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A Historical Review of Debate Question Selection

By Forrest H. Rose

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

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

The coming of the tournament, however, with a large number of competing schools, necessitated the adoption of a common question for all the participants. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta for March, 1919, announced preliminary plans for the Third National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta to be held at Morningside College in 1920. Although the convention program did not provide for a debate tournament, many of the colleges were scheduling debates to be held on their way to and from the convention as a means of reducing their expenses, since most host colleges would provide a couple of meals and a night's lodging in the dormitories for the visitors. To facilitate such debates, Charles A. Marsh (UCLA), a Past National President of Pi Kappa Delta and the National Secretary at the time, urged the adoption of a common debate question. This, apparently, was the first step toward establishing the practice of selecting an official Pi Kappa Delta debate question. (The Forensic, May, 1933, p. 152.)

At any rate, although debate did not become a convention activity until the 1926 convention at Estes Park, an official question was adopted in 1920 and each year thereafter until 1942.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(The Forensic, March, 1934, p. 84.)

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

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

Following Finley's report, Nichols moved that the National President appoint a committee to draw up a plan for the selection of the official Pi Kappa Delta debate question. The motion carried, and President H. Dana Hopkins (Heidelberg University, Ohio), appointed Verton M. Queener (Maryville College, Tennessee); H. R. Pierce, (Rollins College, Florida); John Barnes (Park College, Missouri); Wilbur Moore (Colorado Agriculture College); and Bernard Melland (Central College, Missouri) to carry out the intent of the motion.

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

1. That a standing committee of six members, to be known as the Committee on Question, be appointed by the President. At each subsequent biennial convention, two members of the committee shall be retired and in their places two new ones shall be appointed.

2. That the policy of selecting one question only be continued for the present.

3. That the question be made available by September 30.

4. That for a final vote, a maximum of three questions be submitted.

5. That the procedure for selecting the question, then, be as follows:
   a. The Committee, working through the National Secretary, shall ask the chapters to submit lists of subjects by May 1.
   b. The committee will consider these subjects and all other available subjects, select three, frame a question on each, and, through the National Secretary, submit them to the chapters for a final vote.

In keeping with this mandate of the convention, George McGarty (South Dakota State, Brookings), the newly-elected National President, appointed a Committee on Question composed of Forrest H. Rose (Southeast Missouri State), Chairman; J. W. Carmichael (Bowling Green State University); C. F. Nesbitt (Millsaps College); Earl Huffor (Sam Houston State College); C. H. Talley (Nebraska Wesleyan University); and Joseph Baccus (University of Redlands). The committee served for two years.
Regarding the new plan, The Forensic for October, 1934, editorialized:

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

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

After selecting the four topics it thought were the best, the committee formed a suitable statement for each. It then sent them to the National Secretary and he submitted them to the local chapters for final action . . . The debate committee deserves great credit for the energetic and efficient way in which it carried out this difficult task. In spite of the fact that practically all the work had to be done during the summer vacation months when the members were widely scattered over the country, they kept right at the job and had the questions selected and worded by the first of September. This enabled the National Secretary to send them to the chapters early in the month."

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

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

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

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

At its convention in 1931, Phi Rho Pi voted to use the official Pi Kappa Delta question as its official question. (The Forensic, October, 1932, p. 44.)
A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa, wrote the National Secretary of Pi Kappa Delta:  
"Many of the junior colleges of Iowa are awaiting the announcement of the Pi Kappa Delta question. I hope you can let us have it at once." (The Forensic, October, 1931, p. 43.)

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

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

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

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

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

The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho for November, 1937, carried an editorial a report of the Mid-West Debate Coaches' Association conference at Evanston, Illinois. This report proposed that all forensic organizations unite under the chairmanship of someone selected by the National Association of Teachers of Speech (now the Speech Association of America) to select a question for nationwide use. It also suggested that the question be selected in the spring to give the institutions more time to prepare and to make possible the production of better handbooks. (Pi Kappa Delta had tried and discarded the spring announcement of its question and at various times had fulminated editorially in The Forensic against the use of handbooks.) The report also stated that the Pi Kappa Delta question had gained such influence that all institutions found their programs affected by it.

The Forensic for January, 1938, editorialized regarding the report in The Gavel: "Pi Kappa Delta could tell other organizations much from what it has learned in its eighteen years of selecting official debate questions . . . Forensic associations the nation over use the Pi Kappa Delta question, await its announcement eagerly, and commend the type of proposition selected and the service the society does in making it possible for many colleges to unite in discussing one subject.

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

The official question is Pi Kappa Delta's baby. As the society reared the child from infancy to its present maturity, it naturally has some parental pride in its lusty offspring. It has learned a lot in its years of responsibility. There have been heartaches as well as pleasures. Those who have not had the experience of rearing a baby
of their own would do well to try it. They will miss a lot if they try to take a short-cut and adopt a full-grown child, especially when that child has a home of its own."

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

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

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

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

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

During the 1938-40 period, the members of the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta were under considerable pressure, particularly from the President of Tau Kappa Alpha who was also Chairman of the NATS Committee on Inter-Association Relations and an influential member of the Mid-West Debate Coaches' Association. Unfortunately, the correspondence has been lost, but some of it bordered on the emotional. It was difficult to make others understand that although policies and procedures, such as cooperating with the NATS, might be referred to the National Council, the Council was still responsible to the National Convention, a condition that did not then obtain in the other societies, and that the Council would not commit itself even to making a recommendation until satisfactory orderly procedures for debate question selection were worked out. Further, under the mandate of the 1938 convention, Pi Kappa Delta could enter no agreement until 1940 at the earliest.

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

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

"That a cooperative committee be appointed on Intercollegiate and Discussion Activities to have among its duties the selection of propositions and topics for national use; that this committee be composed of a chairman appointed by the President of the NATS and six additional members, of whom two would be appointed by Pi Kappa Delta, two by Delta Sigma Rho, and two by Tau Kappa Alpha; that these fraternities, insofar as permitted (Continued on page 24)
A Proposal To Improve The Quality Of National Debate Propositions

By Austin J. Freeley

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

At the 1968 Business Meeting of the American Forensic Association a motion was introduced calling for the AFA to “assume the responsibility of selecting the national intercollegiate debate proposition.”

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

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

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

Two elements stand out in the history of this incident: 1) the proposition was controversial and 2) the forensic community was united.
As we all know, debate propositions are necessarily controversial. We may safely assume that at some future time—next year or in five years—we will again have a "controversial" debate proposition—one that some group passionately believes should not be debated. If the forensic community is united we can probably ride out any storm of know-nothings and anti-intellectualism that may arise. If the forensic community is divided—if some national organizations are forced to admit "we were not represented in the process," if significant numbers of debate directors can say, "I was not given a chance to vote, and I certainly wouldn't have voted for that proposition" we would be exposing the forensic community and the whole program of educational debate to serious potential damage.

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

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

I would now like to make such a proposal:

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

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

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

Under its present policy the committee meets in March or April concurrently with the convention of the Central States Speech Association to select certain areas and potential propositions for further study on the basis of suggestions received from its nationwide poll of forensic directors. Each member of the committee then undertakes to do research in one or two areas or propositions to determine if they really are suitable as national debate propositions and to search out the most desirable phrasing. The committee then meets again in May or June. The members report their research findings and the committee then makes a decision on what propositions will be placed on the ballot that will be submitted to the nation's directors of forensics for their decision.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

After preliminary research the committee would be in a position to go to a good, if not world famous, economist for example. The committee could explain the problem they were interested in and ask, in effect --

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

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

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

(Continued on page 16)
The President’s Message

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

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

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

**Theodore O. H. Karl**. Committee on Convention Arrangements and Program

**James Grissinger**. Constitution Revisions Committee

**Fred Goodwin**. Charter and Standards Committee

**Les Lawrence**. Coordinator of Governors

**Edna Sorber**. Committee on Convention Tournaments

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

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

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

By the time you read this, if you do, the new semester will have started. My best wishes to you for a successful and profitable year. Don’t forget the province convention.
At the end of the fiscal year, July 31, 1969, Pi Kappa Delta had a total of 258 active chapters, 4 alumni chapters and a membership of 43,291. We added 1,196 new members in the past year.

