In Tauy Jones Hall on the Ottawa University campus, Pi Kappa Delta was founded 60 years ago. Ottawa debaters have kept the tradition alive for 6 decades and Kansas Alpha Chapter remains a loyal component of the fraternity's 277 colleges and universities. Pictured in the inset are Forensics Director Quincalee Striegel and 4 of the chapter's 10 members, Mike Gannon, Vicki Maddox, and (seated) Randy Lake, President, and Dave Bowers.
Table of Contents

Educational Forensics ............ 3
The President's Message ............ 7
Debate: Circa 1984? ............... 8
New Members .................... 10
The Secretary's Page ............. 11
Pi Kappa Which? .................. 12
Anniversary Oratory Contest ...... 13
Chapter Notes .................... 14
McGovern at Convention ........... 15

Published four times a year in October, January, March
and May by Pi Kappa Delta. Subscription price is a part of
the membership dues.
Office of publication: William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
64068. Second Class postage paid at Liberty, Mo. 64068.
Printed by Trojan Press, Inc.
North Kansas City, Mo. 64116

DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL PRESIDENT — Fred B. Goodwin,
Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo. 63701

NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT — James Grissinger,
Otterbein College, Westerville, O. 43081

NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER — Larry
Norton, Bradley University, Peoria, Ill. 61606

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS — John
Baird, California State College, Hayward,
Ca. 94542; L. A. Lawrence, Montana State
University, Bozeman, Mont. 59715; Evan
 Ulrey, Harding College, Searcy, Ark. 72143

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT — H. Francis
Short, Kansas State College, Pittsburg, Kan.
66762

HISTORIAN — D. J. Nabors, East Central State
College, Ada, Okla. 74821

EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC — Georgia B.
Bowman, William Jewell College, Liberty,
Mo. 64068

STUDENT MEMBERS — Cathy Vetter, Washburn
University, Topeka, Kans. 66621; Mark
Tobin, University of Nebraska-Omaha, Omaha, Neb. 68131

PROVINCE GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS — Duane
Aschenbrenner, University of Nebraska-
Omaha, Omaha, Neb. 68131

2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI! — Tom
Willett, William Jewell College, Liberty,
Mo. 64068

3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS — Dan Salden,
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville,
Edwardsville, Ill. 62025

4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC — Mrs.
Penny Byrne, University of Texas-El Paso,
El Paso, Tex. 79900

5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX — Jerry Win-
sor, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D.
57105

6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI
— Mrs. Barbara Norman, Central State
University, Edmond, Okla. 73034

7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES — Dan Millar,
Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant,
Mich. 48858

8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI
— Jack Starr, University of Wisconsin-
LaCrosse, LaCrosse, Wis. 54601

9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST — Gene
Mathis, Carson-Newman College, Jeffer-
sion City, Tenn. 37760

10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST — Larry
S. Richardson, Western Washington State
College, Bellingham, Wash. 98225

11. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST —
Phyllis Bosley, Towson State College, Balti-
tmore, Md. 21204
Educational Forensics:
Another Viewpoint

Richard B. Gartell
Director of Forensics,
Doane College,
Crete, Nebraska

... There has developed among some members of our association an increasing distrust of the speech contest, a feeling that it consumes time and energy that might more profitably be devoted to other forms of teaching or research, a tendency to doubt its educational values ... We are as usual in the midst of a period of critical analysis.¹

Times have not changed! The pressures of contemporary society have again brought many calls for reappraisal of current forensic practices; much of the recent literature has been of a critical nature seeking resolution to the dichotomy between sterile academic exercises and real life activities.²

Tightening financial pressures of near-crisis proportions, resulting in reduced forensic budgets, limit the implementation of a viable philosophical-educational perspective on competitive enterprises. There remain, however, within forensics, bonafide educational objectives which provide the activities with substance and strength. If we fully understand and develop these objectives, they can become the justification for any forensic program. Herein lies the intent of this article, to enumerate and synthesize these objectives and some kinds of forensic programs which can be developed beyond the traditional tournament concept.

What are some of the educational objectives in forensics? The American Forensics Association has stated that some of the objectives of forensics should be the following: to create opportunities for intense investigations on significant problems; to promote the use of rational discourse supported by available evidence; to develop abilities in selecting, arranging, and composing materials; to train students in persuasive presentations; to stimulate honest and original effort; to provide stimulating speaking experiences; and to assist in demonstrating a realistic approach to solving problems.³

But there are other objectives as well, seldom clearly delineated, which go beyond those stated above.

1. The student, through active participation, increases his fluency skills by acquiring an understanding of the rigor necessary for developing his verbal potentialities. The student begins to rely on himself as a resource and perceive himself as an effective communicator of ideas.

