committee on discussion, the possibility of obtaining information relating to prior preparation, prior experience, and attitude toward discussion, from the people who participated in discussion at Brookings. Since there has been so much scrutiny of tournament discussion the author was particularly interested to determine whether or not any of those factors correlated with the final ratings received. The conversation resulted in a questionnaire being sent to the ninety-five participants at Brookings who received a final rating.

Of the ninety-five questionnaires, eighty-eight (92.6 percent) were returned, but because of the lack of a specific request for the participants to sign their names, the persons who filled out nine of the questionnaires could not be identified. Seventy-nine (83.2 percent) of the questionnaires remained that could be utilized in the rating correlation. Of the other 16.8 percent (9 unknown, 7 not returned), 8 received an *excellent*, 5 *good*, and 3 received no rating. The percentage of the *excellents* was rather high (38 percent), but this should not have affected the reliability of the study too greatly.

### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following information was requested of each of the participants:

1. Have you participated in a discussion tournament this year in which the

same question was used as was used at Brookings? How many tournaments?\_\_\_\_\_

2. Have you participated in a discussion tournament this year in which a different topic was used?\_\_\_\_\_ Debate topic?\_\_\_\_\_ Others\_\_\_\_\_.

3. Have you participated in discussion tournaments prior to this year? High School\_\_\_\_\_. College\_\_\_\_\_. (Please record number of years.)

4. Have you taken discussion courses in College?\_\_\_\_\_ How many?\_\_\_\_\_

5. Have you participated in non-tournament discussion groups? Frequently\_\_\_\_\_. Occasionally\_\_\_\_\_. Rarely\_\_\_\_\_. Almost never\_\_\_\_\_.

6. Have you debated in high school or college? Number of years\_\_\_\_\_.

7. Did you debate this year?\_\_\_\_\_.

8. Would you rather participate in discussion than debate\_\_\_\_\_or are they about equal in your preference\_\_\_\_\_.

9. Do you feel that there is more prestige in taking part in debate than in discussion?\_\_\_\_\_

10. How many hours would you estimate that you have worked on the Middle East problem this year?\_\_\_\_\_

11. How many hours has your coach worked with you?\_\_\_\_\_

12. Do you feel that debate requires more preparation than discussion?\_\_\_\_\_

13. Approximately what is your college grade point average?\_\_\_\_\_



## THE RESULTS

Since the method of computing the final ratings at Brookings was unique, information regarding the method is pertinent. The final ratings were calculated by weighing the judges' evaluation 50 percent, the participants' evaluation of each other 25 percent, and the evaluation of a group report 25 percent. These ratings were based on five rounds of discussion. Three ratings were given at the tournament. The top 10 percent received *superior*, the next 20 percent *excellent*, the next 30 percent *good*, and the lower 40 percent received no rating.

The results reported for each question were as follows:

1. Fifty-three (60.2 percent) of the 88 participants had been in a discussion tournament on the Middle East question prior to the Brookings tournament. The percentages of those in each ratings group were: *superior* 60 percent, *excellent* 58 percent, *good* 62 percent, and no rating 58 percent. These percentages indicate that correlation between prior tournament participation and the final rating received was lacking. The range of prior tournaments attended was from one to five. The range was fairly equally distributed for all ratings, and one and two tournaments attended were reported most frequently.

2. Only 19 (21.6 percent) of the students had participated in tournaments in which other questions were used. Thirteen had engaged in a tournament based on the debate topic, and six on various other questions. The participants who had employed other questions were almost equally distributed in terms of percentage among the ratings.

3. Few of the students (16) had participated in tournament discussion in high school. They were distributed: *superior* 0, *excellent* 3, *good* 6, no rating 5, and rating unknown 2. Forty-two (47.7 percent) out of the 88 participants had had college tournament discussion experience prior to the 1956-57 season. The percentage of those with prior experience according to final rating were: *superior* 50 percent, *excellent* 57.1 percent, *good* 41.4 percent and no rating, 46.2 percent. Although the

trend was not decisive those with higher ratings did have somewhat more prior experience.

4. Forty-seven (53.4 percent) of the participants had taken discussion courses. Most of those 47 had been in only one course. The percentage who took courses according to the rating received were: *superior* 60 percent, *excellent* 46.2 percent, *good* 61 percent, and no rating 41 percent. A trend is noted in the direction of a lower percentage for a lower rating, but the *good* rating disrupted this trend.