The financial report shows that 20 chapters sent in $145.00 or more for all purposes; that 22 added twelve or more new active members; and 10 purchased $40.00 or more worth of keys. An (*) indicates memberships carried over from the previous year. An (n) indicates a new chapter. Six new chapters are among our top twenty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois Univ.</td>
<td>$282.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portland State College</td>
<td>234.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>222.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Univ. of Nevada—Las Vegas</td>
<td>204.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clarion State College</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.W. Minnesota State Coll.</td>
<td>195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wisconsin State—Eau Claire</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wis. State—Stevens Point</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>California State—Hayward</td>
<td>167.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>167.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>162.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dickinson State College</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>159.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>David Lipscomb College</td>
<td>153.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Univ. of Southwestern La.</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fresno State College</td>
<td>148.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wisconsin State—Whitewater</td>
<td>148.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Southwest Baptist College</td>
<td>146.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lamar State College</td>
<td>145.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 22 chapters added twelve or more active members during the past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois University (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clarion State College (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wisconsin State—Eau Claire (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S.W. Minn. State College (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baylor University (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dickinson State College (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>California State—Hayward (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Portland State College (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Univ. of Southwestern La. (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wisconsin State—Stevens Point (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Central Michigan Univ. (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Illinois State University (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marietta College (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Detroit (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wisconsin State—Whitewater (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bradley University (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eastern Montana College (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fresno State College (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan Univ. (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lamar State College (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Southern Oregon College (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Univ. of Nevada—Las Vegas (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 10 chapters purchased more than forty dollars worth of keys in 1968-69.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>$102.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portland State College</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Univ. of Nevada—Las Vegas</td>
<td>79.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Montana State Univ.</td>
<td>77.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>David Lipscomb College</td>
<td>73.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastern Illinois Univ.</td>
<td>$72.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>69.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wisconsin State—River Falls</td>
<td>49.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adams State College</td>
<td>45.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran Univ.</td>
<td>40.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen schools have advanced one or more members to Highest Distinction for the first time this year. Eighty-four chapters have a total of 197 Highest Distinction members. Whitman College still ranks first with 12 HD members.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHAPTERS
Grace Walsh, Director of Forensics, Wisconsin State University, Eau Claire

We made our first installation service in 1951 a great social occasion and it has come to be one of the really important events of the year. I think it should be made very special. Appearing in ordinary school clothes at an informal afternoon gathering is not nearly so effective as an evening dinner with candlelight, flowers, and programs which help make it a memorable and beautiful occasion. That is what we have always tried to make our Pi Kappa Delta installations. That is my first recommendation to any new chapter.

My second suggestion is to take advantage of the opportunity to name deserving people for honorary membership. This is extremely important in the public relations of speech in the community. Many times, particularly when the competitive philosophy has been under fire, we have deeply appreciated the interest and support of those honorary members of our organization.

A third suggestion is to have a headquarters of some sort with a Pi Kappa Delta atmosphere. We have the banners of the years with the name tags of those who attended attached. We have pictures of the National Conventions we have attended. We have certificates in a border around the room. We keep a bulletin board with a big, printed Pi Kappa Delta sign above it and on the board, we carry letters from, announcements of, and clippings about various members of the fraternity.

We make our local chapter an important service organization. We book and supply many groups with programs. Women’s clubs and service clubs call us to supply their programs. Now we are planning a program of high school visitation and a televised intercollegiate debate program for next year.

We take seriously our vow to promote forensic activity. That is why we host an interstate debate tournament, an interstate discussion clinic, an Eau Claire Speech Meet, and a spring forensic contest. These on-campus functions annually attract over a thousand visitors to our campus. Then, in the summer, when we hold Wisconsin’s oldest high school institute, we always know where to turn for judges for those many rounds of debate. They are the members of Pi Kappa Delta.

As adviser of the fraternity, I try to promote membership at every opportunity. We keep careful track of every student whose representation of the university entitles him to membership. When his eligibility is established, he receives a written note of encouragement explaining to him the honor of membership in our speech fraternity. We indicate when representatives of the fraternity will be available to help process memberships.

The chance to be one of the students to go to the National Tournament is something to work for. Those who went to Tempe have told about the great time they had there. They spoke of the pool, the climate, and the students they met at the Ramada Inn. The Freshmen are already asking when and where the next National is going to be held.

Annually, as adviser, I send a letter called “Coachie’s Annual Report.” Volume twenty-five was issued this year. All it is is dubs and dabs of news about the alumni and the actives. I used to have an open house at my house at Christmas time for the alumni and the actives, but when house
growth did not keep pace with the membership, this was discontinued on a formal basis. I still think it is a good idea.

We do not have good attendance at regular meetings. The past records of our organization have been very carelessly kept. People who are very active and interested drift in and out and so we lose track of them. We don’t put on regular programs at a set meeting time. Pi Kappa Delta cannot be encouraged in the same way on every campus. It has to be adjusted to what is right for each school’s chapter. But at whatever place a charter is held, the motivation of this fraternity in making speech very important is a force which can never be underestimated.

No chapter could have done more for an adviser than Wisconsin Zeta did on May 17 when the members planned a big celebration to commemorate my twenty-five years as Director of Forensics at Eau Claire. Any adviser’s students who put in all that effort to make a most memorable and enjoyable meeting, deserve all the praise their adviser can give them.

Whatever success we have had in our program is due to the members who are and have been affiliated with Pi Kappa Delta at Eau Claire. We feel very fortunate that we were accepted to membership in this organization and will welcome any suggestions from any chapters to make our chapter better.

FINANCING FORENSICS

Carroll B. Ellis, Chairman, Department of Speech, David Lipscomb College
Nashville, Tennessee

Money is always a problem in a good forensics program. It is not the only one, but, unless it is solved, the others do not exist. Competitive debating means travel, and this means money.

The 1968 National Forensic Association held its national tournament on the David Lipscomb College campus. In response to how the teams financed debate, some interesting answers were given.

“A letter was sent to all parents of the debaters, interested friends, local lawyers, and judges petitioning funds. One letter netted the needed funds.”

The debaters sold doughnuts, candy, snow cones; and one high school sold stock in Project Nashville.

One school was more fortunate because “the father of one of the debaters was wealthy and he contributed the entire amount.”

The overwhelming majority of the schools responding got their money from school appropriations. This is as it should be and, while not taking from the persistence and enthusiasm of those who raised their money, debate must be financed as an integral part of the educational system.

Adequate financing from the school will always be possible if the following principles are followed:

1. Make the forensic program an educational one. Do not be led down the detour of a shallow, half-hearted attempt to kill time, but make the program sound by demanding quality performance from all of the debaters.

2. Work on a long-range program. Plan the program over a period of from five to ten years. It cannot grow unless there is a plan.

3. Keep up enthusiasm for the program! Be sure the recognition due the debaters is given. This should be done in the newspapers, but especially on the campus.

4. Keep all the school sold on the value of forensics. There is every opportunity to do this because as bright and articulate young people they will be the ones who speak before the school, at civic clubs, and hold student offices. Having a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta is one way of letting the school know what debate means to students.

My experience over a long period of time is that the major responsibility is to stay on the job and develop a sound educational forensics program; and then you will have money from the school to buy snow cones rather than having to sell them.
NEW DIRECTIONS IN FORENSICS

Marvin D. Kleinau, Director of Forensics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Every now and then a situation arises to remind me of that most unique of O’Henry short stories, *The Gift of the Magi*. I’m sure you remember the basic story line from your high school English class. The young man, at great personal sacrifice, sold his watch to purchase a comb for his wife’s magnificent long tresses, only to find that she in turn had cut her hair to obtain the money necessary to purchase a beautiful chain for his watch.

To many this O’Henry plot represents the very limits of human sacrifice. To others, myself included, it represents the very depth of human stupidity. Stupidity in that the nature of the problem might easily have been avoided if the two parties involved had simply been a bit more “in touch”. Such is the case with our forensic programs today, and more specifically, such is the situation involving the status of Pi Kappa Delta, both on the national and local level.

To be quite blunt, O’Henry would seem to be at work within our ranks for the national council of Pi Kappa Delta has recently been, and for all I know is at this very moment, pondering that most perplexing question, “what can they do for the local chapters that will enhance their programs?” At the same time, back on the campus, sponsors of local chapters are engaged in the traditional activity (now a half century old) of constructing a program dedicated to the promotion of a bigger and better Pi Kappa Delta.

Consider then the eventual outcome of this course of action. The national council, by nature, has but a single gift to offer the local chapters and that is a full and complete ENDORSEMENT of the local program as an ENTITY WITHIN ITSELF. This powerful endorsement is indeed a major sacrifice for it would encourage the local chapters to turn from preparing for a Pi Kappa Delta convention to a course of action designed to apply the forensic principles to local issues.