2. The student begins to develop critical listening, comprehension, and reasoning abilities. Skills related to understanding the spoken word, making evaluations and assessments based on verbal dialogue, and being able to respond verbally will improve as the student sharpens his oral capabilities. Keeping abreast of current events, scanning materials and developing perceptions within restricted time periods will develop skills in concise thinking, which should be reflected in other aspects of the student's academic life.

3. A third value from participation in forensics is the development of confidence in one's own abilities; initially, a novice is hesitant and anxious. But after a time, and with patient coaching, that student begins to develop confidence in his abilities which can have a positive effect upon that person's perception of himself.

4. The student participating in forensics will also become conscious of his ethical framework; all communicators must
Above: The author of this article, Richard Gartrell, talks to new forensic squad prospects Bob Parham and Becky Elm.

Left: Lori Bishop and Deb Brandt review materials pertinent to their involvement in the Model UN program at Doane College. Both girls are also debaters.
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develop some set of operating ethics, and the student participant is not exempt. He will define or refine his ethical framework relative to the example provided him by his forensic coach; the matter of ethical practices — whether in debate, individual events, judging, or the general use of materials — is a deep responsibility of student and faculty alike.

5. The student in forensics can learn to cooperate with his peers; this means the willingness to assist one who is having difficulties, share materials with colleagues, and contribute to the smooth functioning of the entire forensic program. But this has another dimension too; greater cooperation should be demonstrated among colleges and universities. Such cooperative exchanges only enhance positive feelings and attitudes and deepen the mutual respect for one another.

6. Students involved in forensics learn a great amount of responsibility; they are the backbone of any on-campus forensic programs. In acquiring experiences related to actually running tournaments, students can ultimately gain tremendous functional competencies.

7. Students also experience the necessity of integrating a variety of feedback information; evaluation forms usually contain constructive comments which students can utilize in refining their presentations. Peer evaluations and conferences with the forensic director also provide for meaningful feedback upon which the student can capitalize. But oral critiques should also be available more than they are; McGuckin calls for the use of oral critiques, claiming that to forbid judges the right to teach because of tournament rules is "downright perverse." 4

These are only a few of the possible educational objectives which seem too often to be lost in the maze of rigid tournament expectations. There is, however, no guarantee that the above objectives will provide one with a year of "victories" — but maybe that depends on the way one perceives "victories."

What can be done to facilitate educational forensics? Some constructive suggestions have already been put forth in order to generate discussion; among those ideas are experimentation with extemporé debate; 5 debate via telelecture; 6 a conference approach to debate; 7 the possibilities of multiple questions during any given academic year for both discussion and debate; an N.C.D.A. proposal; 8 and a student forum. 9

But these are not the only changes occurring within the forensic arts; at the University of Northern Colorado tournament, judges are required to make their evaluations on the basis of quality, not quantity — quality of evidence, quality of analysis, quality of arguments, and quality of the demonstrated rhetorical skills. At the University of North Dakota, an event entitled "Protagoras Debate" was implemented placing emphasis upon reasoning and analysis abilities rather than upon stored evidence. 10 And Central Missouri State predicated rules and scheduling on tournament objectives.

There is an additional dimension to forensics which can enhance educational objectives. Non-competitive forensics refers to that domain of activities which are not tournament bound. For example, a large number of students each year have the opportunity to participate in the Model United Nations programs. This public forum provides for a different set of experiences and skills seldom seen as actively in a competitive event as they are on the floor of the Model UN. The
successful outcome of any maneuvering is found in the passage of resolutions, and the relevant aspect of this program is found in its realistic counterpart, the United Nations.

During the crisis at San Francisco State College in 1968, this author was one of the student coordinators of the Community Relations Speakers Bureau. The bureau was operational at the height of the crisis in an attempt to bridge the information gap between on-campus developments and the public's knowledge of events. Involvement was the key term; it was necessary to research in depth all aspects of the crisis, issues, individuals, and rumors; to develop comprehensive information packets for potential speakers; to maintain up-to-date reporting of all events on campus (and this was not an easy task when one was ditching both the police and the students); to maintain a central coordinating office (sometimes operations were hampered by stink bombs); to secure public speaking engagements within the community; to assign speakers representing various opinions on the crisis; to confirm and handle the pertinent follow-up details — all of these activities required the total involvement of forensic personnel, both faculty and students, in a major cooperative effort. This was educational communication training at its best.

But there have been other recommendations put forth as well; some have suggested campus dialogues between invited congressmen and the debate teams(s) on a mutually agreed upon contemporary issue. Still others have suggested that the forensic program could include leadership training programs for the development of skills related to meeting management among both students (i.e. student government) and faculty (i.e. faculty senates and meetings). Forensic personnel could also be useful in resolving on-campus conflicts, by acting as mediators and/or providing a public forum for open discussion on the issues (some have called this the Hyde Park Forum). Inter-college dialogues centered on a controversial issue might generate some interest for public on-campus forums. And it has been suggested that though forensic personnel travel many miles together, the institution of a human relations program might have a valuable impact in providing students with skills for relating to one another.

