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The Greek master teacher, Isocrates, claimed that his school of eloquence prepared students for participation in the public life of Greece. Plato denied that it did so and said rather that rhetoric as practiced by the sophists was a "knack" like cooking. What claims do we modern teachers of rhetoric, particularly of forensic rhetoric, make?

You have no doubt seen testimonies by various public figures that training in debate was crucial to their later achievements in the public life of our nation. What will you testify that forensic training has done for you, baccalaureate matriculato rs of 1976? Cicero, invoking the power of his model, proclaimed: "Then behold Isocrates arose, from whose school...none but real heroes proceeded..." Do you seniors, products of modern forensic education, feel like "real heroes?"

What relevance to education or "training for public life" has three or four years participation in forensics in high school followed by a more intensive three or four years experience in college or university? Surely there must be some tangible result or carry-over effect from all this work. Can we document our intangible impressions that this frenzied activity is really productive of good for our students?

I, of course, feel that the results of forensic activity can justify all the intellectual and physical exertion which goes into it. However, there doubtless is not a simple cause-effect relationship between amount of activity and desirable results. I want to suggest one criterion for the existence of a forensic program in a college or university.

A good program must have a sound theoretical base. The theory thus must be taught, not just "coached." Since the time of Isocrates, rhetoricians have accepted the truism that practice, theory, and criticism are essential ingredients of an art. We may ask ourselves just how thoroughly our students understand the theory of argumentation and persuasion. If students have been practicing the forensic arts since junior high school, and we recruit the winners and give them scholarships so they can continue their winning ways under our "coaching," one may well ask how sound a theoretical basis they develop for their practice and (Continued on page 14)
Today’s Relevance of Yesterday’s Wisdom
Wayne Thompson

Scholarly expositions abound on Aristotle’s great contributions to rhetoric, poetics, logic, politics, philosophy, and other academic fields, but little appreciated is the great perceptiveness of his commentaries on human nature and problems. Although the tone of the following article is lighthearted, the thesis is serious: Aristotle is an important source of trenchant observations on the human condition.

First in interest to those in forensics is the Rhetoric, which is an excellent source for passages both timely and timeless. In regard to susceptibility to praise or flattery, Aristotle observes, “And we also feel kindly towards those who praise such good qualities as we possess, and especially if they praise the good qualities that we are not too sure we do possess” (Rhetoric ii.4; italics added). Is there any debater or coach who has not known someone like that — perhaps a scholar who paid little attention to praise for his true achievements but who loved flattery for some minor accomplishment?

Other observations of human nature are equally astute. “... the audience,” Aristotle says, “take the truth of what they know as so much evidence for the truth of what they do not” (iii.16). Elsewhere he notes, “We believe good men more fully and more readily than others: this is true generally whatever the question is, and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible” (i.2). As is true in so many other parts of the Rhetoric, Aristotle goes a step beyond most modern commentators: many note the importance of ethical character but not its added importance when “certainty is impossible.”

Still another shrewd observation is in the section on pity: “... what we fear for ourselves excites our pity when it happens to others” (ii.8). Two chapters earlier he notes, “... that is why we feel ashamed to refuse those a favour who ask one for the first time — we have not as yet lost credit with them” (ii.6). Concerning wealth he points out, “Wealth as a whole consists in using things rather than in owning them” (i.5). On bravery he says, “For there are two reasons why human beings face danger calmly: they may have no experience of it, or they may have means to deal with it” (ii.5).

Other commentaries on human nature are numerous. Some are succinct and some are detailed. Of the latter, one of the most famous is the description of youth. Many readers find this passage as accurate today as it was in Classical Greece:

Young men have strong passions, and tend to gratify them indiscriminately. Of the bodily desires, it is the sexual by which they are most swayed and in which they show absence of self-control. They are changeable and fickle in their desires... their impulses are keen but not deep-rooted. While they love honour, they love victory still more; for youth is eager for superiority over others, and victory is one form of this. They love both more than they love money, which indeed they love very little, not having yet learnt what it means to be without it. ... They look at the good side rather than the bad, not having yet witnessed many instances of wickedness. They trust others readily, because they have not yet often been cheated. They are sanguine; nature warms their blood as though with excess of wine; and besides that, they have as yet met with few disappointments. Their lives are mainly spent not in memory but in expectations. ... They are easily cheated, owing to the sanguine disposition just mentioned. Their hot tempers and hopeful dispositions make them more courageous than older men are. ... They have exalted notions, because they have not yet been humbled by life or learnt its necessary limitations. ... They would always rather do noble deeds than useful ones: Their lives are regulated more by moral feeling than by reasoning. ... They are fonder of their friends, intimates, and companions than older men are, because they like spending their days in the company of others. ... They think they know everything, and are always quite sure about it; this, in fact, is why they overdo everything (ii.12).
But much in the *Rhetoric* is timely besides the observations on human nature. Much of the advice is relevant to today’s intercollegiate debate, as three widely different passages demonstrate. First, with a shrewd observation on human nature generally, Aristotle identifies the debater’s motivation:

Victory also is pleasant, and not merely to “bad losers,” but to every one; the winner sees himself in the light of a champion, and everybody has a more or less keen appetite for being that. The pleasantness of victory implies of course that combative sports and intellectual contests are pleasant. . . . For where there is competition, there is victory. That is why forensic pleading and debating contests are pleasant (i.11).