On the other hand the local chapters have but a single gift to offer in return.

With complete dedication they can offer the national council more and more members, each with a single purpose in mind, to aim for that Pi Kappa Delta national or province convention; to promote that bigger and better forensic fraternity. As in the case of the action by the national council, this local decision to give up all for the national image is indeed a significant sacrifice. Here then is the crux of the problem. The shadow of O’Henry has indeed come to life.

The solution of our problem is to take the national council at its word. If they are sincerely interested in strengthening the local chapters, and I think Fred Goodwin’s plans to hold a forum on that topic at Tempe supports that thesis, then we at the local level must take advantage of this gift and divorce ourselves from the outworn role of handmaiden and embrace a more realistic goal. Surely fifty years of paying homage to a national image is sufficient sacrifice. Pi Kappa Delta is now obviously the largest forensic fraternity, our conventions are certainly the most pompous and our national officers easily the most responsible. I think we can all agree “things at the top” are in good shape. But what about things at the bottom? How are things going at the chapter level?

It didn’t take much research to uncover from the pages of the FORENSIC the startling realization that most schools still find the climax of their speech season (any season will do) to be Suzie Senior’s first place in the extemp contest at somebody’s Spring Festival. Nor was it a revelation to read of one specific chapters re-organization after several years of inactivity “because of lack of interest.” What did amaze me was that groups proclamation “to involve itself in the intercollegiate activity arena by entering several tournaments the following year.” While I haven’t double-checked recently it’s my guess that if that anyones idea of an active chapter, we may well find them disbanding again because of lack of interest.

The tenor of this article shouldn’t and
probably doesn’t come as any great surprise or revelation to you. In an age when “things are happening right on our doorstep” it would be a rare person indeed that doesn’t become somewhat involved in some way or another. This may not of course be true of all students and certainly not all coaches, for they are from another era.

Today the college campus has become what eventually may be the pivotal point in our social and economic revolution. Thus to spend hours applying the principles of advocacy to matters of purely theoretical or fraternal value is to ignore the real challenge to the youth of this age. Surely the significant application of the “art of persuasion” is not the “consideration of” but rather the “involvement in” the problem of the day.

It would be fair, I think, to say that opportunity has never been more real than today. Never before has the open forum for youth been more obvious. The student councils, the SDSers, the “blacks for justice” the young Republicans and Democrats, each a growing and vital part of the whole and each “turned off” from the politician but never more “receptive” to the voices of fellow students. Here then is the place for the debater, the orator, the extemporizer, the advocate. Here then is the place for the local chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, smack in the middle of his own campus, where man’s actions will be determined, hopefully, by the force of someones logic rather than by the force of someones ignorance.

May I close then by simply suggesting that we accept the generous gift of independence or vote of confidence from the national council and in return offer them the best we have, not numbers, but rather an active, meaningful and involved local chapter of Pi Kappa Delta.

---

A Proposal To Improve The Quality Of National Debate Propositions

(Continued from page 10)

Once the national proposition was chosen all papers prepared on that proposition could be offered to the journals of the various forensic organizations and thus be made available to the entire forensic community.

The committee has, I believe, done the best possible job it could in securing free advice for us. Free advice was probably all we could hope for given the limited funds of our organizations in the past. But we are no longer poor, forensics is not a poverty operation, our organizations have funds and I suggest that we put some of our money into research early in the process of selecting the national debate proposition.

Collectively we spend many thousands of dollars on debate handbooks and other materials after the proposition is announced. I propose that our organizations spend at least a modest amount to finance committee research before the proposition is chosen.
Financial Report
AUGUST 1, 1968 – JULY 31, 1969

RECEIPTS
Fees and Certificates ........................................ $12,128.15
Keys ........................................................................ 1,519.79
The Forensic ......................................................... 47.75
Initiation Keys and Triangles ................................. 85.00
National Convention Fees ................................. 36,630.01
National Convention Supplies .......................... 246.64
Investment Reserve ............................................... 4,000.00
Balance July 31, 1968 ........................................... 5,649.60

$60,306.94

EXPENDITURES
The Forensic .......................................................... $ 6,428.95
National Convention ............................................. 35,110.65
Keys ........................................................................ 1,754.04
Offices, Secretarial Help, Supplies ................. 2,491.35
Postage and Telephone ........................................ 297.45
Printing ................................................................. 1,395.09
Questions Committee ............................................ 168.97
August Council Meeting ....................................... 3,024.48
Refunds ................................................................ 100.00
Initiation Keys and Triangles .............................. 68.00
Auditing and Bonding Fees ............................... 126.00
Balance July 31, 1969 ........................................... 9,341.96

$60,306.94

Statement of Assets Owned
Invested Reserves (Including Saving Interest .......... $508.87) $10,723.45
Balance July 31, 1969 ........................................... 9,341.96

September 30, 1969

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I have examined the books and records of Pi Kappa Delta Forensic Society for the period of August 1, 1968 to July 31, 1969 inclusive.

The foregoing statement is prepared in conjunction with Dr. Larry Norton according to established form, and is a true and correct report of the financial status of the organization as of this date.

Signed:

Donald M. Albanta
Auditor
EVANGEL COLLEGE, MISSOURI
Reporter: Judy Beasley

H. Francis Short, President of Pi Kappa Delta was the guest speaker at the first Annual Pi Kappa Delta banquet of the Missouri Rho Chapter. Mr. Short entertained with a few select jokes and some choice remarks. The importance of the spoken word was emphasized throughout the talk.

An induction ceremony for five new members was held at the banquet, who were administered a pledge and presented with a red carnation. The banquet was considered such a success that the members voted to make it an annual affair.

Other year-end activities of Pi Kappa Delta at Evangel included the election of new officers. Those elected for the 1969-70 school year were President, John Hershman; Vice-President, Cynde Richards; Secretary-Treasurer, Linda Edwards; Corresponding Secretary, Judy Beasley.

NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE, SOUTH DAKOTA
Reporter: Georgeann Harkness

Funeral services for Paul Jones Harkness of Tucson, Arizona were held last June.

Paul Jones Harkness received his A.B. degree from Muskingum College, an M.A. degree from the University of Iowa and did further graduate work at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Chicago.


Mr. Harkness began his career as a public educator at Tea, South Dakota, where he also published the Tea Signal. He taught at Monroe, then served as principal at Lennox and Centerville. He served as superintendent of schools at Gayville, Avon, and Armour before joining the faculty at Northern State College, Aberdeen, South Dakota, in 1925, where he was professor of speech and head of the department until his retirement in 1956. Mr. Harkness was active and held national offices in many forensic associations. He and Mrs. Harkness moved to Tucson in 1956, where he resided until his death.

ADAMS STATE COLLEGE, COLORADO
Reporter: Whilma Van Kirk

Nineteen guests were in attendance at the banquet for the Colorado Delta Chapter of Adams State College. These included: Dr. and Mrs. Fred J. Plachy, Dr. and Mrs. John P. Turano, Mrs. Lida K. Kennedy, Miss Juanita Sequa, Mrs. Dave Riggs, Mr. and Mrs. James V. Biundo, Mr. and Mrs. Daljit Singh, Dr. and Mrs. Lynn L. Welton, Mr. and Mrs. Carl S. Hartzman, Mr. and Mrs. Virgil I. Hoff, and Mr. and Mrs. John J. Oberrick. Dr. Grant Herbstruth, forensic instructor, and seven Pi Kappa Delta student members were present. There were five Pi Kappa Delta pledges.

After the banquet Ralph Turano, Pi Kappa Delta President, proceeded with the business of the evening. Highlights of the evening included a run-down of the years achievements. It was announced that out of sixteen tournaments, the ASC forensic squad brought home seventeen trophies. Trophies were presented by Dr. Herbstruth to the three people who contributed most to the forensic achievements. Ralph Turano, Mike Ware and Dave Riggs were the recipients of these trophies. In turn, Dr. Herbstruth was given a sweater and plaque from the members of Pi Kappa Delta in appreciation of the work he has done for the ASC and the speech program.

Dave Riggs was installed as the new president; Ann Lockridge, vice president; Beatrice Valdez, secretary-treasurer; and, Whilma Van Kirk, historian.

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Gary P. DeFranco

Illinois Alpha held its annual installation banquet in May and newly elected officers are: Patrick Cox, President; Carl Dixon, Vice President; Janice Bradish, Secretary; Jan Jacobs, Membership; Richard Wray, Treasurer; Gary DeFranco, Publicity.
This past year we participated in 21 tournaments and received 30 awards of excellent and superior. Our year was climaxd by a successful week at the National Pi Kappa Delta Convention. Our activities this year made possible the initiation of twelve new members, bringing the present chapter roll to 40.