Whatever is preferred, the moods of the campus are again shifting; and exactly what kinds of forensic programs will be preferred over others remain to be seen. It is possible, however, to assert that when one loses sight of the educational objectives of forensics, there remains little to justify its existence. Coaches and speech educators alike need to develop their philosophical perspectives on forensics, emphasizing forensics as an arena for teaching and learning within the spirit of healthy competition. Forensics, both competitive and non-competitive, can be viable extensions of working educational principles, thus making it one of our most valuable educational communication laboratories. 11

14 There are two other concerns within forensics not discussed — travel budgets and extensive tournament schedules, and judging behaviors of coaches. Both have significant implications — the former with regard to justifiable programs, the latter with regard to personal biases and objective evaluations.
The President’s Message

Fred Goodwin

Some of you will see this copy of the *Forensic* just before you depart for Omaha and the 28th Biennial Convention and Tournament. Others of you may not have a chance to peruse it until the Convention is only a bit of history. But hoping that most of you will read these words in anticipation rather than retrospect, I’d like to share a thought or two with you about the Pi Kappa Delta National.

Those who have been around this meeting for some years claim, and rightly, that it is not just another tournament. It is big, bulky, ponderous — and wondrously unique. Delegates can make things happen at this tournament which happen nowhere else on the debate circuit.

The keys are participation and sharing of experiences.

All should participate in the business meetings. This year, especially, a number of issues on the agenda should generate arguments which will be far from perfunctory. Changes affecting the selection of the national debate proposition will be argued, and you need to be present to give us the best thinking your chapter can muster.

Coaches should participate in the special coaches seminar (a serious one) slated for 8 p.m. Tuesday. One request made of the planners of the National Convention was to provide a structured forum for reflections on a current issue in contemporary debate theory. The query selected was, “What Makes an Affirmative Case Propositional?” The best of submitted manuscripts have been selected for presentation and discussion, and we believe it will be an interesting session.

Everyone should participate in the Province meetings. Strengthening of province organizations is high on almost everybody’s priority list. Opportunities abound for Province improvement, ranging from restructuring Province tournaments to election of vigorous leadership. Go. Speak. Vote.

Students should participate fully in the contests. We have more events this year than at any time in Pi Kappa Delta history. Enjoy the contests; and while you do your best, make the most of your chances to enjoy the fellowship of other members of our order.

We received a letter from a student after the last Pi Kappa Delta National complaining, politely, that she felt she had not been able to serve her local chapter well enough as a result of her experience there. I liked the letter. The student was looking for ways to improve her local chapter and to further the cause of intercollegiate debate on her campus. Ideas will be sparked in Omaha if all participate. Then each delegate will be able to take morsels of those ideas to students unable to make the trip.

Participate and share. Your Convention experience and Pi Kappa Delta will be the better for it.
Calvin N. Smith,
Associate Professor of Speech,
Eastern Illinois University,
Charleston, Ill.

The current controversy over debaters’ audience adaptation (or, more specifically, their lack of it) plus the sweeping indictments of the entire modern debate scene,1 prompt us to thoughtfully consider what future tournaments will be like should the concept survive. The following may provide insight into the evolution of debate tournaments as we enter the Orwellian era.

Sillers and Brown, the number one team from Bryngelson College, reported to the Matching and Dispatching room for their room assignment for the first round of debate at the Futura College Invitational Tournament. “Room 210 Electronics Building,” the man at the desk said.

As the two debaters rode to their destination on the pedestrian conveyor, they earnestly discussed last minute revisions of their affirmative case. As the conveyor passed the Electronics Building, the two young men stepped from it to the escalator which carried them to the second floor. Their opponents and the operator had already arrived.

After the usual pleasantries were exchanged, Sillers, the first affirmative speaker said: “Well gentlemen, are you ready?” “We’re ready when you are,” said Potter, the first negative, smiling affably. “O.K. then,” said the operator, “let’s turn it on and get going.” With that, the operator stepped to the rear of the room and flicked the switch on EDPAC — the latest version of the Electronic Debate Programmer Analyzer and Computer (Model 330335). A barely perceptible hum came from the machine — it was working perfectly.

A pleasant sounding voice from the machine announced: “This is a recording. Welcome to the 1984 Futura College Invitational Tournament. Will the speakers please indicate their names and their school in order of their appearance on the platform. This information will then be recorded on the computer ballot.” The debaters complied.