5. A definite correlation was indicated between rating and participation in non-tournament discussion. Fifty-eight (60 percent) reported that they participated in non-tournament discussions either frequently or occasionally. In terms of the ratings received these were: *superior* 80 percent, *excellent* 69 percent, *good* 67 percent, and no rating 54 percent. What the causal relationship is, is not clear. One might conclude that the more frequent participation enabled the participant to receive a higher rating, or it might be that since these people were good at discussion they were asked to participate more frequently.

6. Eighty-eight percent of the discussion participants had participated in debate at one time or another. Of those who had not, two received *superior*, one each received *excellent* and *good*, and seven failed to receive a rating. The value of debate training was shown more clearly when the percentages of those with more than two years debate experience were compared. The percents were: *superior* 60 percent, *excellent* 61 percent, *good* 40 percent, and no rating 23 percent.

7. Since the 1956-57 debate topic was so closely related to the discussion topic it was thought that people who debated that season might have an advantage. Seventy-nine percent of the discussion participants participated in debate in 1956-57. The percentage for each rating was: *superior* 80 percent, *excellent* 77 percent, *good* 93 percent, and no rating 65 percent. Interestingly enough, the correlation here was not as great as for debate experience in general.



8. Sixty-six percent of those who participated in discussion either preferred it to debate or gave it equal preference. According to rating received the percentages were: *superior* yes 40 percent, equal 30 percent; *excellent* yes 33 percent, equal 42 percent; *good* yes 31 percent, equal 31 percent; and not rating yes 32 percent, equal 36 percent. There was a slight disposition toward those with the higher rating being more favorable toward discussion.

9. Seventy percent of the participants agreed with the general feeling that debate has more prestige than discussion. Strangely enough, the opinions of the participants on this matter, considered from the standpoint of discussion, had an inverse correlation to the ratings received. The percentages were: *superior* 100 percent, *excellent* 75 percent, *good* 70 percent, and no rating 64 percent.

10. The hours of preparation reported ranged from 2-250. Only seven persons, however, reported preparation of more than 100 hours. The relationship of the preparation of the various rating groups is most clearly seen by comparing the percentage of those who reported preparing more than 10 hours. The percentages were: *superior* 80 percent, *excellent* 85 percent, *good* 61 percent, and no rating 48 percent. These percentages show that those who prepared more had a definite advantage in receiving a higher rating.

11. The hours in which the coach worked with the participant ranged from 0-50. Twenty-three (26 percent) of the participants reported that their coaches did not work with them at all. The percentage of those whose coaches worked with them five hours or more were: *superior* 40 percent, *excellent* 38 percent, *good* 40 percent, and no rating 46 percent. These percentages indicate that the hours of work with the coach affected the final ratings very little.

12. Thirty-five percent of the participants felt that discussion requires as much or more preparation than debate. The percentages according to rating were: *superior* 30 percent, *excellent* 31 percent, *good* 30 percent, and no rating 50 percent.

13. Since not all the students reporting indicated the point system upon which their grade point average was based, only 60 of the questionnaires were usable. The

mean of the grade point averages were as follows: *superior* 3 pt. system — 2.3, 4 pt. — 3.3; *excellent* 3 pt. — 2.0, 4 pt. — 3.1; *good* 3 pt. — 2.05, 4 pt. 3.06, and no rating 3 pt. 2.2, 4 pt. 3.02. While a clear relationship between grade point average and final rating was not established, there was a tendency for the participants with a higher rating to have a higher grade point average.

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study show that at the Brookings tournament there was definite correlation between the final rating received and participation in non-tournament discussion, participation in debate, and hours spent in preparation. The results suggest that although exceptions were existent, higher ratings were given to those participants who had prepared adequately and who were more experienced in discussion.

Correlation to a lesser extent was present between the final ratings and tournament discussion in prior seasons, enrollment in discussion courses, attitude toward discussion, participation in debate in 1956-1957, and grade point average. These results show further that training is of value in achieving greater excellence in discussion. Also suggested is that intelligence has an effect on the ratings.

The items that showed zero or inverse correlation were: the number of tournaments entered in 1956-57, participation in tournaments at which other questions were employed, the attitude about the prestige of discussion as compared with debate, the hours in which the coach worked with the participant, and the attitude toward the amount of time needed to prepare for discussion as compared with debate.

The results of this study reflect only what was true of the discussion participants at the Pi Kappa Delta National tournament at Brookings, South Dakota. If such data is felt to be of value, it would be of benefit to tournament discussion if similar studies of other discussion tournaments were undertaken, and the results compared to the results of this study. It would be of special value to compare the results of this study with a study of a tournament in which the judges' evaluations only were employed for determining the final ratings.