The candidate selected for honorary membership in PKD was Dr. Robert Leh, Associate Professor of Political Science at Illinois Wesleyan.

This year’s “Outstanding Senior Award” was presented to James Tungate for his activities in PKD and the Speech Department. Jim was recently named winner of the Johnne Akin oral interpretation award from the University of Denver Speech Department. Next year Jim will be continuing his studies at Northwestern where he has been granted an assistantship.

EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
Reporter: Lori Egan

The Eastern Montana College Gamma chapter of Pi Kappa Delta concluded a successful 1968-69 season with the annual awards banquet where special awards were presented to several members of the team. The award for Best Pi Kappa Delta Speaker went to Bruce Blaylock. He also won the Best Extender award. The Best Debater for this year was Lon Withrow. Rosalyn Kaplan won the award for Best Oral Interper and the Larry Cook Memorial Award which is presented to the outstanding freshman.

The chapter initiated 12 new members into Pi Kappa Delta during 1968-69. An honorary membership was given to James Bernardi, Assistant Professor of Speech at EMC.

The 1968-69 season was a profitable one for the EMC squad. A total of eight first place trophies, including one Sweepstakes award, six second place awards and five third place awards were won at the various tournaments during the season.

In addition to competing, the members of the EMC team were judges for high school speech tournaments in Billings and Great Falls, Montana, and Powell, Wyoming. This year the first annual debate tourna-

ament for high schools throughout the state was hosted by the EMC forensics team. Team members organized and ran the events. They also judged.

The officers for 1969-70 are: Randy Rose, president; Brad Anseth, vice-president; Trudi Bucy, secretary-treasurer; and Dick Seitz, Student Legislature representative.

Also, the team will be able to attend more tournaments this year because the Student Legislature granted an increased budget. Most of the present members have returned and several freshmen have joined the team.

NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Gerald Sisson

Our Missouri Kappa chapter is proud to announce the initiation of eight new members.

Ceremonial duties were performed by James Oliver, John Bassett, and James Burk. As one of the recent initiates, I can say that it was a moment I had looked forward to and one I will long remember. Our initiation preceded our annual Pi Kappa Delta banquet. Exquisite cuisine and good fellowship was heightened by the articulation of debate trip tales. Guests at the head table included Mr. Jerry L. Winsor, director of Forensics; Mr. George Hinshaw, assistant director of Forensics, and his wife; Mrs. Fred Dunn, Interpretation coach, and her husband; and Mr. Richard Weaver, associate professor of Speech and Drama, and his wife.

Our annual election of new officers took place recently following a brief discussion.

Sponsors Jerry L. Winsor and George Hinshaw with students at Northwest Missouri State.
by Mr. Jerry L. Winsor on the duties and responsibilities of events for the 69-70 school year. From amid the advocacy the following results emerged: James Oliver, President; Linda Sorenson, Vice-President; David Dills, Secretary-Treasurer; Gerald Sisson, Reporter; Elizabeth Watkins, Social Chairman; and James Leu, Parliamentarian.

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

Reporter: Kathie Jinks

1968-'69 has been a busy year for the Mississippi Gamma Chapter.

The year began with the arrival of a new debate coach (but “old” Pi Kappa Deltan), Mrs. Marilyn Norris Woods, who served as President of the MSCW chapter 1961-1962.

We hosted two highly successful tournaments, the Twenty-Second Annual Magnolia Tournament, attended by twenty-five universities and colleges from six states, and the Fifth Annual High School Tournament, attended by thirty high schools from Mississippi and Alabama. Members of the chapter also assisted with judging for the High School District Debate Tournament and Platform Contest held on our campus.

We climaxed the year’s activities with an Awards Banquet at which trophies were presented to Most Valuable Debater, Most Promising Debater, and Most Valuable Individual Events Speaker. Five new members were initiated into our chapter this year.

1968-'69 officers of Mississippi State College for Women’s Mississippi Gamma Chapter are (seated, left to right) Publicity Chairman Jonelle Searcy, Immediate Past President Laurie Stone, Treasurer Cathy Donovan, (standing, left to right) President Cherolyn Hendrix, Secretary Kathie Jinks.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Reporter: Grace Krueger

Our new debate coach and director of forensics, Mr. Kenneth Newton, won honors in both high school and college forensics. He has coached at Illinois State University—a PKD school, and the University of Massachusetts. Our former debate coach, Dr. Melvin Donaho, is now teaching at New York University, Plattsburg.

Also joining our staff is Dr. Daniel Chandler, a former PKDeltan from Central State College, Oklahoma. He remembers competing in the Brookings National Convention. Dr. Gilbert Rau, our advisor, is back from his sabbatical and our chapter is planning an active program of service to the forensic program.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Gil:

In recalling your request at the National I thought the following might be interesting:

When the National was held at Houston, Texas, many of the women’s events were held in the various churches. One morning it was particularly cold and I was in charge of the events at one of the churches. Upon arriving there, the church was locked. I wish I could remember the name of the one coach who showed up with his girls and who helped me check every door and window in the place.

Finally, he turned to me and said, “Mahaffey, give me a push.” I looked at him and said, “What?” He said, “Push me.” I did. He stuck his foot through a window and said, “Now see what you did?” We opened the window, unlocked the door and began the contest.

If you want further episodes, I have three or four more.

Cordially,

R. D. Mahaffey
Head, Speech Department
Linsfield College, Oregon
New Members of Pi Kappa Delta

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS
42902 Mary Edith Van Buskirk
42903 Teresa Godfrey
42904 Jim Mora
42905 John E. Myers
42906 Dennis Steele
42907 Janet Vannatta

BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE
42908 Karl Kramer

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE COLLEGE
42909 Claudette Bayless
42910 Jeremy Howard Ellis
42911 J. Michael Lynch
42912 Michael W. Manners
42913 Frank Stephen Zulian

WARTBURG COLLEGE
42914 Byron Bunge
42915 Valdemar D. Gies
42916 Kathleen M. McElligott
42917 Jean Marie Hunt
42918 Jeffrey H. Allen

SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE
42919 Gregory R. Mayer
42920 S. Kent Moganum

HARDING COLLEGE
42921 Arthur A. Kauffman, Jr.
42922 Hattie H. Lavender
42923 Marsha Jean Murphy
42924 Don Curtis Pierce
42925 Sarah Jeanne Robinson
42926 James Batey Sigmund

LOUISIANA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
42927 Hans Hess
42928 Kathy Morrow
42929 Richard A. Thompson

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
42930 Constance Davis
42931 Dan DeStephen
42932 Gene George
42933 Bette Kremer
42934 Roger Miller
42935 Russell H. Nichols

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE
42936 Donald W. Hasbargen
42937 Mary E. Peterson
42938 William S. Seeley

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
42939 John Cliff
42940 David Cobb
42941 Lee Garrison
42942 G. T. Goodnight

GENERAL BEADLE STATE COLLEGE
42943 Tom Blair
42944 Donna Brum
42945 Bonnie J. McCullough
42946 Sharon McCullough

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
42947 Mary Ann Barnett
42948 John Gregory
42949 James Gunville
42950 David Sier
42951 Patrick Wheley

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
42952 Stephen P. Connolly
42953 Mark Alan Hart
42954 Daniel S. Markowitz
42955 Lee Pearce
42956 Helen K. Worfolk

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE
42957 William R. Cartmill
42958 Douglas D. Fiersel
42959 Kathleen E. Ramage
42960 David R. White

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
42961 William D. Emerson
42962 Mary Kay Royse
42963 Vera Young

STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE
42964 Cecelia Holtermann
42965 Thomas L. Pivetti
42966 Katsuya Yamada

SIMPSON COLLEGE
42967 Wayne Clark
42968 Steve Courson
42969 Judith Anne Lynch

MARY HARDIN-BAYLOR COLLEGE
42970 Evelyn Cadenhead
42971 Bobby Wayne Connally
42972 Susan Pavoggi

EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
42973 Ronald Paul Mickelson
42974 Alex George Rajala
42975 Maurice Noel Regnier

GREENVILLE COLLEGE
42976 Ruth Koch
42977 Kathy Smith

SEATTLE PACIFIC COLLEGE
42978 Sandra Smith

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. — EDWARDSVILLE
42979 John M. Cummins
42980 Daniel Edward Wille