Sillers stepped to the speaker’s platform. There he deftly donned the electronic gesture indicators (commonly called “GIs”). The GIs consist of four adjustable rings. Three of the rings are for the index, middle and ring finger of the right hand respectively. The remaining ring is placed on the index finger of the left hand. The GI mechanism is simple but effective: each time a ring-bearing finger is moved, the arc and intensity of that move is computed by EDPAC and credited to the speaker’s delivery score. Since, even in 1984, almost all gestures made in debate are of the traditional sort, the four GIs are considered completely adequate to measure gestural activity. The three fingers of the right hand are used to cite each of the affirmative’s “three major contentions” while the index finger of the left hand is used to check off each contention in order. Of course, the negative team uses the same gestures to cite their objections to the affirmative’s need. The remarkably sensitive GIs transmit finger movement (or “digital delivery data”) to a photoelectric scanner which integrates that numerical coefficient with the coefficients of other communication skills. A jargon strainer (which must be changed after each round to avoid saturation) covers the vocal input evaluating mechanism. Its purpose is to convert esoteric terms to plain English. Vocal variation and force are checked through a sophisticated oscilloscopic tabulator. Dogmatism and sarcasm are checked by the Inflectometer, an instrument which computes the deviation of the speaker’s voice under pressure compared with his normal speaking voice.

As Sillers spoke, the programmer automatically broke down his words into syllables, counted them and sent the total to the computer which determined their “listenability” through the use of the Bone listenability test.2 The results of this test counted exactly 23.006 per cent of the total speaker score.

The debate progressed in the normal 1984 fashion. All of the debaters knew better than to try to appeal to the emotions much since EDPAC operated almost exclusively by logic, allowing only 3.0903 per cent of the final score to be
based on pathos appeals. The teams were also well aware that twisting evidence was impossible to successfully conceal. This was due to the fact that all the existing information on the topic has been collected, correlated and stored in the fantastically intricate (and accurate) “brain” of EDPAC. Hence, when each debate card was read, that quote was checked for accuracy against the master program inside the machine, and received a numerical rating depending on its proximity to the ideal debate case.

How did all this come about? The answer is simple. Ferron Feedback, a brilliant graduate student in speech at Pardou University, developed the project back in 1979. Feedback, who had an undergraduate degree in both statistics and electronic engineering, was deeply concerned by the fact that there were no rules to insure uniform debate judging. Having read a few books on cybernetics, this imaginative young man became obsessed with the idea of devising a system to make Corax’s Theory of Probabilities obsolete. Feedback wangled a government grant and with sliderule in hand and a determined glint in his eye he went to work on the problem. After three months of earnest effort he finally found the answer. He immediately wrote a book called The Science of Rhetoric in which he fully explained his Laws of Certainty. This discovery was hailed as the greatest advance in the field of Rhetoric since the advent of the comparative advantages case. Realizing the importance of his discovery, the selfless Feedback turned over his rhetorical secrets to the government. He realized that if such information fell into the wrong hands the holder of it could, through this statistically verified system, gain domination of the world. Feedback’s original notes were stored alongside the formula for the Hydrogen bomb.

The government quickly set up the U.S. Bureau of Rhetoric and, after a thorough investigation, decided that there were only two agencies in the world ethically qualified to produce and program the EDPAC system. The producer of the machine was, of course, The International Business Machines Co. The job of gaining all the available information on the national topic and running a content analysis of it went to another “natural” — the J. Weston Walch Company.

When EDPAC first came on the market it sold for $7900 or about the average annual salary of a debate coach. However, mass production at IBM soon cut the cost to a more modest figure ($4750 — slightly higher west of the Rockies) and soon most of the major schools had at least seven or eight of these devices at their disposal. Each machine was equipped with an automatic decision giver. This device computed all the factors considered important in the debate and transmitted this information to the Matching and Dispatching office within 071 of a second after the debate had ended.

So efficient was this system, that in 1983 all debate cards were printed by Walch and assigned numbers. As a result, instead of wasting time reading a long well-worn quote by some authority, the speaker could, if he desired, merely say for example “Affirmative card number 436”. The time the speaker would normally have taken to read the quote was then subtracted from his total allotment and credit given him for the quotation (with due mathematical adjustment if he fell below the debate norm of 375 words per minute). Thus both teams were spared the boredom of listening to and repeating stock evidence in every debate. Toward the end of the year debatees using this technique sounded more like they were giving a series of football signals than engaging in a forensic endeavor.

Of course the machines required an operator to turn them on and off as well as making sure no one tampered with them. This was desirable since it allowed many unemployed debate judges to assume that responsibility. There were other advantages as well. No longer would mere mortal judges be forced to meet the agonizing crisis they faced at the end of each round in the pre-EDPAC days: that is, making sure that the total speaker rating points of the winning team were higher than the total points scored by the losers.

Sometimes, just for fun, an operator could still judge a debate like he did in the old days. But one who was recently interviewed said he still had trouble “with those # “$%&’ speaker rating systems!” He also discovered that his score and decision, when compared to the
machine's, was almost invariably wrong. "That was the trouble in the old days," he mumbled apologetically, "we were just too darned subjective." He paused, sighed nostalgically and added, "There are times when I wish we could go back to the old system though: we may not have been statistically accurate to the .001 level of confidence, but we sure had fun."

