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The President's Page

I expect you too were disturbed after having read recent publications regarding the misuse of evidence in certain intercollegiate debates. Perhaps comments and judgments should be withheld regarding ethical violations in the use of evidence until after further studies determine the full magnitude of the problem and reveal the pressures and practices that may encourage debaters to manufacture and misrepresent evidence.

If further studies indicate that the forensic community is confronted with a problem of considerable magnitude, then a solution for that problem must be found if debate is to survive as an intercollegiate activity. The forensic community cannot tolerate practices that are unethical in nature.

We are about to convene for the Twenty-fourth Biennial National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta. As we participate in the social, business, and forensic activities of this meeting, let us live up to our motto, “The Art of Persuasion, Beautiful and Just.” If we do, then we will not be plagued with ethical violations. I hope that upon adjournment each convention delegate will be able to say, “I lived the motto of Pi Kappa Delta.”

Recent reports seem to indicate that the 1965 National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta will prove to be one that will long be remembered by the delegates. We are expecting a good attendance. The meeting will be saturated with new and traditional social, business, and forensic activities. Our hosts are working hard in completing arrangements for our comfort and enjoyment.

Please remember convention features of special concern to delegates as follows:

1. **All Delegates**—Religious Program; Business Meetings; Convention Picture; Talent Night; Indian Salmon Bake and Indian Dancing at Tillicum Village; and Convention Banquet.

2. **Student Delegates**—Forensic Activities; Student Meetings; Province Meetings; Special Distinction Student Members — National Council Luncheon; and Pictures of Winners.

3. **Province Governors** — Province Governors Luncheon; Province Meetings; and Province Governors—National Council Luncheon.

4. **New Chapter Delegates**—Charter Presentation.

5. **Faculty Delegates** — Judging Assignments; and Convention and Contest Committee Assignments.

I sincerely hope that an atmosphere of goodwill, good fellowship, and friendly competition will continue to prevail at the National Conventions of Pi Kappa Delta. If you are among those present for the convention, then I trust it will prove to be a pleasant and profitable experience that you can place among your fondest memories.
Certain characteristics distinguish the three major national collegiate forensic honorary fraternities from each other. These characteristics perhaps represent differences which result from the distinctive purposes and goals of Pi Kappa Delta, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, and Phi Rho Pi. The historical context of these differences is described by Annabel Hagood in the Tau Kappa Alpha text, *Argumentation and Debate*.

A recent survey conducted for the American Forensic Association provides some useful information about the similarities and differences in our forensic honoraries. The information reported here comes from a questionnaire distributed during 1963-64 to all colleges, universities, and junior colleges with departments of speech. The directors of forensics or heads of speech departments at 1200 schools were questioned about their programs; 50% responded, but the percentage was better of schools with a national forensic honorary fraternity chapter.

The 377 responses from honorary-affiliated schools represents 63% of the total replies. PKD has 220 chapters, and 209 replies from PKD schools were received (an amazing 95% return); DSR-TKA has 190 chapters, and 135 or 71% replied; PRP has 67 chapters, and 33 or 50% replied. The 377 responses represent 80% of the 477 honorary chapters.

Table 1 shows the type of schools that hold membership in the separate honoraries. PRP obviously maintains membership only with junior colleges. DSR-TKA is stronger in the universities while PKD is stronger among colleges. Both PKD and DSR-TKA are equally represented in publicly supported institutions (50% each) and privately supported schools (50% each). PRP has its strength in public institutions: 90% of its chapters are in public schools, 10% in private.

Table 2 indicates the size of the schools of chapter members. Eighty-two percent of the PKD schools have enrollments below 5000 students; 56% of DSR-TKA schools have enrollments over 5000; 79% of PRP schools have enrollments below 5000, and 100% below 7000 students. Tables 1 and 2 together suggest that PKD has its greatest strength in smaller colleges, DSR-TKA in larger universities, and PRP in small junior colleges.

Table 3 presents the number of years the responding schools have participated in forensics. PRP chapters are the newest; 98% have been engaged in forensic activity ten years or less. DSR-TKA schools have the oldest forensic participation tradition, 71% having been active twenty-five years or longer. Of the two senior college honoraries, PKD seems to be growing more rapidly with 23% of its chapters having begun forensic programs within the last ten

---

1. Hereafter in this paper these organizations will be referred to as PKD, DSR-TKA, and PRP simply to conserve space.


3. A more complete description of this study and its results have been published in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, Volume II, Number 1 (January, 1965).
years as compared to 9% for DSR-TKA.

Table 4 reveals the increase or decrease in the number of students participating in the program over five years earlier (1963-64 compared with 1958-59). Two-thirds of PKD chapters have expanded their membership over five years ago, while in only 2% of the chapters has membership declined. PKD and PRP both share a slightly higher degree of expansion than either DSR-TKA or the national average (which includes non-affiliated schools).

Table 5 notes the actual number of student participants in forensics during 1963-64 for each organization. PKD corresponds most closely to the national average. DSR-TKA schools involve the greatest number of participants; 50% of DSR-TKA chapters have twenty or more students active in forensics. PRP schools maintain the smallest squads: 75% have ten or less participants, while none have over twenty-five participants.

These conclusions appear to be warranted concerning differences between the three forensic honorary fraternities:

1. Pi Kappa Delta appeals largely to smaller colleges. PKD has a relatively large number of new and expanding chapter members, and the number of student participants corresponds very closely with the national average.

2. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha appeals to large universities. DSR-TKA chapters are relatively older, have expanding programs, and have relatively large numbers of student participants.

3. Phi Rho Pi serves only junior colleges. Its chapters have relatively new and expanding programs with relatively small numbers of student participants.

These distinguishing characteristics probably reflect differences in membership policy between the three organizations. As Hagood indicates, all three forensic honoraries have shared a common purpose—the recognition of excellence in public speaking. The differences indicated are overshadowed by that shared common objective.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>PKD Percent</th>
<th>DSR-TKA Percent</th>
<th>PRP Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>PKD Percent</th>
<th>DSR-TKA Percent</th>
<th>PRP Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-4999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-6999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000-8999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000-10999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 11000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>PDK</th>
<th>DSR-TKA</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>National Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all affiliated and non-affiliated schools.