Also on debate is a justification for debating both sides, an issue that a few years ago was hotly waged in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* and other learned journals: “. . . we must be able to employ persuasion, just as strict reasoning can be employed, on opposite sides of a question, not in order that we may in practice employ it in both ways but in order that we may see clearly what the facts are” (i.1).

Of the many passages related to the techniques of debating, the one that I favor for its perceptiveness is this one on examples:

. . . we should use our Examples as subsequent supplementary evidence. They should not precede the enthymemes: that will give the argument an inductive air. . . . if they follow the enthymemes, they have the effect of witnesses giving evidence. . . . For the same reason, if you put your examples first you must give a large number of them; if you put them last, a single one is sufficient; even a single witness will serve if he is a good one (ii.20).

The main thrust of the *Rhetoric* is that of advising on speechmaking, but space permits citing only those passages of unusual astuteness. On the nature of metaphors, Aristotle says, “Metaphors must be drawn. . . . from things that are related to the original thing, and yet not obviously so related” (iii.11); and on the place where special devices for stimulating attention are needed, he says, “. . . calls for attention, when required, may come equally well in any part of the speech; in fact, the beginning of it is just where there is least slackness of interest” (iii.14).

Striking is the explanation of the proper length for the opening section of a speech: “Remember what the man said to the baker who asked whether he was to make the cake hard or soft: ‘what, can’t you make it right?’ Just so here. We are not to make long narrations, just as we are not to make long introductions or long arguments” (iii.16).

Scattered through the *Rhetoric* are many ideas that have retained their importance. The basis for English democracy is the concept that the basis for government should be not men, but laws; this idea can be found in the first chapter of the *Rhetoric*. Basic plots for tragic drama appear in the section on pity. Moreover, as an article in the magazine *ETC* indicates in detail, the roots of general semantics are found in Aristotle. The ideas that “the word is not the thing,” that “the map is not the territory,” and that careful discourse requires dating and indexing all appear in Aristotle. Likewise to be found is an early version of the motivational explanation of behavior; man does, he points out, “whatever creates or increases happiness or some part of happiness,” and he avoids “whatever destroys or hampers happiness” (i.5).

Besides the *Rhetoric* other Aristotelian works contain passages and ideas that are timely, timeless, or both. During one autumn I compiled a collection of several hundred striking and sometimes humorous passages that he organized under 189 topic headings ranging from “the active life” to “youth.” A few of these topics and the related passages will close this article.

On adultery Aristotle says, “Nor does goodness or badness with regard to such things depend on committing adultery with the right woman, at the right time, and the right way, but simply to do any of them is to go wrong” (*Nicomachean Ethics* ii.6).

On appetite he writes, “. . . children in fact live at the beck and call of appetite” (*Nicomachean Ethics* iii.12).

On censorship the stand is clear: “And since we do not allow improper language, clearly we should also banish pictures or speeches from the stage which are indecent” (*Politics* vii.17).

On civil rights Aristotle says, (Continued on page 8)
Larry Norton, the current historian, who also served PKD as national president and secretary-treasurer, pulls from his prodigious memory in...

HOUSTON, 1936, AND ON.

It was the academic year 1935-36 and the twenty-fourth in the history of Pi Kappa Delta. The fraternity historians of that era refer to it vaguely as one of the years in the period of tournament expansion. For me it was the year that I was introduced to Pi Kappa Delta. In September of 1935 I moved from Adrian College in Michigan, a non-affiliated school, to the Beta chapter number thirteen at Eureka College in Illinois. Dr. Harry Pritchard, one of the national founders, had been president of the college several years earlier. The proud heritageingers on to this day. Adrian College was granted a charter in 1971.

No single forensic year exists unto itself, so it is natural that the following reflections should not be limited entirely to the one particular year. Through much of the twenties and into the thirties, rapid expansion of intercollegiate forensics was accompanied by problems of judging, ethics, and awards. Criticisms of the tournament as a way of forensic life were numerous and justified. By 1936 the editor of The Forensic, Alfred Westfall, former historian, treasurer, secretary, and president of Pi Kappa Delta, was asking the question: "What does a debater get from his 50th debate that he has not already obtained from his 49th?"