1See the January 1971 issue of the Forensic, for example. Two articles there are pertinent: John E. Baird's "Attorney Judges: A Communication Problem for Debaters" and David Walker's "Is Contemporary Debate Educational?"

2Which, of course, is a complementary development to the Flesch Readability Test of an earlier vintage.

### New Members of Pi Kappa Delta

| PANHANDLE STATE COLLEGE       | 46493 | Marvin Allen Lawson |
| 46467 Johnny Anderson          | 46494 | June Meitz         |
| 46468 Gene Hillman             | 46495 | Barbara Mizerek    |
| 46469 Jean Twombly             | 46496 | Peter Parts        |
| CHADRON STATE COLLEGE         |       |                    |
| 46470 Joe Anderson             | 46497 | John L. Boyer      |
| 46471 Bill Bailey              | 46498 | Craig V. Evans     |
| 46472 Brad Barrows             | 46499 | Larry Andrew Madsen|
| 46473 Jennie May Donnell       | 46500 |                   |
| 46474 Greg Gehrig              | 46501 |                   |
| 46475 Gretchen Golden          | 46502 |                   |
| 46476 Harry Holmberg           | 46503 |                   |
| 46477 Kevin Lang               | 46504 |                   |
| 46478 Steve Manion             | 46505 |                   |
| 46479 Judy Mattern             | 46506 |                   |
| 46480 John Myers               | 46507 |                   |
| 46481 Jim Patterson            | 46508 |                   |
| 46482 Janet Pokorski           | 46509 |                   |
| 46483 Cody Runyan              | 46510 |                   |
| 46484 Janice Tiensvold         | 46511 |                   |
| 46485 Iris Watchorn            | 46512 |                   |
| CULVER-STOCKTON COLLEGE       | 46513 |                   |
| 46486 Joseph D. Masterson      | 46514 | Daniel Greenman    |
| CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY    | 46515 | John Patrick Lapuzza |
| 46487 John S. Hynd II          | 46516 | Gary Reiners       |
| STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE      | 46517 | Judith Roberts     |
| 46488 Kenneth Lee Adair        | 46518 | Jackie Rupp        |
| WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY        | 46519 | Gail Y. Wantlin    |
| 46489 Clete Biersack           | 46520 | Stephen Michael Allen |
| 46490 Kathie Brockman          | 46521 | Gary Bonds         |
| 46491 Donald Feltz             |       |                   |
| 46492 Robert Gleadall          |       |                   |
| 46522 Joseph C. Calloway       | 46523 | Keith Grace        |
| 46524 Deborah Louise Thomas    | 46525 | James Herr         |
| HOPE COLLEGE                   | 46526 | Carl T. Camden     |
| 46527 Clyde R. Elder           | 46528 | Timothy Wayne Triplett |
| 46529 Gordon Upchurch          | 46530 | Bill Wallace       |
| SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE      | 46531 | Eugene A. Hancock, Jr. |
| 46532 Barbara Jean Helms       | 46533 | David Corey Joyce  |
| 46534 Robert Carlton Kuhn      | 46535 | Dianne Long        |
| 46536 Philip H. Manly          | 46537 | Norma Webster Stowe |
| PREIFFER COLLEGE               | 46538 | Doloras Cikrit     |
| 46539 Daniel Flanagan          | 46540 | Jo Anne Jordan     |
| 46541 James McLean             | 46542 | Margaret Moffat    |
| CARROLL COLLEGE — MONTANA      |       |                   |
| 46543 Greg Bistline            | 46544 | Girina Chen        |
| 46545 Michael P. Kelley         | 46546 | Ramon Poole        |
| 46547 Gwen Rath                | 46548 | Mary Patricia Brown |
| WAYNE STATE COLLEGE            |       |                   |
| 46551 Mary Hisle                | 46552 | Mary Patricia Brown |

### Forty Years Ago...

The January, 1913 Forensic carried an article about the new phenomenon of debate tournaments. Prof. Ross Compton of Texas Eta (North Texas State) wrote that "at these meets we find college students vitally interested and well prepared."

Three tournaments were mentioned:

Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.; a "women's get-together" at Bowling Green; a practice tournament at the University of Redlands.

H. Dana Hopkins of Heidelberg College was Pi Kappa Delta's national president that year. The 1932-33 debate proposition was Resolved: That the United States should agree to the cancellation of the interallied debts.
Pi Kappa Delta is 60 years old. It is this fact which prompted us to re-read the history of those first 50 years as summarized by former Secretary-Treasurer and present Historian, D. J. Nabors.