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>PDK</th>
<th>DSR-TKA</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>National Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp'nd'd</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd Same</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1963-64 compared with 1958-59.

### TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>PDK</th>
<th>DSR-TKA</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*During 1963-64.
Cross-Examination Debate
by GERRY NEELY

Debate, ideally, involves persons showing willingness to subject their arguments to logical analysis by the opposition; it can be assumed that the rational approach is desired by the majority of debaters.

Keeping this in mind, perhaps we can draw a comparison between the traditional mode of debate and that of cross-examination debate, the thesis of this article being that the latter is more beneficial in terms of the judge, audience and debater. What to look for and how to obtain it through questioning will also be discussed.

Reasoning can be thought of as the relationship of the evidence presented to the conclusion drawn, either implied or stated. It would seem to follow that the arguments of a debate should be measured by questions which would test the adequacy of that relationship. This is difficult in the traditional form of debate, and abundant use of the fallacy of “Appeal to Authority” (“You aren’t questioning the President of the U.S., are you?”) and the so-called “stacking of cards” is apparent. Reams of contrary evidence can be obtained regarding any point of contention, but ideally the debate should revolve around the meaning of the evidence presented. This has its practical application, for this abundance of evidence is not usually at hand during the ordinary conversation or discussion and the individual is left with little recourse but to question the meaning of that evidence presented. The difficulty in traditional debate in this area stems, not from the fact that the evidence-conclusion relationship cannot be questioned, but from the time-lag between question and answer; the questioning process available in traditional debate is too limited. Negative questions cannot be advanced until the constructive, and the affirmative can easily refrain until the last rebuttal with an insufficient answer, in terms of what the negative desires; the objection that “we have tried to consider the more important affirmative” (or negative) questions, allows both to skirt the issue and avoid an optimum confrontations within the allotted time. By the very nature of the traditional debate, the number of questions is severely limited, both in scope and number. Thus we find that cross-examination debate is merely a logical extension of the desire to eliminate the time-lag between questions in the constructive speeches of traditional debate, place them in their own timed area, and provide a more adequate means of questioning the evidence-conclusion process of the debate.

Since the rational approach is desired, cross-examination is also important because it leads to a more rational discussion due to its ability to weed out much emotionalism, or to make it secondary in the consideration of the decision; it requires consistent application of reason to the thoughts we hold. Through cross-examination we find a systematic probing of the hypothesis formulated earlier in the debate, giving shallow thoughts an early death; productive inquiry is fostered to a greater extent through cross-examination because errors are exposed due to the rigorous tests of consistency and logical adequacy put forth; the traditional pattern, especially towards the end of the year, assumes the position of rutted unproductive analysis-patterns.

Cross-examination gives more credit to those more fully prepared—the glib already have their due reward—for it credits instantaneous perception, evolved during the debate, and not at the coaches’ knee. The use of the answers later in the debate encourages extemore speaking. The foreknowledge that one is going to be subjected to questioning undoubtedly stimulates more thorough study and preparation, for one must learn to adapt to ideas rapidly, must be ready for all eventualities and

Cross-examination is a welcome
breather from the all-evidence debate, and lends a certain amount of informality to the debate. Audience contact is made to a greater extent because of the cross-examination period itself, and because of the greater clash resulting from that period; the same can be said for its effect in keeping the judges awake, which can be especially important towards the end of a long day.

One of the few shameful aspects of debate in general today is the falsification or purposeful distortion of evidence during the debate; no style of debate is impervious to it. However, cross-examination curtails this trait to a much greater extent than does traditional debate; the ability to directly question an individual about a questionable source or sources is invaluable in moving debate to a higher plane, or in exposing those who would lead it to the gutter.

A few points might be made before moving on to the technique of cross-examination. Traditional debate has its advantages, all of which are present in cross-examination debate; cross-examination debate has further advantages which, in this author’s estimation, easily outweigh any disadvantages which might be apparent. What is important, however, is that cross-examination is increasingly being used in tournaments across the nation on the intercollegiate level. It is of course used in the high schools today, and numerous tournaments have used it during one-man or Lincoln-Douglas debating; in the early part of the century it was used on the collegiate level, but fell by the wayside. Within recent times it has been revived, principally because of the efforts of Mr. L. A. Lawrence, debate coach of Montana State College, who reintroduced it to the Northwest in 1957.

In short, it can be summarily said that cross-examination is merely the art of making concise, clear statements that answer questions, while simultaneously defending fundamental positions; the ability to maximize the use of the results in subsequent speeches is of course essential.

One of the more educational advan-
tages of the cross-examination debate is that to truly master the technique of cross-examination the debater must ultimately master the subtleties of logical argumentation, as well as be familiar with the structure of the supposedly “perfect” debate case. The art of cross-examination merely involves knowing what must be pointed out, and how to point it out. The process requires the destruction of the opponent’s arguments, and the construction of your own, the two being inter-related.

The destruction of the opponent’s arguments merely involve the exposing of some forms of error on his part, either through logical inadequacy or contradictory positions.

It is important to point out first of all that every argument either makes a generalization or proceeds from a generalization. With this in mind, we can note that the inadequacy of an argument can be shown in the following manner through the process of cross-examination:

1. The debater can show that the facts are “not true” or “irrelevant”.

Consideration of the “truth” of the facts entails an analysis of: a) the reliability of the sources; b) the consistency of the evidence; c) the weight of the evidence; d) the accuracy of the evidence as presented. Questions relating to the qualifications of the authorities presented, and whether or not these authorities continually express this point of view, are important. “Are you aware that Dr. ‘X’ later in that same article stated _________?” is one effective way of showing inconsistency of evidence from an internal standpoint. Regarding external consistency, it can be pointed out that two or more pieces of evidence are actually contradictory, by saying: “Are you aware that your statement X contradicts your statement Y?” Weight of evidence might pertain to the relative merits of the authorities considered, although too much emphasis on this is fallacious. The accuracy of the evidence as presented might deal with the source or figures contained therein which might be thought to be either
contrived or inadvertently misquoted. A simple question may be used such as: “What is the source for your statement concerning X?” or “Are you aware that the figures presented are inaccurate or not true?”