Clarence Nystrom of Wheaton College, now retired and living in Scotts Valley, California, was but one of a number of skeptical coaches who doubted that the critic judge could adequately coach the many unprepared debaters attending tournaments. Adding to the growing problem was the large number of critic judge-coaches who were also unprepared to present adequate critiques, because the time between weekend tournaments was too short for preparation, not only of their speakers but also of themselves.

In the early thirties numerous experiments were introduced in an attempt to "save debate." The non-decision debate became popular as a means of escaping the competitive pressures and the decision-making judge. The Oregon cross-examination plan and the direct clash debates were given a trial in an effort to spark enthusiasm of speakers and, hopefully, of audiences. The congressional form directed attention to new values, and the extempore debate added a variety of topics for a variety of audiences.

Such experiments, together with the period of economic depression, calmed the critics to some extent, and by the middle of the decade it was full speed ahead.
Coaches and students were digging deep in their own pockets to finance frequent trips from January through March. Soon it was December through March and then November through April. In that year coaches were thinking, “Can there be too much of a good thing?” but they were saying, “I need an assistant coach.”

The Eleventh Biennial Convention of Pi Kappa Delta was held at Houston in March of that year. George McCarty was president and Sylvester Toussaint was president elect. Among the 666 delegates from the 150 active chapters was E.R. Nichols, founder and first president and editor. One of his many talented students from Redlands was Weston McIntosh who went on to become a director of forensics and college president. The roll call included an amazing number of students and coaches who later made significant contributions to their chosen profession.

The three LeVander boys were there. Ted, coach of oratory at Augustana in Illinois, was starting a career in which he would be responsible for many of the best orators in the long oratorical history of Illinois. Forty years later, still at Augustana, Ted judged in the Interstate Oratorical Contest held at Bradley in 1975. His brother Harold attended as coach of the Macalester delegation and served as chairman of the men’s extemporaneous committee. He was appointed chairman of the Constitutional Revision Committee for the following convention. Harold later became Governor of Minnesota. Bernard, a younger brother, competed for Gustavus Adolphus at Houston. All the brothers were at one time intercollegiate orators and special distinction members at Gustavus Adolphus under coach Evan Anderson.

George Henigan and Donald Smith were debating together again as they had in 1934 at Lexington, representing Kearney State of Nebraska. Later, George became chairman of the speech department at George Washington University, and Don is now serving as vice-president of the University of Wisconsin. Walter Murrish, currently chairman of the Public Relations and Research Committee of Pi Kappa Delta, was another member of that distinguished delegation.

The late United States Senator Karl Mundt, coach at Eastern State Teachers at Madison, South Dakota, and governor of the Province of the Sioux, stayed home to campaign for the office of Congressman. Thirty-five years later another South Dakota politician and Pi Kappa Delta stayed home to campaign for President of the United States and received his Distinguished Alumni Award in absentia. His name is George McGovern. Dwayne Orton, coach at the College of the Pacific, brought four students. Dwayne later became a college president and then editor of THINK magazine, a high quality IBM publication. He was an outstanding lecturer on the college circuit and was honored with a Distinguished Alumni Award at the Bowling Green Convention in 1959 where I had the privilege of making the presentation.

Warren Strausbaugh had just succeeded Wilbur Moore at Colorado Alpha. Wilbur became editor of The Forensic from 1947-51 while at Central Michigan University. Twenty years later The Forensic returned to Central Michigan under the editorship of Gil Rau. Among Warren’s students at Houston was Alfred Westfall, Jr. whose father, mentioned earlier, was a national officer for twenty-seven years. Warren became a very longtime member of the University of Maryland Speech Department. During some of the depression days of 1933-34, we worked together in a survival job — dishwashing in Iowa City’s finest hotel.

From Illinois State University came Donald Holley and Robert Turner among the many who were directed into the speech profession during the great eras of F.L.D. Holmes and Ralph Micken. They blazed the trail for Carl Wilson, John Keltner, Dane Harris, Don McConkey, Marvin Kleinau, Stan Rives, Roger Huf- ford, Jack Parker, Neal Claussen, Ed Carpenter, Don McHenry, Jim Backes, George Tuttle, and many others. From Western Illinois at Macomb were two undergraduates, Wayne Thompson and Otis Aggert, Jr. Both were destined to become national leaders in speech as teachers, authors, editors, and administrators. Obviously scores of others, many of whom we never met personally, went
away from Houston in 1936 to achieve success and recognition. One was Ralph Fjelstad, a junior and special distinction member in debate, who represented Concordia College in Minnesota. He placed in the semi-finals of men’s extempor speaking and tied for third in debate. The general subject for extempor was, “The Foreign Relations of the United States.” Ralph later earned a Ph.D. degree in political science at Northwestern University. Since 1948 he has taught at Carleton College. When my daughter Jeanne entered Carleton and majored in government and international relations from 1958-62, Ralph was her instructor and department chairman.