# Shift of Opinion Study

Donald E. Sikkink

The purpose of this report is to present the results of a shift of opinion study of the November 1956 International Debate between South Dakota State College and Oxford University. The topic for debate was Resolved: That N.A.T.O. has Outlived its Usefulness, with the British taking the affirmative.

The decision to study the debate was made for two principle reasons; (1) since most of the controversial discussion of the annual International Debate has been limited to debaters and their coaches, it seem desirable to frequently measure audience reaction to such a debate and (2) the author was interested in checking the results on this topic against a previous study completed at a different school and using a different resolution for debate.<sup>1</sup>

The method of the study was simple. Each audience member received a ballot at the door and was asked to complete the first part. After the debate the audience completed the ballot and it was collected at the door.<sup>2</sup>

Table I provides a summary of audience attitude on the debate proposition before and after the debate.

**TABLE I**  
AUDIENCE ATTITUDE  
BEFORE AND AFTER THE DEBATE

	For Affirmative		For Negative		Undecided	
	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Men	29	39	58	83	69	34
Women	8	11	15	48	51	14
Total	37	50	73	131	120	48
Percent	16	22	32	56	52	22

Table II presents the data on the number and direction of individual attitude shifts.

**TABLE II**  
NUMBER AND DIRECTION  
OF INDIVIDUAL ATTITUDE SHIFTS

	Shifts to Affirmative	Shifts to Negative	No Shift
Men	36	55	65
Women	14	41	16
TOTAL	50 (22%)	96 (42%)	81 (36%)

Table III provides a tabulation of the

answers to three questions that were placed on the ballot concerning which team did the better debating, demonstrated better reasoning and evidence, and used the better speech delivery.

**TABLE III**

	Better Debating		Better Reasoning and Evidence		Better Delivery	
	Aff.	Neg.	Aff.	Neg.	Aff.	Neg.
Men	91	54	60	82	87	56
Women	39	36	16	53	27	36
TOTAL	121	90	76	135	114	92
Percent	57	43	36	64	55	45

On the basis of attitude shift the decision in this debate would go to the American team while on the basis of answers to the question of "better debating" the decision would be given to the British. The reasons for this apparent contradiction in audience behavior can only be guessed at, but certain possibilities suggest themselves for discussion. The definition of "better debating" employed by the audience in forming their judgments may have had no relationship to their judgment on the effect of the content of attitudes. Thus the audience could move in the direction of the negative argument, but judge the affirmative as having done the "better debating" in terms of some specific factor such as speech delivery techniques (e.g. poise, delivery, humor, etc.). Such an explanation seems to be supported by answers to questions two and three where the British are voted as having the better delivery, but the weaker use of reasoning and evidence.

The results on attitude shift and in response to question two and three are consistent with results of the first study.

The results on question one are not consistent with the first study.

\*Donald E. Sikkink, A.B., M.A., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, Director of Forensics, South Dakota State College.

<sup>1</sup> Sikkink, Donald E. "A shift of Opinion Study of the Stanford-University of London Debate, *The Gavel*, Vol. 38, No. 1, Nov. 1955, pp. 18-19.

<sup>2</sup> The Woodward Shift of Opinion Ballot was used for measuring attitude shift. In addition a yes-no response was required for three questions; 1) which team did the better debating, 2) which team used the best reasoning and evidence, and 3) which team had the better delivery.



# *Procrustes and the Parrot*

JOYCELYN GILBERTSON  
*Wisconsin State College*  
*Eau Claire, Wisconsin*

*The following oration won a rating of Superior at the 1957 Brookings National Tournament.*

In Greek mythology there is a story of a bandit named Procrustes, who fitted each of his victims to an iron bed. If they were too short, he stretched them on a rack, and, if they were too long, he amputated their legs at the right point. He insisted, you see, that no one could be any taller or shorter than he. Procrustes was, in a sense, an early proponent of standardization.

We would be amazed to find in us, centuries later, a similar uniformity. Just as Procrustes insisted on conformity to his particular height, so modern society has insisted on conformity to a particular level — the average.

Perhaps you have noticed in your lives, as I have in mine, the readiness with which we Americans accept the common and the ordinary, and the scepticism with which we regard the different and the superior. The individualist we often ridicule; but the parrot we applaud.

Take the case of Johnny as an example. Young Johnny showed a great deal of musical talent, but his parents wouldn't let him play the piano as much as he liked. They wanted him to be a "normal" boy. Today Johnny works in a factory. He earns a normal wage; he lives a normal life. But the music he might have produced has been lost. It could have been lost no more completely had his arms been cut off. Is Johnny simply a unique example? Or are the factors that molded him into an anonymous normality at play in other lives? Could we, too, in our rush to conform to the average, lose the one great talent distinguishing each of us from others? Consider with me, these facts:

Today many kindergarten hobby horses have been placed out of bounds, now that school consultants have determined they don't develop the "group spirit." Today's

teacher, according to David Riesman of the University of Chicago, often stresses the need for "adjustment to the group," never questioning whether adjustment to a particular group is of any value. No wonder so many of our six-year-olds already have a phrase, "He thinks he's big," to indicate their intense dislike of anyone unusual.