Consideration of the “relevancy” of the facts entails an analysis of whether or not the generalization is warranted. An unwarranted generalization may be pointed out by noting: a) the relative size of the observed parts of the class in relation to the whole—too small a number of parts will discredit the generalization; b) the members of the class may be shown to be atypical; c) it may be shown that there are exceptions to the general rule of the statement. Such questions as: “Were you aware of the contrary example of _______? Can you account for this?” or: “Do you have any further examples?”, will usually take care of this situation.

2. If the facts are judged to be logically adequate, the validity of the reasoning process is challenged.

Many errors in reasoning are due to a lack of causal relationship, either stated or implied, for the relationship must be said to exist or must exist if the inference is to be valid. For a causal relationship to be logically adequate: a) the connection between the cause and the alleged effect must be complete; b) the extent to which the alleged effect is the result of the known cause must be known; c) the cause must be adequate to produce the effect in question. The error of the false causal relationship can be shown by pointing out: “Were you aware that X is actually caused by A?” “Were you aware that X would exist even if Y were not in existence?” “Do you feel that Y is sufficient to produce the effect in question?” These are of course the bare outlines of questions that could be phrased in terms of the debate resolution that is being used at the time.

3. If the facts are logically adequate, and the validity of the reasoning process is sound, it may be shown that the arguments are not sufficient to establish the point at hand.

Of course, this point can be made in addition to the inadequacy of the first two points; it merely means that other programs might either be solving the problem at hand, or that the present programs are insufficient to solve the problems posed.

Realizing some of the outlines of questioning that are necessary to destroy any negative or affirmative contentions, we might turn to some of the more common approaches regarding logical fallacies or inadequate presentations.

The Reliability of Sources

Considerable doubt can be cast upon a source merely by asking who the individual is; most debaters won’t know fully the background of their sources. The obvious question will be “do you consider X a reliable source?” The obvious answer is “yes”, but doubt can still be cast upon the person answering the question, unless he elaborates on the relative merit of that particular authority vs. the opposition’s authorities.

The Consistency of the Evidence

Further use of pointing out inconsistencies would be the question: “Are you aware of studies X and Y which contradict the results of your study?” “In other words you didn’t take them into consideration in your constructive case?” Of course, one merely answers that, no, he didn’t consciously take them into consideration, but that even in light of these, the adequacy of his case still stands because of reasons X, Y, and Z.

The Weight of the Evidence

Questions such as: “Do you have any further documentation for such and such a point? If so, you can present it in your next stand on the floor.” Never allow them to use the precious time of cross-examination for the admittance of evidence. If asked for further evidence, say that you would be glad to read it at that time; if you have no further evidence remark that the point still has not been refuted — one piece of evidence should be sufficient to establish a point that has not been refuted. If matched by number of pieces of evidence, one
should remark that the meaning of the evidence should be considered.

Statistics and Statistical Correlation
It must be considered whether or not statistics cover a sufficient period of time. "Did you consider the year X in your evaluation? Are you aware that such and such is true during such and such a year before your figures were compiled? How do you account for this?" This is the way one can eliminate the statistical arguments of the opposition. Such questions as: "How old is the source on your quote concerning?" are effective in outdating the opposition's sources. It can be easily answered by stating the date and saying: "Of course the situation since then has not altered my data." It must be considered whether or not the statistics cover a sufficient period of time, whether they are correct, and whether they are meaningless or not. Such questions as: "What does X have to do with Y" can be asked. A statistical correlation is but a description of certain observable occurrences as they are, and the correlation does not necessarily show how the items got that way. There may be a high correlation between low wages and unemployment, but this does not prove that one caused the other.

Begging the Question Fallacy
Ask your opponent what the premise of his argument is, or state the premise and ask if he agrees with it. He must either ignore the question, or in attempting to prove the premise, expose his own fallacy. The entire case can actually fit in this area, for if evils are shown to exist, this does not warrant the adoption of the program; that which must be proven—workability of plan—is assumed.

Opinions should be: 1) qualified; 2) a fair indication of the person's real opinion, and not out of context; 3) consistent with other authorities, or 4) have a definite reason behind them (opinions are based upon reason and are subject to the exacting tests of reason that apply elsewhere). Some of the appropriate questions might be phrased in testing the opinions of authorities used as follows: "What does Dr. X do?" "Are you aware that X has said such and such?" "Why did Dr. X say such and such? Are you aware that he felt that this was true because of such and such?" "Did you take this into consideration?"

Unsupported Assertions
"Do you have any documentation for that assertion" is very effective, but make him present it later if he does. If no documentation, ask if he has any logical reason for believing as he does. It is surprising how many will be speechless with this last.

Attacking the Plan
"Did you include such and such in your plan? Why didn't you show a need for it?" You can actually find out much of the plan in advance, if the situation is approached properly. If asked about your plan, reply that your colleague is to present it in his stand on the floor, unless the gentlemen would wish you to present it at that time.

The Loaded Question
When asked a loaded question or a series of two or more questions state: "That sir is a loaded question" or "In answer to your loaded questions I can only say X, with qualifications of course." Or: "Which question did you wish me to answer first: A or B."

Reversal of the Burden of Proof or Rejoinder
Ask: "Are you trying to say that such and such is the situation?" This will usually make them, by answering the question, assume the burden of proof. A good answer is: "you brought up the point; I'm waiting for your proof of your assertion before replying."

These are merely a few of the areas that can be covered. Care should be taken to lay the groundwork for the debate by eliciting from the opposition the points of agreement and contention. After this, the test of the inadequacy of the opposition follows.

The following are a few points to consider in debating cross-examination style:

Points to Consider:
1. Don't quibble over terms.
2. Don’t ask the question “why” if possible. It is better to use the Socratic method of eliciting a “yes” or a “no” from your opponent.

3. Set up your colleague’s speech by asking material pertinent to what he will probably deal with.

4. Determine beforehand the position on all issues that you and your colleague will take. This will save contradictions in cross-examination.

5. Avoid complex questions and extended statements.

6. If put on the spot, say that your colleague will take care of it. Even his equivocation in a rebuttal or constructive is better than your equivocation during cross-examination.

7. Don’t lose your temper.

8. Ask for clarification of vague questions or terms.

9. Speak clearly and direct your answers to all concerned, not just your opponent.

10. Look your opponent in the eye while questioning him.

11. Put the man you are questioning on the defensive. Pursue him politely when you notice a weak point in his answers.

12. Don’t ask questions that are irrelevant.

13. Don’t ask questions that are mere repetition of what was said in his constructive speech unless they form a premise of a syllogism that you wish to form — otherwise you waste your time.