Today’s Relevance of Yesterday’s Wisdom
(Continued from page 5)

“Everywhere inequality is a cause of revolution” (Politics v.1); and later he writes, “Equality consists in the same treatment of similar persons, and no government can stand which is not founded upon justice” (Politics vii.14).

On corruption (which did not begin with Watergate or Teapot Dome) Aristotle observes, “For the people do not take any great offence at being kept out of the government. . . but what irritates them is to think that their rulers are stealing the public money” (Politics v.8).

On courage and cowardice the sage remark is that “People who are ignorant of the danger also appear brave” (Nicomachean Ethics iii.8).

On drunkenness Aristotle has numerous comments, one of which is this: “Wine also makes men amorous; as is shown by the fact that a man who is drinking is induced to kiss those whom, owing to their appearance or age, no sober person would kiss” (Problems xxx.1).

On the values of early rising, Aristotle predated Franklin: “And since it is good for the formation of character and useful in the interests of economy, masters ought to rise earlier than their slaves and retire to rest later. . . . when anything needs doing it ought not to be left undone, whether it be day or night. There are occasions when a master should rise while it is still night; for this helps to make a man healthy and wealthy and wise” (Economics i.6).

In various places Aristotle writes on such timeless topics as health, happiness, friendship, marriage, and love; he also writes on developments and problems that we consider contemporary — athletics, Communism, free love, “hippies,” juvenile delinquency, long hair, women’s rights, medicare, welfare programs, and the population explosion. That space does not permit citations on all of these topics is regrettable, for the views remain fresh.

Perhaps a good way to close this brief excursion is to refer to one of the liveliest of contemporary issues — women’s liberation. On most issues Aristotle is consistent; but as with the Bible and the writings of Shakespeare, the Aristotelean corpus is so vast and the contexts in which sentences appear are so varied that one can find support for both sides of some issues. So is it with women’s “lib,” as it is with civil rights demonstrations and the giving of welfare. “Where, as among the Lacedaemonians, the state of women is bad,” the Stagerite writes, “almost half of human life is spoilt” (Rhetoric i.5). Elsewhere, however, is a passage that gives the Germaine Greers and the Gloria Steinems no encouragement: “. . . the male is by nature superior, and the female inferior; and the one rules, and the other is ruled” (Politics i.5). Male chauvinists and female activists, choose as you prefer!

Note


Wayne Thompson was a student member of Illinois Nu, and he served as PKD sponsor at Bowling Green State University and at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He holds the degree of highest distinction in the orders of debate, competitive individual speaking, and instruction. Presently he is a professor at the University of Houston, Central Campus. This article is a revision of a speech given on October 2, 1975, at the annual meeting of the Texas Speech Communication Association.
PARAMETERS FOR THE NATIONAL DEBATE RESOLUTION: A NEGATIVE RESPONSE

James J. Floyd

In the January issue of The Forensic, President Ulrey presents several arguments in favor of "parameters" for the national debate resolution. He suggests, further, that it might be necessary to "go beyond parameters to limit the topic areas." And while he feels that "we shouldn't have to have them," it has become necessary if we are to maintain tournament debating "as an educational activity rather than as an exercise in sophistic nit-picking."

Having read Professor Ulrey's arguments, I feel that it is necessary, in the spirit of honest debate, to question what appear to me as unfounded and unsupported assumptions about the current status of tournament debate. Surely we cannot afford to ignore the negative side of such a sweeping indictment of the status quo as that presented by the President.

In order to avoid mere "nit-picking," I shall limit my response to five of Dr. Ulrey's arguments: 1) that comparative advantages cases are used primarily to avoid topicality, 2) that "it is rather passé...to argue topicality" in a debate, 3) that it is "passé to argue that the affirmative must show its 'comparative advantage' is a significant improvement over the status quo and that it is unique," 4) that because teams winning the flip of a coin in elimination rounds choose the affirmative side, most winning cases are off the topic, and 5) that establishing parameters will somehow solve any problem that might now exist.

Turning to that first argument, there are indeed other reasons for presenting a comparative advantages case than merely to avoid topicality. The simplest reason is that the affirmative may decide that the proposed plan will more effectively meet the goals of the status quo. This merely shifts the debate from arguing for total rejection of the status quo to arguing the benefits that a topical plan can produce. A second reason, as William English and B.L. Ware have explained, is to "directly counter some negative disadvantages" and to give the affirmative a better chance to deal with "negative expansion tactics." Evidently Professor Ulrey is not concerned with the frequently employed negative practice of making the first affirmative rebuttal an almost impossible task by presenting an overwhelming number of plan attacks.