NORWICH UNIVERSITY
42981 Kenneth J. Erickson
42982 Lawrence E. Wesneski

DRAKE UNIVERSITY
42983 Beverly K. Buster
42984 Dennis R. Taylor

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE
42985 Edward J. Gallagher III
42986 Timothy O'Malley

MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE
42987 Barry Lynn McCracken

CARROLL COLLEGE — WISCONSIN
42988 Fred K. McPherson

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
42989 Christine Wagenschur

WHEATON COLLEGE
42990 Tim Fisher

WHITMAN COLLEGE
42991 Bob Bell

CENTRAL STATE COLLEGE
42992 Dan N. Young

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
42993 Daniel L. Scott

WESTMAR COLLEGE
42994 Dennis W. Wrede

LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE
42995 John W. Banner
42996 Jean Miller Pomeroy

MOORHEAD STATE COLLEGE
42997 Paul Brue
42998 Janis Mae Isaacson
42999 Flora McIntyre
43000 Karl R. Schoeller

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIV.
43001 Catherine S. Colebrooke
43002 Maury Austin Norman

CENTRAL STATE COLLEGE
43003 Jane Hellwege

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA—LAS VEGAS
43004 Cynthia Hartman
43005 Dave Johns

MOORHEAD STATE COLLEGE
43006 Virginia Lee Wheeler

SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF MINES & TECH.
43007 Barbara Coyle

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA — OMAHA
43008 Barbara R. Swenson
NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
43009 Jill Grabb
43010 Bill Hinze
43011 Edward L. Muttingly
43012 Aaron Vessup

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
43013 Tom Fergen
43014 John Carrand
43015 Dennis Hall
43016 Laurie Kinkel
43017 Phillip Kohl III
43018 Ned Leonard
43019 Karen Lerdal
43020 Mary Plahn
43021 Del Wolkow

CENTRAL METHODIST COLLEGE
43025 Herold Ross

CLARION STATE COLLEGE
43026 June Bruner
43027 Lillian Pfaff
43028 James Rarick

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECH.
43029 Sue Ellen Seward

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
43030 Connie Lockmiller
43031 Phillip W. Shedrick
43032 Donita Wallace

LUTHER COLLEGE
43033 Cynthia Fisher

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. — CARBONDALE
43034 Dale F. Johnson
43035 Nina Jo Navulis
43036 Shari Rhode

TEXAS A & I UNIVERSITY
43037 Ronald M. Sommer

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE
43038 Robert Mundy

MOUNT UNION COLLEGE
43039 Gregory Russell
43040 Charles Morford

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY
43041 John Anderfurren
43042 William Dunlap
43043 William J. Hansen
43044 James C. Harris
43045 Roberta J. Kretschmer
43046 Karyl McCurdy
43047 Kay McCurdy
43048 James R. Pobis

43049 Joseph Sturmiolo
43050 Lorraine Tani
43051 Ed Wehrli
43052 Aleta You

OLIVET COLLEGE
43053 Daniel W. Boxwell
43054 Donald J. Keller, Jr.
43055 Charlene A. Barick

WISCONSIN STATE UNIV. — EAU CLAIRE
43056 Susan Borkin
43057 Sue Bucks
43058 James Erdman
43059 Caroline Gottgart
43060 Pamela Keister
43061 Louise Kutz
43062 Lawrence Sturgis
43063 Mary Podvin
43064 Laura Verhulst
43065 John E. Walsh
43066 Mark Zellmer

TENNESSEE TECH. UNIVERSITY
43067 Barbara K. Burch
43068 Mark D. Allenberger

WHEATON COLLEGE
43069 Robert C. Baptista
43070 Kenneth E. Blackwell
43071 Robert H. Chandler

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY
43072 Ezra Wayne Campbell
43073 Ronald L. Garrett
43074 Sandra L. Holdcraft
43075 Wayne C. Huff
43076 Ernest J. Istock, Jr.
43077 Rodney Lee Kidd
43078 Larry Lassiter
43079 Alecia Sims
43080 Sherri Taylor

UNIV. OF SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA
43081 John Schneider

BLACK HILLS STATE COLLEGE
43082 Meredith N. Freeman

WISCONSIN STATE UNIV. — STEVENS POINT
43083 Helen J. VanDerhyden

STETSON UNIVERSITY
43084 Foday Kalon

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
43085 Bradley P. Shelton

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
43086 Mary D. Adams
43087 Mark Harris
43088 Charnim Hooban
43089 John Merzlock

OUACHITA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
43090 Sherry Arnold

43091 Tommy D. Daniels
43092 Diane Martindale
43093 Tom Roberts

NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE
43094 Sharon M. Hansen
43095 Jo Ann Maxwell

BLACK HILLS STATE COLLEGE
43096 Sybil Finley
43097 Marilyn Gray

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
43098 Jane Carter
43099 Diane Gulden
43100 Susie Hendrix

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY — WHITewater
43101 Anthony F. Casalino
43102 Camille Passler

EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
43103 Rosemary A. O'Connor

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY — OSHKOSH
43104 Sheila Dickvoss
43105 Adrian W. Fara
43106 Linda Van Horn
43107 Donald La Fontaine
43108 Mary E. Martin
43109 William A. Schembera
43110 George M. Stealey
43111 William Welch

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE
43112 Steven Beilman
43113 Mary E. Fuller
43114 Michael R. Lindsey
43115 Richard J. Smith
43116 Sharon E. Tittes
43117 Monica M. Zumbrun

STETSON UNIVERSITY
43118 Patricia Wilkinson

UNIV. OF SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA
43119 Brad Broussard
43120 George W. Carr
43121 Josette Cook
43122 Marie Kovach
43123 Charlene Lastraps
43124 Nancy Marcantel
43125 Carolyn Morvant
43126 Marilyn Stanzel
43127 Donna Taber
43128 Clodagh Thurbur

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
43129 James Agoranos
43130 Janice C. Bradish
43131 Gary Bruch
43132 William L. Devore
43133 Carla Dickinson
43134 Michael Hildebrand
43135 Robert G. Lehn
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43136 Deborah Long
43137 Paul McVicker
43138 John Lee Meyer
43139 Susan Sumner
43140 Thomas Wetzel

MARIETTA COLLEGE
43141 Robert E. Baldwin
43142 Kenneth Becker
43143 Edgar K. Byham
43144 Sarah Jane Clark
43145 Nancy Ann C. S. Dale
43146 Howard L. Dompman
43147 Peggy Lou Golden
43148 Gregory D. Hanson
43149 James P. Hermanoe
43150 Kathryn M. Kobs
43151 Marianna Sculos
43152 John E. Selser

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
43153 Michael E. Foltz

ST. OLAF COLLEGE
43154 Anthony Aldwell
43155 G. Bradley Lennon, Jr.
43156 Arnold Osteebe

WISCONSIN STATE UNIV.--EAU CLAIRE
43157 Donnie L. Burke
43158 Kerry W. Doherty
43159 Peggy Anne Fauks
43160 Pearl Louise Griffin

ADAMS STATE COLLEGE
43161 John J. Oberrick
43162 Whilma F. Van Kirk
43163 Carole D. Walker

NORTHEASTERN COLLEGE
43164 R. Keith Allen
43165 Robert D. Hulstein

HASTINGS COLLEGE
43166 Jan Ackerman
43167 George E. Hejna
43168 Douglas E. Johnson
43169 Claudina Soucie

SIOUX FALLS COLLEGE
43170 Norbert Griebel

EUREKA COLLEGE
43171 Tom Felts
43172 Franklyn M. Malone
43173 Paul Martin
43174 Allen A. Moushon
43175 Arthur J. Penninger

WHEATON COLLEGE
43176 Tom Aaland

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
43177 Jeanne Ann Bollman
43178 Edward Boyv
43179 Carolyn Fitzgerald
43180 Lee Duane Grover
43181 Richard A. Hufford
43182 Nancy Jane Livermore
43183 Linda A. Miller
43184 Mary Sue Offutt
43185 Richard A. Peterson
43186 Allan Sincox
43187 Daniel V. Taylor
43188 Jeannette D. Wallace
43189 Charlene Ann Yeargin

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
43190 James M. Crawford
43191 Carl James Decator
43192 Kenneth V. Eckhart III
43193 Brian Lee Steffens
43194 Wernought Williams

DAKOTA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
43195 David Miller
43196 Jim Moro
43197 Joe Vancavage