14. Assume good posture while questioning.

15. Stay within the realm of the debate topic. Don’t ask personal questions.

16. Never ask the opponent to read a quotation supporting your case. This is a bit outside the bounds of building your own case.

17. Ask him if he considers his position in relation to enumerated statements to be contradictory — this can be the most telling point in a debate.

18. Don’t browbeat your opponent!

The Creed of a Director of Forensics

WILLIAM H. BOS

I believe in the educational value of co-curricular activities. I believe in athletics as a means of training the bodies and minds of students, and as an aid in the development of inter-personal relations. I believe in musical activities as means of developing cultural appreciation as well as personal skill and artistry. I believe in journalism as a vehicle to develop an individual’s awareness and perceptiveness, as well as his capacity for personal verbal communication.

I believe in the superior educational value of forensics, the most rewarding of all co-curricular activities. I believe in debate as a superior means of training students in the search for truth, the capacity for valid reasoning, the art of effective oral communication and the cultivation of favorable personal relations. I believe in oratory as an equally fine means of attaining these same ends, developing individual style in expression, skill in audience analysis and adaptation, and effectiveness in the use of techniques of persuasion. I believe in extemporaneous speaking as a stimulus to knowledge of world affairs, facility in the organization and support of ideas, and skill in effective oral presentation. I believe in group discussion as a superior training in critical thinking, systematic problem-solving, and cooperation.

I believe in the consummate power of the effectively spoken word to influence the thoughts, attitudes and judgments of men and nations, to determine the decisions of today, and to shape the course of the world of tomorrow.

I believe that mine is the most responsible, most challenging, and most rewarding task in the whole realm of education.
In reading Mr. Leon Camp’s article on “Extemp Speaking” in the October, 1964 issue of The Forensic, it was a pleasure to see Mr. Camp’s references to my “Draw Three” article in The Forensic of May, 1950. But, as Mr. Camp is doubtless aware, no brief digest of an article can possibly satisfy the original author, so he will probably not be surprised if I protest mildly that his summary, at three or four points, does not seem to me to quite state my case.

I shall not attempt here to present another digest of my indictment of the “draw three topics” procedure as tending to make the extemp contest, to some degree, “unrealistic, uninteresting, and unfair.” I do want to modify and amplify Mr. Camp’s comment on my recommended reform of the contest, and to report on my experiences with that reform.

My suggested remedy was not merely that contestants should speak on a “statement rather than a question,” but that they should speak in response to “the kind of statement which would bring forth speechmaking in real life—a brief editorial or a speech, or a selection from an editorial or a speech, or a resolution, which will not only give the speaker something to talk about, but which will give meaning and purpose and motivation to that talking.” And, equally important, my suggestion was that all contestants should speak in response to the same statement.

In 1950, I think my plan for the reform of the extemporaneous speaking contest seemed to me pretty infallible and unattackable—much as early-season affirmative plans are likely to seem to the eager debaters who concoct them. Now, fifteen long years after, my confidence in the reform has been some-what shaken by experience. I have tried it.

Let me report briefly on that trial. For several years, in our West Virginia Intercollegiate Extemporaneous Speaking Contest, we used, not a list of one-sentence topics or questions, but one hundred- to two hundred-word statements on the contest subject. One year John Foster Dulles gave us a statement on the conduct of United States foreign policy. One year we had a statement from James Michener on the role of the United States in the Far East. (The winners in these contests got autographed copies of books by Dulles and Michener.) Senator Douglas of Illinois provided a capsule discussion of “Ethics in Public Life.” We had a State Department expert’s comment on the European Common Market. Robert Kennedy, in 1960, sent us a statement on racketeers in the labor movement—but, unfortunately, the press of primary campaigning so delayed his response to our request that, long before it arrived, we had given up and scheduled a contest on “Featherbedding.” That, I think, was our last experiment with the full statement system.

How did it work? Frankly, not very well. While the contest did seem to me to be more fair and more realistic, I do not think that the contestants particularly shared my views. To some extent, I blamed this on the fact that this once-a-year trial, interrupted every year or so by a return to the topic-list system, did not permit us to get fully adjusted to the variation in procedure. Another factor that I became aware of, with some surprise, was that many contestants like the element of chance in the “draw three” method—due, apparently, to a streak of optimism in man’s nature that encourages him to expect that the luck is going to be on his side. The fear that the draw is going to present the contestant with a choice among three
less manageable topics seems to be outweighed by the hope that the breaks will be in his favor. And—the prospect of speaking on the same subject as other contestants, thus subjecting the speeches to direct comparison, is apparently unattractive to some extemp speakers.

A much more important factor, however, was the deficiency in the statements used. In attempting to exploit the interest value of public figures like Dulles and Kennedy, we solicited our statements from men who had neither the time nor the knowledge of the contest to provide the kind of statements we needed. Clearly, not just any "statement" will do. Particularly, our experience with the full statement method taught us that a string of generalities, or an expository review of a subject, leaves the contestant up in the air, groping for a clear target for his speech.

Nevertheless, although these fifteen years have made me aware of certain awkward difficulties in the use of the "full statement" system, they have at the same time reinforced my doubts about the "draw three" method. I have seen lists of topics so narrow and technical that even well-prepared speakers had to bluff their way through their speeches. I have seen lists of topics so general that they made almost no demands on the speaker's subject-matter preparation, or left the way wide open to the use of canned speeches or to "speeches" that were simply abstracts of magazine articles. And I have never seen a list of topics—including those which I have prepared myself—that did not make the "luck of the draw" an important factor in determining which contestant was able to come up with the best speech.

Take these examples from what seem to me to have been comparatively good topic lists, on which a great deal of intelligent effort must have been expended. (These were used in one of our Pi Kappa Delta contests a few years ago.) Compare topic number 7 ("The current brain-power race with the Soviet Union makes financial support of education our first line of defense") with topic number 14 ("The Communist threat and the need for federal aid to education"). Everything in the contestant's file that would be useful on number 7 would be equally usable on number 14, and on the latter he could use a great deal of material that would not be relevant to number 7. The speaker drawing number 14 could choose to talk about the "current brain-power race with the Soviet Union," and/or about other aspects—internal and external, military defense or democratic values—of the "Communist threat" and our response to it.