Secondly, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can reasonably conclude that it is "passé" to argue topicality. In weekend after weekend of judging debates, I cannot recall a single tournament in the last four years in which I have not heard negative teams present topicality arguments. I see no reason why the negative team cannot argue for rejection of the affirmative case on the basis of topicality and convince the judge to vote accordingly. This is exactly what happened in a large tournament early this season. Other judges and I voted against a blatantly non-topical case, and the team running it failed to qualify for the elimination rounds. While this is only one example, it clearly leaves open to question the blanket assertion that topicality arguments are "passé." In addition, I would like to quote what a judge wrote on the ballot in a debate in which one of my teams went negative against a team from a respected debate school. "I accept negative position on this not being a comprehensive land use case." The least President Ulrey could do is to provide some support for his conclusions that topicality is not argued and that the affirmative can successfully "present any case at all, however remote to the national topic."

Closely related to the charge that topicality is a "passé" issue is the assertion that it is also "passé" to challenge the af-
firmative to demonstrate significance and uniqueness of advantages. I know of nothing that supports this position and would expect anyone maintaining it to provide some kind of proof that it is true. While the degree of significance is less in a comparative advantages case, I know of no debate theory that frees the affirmative from demonstrating significance. Neither do I know of any justification for freeing the affirmative of the burden to prove uniqueness. In fact, this is the very issue that dominates many debates in which the CA case is presented. This is why I spend hours with my debaters reviewing ballots and revising cases when we have lost because we have lacked impact and uniqueness.

Professor Ulrey's fourth major argument implies that, since teams frequently choose to defend the affirmative side in elimination rounds, they wish to take advantage of the "hapless negative" by whipping out their successful off-topic cases. Again, I must ask for some kind of proof. For example, is there any evidence that affirmatives win more preliminary rounds than do the negative teams? If not, it might be just as reasonable to conclude that these teams have good affirmative cases and feel more comfortable defending cases that have helped them reach elimination rounds, especially when they know that their opponents probably have good cases also. Topicality does not necessarily have anything to do with it.

Finally, I would like to examine the idea of establishing parameters (or specific topic areas) as a means of solving our alleged problems. If the desire to present off-topic cases is as pervasive as Professor Ulrey would have us believe, it is not beyond the realm of probability that we will hear complaints of "non-parametric" cases. This would merely demonstrate the difficulty of solving a problem of interpretation by decree. If it is true that judges refuse to vote against non-topical cases, why is it reasonable to assume that they would not vote for cases outside the parameters?

Additionally, it is not particularly clear to me that anyone (or any group of people) have the inside track on determining what the correct parameters are. I would maintain that few topics actually have clearly definable parameters. What authority would decide? If, for example, we were to turn to Black's Law Dictionary for a definition of land, here is what we would find: "'Land' includes not only the soil or earth, but also things of a permanent nature affixed thereto or found therein, whether by nature, as water, trees, grass, herbage, other natural or perennial products, growing crops or trees, minerals under the surface, or by the hand of man, as buildings, fixtures, fences, bridges, as well as works constructed for the use of water, such as dikes, canals, etc. It embraces not only the surface of the earth but everything under or over it."6

Essentially, my disappointment in the President's article centers upon the lack of substantiation in support of his assertions. He presents a bleak picture of the state of tournament debating and does so in a manner that falls short of what I would expect of a debater's obligation to present a prima facie case. In spite of the need to strive for better judging and coaching, I am favorably impressed with the efforts of today's college debaters. I think they justify every cent of budget money being spent on them.

Notes


4. Western Illinois, Round I, Central Missouri State University (Negative) vs. Eastern Illinois University (Affirmative). Decision to CMSU.

5. English and Ware, p. 11.


James J. Floyd is an assistant professor of speech and the director of forensics at Central Missouri State University. He sponsors the Missouri Eta chapter.
WHY INTRODUCE PARAMETERS?
HOW CAN THEY WORK?
WHAT GOOD CAN THEY POSSIBLY DO?

Roger Hufford, PKD's representative to the National Committee on Discussion and Debate, gives his replies to these questions.

Two recommendations of the National Developmental Conference on Forensics include specific suggestions relevant to parameters:

Organizations appointing members to the SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate should instruct them to include with each proposition submitted for final vote a brief statement of its substantive parameters.¹

Forensic organizations and directors of individual tournaments in academic debate should develop methods whereby the central themes of debate cases to be employed in a given tournament are disclosed to all participants in that tournament in advance of the event.²

While disagreement exists about both suggestions, both were passed by the conference, and the first has now been endorsed by all organizations appointing members to the topic selection committee. This year the ballot for the national debate topic will include parameters.

The rationale is stated succinctly in Forensics as Communication:

...decisions are best made after rigorous testing of opposing arguments. Rigorous testing is not achieved when arguments are encountered by surprise, without the opportunity for prior research or reflection by the opposition.³

Parameters are a tool, and it will take time for the forensic community to develop skill in their use. Most tools can be misused. Parliamentary procedure, for example, can be used by persons of good will to make meetings run smoothly or can be misused to impede and confuse.