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
43198 Darrell Austin
43199 Susan Bee
43200 Lynn Burch
43201 Gregory Hulbert
43202 Timothy Khoe
43203 Carolyn Mays
43204 Gregg Alan Newby
43205 Sarah Frichard
43206 Helen Sybil Rothrock
43207 Lowell Stacy
43208 Tom Tennant
43209 Eugene Whitley

HOPE COLLEGE
43210 Richard L. Bradley
43211 Susan Donna Buckman
43212 Joan Marie Grunzow
43213 Mark Volkers

GROVE CITY COLLEGE
43214 Darrell Kadunce
43215 David Ritchie
43216 Michael Sherman

MCNEESE STATE COLLEGE
43217 Ann Hagan

HASTINGS COLLEGE
43218 John D. Reimers

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
43219 Lyle Arney Garcia
43220 Jeanne Marie Toggetti
43221 David C. Wheeler

LOUISIANA COLLEGE
43222 Foster B. Fletcher, Jr.
43223 Ann Kennison
43224 Tony Tarpley

NORWICH UNIVERSITY
43225 Brian F. Attenborough
43226 Mauri C. Korhonen
43227 Francis A. Quander II

AKRON UNIVERSITY
43228 Natalie Corderidge

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE -- HAYWARD
43229 John Cambus

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE -- PA.
43230 Melinda Lincoln
43231 Patrick Miller
43232 Lora M. Oxnerreiter
43233 Stephen V. Russell
43234 Patricia A. Tiani
43235 Linda Truzzi

PASADENA COLLEGE
43236 Gilbert R. Garcia

DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE
43237 Terry Jane Cook
43238 Anna Lou Daniels
43239 Daniel F. DeLoach
43240 Dennis Hood
43241 Judy Gayle Jones
43242 Elizabeth D. Owen
43243 John Tracy
43244 Bruce E. Willoughby

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
43245 Peggy Jones
43246 Annette L. Kasper
43247 Genevieve B. Kurchab
43248 Dennis L. McLaughlin
43249 Eileen Millstein
43250 George Mueller
43251 Ruth Anne Perley
43252 Rita Jean Rice
43253 Christine Saaco
43254 Michael J. Schneider
43255 Susan Wilkerson

MACALESTER COLLEGE
43256 Steven R. Frederickson
43257 J. Stan Freeman
43258 Kurt M. Garmaker
43259 Nicolette A. Heidelprim
43260 Peggy Kottner
43261 John A. Lampland
43262 Teresa Ann Tjebben

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
43263 Glen E. Edenburn

NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE
43264 Linda Aasby
43265 John W. Holthus
43266 Janice Jager
43267 Steven A. Wurzig

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE -- HAYWARD
43268 Yvonne LeVelle Kier

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE
43269 Robin Jean Biswell
43270 William M. Chapman
43271 Ben Whitney Morse

STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE
43272 Ramona Adams

MONMOUTH COLLEGE
43273 Jo Ruth Liska
43274 Carol Anne Wilson
by their respective constitutions, vest in this committee the power and duty of selecting national debate propositions and discussion topics; and that the NATS contribute not more than $50.00 annually toward the expense of this enterprise.” (QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, April, 1941, p. 306.)

Two days later, the Executive Committee of NATS adopted a resolution stating “That Charles R. Layton, Chairman, and two representatives from each of the three forensic societies—these persons to be also NATS members—comprise the special cooperative Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion.”

Apparently it did not occur to those involved in the recommendations and the enabling resolution (1) that the recommendations and resolution ignored the fourth forensic organization, Phi Rho Pi, the members of which participated in numerous tournaments administered by Pi Kappa Delta schools; (2) that NATS was perhaps legislating outside its jurisdiction; (3) that because of the action taken at the 1940 convention, Pi Kappa Delta was committed to selecting an official PKD question until 1942; (4) that Pi Kappa Delta would be most reluctant to discard a democratic procedure by which every chapter had a voice in the selection of the final question and to substitute a procedure as dictatorial as the recommendation appeared to be; (5) that Pi Kappa Delta, with a well-established procedure for selecting its own official debate question, would be quite unlikely to adopt a procedure which up to that time had not been formulated; and (6) that the limitation that the appointees be members of NATS was unrealistic, since many debate directors were not in the field of Speech.

However, in an attempt to exhibit some semblance of cooperation in the interim period before the 1942 convention, the National President of Pi Kappa Delta, W. V. O’Connell (East Central State, Oklahoma), appointed two Past National Presidents, S. R. Toussaint and Forrest H. Rose, to represent Pi Kappa Delta on the NATS committee, with the understanding that Pi Kappa Delta would continue to select its own official debate question, as the 1940 convention had ordered and as a later referendum had supported.

The question selected by the representatives of NATS, Delta Sigma Rho, Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, and Phi Rho Pi (which was eventually included) for 1941-42 was: Resolved, that the Federal Government should regulate by law all labor unions in the United States, constitutionality conceded. The question was announced in September, 1941.

The Committee on Question of Pi Kappa Delta followed its usual procedure and an official debate question was selected: Resolved, that the democracies should form a federation to establish and maintain the eight Churchill-Roosevelt principles. This question was announced in December, 1941.

On December 30, 1941, the Committee on Committees of NATS recommended that the NATS Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion Activities be made a standing committee, with Charles R. Layton as chairman, the other members to be selected by their organizations. However, the Executive Committee voted, instead, “to continue the committee...for one more year.” (QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, April, 1942, p. 235.)

There was apparently some doubt in the Executive Committee regarding the effectiveness of an NATS committee if Pi Kappa Delta continued its practice of selecting an official Pi Kappa Delta question.

At the April, 1942, Pi Kappa Delta National Convention in Minneapolis, a specific proposal from the Chairman of the NATS Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion was presented to the convention. It seems significant that at this first business meeting President W. V. O’Connell appointed a Pi Kappa Delta Committee on Question and a special ad hoc committee on the NATS question proposal, the latter composed of Forrest H. Rose, Chairman; H. D. Hopkins; S. R. Toussaint; and Glenn Capp. This was the
first time a specific proposal had been presented to Pi Kappa Delta by the NATS committee chairman, and Pi Kappa Delta wanted to take a good look at what was proposed.

The plan of procedure suggested by the NATS Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion involved fourteen items (*The Forensic*, May, 1942, p. 117.)

1. Committee to be chosen as last year — each of the four forensic societies that have been cooperating — Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, Tau Kappa Alpha and Phi Rho Pi — to select two members, and the executive Council of the National Association of Teachers of Speech to choose an additional member who will serve as chairman.

2. The committee to meet at the annual NATS Convention in December to consider its (committee) work and to receive and discuss each member’s tentative suggestions for intercollegiate debate and discussion topic or topics to be used the following school year.

3. The two committee members for each forensic society to canvass, or to ask officers or committees of the fraternity to canvass, the chapters of its society for suggestions as to prospective topics or questions for debate and discussion to be used the following school year. From these topics and questions the two committee members in each case to offer to the chairman of the NATS committee not later than May 1, two to five topics or questions (more may be offered if committee members desire) for the consideration of the committee.

4. At the same time the chairman of the committee to send a communication to the forensic director of each college or university that is not a member of one of the four cooperating forensic societies asking for similar suggestions to be offered not later than May 1. The chairman also to seek the suggestions of state or regional forensic or speech groups other than the four cooperating forensic societies. The chairman to formulate the suggestions received from individuals and groups other than the four cooperating fraternities by May 1 into a list, labelling the group recommendations as such.

5. The chairman immediately after receiving the fraternity and other suggestions to circulate the lists among the committee members for consideration. The committee members to exchange ideas and collectively choose from three to five topics or questions to be submitted not later than July 1 for a preferential vote of the chapters of each of the four cooperating societies and of the forensic directors of each college or university not thus affiliated that has previously expressed a wish to participate in the preferential voting. The unaffiliated colleges and universities to be given opportunity to express such wish when they are asked for suggestions in the spring.

6. The chairman to prepare the copy for transmittal of the three to five topics or questions to be submitted for vote, and to furnish each committee member with a copy. The two committee members for each of the cooperating fraternities to be responsible for seeing to it that their fraternity supplies and forwards copies of the transmittal statement to its chapters not later than July 1. The chairman to be responsible for forwarding by July 1 such copy to the forensic directors of the colleges and universities that are not affiliated with the four cooperating forensic societies but have indicated desire to participate in the final selection.