On the other hand, either of these topics would give the contestant a running start toward an interesting speech as compared to other topics on the list: "Can local and state governments continue to carry 96% of the total cost of education?" "What has been the history of federal aid for the construction of school buildings?" "Real estate taxes should be the chief source for the costs of education."

Or, in the topic lists on curricula changes used in the same contest, look at these topics which asked the speaker to discuss whether our high school curricula should require algebra (topic number 2), or foreign language (topic number 8), or four years of English (topic number 11), and compare them with topic number 14: "If you had the chance to make one change in the curriculum of the high school from which you were graduated, what would it be and why?" With topic number 14, the contestant has the choice of speaking, in effect, on numbers 2, 8, or 11, or any of several other such topics, depending on his interests and his material. Why not, I am compelled to wonder, require all speakers to speak on number 14, thus giving to all fairly equal opportunities for good speaking, and making it infinitely easier for the judges to evaluate the comparative merits of the competing speeches? Or, if we feared that a topic like this leaves too much room for a prepared-in-advance speech, then I would suggest that one solution would be to expand this brief question into a statement which would to some degree
"structure" the contestant's response, and thus require that the speech really be put together in the one-hour preparation period.

Let me quickly retreat from this suggestion to my original point: this "full statement" method introduces difficulties of its own, as my experiences with it have painfully illustrated. I am not sure that I thought, even fifteen years ago, that it was a sure-fire cure for all the deficiencies of the extemporaneous speaking contest. I did think that we needed more experimentation with possible reforms in the contest. I still think so.

New Members of Pi Kappa Delta

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COL.
37734 Betty Ann Brice
37735 Marc Merchasin

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
37736 Danny Cupit
37737 Paul Daniel
37738 Sandra Douglas
37739 Stephen Holstein

FRESNO STATE COLLEGE
37740 Katie Burmester
37741 Larry Cole
37742 Patricia J. Harvey
37743 Elizabeth Moore
37744 Patricia Diane Prewitt
37745 Arthur Sidney Tindill
37746 Andrew Tobar

YOUNGSTOWN UNIVERSITY
37747 Ruth E. Anderson
37748 Barbara S. Drabkin
37749 David Howland
37750 John Koning
37751 Frederick C. Lanz
37752 Ronald N. Towne

GENEVA COLLEGE
37753 Wilson L. Cummings
37754 Robert B. Hendrickson, Jr.
37755 Forrest L. Horn
37756 John R. Mandeville
37757 Thomas W. Mason
37758 James H. Mitchell

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
37759 Janet Louise Bauer
37760 Pamela Gray
37761 Jacqueline Kay Hubert
37762 Sarah Ann Lantto
37763 Karyn M. Lohnke
37764 Barron Craig Redmond
37765 Linda Saari
37766 Dennis Dean Shepherd
37767 James Harold Telfer

THE COLLEGE OF IDAHO
37768 Don Bennett
37769 Joniann Storer

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
37770 Fred K. Lamb

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
37771 Walter Beatty III
37772 Emily Chase
37773 Bedford Douglass, Jr.

37774 Lois Drossman
37775 Betty Duffy
37776 Mahlon Gaumer
37777 Patricia Marie Price
37778 Deborah Dine Rice
37779 Wesley Neil Shellen
37780 Charles L. Spencer
37781 Larry Dean Stephan
37782 Charles Stewart
37783 James Victor Stoffa
37784 Robin Vair
37785 Michael A. Yarnell

CARTHAGE COLLEGE
37786 George M. Anderson
37787 Carol Cory
37788 Robert Wm. Evans
37789 Lucinda Pump
37790 Jeanne Ramey
37791 Kay Tostrud

YOUNGSTOWN UNIVERSITY
37792 Martyn I. Gefsky
37793 Albert Ispa
37794 Kenneth Kednall
37795 Ronald Kendall
37796 William C. Moss
37797 Robert W. Patrick
37798 John Popescu, Jr.
37799 S. Victor Rubenstein
37800 Luis F. Suarez

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
37801 Edith Kathryn Forbes

WISCONSIN STATE—EAU CLAIRE
37802 Helen Elizabeth Biza
37803 Muriel Bunderson Harper
37804 Joyce Ann Jepson

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
37805 David Pomeroy
37806 Louise Arlene Strong

APPALACHIAN STATE TEACHERS COL.
37807 Hildard Dan Bowman
37808 James Thomas Brooks, Jr.
37809 Stephen Lee Canipe
37810 Jo Ann Key
37811 Philip Neil McCall
37812 Robert Lacy Price

ROCKY MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
37813 Sandra Dew
37814 Carolee Erickson
37815 John E. Feathers
37816 Jenni E. Gebhardt
Montana Alpha Chapter Reinstated

Montana Alpha chapter of Pi Kappa Delta was installed (or reinstalled?) February 12, 1965, at Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Montana.

The ceremony was performed by a team from Montana State College, headed by Prof. L. A. Lawrence, editor of the Forensic, and consisting of Prof. Clarence Brammer and Dr. Carl Isaacson.

The seven “charter” members are Richard McCann, president, Jenni Gebhardt, vice-president, Virginia Madeen, secretary-treasurer, Sandra Dew, corresponding secretary, John Feathers, Carolee Erickson, and Robert H. Lyon, director of forensics.

Whether this is a new chapter or an old one has even the national officers stumped. The original Montana Alpha was founded at Montana Wesleyan College in 1920. That school became Intermountain Union College in 1923, and in 1935 it moved to Great Falls. In 1936, IUC moved to the campus of Billings Polytechnic Institute in Billings and the chapter remained active at Polytechnic-Intermountain until at least 1941 when it took in its last member.

All of these schools were merged into Rocky Mountain College in 1947, hence the justification for renewal of the old chapter.

Thus, Pi Kappa’s newest chapter began its life again with the distinction of having some 70 alumni members, and made Chapter No. 38 on the national list an active one.
The History of Pi Kappa Delta

Introduction

It was over fifty years ago that two college students, John A. Shields and Edgar A. Vaughn, met for a weekend to make the final draft of a document that had been discussed by mail for several months. After the final touches had been made late one night, the boys flipped a coin to see which would have the privilege of signing it. Thus, the Constitution of Pi Kappa Delta became a reality. One of the young authors ventured a prediction that someday as many as three hundred members might be added to the organization—perhaps even three hundred fifty.