Debaters, coaches, and judges will need to work cooperatively to make the parameters serve the forensic community well.

Why do we select a debate topic, anyway? Ordinarily, serious discussion of issues requires adequate notice so participants can be well informed. In court, briefs are exchanged. In government, bills go through committee, then are listed on an agenda. We require environmental impact statements on a variety of projects. Serious problem solvers do not take opponents by surprise but invite full deliberation in advance of reaching a decision. We select a topic to let people know what is going to be debated!

Outside of academic debate, notice is ordinarily clear and specific — "The House of Representatives will debate on H.R. 6278 on Wednesday at 2 P.M.," and copies of the bill are available in advance. Only in academic debate do we put a double burden on a topic statement: it must indicate what is to be debated in October but in such broad language that we will not have exhausted the subject next April or May.

This double burden is more than language or the topic selection committee can reasonably bear. Some critics are outraged at the squirrel interpretations and unreasonable research burden resulting from an attempt to phrase a topic that will "last the season." I share their outrage. Others condemn the kind of narrow, restrictive pattern they believe the first set of critics is advocating — a return to the
days when we spent a season arguing whether the U.S. should recognize the Communist Government of China. I share the concern of this second set of critics that the debate resolution may be exhausted before the season is well begun and the fear that a set of restrictive parameters will accompany the topic, thus straight-jacketing student analysis into a single set of affirmative arguments and negative responses. Clearly, it is impossible to satisfy both criticisms with a single topic statement.

Parameters can help us out of the dilemma. I hope we will be able to steer a course between an overly narrow topic that will make debates a bore by November and an overly broad one that fosters squirrel interpretations and guarantees unprepared negatives. The process of selecting a topic should promote the goals of educational debate. The topic should be worthwhile in its substance and balanced so that both sides have a reasonable chance in competition. The topic should also be manageable in scope, thus enabling debaters to prepare for tournaments with a reasonable amount of effort, without the necessity of purchasing prepackaged evidence or hiring research assistants. The topic should help us bring interested persons into the activity, rather than excluding them by posing an impossible research task for the beginner. While this imposing list of goals is probably more than human beings can manage, the parameters can help us move in the general direction desired.

For example, look at the topics not chosen last year. "Resolved: that freedom of expression in the United States should be significantly strengthened." Some coaches voted the topic down because it seemed too broad. Parameters could have clarified "expression" to mean "the spoken and/or written word" rather than other forms of "expression" that are also debatable.

Or consider "Resolved: that the federal government should adopt a comprehensive program to alleviate urban problems." What urban problems? It is not necessary to be prescriptive in order to make clear areas that would lend themselves to good clash in debate. Mass transit, slum clearance, property tax, and desegregation of schools are all areas of concern. Others could be added. Indicating what is meant by "urban" would help both sides determine the issues that belong to each. The topic selection committee commissions research papers to help find appropriate wording and balance, and the parameters can provide more flexibility for the task.

Any set of parameters will be arbitrary to a degree and run the risk of declaring important arguments as "out of bounds." Frankly, that is a chance we should be prepared to take. Whenever we choose a topic we make a decision about what is to be debated, and we also decide what is not to be debated. If the topic is worthwhile for research and suitably balanced for competition, then the topic and the parameters serve educational debate well. If every affirmative team has confidence that their case is topical and will get a fair hearing, we shall have strengthened intercollegiate debate. If every negative team can approach every tournament prepared on the substantive issues they will debate, we shall have strengthened intercollegiate debate. If more students are attracted to debate and fewer drop out because of an unreasonable research burden, we shall have strengthened intercollegiate debate.

To the team with a burning desire to debate a case that falls outside the parameters, I suggest you hold an off-topic tournament on the problem area you are so eager to discuss. This will add desirable variety to our debate season and give you the chance to defend your views against the strongest possible attacks of prepared opponents. And nobody will doubt that your interest is genuine or suspect you of being motivated by desire to win rather than by concern for the issues. Your willingness to give notice will raise your motives above suspicion, and you will have strengthened intercollegiate debate.

Parameters can work best with cooperation from those who direct tournaments. A tournament director may use parameters to narrow the topic for early season tournaments or for novice competition.
"I’m always stumped when trying to find topics for my original orations. Can you help me?"

I’ll try. Essentially there are three guidelines that any oratory contestant should follow when choosing a topic, and the first of these is significance — quantitative, qualitative, or potential. Assuming that contest judges are like other human listeners, no judge will be particularly interested in a speech, let alone impressed by it, unless he can see some importance to it.