As we study this 50 year record and add to it the last decade, two guiding principles of the fraternity constantly appear. First is the dynamic development of the type and structure of tournament events, always in response to forensic needs and practices throughout the nation. Second is the persistent effort to create and preserve a convention as well as a tournament image.

The historical record as compiled by Dr. Nabors reminds us that no contests were held at the first convention in 1916 at Washburn University. At that meeting the insignia and ritual were designed, the constitution put in more complete form, and plans were developed for interfraternity relations. A debate between Redlands and Ottawa was on the program at Ottawa University in 1918. An oratorical contest was first held at Morningside College in 1920. Extemporaneous speaking was added at Bradley in 1924. At the sixth biennial convention in 1926 at Fort Collins and Greeley, a national debate tournament was established with separate divisions for men and women. Twelve years later the student congress was added at Topeka. In 1947, at Bowling Green, discussion was substituted for the student congress. Separate contests were held for men and women in all events until a breakthrough in 1965 when men, women or mixed teams were permitted to enter the experimental open division cross-examination debate. In 1969 men and women competed against each other in all contests. The championship cross-examination debate was now an established event and oral interpretation was added as an experimental contest. In 1971 interpretation was an accepted event and extemporaneous debate was included on an experimental basis. Now, in 1973, extemporaneous debate is continued with general approval and informative speaking is on a trial basis. Throughout these years of event additions and rule revisions, the policy has been to make changes upon the recommendation of provincial areas where the event has been first used and approved.

From its origin, the purpose of Pi Kappa Delta has been to promote and establish educational values in forensic activity. The convention aspect of the biennial meetings has been a part of all programs as reflected by business sessions, the student congress, peer evaluations in discussion, talent nights, student meetings, special lectures, coaches meetings and free periods for sightseeing. By 1957, tournaments had increased in number and public pressure had continued to mount for something more than "just another tournament". Pi Kappa Delta responded with increased effort by adding two new convention features at Brookings. A session was devoted to professional problems with Robert T. Oliver as the speaker. A distinguished alumni award was presented to Senator Karl Mundt. These features have been continued periodically.

The 1973 convention includes many of the best features supporting the two principles described above. The format for discussion has been altered to incorporate more thoroughly the educational values within both the content and procedures of the event. The coaches’ meeting will feature a special symposium-forum treating the question, "What makes an Affirmative Case Propositional?" Informative speaking has been added at a time when the communication of informative material has become an intense problem as a result of the information explosion. Business sessions and student meetings are provided with a good percentage of the total time for deliberation and formulation of policy pertinent to the future welfare of the organization.

The ability of Pi Kappa Delta to implement these dynamic goals is one of the real reasons why it has been a great privilege for me to serve the organization as secretary-treasurer during its sixth decade.
Pi Kappa Which?
Paul D. Stamm
and Trich Terranova,
Wisconsin State University,
Whitewater

In a recent survey there were some rather surprising results.

Question: “What is Pi Kappa Delta?”
Answer: “That’s one of those Jock Frats, right?”

Question: “Have you ever done any forensics?”
Answer: “Sure, every Friday night, but don’t tell my mother!”

Those answers were of course slightly exaggerated, but all too often the “average” college student simply is uninformed about PKD and its activities. The Wisconsin Epsilon Chapter at UW-Whitewater decided something should be done to inform its student body. In conjunction with our persuasion class, Trich Terranova and I set upon a campaign to change the attitudes of our student body. As a secondary goal we tried to recruit new members to the forensics squad. This type of campaign can be very useful to PKD and to the learning experience of its members.

The basic campaign was divided into five parts — four sets of speeches and an attitude test. The first set of speeches was given before 16 Fundamentals of Speech classes. We used the same speech in each class. Trich spoke to five of the classes and I to seven. We divided the 10 minute speeches for the remaining four classes. We emphasized the educational and social aspects of debate and individual events. The second set of speeches was given as an evening of individual events. A night of debate was used for the third set of speeches. During these two evening presentations we again spoke of the reasons for joining a forensics squad. Each of these sets of speeches took one week to complete. In the fourth week we returned to the classrooms to make one last pitch. After this last speech we handed out a questionnaire.

A control group was set up to measure how effective we were in changing the attitudes of our audience. We had the instructors, in three Fundamentals classes we did not talk to, hand out the questionnaire for our control group. That gave us 53 responses to use against the 252 in the experimental group. The responses were run through the University’s computers. Most of the results were not useful in making accurate observations, because of the excessively high number of variables. We did, however, find the outcome of the overall survey of importance.

We discovered that this type of project is of immense value to a chapter and its members. We attained two goals that we feel all chapters should strive for. We received a good deal of publicity and a practical understanding of public speaking and speech research techniques.

Forensics has always tried to make a good public image for itself. Often this is a difficult task since tournaments are usually not attended by the student body. In a campaign such as this, we got the “word” out to a large number of people. We reached over 550 students and the responses we received tend to show they enjoyed the experience. Good publicity is, of course, the life blood of forensics and of good appropriations for the next year’s budget.