In many parts of our nation, educators have concentrated so heavily on providing equal opportunity for all students that they have sometimes neglected to provide special opportunity for the superior. Exam papers we often grade on the normal level of accomplishment. And even the words with which the average student is not familiar we sometimes edit out of the books he is given to read. In Memphis and in Philadelphia citizens went so far as to term special classes for exceptional students "undemocratic."

This discouraging of superiority becomes a part of the adolescent's attitude as well. An above average student, then, is a "square", an "egghead", a "curvepusher."

Dangerous as this philosophy may sound, another aspect of it is far more serious. For modern society not only pressures children to become a part of the crowd, but encourages adjustment in adults as well.

Job seekers may find, for example, that some corporations make it a policy not to hire honor graduates, for fear they will not be "good mixers."

Advertisers urge that we buy "the cigarette most people smoke", "the most popular car in its field". They realize the tremendous attractiveness we find in anything other people like, and, for that reason, they base much of their propaganda on our desire to have what others have, to do what others do.

Our exaltation of the average is evident



also, in modern politics. All too often, political office seekers have only to boast, with Huey Long, that they are "simple", "ordinary", "uneducated men", and we accept them. They have convinced us they are average. It is as though, in an age crying for exceptional leaders, we have made the prime requisite for leadership the lack of ability to lead.

Finally, even the field of morals is infected with a pathetic reliance on group standards, evidenced in the phrase, "Why not? Everybody does it!" You may have used the college textbook, *Psychology and Life*, which defines morality in widely accepted terms. A moral action, it says, is one "society approves". Thus, the morality of an action is not to be determined by an individual's basic beliefs, but by how many people are doing it.

Unfortunately for us, all of these incidents are true. They exist in our lives as well as others'. They typify the American demand for normality, for social acceptance, our glorification of the Common Man to the extent that he can be none other than common.

What has this training done to us? To the Common Man, it has given little chance to be superior. To the superior man, it has left little choice than to become common.

We have forgotten that progress is impossible in a static, completely adjusted society. It has always been the work of the dissatisfied, the result of an infinite mass of conflicting minds and conflicting interests. Today's atmosphere, if carried into future years, may take away from us even our desire to disagree, to think independently, to formulate new ideas.

Am I perhaps ascribing more to the problem than really exists? Granted, we now offer scholarships to exceptional students; we run contests; we engage in competitive sports. Indeed, we Americans, living in a highly competitive nation, have much of the needed machinery with which to encourage excellence. Yet, the fact that we still ridicule intellectual superiority and often attach a social stigma to high accomplishments, the fact that we think it healthier for a child to be "average" —

these facts more than counterbalance our present attempts.

Our solution, then, must deal primarily with an inner attitude on our part. This is obviously not a problem that can be erased by the passing of a law or the action of a single organization. This is a problem deep within the emotions and ambitions of many people. If, then, the source of the problem is deep within man, its solution, too, must begin with him.

First, it must be our firm conviction that man's real value lies within himself. That, in the words of St. Paul, "It is indeed a very small matter to be judged by you or by man's tribunal." We must see the error in believing that what the average fellow does is what is normal, and, therefore, what we should do. We must realize that we have been wrong in supposing that man has no higher purpose in life than to get along with his fellows. And this privilege of private thinking and personal evaluation we must extend to others as readily as we claim it for ourselves.

Second, the attitudes of many of our educators must be re-aligned. Where possible, teachers should strive to give greater individual instruction to their pupils, stimulating in each the desire to work to his full capacity. The idea of "adjustment to the group" should be altered. A student should be advised that when a clash occurs between his rational beliefs and the opinions of others, he must try to see both sides of the question, but he should never blindly change his beliefs for the mere sake of social amiability.

Finally, we must apply these beliefs and attitudes to our own lives; by dressing and speaking and voting and thinking as we like, watching that in every aspect of life, unimportant though it may seem, the decisions we make are our own.

I do not ask for a nation of nonconformists. I realize that in a complex society men must learn to live with each other, and, for that reason, adjustment is often essential. But I do plead for a nation of thinkers — men who realize their abilities and strive to fulfill them, men who make their own decisions and think their own thoughts.