You should note, however, that a subject area does not necessarily have to be a well-known one in order to be significant. Several years ago a student speaker from a midwestern school won a number of awards by delivering a speech concerning the social stigma attached to people who have suffered leprosy but have been cured through extended hospital treatment. Most judges probably didn’t even know that the United States has leprosy patients and leprosy hospitals, let alone realize that former patients have a serious problem of societal readjustment. While the leprosy problem itself may not be a quantitatively significant one, it can be a qualitative one. And since the speech dealt with a unique subject area, it was all the more interesting.

As much as possible, contest speakers ought to combine significance with uniqueness. But beware of choosing something so off-beat, so different that you wind up discussing a subject which is, in reality, non-consequential or even trivial. If you must choose between significance or uniqueness, opt for significance.

A second guideline, for those who can’t come up with something overly unique, is to choose controversies that are very current, timely, or relevant. For instance, the academic year 1975-76 was a perfect time to discuss our presidential primary system. In short, think about things which are happening around you and see if they can’t provide the basis for speech material.

Keep in mind, however, a fundamental rule of communication — listeners like to hear something new, otherwise they perceive the communication situation to be a waste of time. Thus, when discussing a well-known topic, you should strive to present either new material on the topic or a fresh interpretation of older, already familiar material. In other words, exhibit some original thought.

Experimental studies in communication also tell us that evidence used in a speech should be new and different, otherwise its potential impact is limited. Obviously, if a listener hasn’t been persuaded by certain evidence before, there is no reason to believe he will be persuaded by your usage of the same evidence. So again, either present new and different supporting information or take familiar evidence and put a fresh perspective on it. While judges’ minds can become dulled after hearing numbers of speeches, your novel approach to a subject can be a refreshing change which might help you to stand out favorably.

Finally, choose a topic that you can “live with.” After all, you will probably be working with your oration for a nine-month period. Thus you need something that won’t begin to bore you after many
enthusiasm can become contagious — the more vitality you, the speaker, exhibit, the more interested and concerned your listeners will become.

Significance, relevance, and personal interest. These three criteria, plus some originality and freshness, should give you the framework for an enjoyable and successful oration.

Robert Beagle is an associate editor of The Forensic and the sponsor of Pennsylvania Nu chapter. Professor Beagle welcomes questions on any aspect of forensics. Address him at Edinboro State College, Edinboro, PA 16444.

The President’s Message (Continued from page 3)

what critical insights they acquire. Surely any of us involved in forensic education would be embarrassed if students were to go through two, three, or four years of intercollegiate participation without developing a rather sophisticated theory, practice, and criticism which should have potential or real carry-over in their later personal and professional lives. Perhaps we should inquire of ourselves whether we are teaching many solid educational goals which will be validated by our students as they discover that what they did in the forensic program was, after all, training for life.

When, as forensic educators, we place a disproportionate emphasis on traditional tournament debating, we may create legitimate questions in the minds of our academic peers as to the educational goal and value of forensics. After college there are no more debate tournaments with 10-5 or 8-3-4 time formats. Nevertheless, if we teachers and students have done our work well, we will have learned a great deal about researching issues and analyzing them, about organizing ideas in a clear, convincing manner, about interacting with people with whom we clash in opinions, and about how to improve our use of language, voice, and body in communication.

If, as R. C. Jebb says, the Roman, unlike the Greek, "...did not instinctively conceive the public speaker as an artist" but "...as a citizen, weighty by piety, years, or office, who has something to say for the good of the other citizens, and whose dignity, hardly less than the value of his hearers’ time, enjoins a pregnant and severe consciousness," will we not agree that forensics, U.S.A., 1976, should share quite a lot of goals with the Roman?

Notes

3 Jebb, II, 446.
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More on Ulrey and Black

In the January, 1976 issue of The Forensic articles appeared by Evan Ulrey and Dale Black deploring the considerable number of affirmative cases on “the razor’s edge of the topic” and proliferation of “small nut-gathering creatures.” Both authors colorfully present their personal experiences and observations, but they fail to address more fundamental problems.

Few would deny that numerous affirmative cases with questionable relation to the national resolution are being advocated. Most of the teams referred to by Ulrey and Black evidence this by their elaborate defenses prepared for frequent topicality challenges. These teams recognize that their cases are considered on the fringe of the topic.

These teams are generally successful, and their success is not due, as the authors believe, to overly subjective decisions or any reduction in the requirements for a prima facie case. Professor Black complains, “Every debate seems to hinge on significance and/or inherency.” I would certainly hope that these issues are appropriate grounds for argument. Besides defending significance and inherency, the advocates of uncommon cases are victorious because they are willing to argue topicality. Consistently negative teams challenge topicality solely by declaring that they do not believe the case to be topical. Some teams are more subtle and complain, “We came a long way to debate this case.” The only criteria for topicality appears to be the distance each team has traveled.