That the young organization was destined to serve a definite need has been proven as almost fifty years later it has granted 260 charters and added more than 32,000 members.

For a number of years the FORENSIC included accounts of the formative years of Pi Kappa Delta. However, little has been done to bring the history up to date for almost twenty-five years. Realizing a need for a more complete history, the Public Relations Committee was authorized to prepare a history for general distribution. This version is based on a study of the historical accounts given in the early FORENSICS, an examination of records, and correspondence with the past presidents and other officials.

It would take an entire volume to record the history of Pi Kappa Delta. A complete history should contain the winners of national contests, results of business meetings, members who have served on the National Council, the record of admission of chapters and achievements of outstanding alumni. In this brief edition, no attempt has been made to include all such details; however, that is a project that the next Public Relations Committee might consider. The information assembled by the committee was submitted to the National Secretary for editing.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FRATERNITY

The concept which resulted in the creation of Pi Kappa Delta was the realization of the need for a means of proving recognition for orators and debaters in the smaller colleges. The idea came to two of the founders of the fraternity, John A. Shields and Egbert R. Nichols, almost simultaneously.

In the autumn of 1911, Shields was a junior at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas, and Nichols, who had been a professor of English for two years (1909-1911) at Ottawa, began his work at Ripon College, Wisconsin, as head of the Department of Composition and Public Speaking. The two were friends and kept in touch with each other by occasional letters.

Nichols related how his debaters on a trip to Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, discovered the debaters were wearing a forensic key. Lawrence College had just been admitted to an organization, which at the time established only one chapter in a state. This suggested to the Ripon debaters the need of establishing a new organization.

In Kansas, Shields had likewise discovered the need for such a society. When the debaters to the Kansas State Prohibition Oratorical Association assembled in Manhattan, Kansas, Shields found another person, Edgar A. Vaughn, who was also interested in a means of giving recognition to orators and debaters.

The Ripon group adopted a constitution and sent it to Shields at Ottawa and it was adopted by the Kansas group with some changes. Suggestions for the design of the key were also made. After some modification, a pear-shaped key with two jewels were accepted, and the first key was ordered by Vaughn in January, 1913.

The name for the organization was supplied by Miss Grace Goodrich, a student in Greek at Ripon College. Pi Kappa Delta was chosen because it was composed of the initial letters of the phrase Peitho Kale Dikaia, "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just."

The Kansas group proposed the idea of including degrees as well as orders in the new society, which showed the Masonic influence—both Shields and Vaughn were Masons. Vaughn had the imagination to see the essential purpose of the organization, which was to bestow an honorary key on orators, debaters, and coaches; he wished to show by jewelery the key the distinction of each individual.

Shields received credit for taking the action that officially launched the organization. He selected the officers from the founders and as secretary, cast the ballot which put them into office. According to Shields' selection, Nichols became the first president, Vaughn, vice-president and chairman of the charter committee; Shields himself acted as secretary-treasurer; and J. H. Krenmyre, Iowa Wesleyan, the historian. A. L. Crookham, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas, and P. C. Sommerville, Illinois Wesleyan, were appointed on the charter committee.

THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS, 1916-22

The first national convention of Pi Kappa Delta was held in the spring of 1916, with Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas, serving as the host chapter. The constitution was put in more complete form, the insignia and the ritual were designed, and the plans for interfraternity relations were developed.

The first contest was held at the second national convention at Ottawa University, 1918, and was a debate between Redlands and Ottawa. Later the contests became the chief feature of the national conventions. It was announced that plans were being made to estab-
lish an arrangement with Delta Sigma Rho for co-operative forensic endeavors.

The third national convention was held at Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, in 1920. An oratorical contest was included in the program. No debate tournament was held but teams arranged debates to be held en route to and from the convention, and during free periods of the convention. To facilitate debate plans, Secretary Marsh suggested that the colleges adopt the same debate question, which was the first step toward the policy of selecting an official question.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY, 1922-26**

The Fourth Biennial Convention was held at Simpson College, Iowa, in 1922. To facilitate scheduling debates, an official question had been adopted by chapter vote for the first time in 1922. The question was: “Resolved that the principles of closed shop are justifiable.” This was a period of rapid growth for Pi Kappa Delta as the society added forty-one chapters during two years.

**Provincial Organizations.** In 1923, the chapters in some of the provinces initiated provincial conventions. These regional meetings were of historical importance since from them developed the debate tournament, thefirst being held at Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas. At the close of the first tournament a prediction was made that it was not beyond reason to expect that within the next biennium other provinces would hold like meets, resulting ultimately in inter-provincial contests.

**Extempore Speaking.** Experiments were made in extemporaneous debate in which the question was not revealed until twenty-four hours before the debate. Also the extemporaneous speaking contest was developed and was added to the program of the 1924 national convention at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois.

International debating brought the British system of debating before the American colleges. This tended to free debating in the United States from its rigid system of memorized speeches and increased the popularity of the audience decision. But the development of the tournament plan with its crowded program of many simultaneous debates and contests after contest on the same question forced the American schools more and more to the single expert judge, usually a debate coach, a method of judging which was gradually adopted for general use.

During Marsh's term of office, a number of Pi Kappa Delta members were interested in formulating a code of ethics. The National Council suggested that such a code covering "every phase of debate" should be undertaken.

During the early years of the 1920's there was a great deal of interest in the problem of judging. As debates multiplied in number it became difficult to provide interested judges. In an effort to improve the judging, H. B. Summers, Kansas State College, compiled and published a directory of judges, listing men in all parts of the country who had served as judges and giving a summary of the estimates of their ability made by the institutions they had judged.

The fifth national convention of Pi Kappa Delta was held at the Bradley Polytechnic Institute in Illinois, April 1-3, 1924. The addition to the program of the extemporaneous speaking contests and the scheduling of separate contests for men and women in both extemporaneous and oratory attracted more delegates. Plans were made at this meeting for the inauguration of a national debate tournament at the next convention.