7. The two committee members for each cooperating forensic society to be responsible for seeing to it that a report of the preferential ballot of each of its chapters is in the hands of the chairman of the NATS committee not later than August 1. The chairman to be responsible for the ballots received by August 1 from the institutions outside the cooperating fraternities. The chairman to compile all of the results of the preferential balloting, counting each voting institution’s ballot as equal to that of every other. The balloting reports and compilations to be open for public scrutiny. The final result to be
sent at once to all members of the committee.

8. If the topic or topics selected has or have not been phrased into proposition form or if the phrasing requires in the judgment of the committee a reconsideration, the committee, after consultation with authorities on subject matter and argumentation and debating and discussion, is to proceed to phrase.

9. The result of the balloting and the official wording to be announced as early as possible in September, preferably by September 10. The two committeemen of each fraternity to be responsible for the announcement of the choice of proposition or propositions to their fraternity. The chairman to be responsible for making this announcement to other interested groups, to the forensic directors of institutions not affiliated with the cooperating fraternities and to the public in general.

10. The committee to embody the essential elements of the question in the proposition itself, and to append no qualifications or definitions.

11. The four cooperating forensic fraternities to agree to use the NATS question or questions exclusively as their official fraternity proposition or propositions for debate and discussion for the college year. This would not prevent individual schools or groups of schools from debating more than one or two questions during the school year; but it would mean that none of the four fraternities would select a different question.

12. Each fraternity to agree to bear the expense of its own committee members and of circularizing, polling and notifying its own chapters as provided for above. The National Association of Teachers of Speech to be asked to pay expense of the chairman of the committee and of the cost of including within the above project the large number of colleges and universities that are not members of any of the four cooperating forensic societies.

ADDENDA

A. If after the debating season is under way a difficulty or emergency, war, etc., should arise which renders the regularly selected question or its wording unsuitable, the committee is to have the power, by a three-fourths vote of its entire membership (i.e., by at least seven out of nine votes), to rephrase the proposition or to select an entirely new question.

B. The committee is empowered to modify dates and details of the various steps in its procedure from time to time if by a three-fourths vote of its entire membership (i.e., by at least seven out of nine votes). Other than by the method provided above, no change in any of the above articles may be permitted except by the action of the executive committee or council of each of the four cooperating fraternities.

The Special Pi Kappa Delta committee recommended four modifications:

"1. Strike section 1 and substitute the following: The National Debate Question Committee shall be composed of the following nine members: Two members from each of the four cooperating forensic societies — Tau Kappa Alpha, Delta Sigma Rho, Phi Rho Pi, and Pi Kappa Delta — and one member appointed by the NATS, the latter member to represent the unaffiliated colleges. The chairmanship of this committee shall rotate among the forensic societies and the NATS appointee in the order indicated above, the chairman for any given year to be designated by the President of the organization.

2. Strike all reference to ‘questions’ so that only one question will be selected by the National Debate Question Committee.

3. Amend section 12 by striking the phrase ‘expense of the chairman of the committee and the phrase ‘to be asked’ so that the section will read: Each fraternity to agree to bear the expense of its own committee members and of circularizing, polling, and notifying..."
its own chapters as provided for above. The NATS to pay the cost of including within the above project the large number of colleges and universities that are not members of any of the four cooperating societies.

4. Amend the addition of Addendum C which shall read: If under the provisions of Addenda A and/or B a modification of question or procedure should be passed by a three-fourths vote, any committee member may demand a revote in which case eight out of nine votes will be required to give the action binding force.

The convention adopted the amendments and the plan of procedure as amended. Following this action, the convention adopted a motion by Glenn Capp that,

"If the Pi Kappa Delta amendments to the NATS proposal were rejected, the Pi Kappa Delta Committee on Question proceed as usual and report the question October 1."

At the third business session of the convention, April 10,

"The chair called on acting secretary Toussaint to report on his telephone conversation with Charles R. Layton, Chairman of the NATS question committee. Toussaint reported a favorable reaction and read a telegram from Professor Layton confirming this attitude." (The Forensic, May, 1942, p. 120.)

At the 1942 NATS convention, the following Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion Activities was named: George Beauchamp (Manchester College) chairman; James D. Davis (Glendale Junior College); Nelle Jones (Chanute Junior College); Charles R. Layton (Muskogum College); N. Edd Miller (University of Texas); Orville C. Miller (Purdue University); Wilbur Moore (Central Michigan College); Robert F. Young (Williams College); and Forrest H. Rose (Southeast Missouri State College). (Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1943, p. 247.)

Thus, for the first time, the four forensic societies, with an appointee of NATS representing the unaffiliated schools, joined officially to select a truly national debate proposition, with every school having an opportunity to vote on the selection of the question it would later debate.

The first modification to the approved "articles of agreement" came in 1949. T. Earle Johnson (University of Alabama) proposed to the Committee on Committees of the NATS (1) that the membership of the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion be reduced from nine to five, (2) that the Committee meet annually, and (3) that to promote accuracy the chairman of the Committee announce the question selected by the vote of the societies and the unaffiliated schools. These changes were approved by the Committee on Committees and became effective January 1, 1950.

In 1954, following the merger of Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha, a representative of the American Forensic Association (AFA) was added to the Committee. Austin J. Freeley (John Carroll University) was President of the AFA, and one of the projects of his administration was to secure representation for the AFA on the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion. After nearly two years of negotiation with the organizations already represented on the Committee, the approval of the various national councils was secured in 1953 and an AFA representative was appointed. (Letter from Austin J. Freeley, dated 6/30/69). With this change, the Committee was, and still is, composed of one representative each from the SAA, the AFA, DSR-TKA, PRP, and PKD.

Since 1954, no changes have been made in the representation on the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion, nor has the procedure of the Committee been altered appreciably from that originally established by Pi Kappa Delta.

An attempt was made by the AFA in 1963 to alter both the representation and procedure. At its meeting in Chicago, December 29, 1968, the AFA adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved that:

1. The American Forensic Association declare its desire to assume the responsibility of selecting the national inter-
collegiate debate proposition and discussion question, and

2. The President of the American Forensic Association should begin at once negotiations with Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, Phi Rho Pi, and the Speech Association of America with a view toward the assumption of responsibility for the selection of the national intercollegiate debate proposition and discussion question by the American Forensic Association, and

3. The President of the American Forensic Association should appoint an ad hoc committee to be charged with the responsibility of considering the method of selecting the national proposition and recommending to the Association a procedure to be followed in selecting future national debate propositions and discussion questions."

In transmitting this resolution to the Presidents of Pi Kappa Delta, DSR-TKA, Phi Rho Pi, and the Executive Secretary of the SAA, Gifford Blyton (University of Kentucky), President of the AFA, wrote:

"This is to inquire as to whether or not your organization is willing to support such action on the part of the American Forensic Association. Here is a summary of the thinking which prompted AFA to support the proposal:

1. The American Forensic Association is a national organization established for and dedicated to the promulgation of intercollegiate forensics in the United States.

2. Most of the institutions in the United States with intercollegiate forensics programs are represented by memberships in the American Forensic Association.

3. All members, except one, of the current intercollegiate debate and discussion committee are active members of AFA (This pattern has been true for the last fifteen years). Furthermore, because members of the Committee often attend the same debate tournaments, it is convenient for them to discuss in person the various problems with which they must deal.

4. The American Forensic Association sponsors and administers the National Debate Tournament. This tournament in a real sense sets the pattern for intercollegiate debating in the United States.

Please let me have your reactions as soon as your group has had an opportunity to evaluate the proposal."

In view of the rationale presented to support the AFA proposal, it is doubtful if the AFA official body expected the answers it received.

The minutes of the SAA Executive Committee meeting in New York, April 22-23, 1969, state:

"Following extended discussion, it was moved, seconded, and carried that the SAA reject the proposal of the American Forensic Association that the AFA assume responsibility for selection of the National Debate Proposition and the National Discussion Question."

In his letter notifying the AFA and the forensic societies regarding the rejection of the AFA proposal, William Work, Executive Secretary of the SAA, wrote:

"In so doing (rejecting the proposal) the Executive Committee reaffirmed its faith in the present inter-organization committee. Implicit, too, . . . was a reaffirmation on the part of the Speech Association of America to cooperate in any feasible way toward the end that the work of the Committee on Intercolligate Debate and Discussion will be facilitated."

In a personal letter to the writer, Dr. Work wrote:

"I believe that it would be fair to say that there was a consensus among the members of our Executive Committee to the effect that the present selection mechanism is preferable to one that would be controlled by a single participant organization."