Trich and Paul puzzle over what to do with their 58,000 computer figures. — Photo courtesy UW-Whitewater Information Service.

In order to understand speech one must be able to read and understand the speech journals. It has been our experience that students may read QJS or CSSJ or some other journal without understanding why the results of a research project came out the way they did. It should be a goal of PKD to make all aspects of speech clear to its members. PKD has the responsibility to teach an understanding of the art of persuasion. One cannot advance the art if
one doesn’t understand it. The goal of PKD is not just tournament activities but rather to give a broad and meaningful approach to the learning aspects of speech. A campaign of this type can be very helpful in reaching this goal.

Perhaps one day, campaign results from a PKD sponsored project will be considered valid enough to be used for the advancing of knowledge in speech. Our project could not do this. With nothing to use as a base of operations, we made serious mistakes in the compilation of statistics. Yet from these errors we have learned how to do a survey better, so results will be more meaningful the next time.

We received 74 pages of computer print out data. That represents over 58,000 statistics to sort out. Because of the size of the project and the poor validity, we may never be able to complete the findings. Perhaps one day some other PKD Chapter will do the same sort of “experiment”, and perhaps their findings can be used.

Anniversary Oratory Contest

The first published historical sketch of Pi Kappa Delta states: “It was January, 1913, before Pi Kappa Delta was considered organized.” Thus, we celebrate our 60th anniversary this year. In recognition of this birthday, a special round of commemorative anniversary oratory is scheduled at the Omaha convention.

This special event is open to the schools who were national founders and still have an active Pi Kappa Delta chapter.

Starting in 1911, agitation at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans., for recognition of forensic activity resulted in efforts by John Shields, a student, and Egbert Ray Nichols, a former Ottawa faculty member who had moved to Ripon College, Ripon, Wisc. It was their idea to organize a fraternity for forensics. Without going into details, the culmination was the preparation of a final document with places for signatures of representatives of 12 colleges in the Midwest.

The March, 1963, issue of The Forensic has a picture of the signature part of the founding document. Two spaces are unsigned. Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill., and William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., for various reasons did not become national founders of Pi Kappa Delta. The 10 schools and their representatives, who became known as national founders, were:


Of these 10 schools, Kansas Agriculture College, now known as Kansas State University, dropped out of Pi Kappa Delta and installed a chapter of DSR-TPCA. Iowa Wesleyan also left the fold, and Cotner University closed its doors and no longer exists.

So, in the 60th anniversary year, seven chapters remain. These are all fairly small colleges, all in the Midwest, and all have the distinction of supporting active forensic programs within the structure of Pi Kappa Delta for 60 years.

The anniversary round of oratory is composed of one representative from each of the seven schools, with judging by a panel of past presidents of Pi Kappa Delta, known as the Order of the Beards.

In doing research for this article, it was noted that no picture can be found of two of the national founders: C. J. Boddy (Kansas Wesleyan) and Daniel C. Lockwood (College of Emporia). The two chapters involved might perform a service to the national historian by locating a picture of their respective national founders.

Another suggestion might be that each of the seven founding chapters organize an alumni chapter and name it after their respective founders.
Chapter Notes are abbreviated this month. Because of the long December-January lay-off for many schools, a call for news was not sent out for this issue. Be sure to send a report from your chapter for the May issue [deadline April 2].

**PROVINCE 1**

**1 Chapter Reporting**

**OTTAWA UNIVERSITY**

Kansas Alpha Chapter has had a busy and profitable debate season beginning with Randy Lake and Susie Clough winning first place in Junior Division at the Garden City Junior College Tournament.

Next, four novice and amateur teams won second place in Sweepstakes at the Kansas State University Novice Tournament. After a fourth place win at Wichita State, Randy and Susie represented O.U. at the Georgetown Invitational in Washington, D.C. The first semester of debate ended with again a first place for them at the Johnson County Community College Tournament.

This January the Pi Kappa Delta members at O.U. ran an experimental tournament where all freshmen class members debated on five different topics ranging among such subjects as abortion laws, family planning, euthanasia, and pollution. Almost 200 freshmen participated in the two day, five round tournament with ten tuition scholarships given as awards. It was a lot of work organizing such a project, but a valuable experience for all involved.

Another exciting trip for PKD members David Kroll, Vicki Maddox, Wayne Morris, and David Bowers was to Tulane University in New Orleans.

Later in March PKD will host the Missouri-Kansas Intercollegiate Debate Tournament, a junior division state championship for the two states. Of course, the high point of the year will be the National Tournament in Omaha.