**THE PERIOD OF NATIONAL TOURNAMENTS, 1926-42**

The sixth national convention was held in 1926 at Fort Collins and Greeley, Colorado. For the first time national debate tournaments for men and women were undertaken and the double elimination plan was used. At this convention the plan was adopted of holding provincial meetings in the years in which the national conventions were not held. The official debate question for 1925-26 was the proposal to control child labor by an amendment to the constitution. "The Crime Situation in America" was the topic selected for the men's extemporaneous contest and the women's topic was "Marriage and Divorce." Pi Kappa Delta planned a certificate for proficiency in debate coaching to be awarded upon graduation to students who had been active in forensics. It was voted to publish the winning speeches of the national conventions; Volume One of Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations appeared in 1926.

**Chapter Activities.** The year 1929 marked the use of the airplane for debate travel. G. R. McCarty, South Dakota State College, and his debaters travelled by air from Oklahoma City to Chickasha to maintain their schedule. The College of St. Thomas debaters flew from St. Paul to Chicago for one of their forensic engagements.

Wichita, Kansas was selected for the location of the eighth national convention which was held March 31 to April 4, 1930. The tournaments had developed gradually with no definite plan; however, in 1930, an organization was planned for their administration, with carefully selected officers and committees in charge of each contest. At previous conventions, a chapter could enter more than one team. At Wichita, for the first time, each chapter was limited to a single team.

**Changes in Contest Procedure.** The addition of contests in debate, oratory, and extemporaneous speaking resulted in a great increase of interest in the Pi Kappa Delta national conventions. Business sessions, side trips, banquets, and other special features were included in the convention programs; however, the contests were the outstanding features of the conventions. During the early years of the national contests, the National Council did
most of the work of planning and conducting the events. In time, special committees were appointed to take charge of the contests with a different committee being responsible for each event. In the first contests in oratory and extemporaneous speaking, the contestants were divided into several divisions for a preliminary round with the best two or three in each division competing in a final round.

In the early tournaments the double elimination plan was used with a team being dropped after its second loss. The number of preliminary rounds in debate was increased to five at the 1932 convention held at Tulsa, Oklahoma, with an elimination bracket set up for those teams that were undefeated at the end of five rounds. This plan was used in the national conventions of 1934 and 1936.

The next major change in contest procedure was made in 1938 at the Topeka, Kansas, convention. In debate, the preliminary rounds were dropped and each team was scheduled to debate eight rounds with the teams given a rating based on the number of debates won. The committee in charge of debate asked tournament directors to recommend outstanding teams that were to be "seeded" teams. These teams were placed on the bracket at regular intervals in an attempt to provide equalized competition for all teams. In the individual events, four preliminary rounds were held and the six best speakers selected for a final round in which they were ranked from first to sixth.

Another new feature of the 1938 convention was the addition of a student congress. State and regional congresses had been held for several years resulting in a demand for such activities at the national level. The Pi Kappa Delta Congress was held in the Kansas Capitol as a two-house legislature. Each chapter was invited to send one delegate to the lower house, and each province elected two senators to comprise the upper house. Interest in the Congress resulted in a new attendance record for Pi Kappa Delta conventions with more than 800 delegates and visitors being registered.

At the Knoxville Convention in 1940, the plan used in debate was a combination of that used at Topeka and the earlier tournaments. Each team was scheduled to debate eight rounds and was given a rating based on the number of debates won. Teams winning seven or eight debates were rated superior; those winning six were rated excellent; and those winning five were rated good. At the end of eight rounds eight teams were selected for a quarter bracket with first and second place winners being selected after three additional rounds of debate.

Because of the popularity of the Student Congress at the Topeka convention, another Congress was held at Knoxville. Several changes in the rules were made as a result of the previous Congress; however, without the atmosphere of the State Capitol, the Congress received less attention than the one held at Topeka.

In 1942, in the convention at Minneapolis, dissatisfaction with the combination plan resulted in a return to the 1938 pattern in which teams debated eight rounds and were rated on the number of wins and losses. The plans for the convention had already been made before the start of the war and an attempt was made to conduct the convention with as little deviation as possible. The Student Congress was retained as one of the features of the convention but was modified to an unicameral house.

THE CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATION, 1947-59

Post-War Conventions. Following a five-year interim of war years, Pi Kappa Delta resumed its national tournaments in 1947. In the individual events four preliminary rounds were held and eighteen speakers selected for the fifth round. In oratory and extemporaneous speaking, the 10 per cent of the speakers ranking highest were given the rating of "superior"; the next highest 20 per cent were rated "excellent"; and the next highest 20 per cent were rated "good." The major change at the 1947 convention was the substitution of Discussion for the Student Congress. An interesting experiment in the Discussion was the use of ratings by opponents. Ratings were given in Discussion on the same basis as in extemporaneous speaking and oratory, with the rating based entirely on scores given by the opponents from round to round.

The 1949 convention was held at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois. Discussion was continued with a combination plan of coach judging and judging by opponents, with final ratings based on the combination scores of the two groups.

In 1951 the Pi Kappa Delta national convention was held at Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma; this proved to be a popular place for a convention site as delegates from 135 chapters assembled for a four-day convention. The plan for the contests had become standardized from the previous conventions. The major change at Stillwater was that of doing away with all judging and ratings in the Discussion event.

The national convention was held at Kalamazoo College, Michigan, in 1953. The decline in college attendance as a result of the Korean War was reflected in the attendance at Kalamazoo. However, the contests were held with little change from the procedure of the previous national. A distinctive feature of the Kalamazoo convention was the acceptance of an invitation that had been extended over a period of twenty-five years to hold the next national convention on the West Coast.

The 19th biennial convention was held at Redlands University in 1955 with 117 chapters sending 554 delegates. At Redlands a return was made to a five day convention in order to allow free periods for sightseeing and other special features. The growth of Pi Kappa Delta in California has been impressive.
with an increase from five to thirteen chapters since the close of World War II.

The 1957 Convention was held at South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota. New features added to the program was a session devoted to professional problems with Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State University, as the speaker. The tradition of making a Distinguished Alumni Award was started at this convention with Senator Karl Mundt being selected to receive the award. Plans were made to inaugurate a Pi Kappa Delta forensic scholarship in honor of one of the founders, John A. Shields.

Plans were made to return to Bowling Green State University for the 1959 Convention. Bowling Green had served as host for the first post-war convention in 1947 and advanced registrations indicated that more records for attendance and participation were in prospect.