The National Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, meeting in Lincoln, Nebraska, April 8, 1969, unanimously adopted the following:

"The National Council of DSR-TKA in-
structs President-elect McBath to respond to the request of President Gifford Blyton of the AFA as follows:

1. DSR-TKA commends AFA's interest in and desire to improve procedures employed in selecting the national debate proposition and discussion question. DSR-TKA shares this interest and is delighted to cooperate in seeking ways to improve the selection process.

2. We express our conviction that any process for selecting the national debate proposition and discussion question should make provision for participation by the members of the forensic community.

3. We request that the ad hoc committee appointed by President Blyton of AFA include persons representing each of the organizations now represented on the selection committee.

4. We reserve final judgment until the nature of the new selection process has been defined. We ask that when the ad hoc committee has drafted a specific proposal that the proposal be submitted to Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, Phi Rho Phi, and the Speech Association of America for approval."

Somewhat more pointed in its opposition was the resolution adopted by Phi Rho Pi at its convention in Phoenix, Arizona, May 8, 1969:

"WHEREAS, the American Forensic Association has resolved that

It 'desires to assume the responsibility of selecting the National Intercollegiate Debate Proposition and Discussion question,' and

Its president 'should begin at once negotiation with Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, Phi Rho Pi, and the Speech Association of America with a view toward assumption of said responsibility,' and

Its president 'should appoint an ad hoc committee to be charged with the responsibility of considering the method of said selection and recommending to the association a procedure to be followed in selecting future national debate propositions and discussion questions,' and

WHEREAS, Phi Rho Pi desires to pursue all avenues which hold promise of increasing the constructive potential of American debating, and

WHEREAS, Phi Rho Pi is unwilling to grant carte blanche to the American Forensic Association, and

WHEREAS, the said ad hoc committee has yet to report, and

WHEREAS, this status quo presents no substantive questions for analysis and investigation,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Phi Rho Pi declare its willingness to negotiate when and if proposals are made which might improve the quality of topics selected for intercollegiate debate and discussion."

The National Council of Pi Kappa Delta referred the AFA resolution to the students attending the 26th PKD Biennial Convention, Arizona State University, Tempe, March 31-April 4, 1969. The resolution, formulated and adopted by the students and later endorsed by the National Council, stated:

"WHEREAS, all organizations would not have an assured voice in the selection of the national debate and discussion topics, and

WHEREAS, this organization reduces the student's voice in the selection of said topics,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the member chapters of Pi Kappa Delta here assembled reject the American Forensic Association resolution that the American Forensic Association solely determine the national debate and discussion topics."

Not only did the other four organizations rebuff the attempts of AFA to take over the question selection, but some individuals took the trouble to express themselves both orally and in writing, in very pointed terms. AFA was accused of being power-conscious, of consistently pursuing a policy of domination and control, of trying to take matters into its own hands without showing anything wrong with present machinery
or how the AFA could improve the selection process or the question. It was argued that none of the stated "reasons" provided any support for its proposal, that the so-called National Debate Tournament was not educationally constructive, and that the statement,

"This tournament in a real sense sets the pattern for intercollegiate debating in the United States,"

a statement that was heartily booed when presented to the students at the 1969 Pi Kappa Delta Convention in Tempe, was not only nonsense but was revealing as to the

"Thinking which prompted AFA to support the proposal."

In a letter to the National President of AFA, Professor Ron Tabor, then President of Phi Rho Pi, wrote:

"Please remain assured that I don't like the coercion the AFA attempts to practice. I don't like the 'thinking' it so obviously fails to do, and I do not like the deliberate pursuit of power for its own sake on the part of anyone, anywhere, anytime." (Letter to the groups represented on the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion, dated March 7, 1969.)

Overlooked by the AFA, it seems, was the simple, obvious fact that its proposal was a reverting, at least in principle, to what the situation was over a quarter of a century ago when Pi Kappa Delta was selecting its official PKD proposition. Further, its proposal ran counter to the historical development of the debate question selection Committee. The AFA might have considered that the SAA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion has always been a cooperative committee, with the SAA appointing only one of the five members. It might have considered, too, that if any one group were to assume the responsibility for selecting a "national" proposition it would be relatively simple for Pi Kappa Delta to resume its former practice of selecting an official question - as it did, successfully, for nearly a quarter of a century - with each chapter having the democratic right of voting on the propositions presented by the PKD Committee on Question. (The wheel would then have come full circle, as wheels so often do.) It might have considered that any appointment of an AFA committee to consider the method of selecting the national proposition, etc., was somewhat premature.

(It might be noted that at one time the AFA had proposed the consolidation of the budgets of Pi Kappa Delta, Delta Sigma Rho, and Tau Kappa Alpha into one national office with one publication and one secretary who would send out materials, membership applications, etc., for all three groups. This proposal was disapproved by the forensic societies. (Letter, dated 7/3/69 from D. J. Nabors.)

(Also, in the Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1961, p. 182, Action Report K recommended that the Executive Committee of the SAA delegate to the AFA, at its request, the authority to set up a committee to choose the national high school debate question for 1962-63 and thereafter. Instead of acting on this proposal, the Executive Committee voted that a study committee be appointed to report to the Executive Committee regarding the advisability of delegating such authority to the AFA. There is no indication in the minutes of the Executive Committee for the succeeding four years that the study committee ever made a report. One member of the Executive Committee who was involved in the selection process stated in a personal letter to the writer:

"I am quite aware of the circumstances to which you refer, i.e., the request by the AFA that the job of recommending a high school question be delegated . . . to the AFA, etc. The request . . . was not unlike a request that Mexico might make to Russia to cede the state of Missouri to Mexico; Russia has no jurisdiction."

From time to time complaints regarding the annual question are voiced, although there seems to be no particular quarrel with the procedure by which the debate proposition is selected. In the Quarterly Journal of Speech, October, 1965, p. 333, Donald Torrence, Knox College, asked,

"What is happening to intercollegiate debate? Something is wrong and we'd better correct it soon . . ."

Then he states that the 1965-66 questions
selected for the preferential vote were far from realistic — a thirty-year old topic, nationalization of basic industries; an international monetary system; farm subsidies; a unitary form of government; federalizing the public schools — when there are such problems as the quality of higher education, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Civil Rights, poverty, the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.

“How and why have we, the teachers of debate, managed to avoid all this? Are these issues . . . not debatable?”

Then Dr. Torrence makes two suggestions: (1) The SAA should play a more active role in the selection of the committee and in developing new procedures for enabling intercollegiate cooperation; (2) The demand for a single resolution for a full year is unrealistic.

In the Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, 1966, p. 184, Austin J. Freeley, chairman of the Committee, answered:

“The process of selection is designed to produce the proposition the nation’s debate directors want . . . The committee seeks to serve the forensic community — it asks only that the debate directors give a clear indication of what they want through the ballots.

How is a proposition chosen for the preliminary ballot? The process begins in February of each year when the committee mails requests for selections to almost 900 debate directors. This list includes every debate director the committee can identify and every debate director who asks to be on the list. Allowing for normal job turnover, new entries to the field, etc., the mailing reaches just about every debate director in the country.

First of all, the propositions on the preliminary ballot must come from the suggestions received by the committee . . .

Second, for a proposition to appear on the ballot, that problem area must have been suggested by a number of debate directors. There must be evidence of reasonably widespread interest in an area to warrant placing it on the ballot. Very simply, those propositions appearing on the ballot represented the problem areas most frequently suggested. Those areas with less support or no support are not included on the ballot.

Once a popular area is identified, the committee undertakes research to determine if there is a proposition within that area that meets the criteria for a national proposition (it is, for example, a relatively simple matter to phrase a proposition suitable for one or two debates — it is another matter to phrase a proposition in May which will be viable from the following September through the next April) . . .

If the problem area is popular and if research establishes that there is a proposition that meets the requirements, than it is placed on the preliminary ballot.”

From this point, the process is primarily one of reducing the number of propositions to one in much the same way the first Pi Kappa Delta question was selected in 1920 — by preferential voting of the participating schools.

As for the future, it should be constantly recalled by those urging changes in present procedures that the present Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion functions under delegated powers — powers originally delegated by the four forensic societies. Its policies and procedures are, therefore, subject to review by any of the societies at any time. As a natural consequence, the procedures followed are — and must be — voluntary, democratic, and cooperative. On that basis, the Committee can continue indefinitely to contribute to the debate program of the nation’s colleges and universities.

BECAUSE . . .

The length of the lead article in this issue, “A Historical Review of Debate Question Selection”, and the abundance of other timely articles necessitated the withholding of CHAPTER REPORTS until the next issue. You will see this report on fees paid and keys ordered in the January issue.