**PROVINCE 3**

**1 Chapter Reporting**

**WINONA STATE COLLEGE**

Competing against teams from 25 schools, Winona State College won sweepstakes honors at the November New Era Tournament at Sioux Falls College. Novice debaters Alicia Smith and David Galchutt and Mary O'Neill and Douglas Hamper advanced to the finals with 6-0 records. Varsity debaters Kevin Brooks and Tim Stoltman placed third, behind PKD schools MacMurray and McNeese.

The squad has also participated successfully in the Twin Cities Debate League.

**PROVINCE 7**

**1 Chapter Reporting**

**MARSHALL UNIVERSITY, WEST VIRGINIA**

**Reporter:** Marilyn Davis

Beta Chapter of West Virginia had a productive year in forensics in 1971-72. We sponsored discussion, debate, and oral interpretation programs for four community organizations. We also sponsored the John Marshall Debate Tournament for West Virginia high schools and served as hosts for the British debaters. On the debate and individual events circuit our trips were recreational, our losses educational, and the hardware (33 items) inspirational.

On March 1, we initiated four new members: Mark Taylor, senior from Charleston, W. Va. and Steve Haeberle, Eddie Novak, and Marilyn Davis, sophomores from Huntington, W. Va. Officers for 1972-73 are: President, Bruce Tucker, Dayton, O. junior; vice-president, Steve Haeberle; secretary-reporter, Marilyn Davis; and public relations, Mark Taylor. Our chapter sponsors are Mrs. David Murphy and Dr. B. W. Hope.

By the end of October, 1972, the M.U. forensics squad had attended four tournaments. Our individual events representatives had brought home four trophies and our varsity debaters placed fourth at the tournament sponsored by our Pi Kappa Delta neighbors, Morris Harvey. We had also conducted three demonstration debate workshops for area high schools, and sponsored the Intramural Forensics Contests for Marshall University students.

Plans for the second semester include attendance at 11 novice and varsity debate tournaments and five individual events.
Officers for the Minnesota Kappa chapter were elected at our annual spring meeting and initiation. Kaye Shell, Robert Littlefield, and Rhonda Lee compose the executive committee as president, vice-president, and secretary, respectively. The chapter also elected class representatives: Kathy Holiday - senior; Belle Edson - junior; Carole Nepstad - sophomore. In addition, Mr. Michael Kelly was appointed as the chapter historian — a most honorable position! We were pleased to welcome two honorary members into our chapter: Mrs. Rhoda Hansen of Fargo North High School, Fargo, N.D. and Mr. Harlan Schuck of Moorhead High School, Moorhead, Minn. Both of the new members were recognized for their valuable contributions during our annual fall high school tournament in which several Pi Kappa Delta students are involved.

Our previous adviser, Mrs. Hazel Scott, is on sabbatical this year with her family in Europe. Intermittent word from her indicates that she is enjoying her voyage and is recuperating in preparation for next year's trials when she will return to the chapter. In her stead, Mr. Steve Leth is advising the chapter and coaching debate. Mr. Timothy Choy is in charge of individual events and Mr. Michael Kelly is coaching oral interpretation and reader's theatre. We have another addition to the forensics staff in Dr. Patrick McDonough — our administrative director.

The chapter is pleased to witness a large turn-out of students for forensics this fall with approximately 60 participants in all. We are planning for a bumper crop of initiates next spring with students qualified in both individual and group events. Although the chapter is feeling the pangs of budget reductions, our forensics staff is making a concerted effort to involve all interested students. Mr. Kelly is directing numerous students in a community oriented reader's theatre program and Mr. Choy is presently preparing students for a speaker's bureau. Through such programs, the staff is planning to provide experience for all.

We are looking forward to a successful year and are planning to see you all at the national tournament in Omaha. Let's hope that the snow is melting in Nebraska by March — those of us in the northern states could use a break from the icy blast of winter.

McGovern Honor at Convention

Highlighting the National Convention at Omaha is the appearance of Sen. George McGovern as outstanding alumnus of the last biennium.

Senator McGovern appears at the business meeting March 30 to receive a plaque. His speech to the convention, on a non-political theme, relates to the role of the public figure in calling on Americans to do what is right.

George McGovern was born in Avon, S.D. in 1922. He received his B.A. degree from Dakota Wesleyan University and his M.A. and Ph.D. in history and government from Northwestern University.

As a bomber pilot in World War II, he flew 35 combat missions, receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters.

A leader in the rebuilding of the Democratic state party organization, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1956 and in 1958. In 1960 he was named by President Kennedy to be Food for Peace Director and Special Assistant to the President. His election to the U.S. Senate in 1962 was the first Democratic Senatorial victory in South Dakota since 1936. Since the November elections he has resumed his senatorial role as a spokesman for "the loyal opposition."

As one of the "Famous Fifty," he was honored at the 1963 PKD Convention.
If the truth loses in public debate, the fault lies with its defenders.

Bormann and Bormann
Speech Communication