Pi Kappa Delta has made a number of contributions to forensics for which it may be proud. It was the first of the forensic societies to hold a national convention. It was the first to sponsor an oratorical contest as a part of its program. It was the first to adopt the policy of selecting a question for all chapters to use. It was the first to add the contest in extemporaneous speaking to its national program. It was first in making an effective provincial system to sponsor activities on the regional level. Out of one of its chapters came the first debate tournament and it was the first to add the debate tournament to its national program.

CONCLUSION

Pi Kappa Delta is proud of its significant contributions to intercollegiate forensics. It helped to fill the period between the decline of the literary society and the development of the speech department as a major phase of higher education. The organization on a national basis was established to coordinate the work of the local clubs, and to give recognition to orators and debaters according to uniform criteria. Experiments were carried on with new types of speech activities, and policies were developed to guide forensics on the local, regional, and national levels.

High ethical standards have been maintained and requirements for membership increased from time to time to make affiliation of greater value. Pi Kappa Delta has provided a service magazine, THE FORENSIC, to members as a means of unifying the work of the local chapters and providing other information on speech and forensics.

At the regional and national level, conventions, tournaments, and congresses have been provided that have brought students together from all parts of the country. Many of these young people, otherwise, would never have had the opportunity to attend a national meeting with the many personal benefits to be gained from participation in forensic activities on such an extensive basis.

Although Pi Kappa Delta was the third fraternity of its kind to be organized, it became the largest in terms of the number of chapters and total membership. This may be attributed to its more liberal policy of granting charters to smaller institutions, and its more vigorous policy of sponsoring regional and national conventions and tournaments. With strict attendance requirements, as many as 145 chapters have sent more than 800 members to participate in some of its national assemblies.

Pi Kappa Delta is the only forensic society that has provided several orders in which membership may be earned and a series of degrees through which the member may progress from year to year. After three years of forensic activity one may qualify for the highest degree and the distinction of wearing a diamond in his key.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION

Pi Kappa Delta has endeavored always to keep its standards of admission, those which would be in harmony with the principles of an honor society. In order to do this, certain procedures have been developed which must be allowed by all applying institutions.

Any group wishing to petition for a charter of Pi Kappa Delta should make application to the National Secretary-Treasurer. One of the basic factors is that of a local forensic organization upon which the chapter may be built. The chapter committee, headed by a member of the National Council and composed of selected members, will be guided by the governor of the particular province in which the school is located and by the opinion of the schools in the province.

An institution considering application should have had forensic contact with all of the schools in its area, demonstrated interest in and a desire to maintain a sound extracurricular speech program. In keeping with this, the school should have a budget sufficient to assure the continuance of the program as well as qualified faculty leadership for the same reason. Since Pi Kappa Delta is an honorary, applying institutions are expected to be fully accredited. The application should have the unqualified endorsement of the administrative officers. For further indication of strength within the school, a well-defined program of academic speech courses is desirable. No institution which has a chapter of one of the other national forensic honoraries will be considered for membership in Pi Kappa Delta until such association has been clearly terminated with the full understanding of the national officers of both organizations.

Each applicant should be familiar with the requirements as specified in Article 9, New Chapters, of the constitution of Pi Kappa Delta. Upon approval of the charter, a sufficiently large group of initiates should be available to give the new chapter the impetus and continuance which it will need.
From the Province of the Pacific

Weldon Moss, Jr., former debater at University of Pacific, reports that he is assistant director of Debate at Cornell University and is pursuing studies toward completion of the M. A. degree. He looks forward to the day he can return to the West and work with forensics in this area.

Steve Shiffrin, debater of note several years ago at Loyola University, is spending the year as Assistant Director of Forensics at Memphis State University. Steve will return in September, 1965, to join the faculty at San Fernando Valley State College.

Paul Newman, a Pi Kappa Deltan from San Fernando Valley State College, has returned to California after three years spent working on his Ph.D. degree at the University of Iowa, Paul is currently in charge of the debate program at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

From the Province of Illinois

Former Greenville Pi Kappa Delta members have found places for themselves in various positions in higher education. Milo Kaufman ('56) and Gary Cronkhite ('57) are at the University of Illinois in the Departments of English and Speech. Robert Joseph ('61) is teaching in the Physics Department at Greenville College. Richard Huseman ('61) is teaching and directing forensics at the University of Georgia. Onva Boshears ('61) is Assistant Librarian at Asbury Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky. Robert Primrose ('57) serves as Librarian and Instructor in Speech at Open Bible College in Des Moines, Iowa.

From the Province of the Northwest—

From Montana, "The Big Sky Country," comes news of Montana State College alums. According to coach L. A. Lawrence, MSC ex-debaters travel faster and farther than they did as debaters!

Letters, phone calls, personal visits, etc., indicate that: Dan Wolfe has completed naval officer training and is now serving with the legal branch of the Navy at San Diego; Jack Dunn is still with the electrical firm of Hewlett-Packard in Loveland, Colo.; John Nickey is a 1st Lt. in the Air Force in North Africa; John Kearns, who has been working on his Ph.D. at Wisconsin, is presently home on vacation; Don Micken is working for an architectural firm in Reno, Nevada; Terry Carlson is teaching in the high school at Kalispell, Montana; Idell Weydemeyer has finished her Fulbright in New Zealand and should be returning soon; Merrill Garrett is completing the Ph.D. at the University of Illinois and has accepted a teaching position at M.I.T. for next year; Jim Guenther is working as a legislative specialist in Salem, Oregon; Arnold Malone is in charge of the Province 4-H debate program in Alberta, Canada; Keith Wilson is a professional Boy Scout executive; Roy Weston is still with the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and Gary Crane is now practicing law in California. This list is incomplete, but it gives an indication of the versatility of MSC debaters!

Timothy A. Browning, B.A. Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington, is studying at the University of Khartoum, Sudan, on a Rotary Foundation Fellowship. Planning a legal career, he is studying international law at the university.

Browning is one of 146 outstanding graduate students from 28 countries who received grants from Rotary International, world-wide service organization, for the 1964-65 academic year.

The Rotary Club of Centralia, Washington sponsored Browning for the fellowship.
THE ART OF PERSUASION
—BEAUTIFUL AND JUST