Before searching for culprits on which to blame our misfortunes, we might find remedy closer to home. Challenges on topicality should be equally reasoned and articulate as arguments concerning other issues in each debate. The challenges should offer an alternative interpretation of the resolution that the negative can support as an accurate reflection of the topic’s meaning. The challenges should also detail the manner in which the affirmative proposal is incompatible with the resolution. Such challenges provide opportunity for the negative to demonstrate the ability to think as well as read evidence. One of this year’s most pleasant experiences for me involved watching one of Professor Ulrey’s teams develop and extend a carefully considered line of reasoning concerning the extratopicality of their opponents’ case. Professor Ulrey need not be so pessimistic about his team’s chances when they face a case on which they lack evidence. . . .

Don Brownlee
Sponsor, Texas Eta
North Texas State University

Parameters a perversion of the debate process

The recent decision by the National Council of Pi Kappa Delta to join the AFA, Phi Rho Pi, and DSR-TKA in favoring the establishment of parameters for the 1976-77 intercollegiate debate resolution is

(Continued on page 19)
Kenneth Lee Adair

Upon entering Cal. State-Stanislaus, I thought of the lyrics of the song "Big Brother" by Rare Earth:

...As soon as you arrive, you better get in touch with the people, big brother, and get them on your side...

Having been extensively involved in high school forensics for three years, I knew the value of having speech experience on my side. This wisdom enabled me to open doors at the high school level; I was now ready to experiment with it on the college level. After completing the necessary requirements to join Pi Kappa Delta, I did, both in individual events and in debate. I was pleased to learn that I fit in rather well on the college speech circuit. Also, I found that being a member of PKD made it easier for me to adjust to college life.

Tournamentwise I did rather well. During my first year I debated, did extemp., impromptu, oratory, readers theatre, and off-topic debate. I received various awards in each of the above, except for readers theatre (I'm a debater not an actor!). This was also the year of PKD Nationals. Six other students and I represented Stanislaus in Omaha. As a school we did extremely well: we were tenth place in individual events — the best our school has ever done in national competition.

Personally I found the experience very educational. You see, I only had three rounds of competition. This left me almost a full week to party! I was only eighteen at the time, and the drinking age in Nebraska is eighteen, so... we hit more bars than Carter has pills! By the time we left Omaha we were nationally known in speech and partying.

Fun aside, I learned quite a few lessons during my first year. Some have left last-

Patricia Harrison

Forensics has been a part of my vocabulary since two weeks after the start of my freshman year. From just a new word it has become an integral part of my college experience, an experience I would gladly relive many times over. Who could give up incidents such as ice fights at PKD provincials, long talks in vans to people I've grown to love, and fourteen-hour drives through blizzards in vans lacking heat?

Writing an article such as this can only bring back memories and a sense of accomplishment. My most vivid memory is the third round at my first tournament — I refused to debate. My attitudes have changed. I've expanded from a novice debater to include extemp. and impromptu (as to be expected). I've also done the traditional IE events of interp., persuasion, and informative. But I must admit my first love is debate.

It's just been discovered that I'm the senior member on the Plattsburgh team and that I have no present position. Since my sophomore year I had been treasurer of both the Union and our PKD chapter, but I had to resign in December when I was elected treasurer of our student government. Conflict of interest is not appreciated in these recent political years.

My accomplishments aren't as tremendous as some I've seen, but I can lay claim to winning novice debate at the 1974 Convention and Tournament of the Province of the Northeast and having a decent record in extemp. I've also been part of a New York State championship team. I'm the second person at Plattsburgh to make it out in extemp.

Coaching has to be the hardest part of the forensic program. My coaching has been extensive and probably will have to continue to be. Al Montanaro, our director of forensics, has put up with far too
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ing impressions. One of these lessons was education versus winning. In high school I believed that winning was everything. Upon arriving at Stanislaus I was surprised that there was no distinction between winners and losers, that is, everyone was treated the same by us and our coach, Dick Lucas. You see, Mr. Lucas’ goal was for each one of us to learn. He felt that you learned when you lost as well as when you won. This took some getting used to, but as the year progressed, I began to see that he was right: you had no reason to feel badly if you got a four in a round if you tried. This kind of incentive caused us to work harder than if we had been forced to “bring back the gold.”

A second lesson I learned was of style. The debate style I had used was rapid-fire delivery. This mile-a-minute delivery was effective in competition; however, it was not practical nor effective communication. When I slowed down, I became a much more effective debater and communicator.

I attended many tournaments during my second and third years. Perhaps the one that stands out is the attorney-judged mock trial debates every year at Cal. State University-Hayward. We attend this every year for two reasons: first, it’s an interesting and experimental tournament, and second, we win. I think that Hayward is getting tired of us. For example, Larry Medcalf of Hayward (He was also at PKD Nationals in Omaha) told us we should have stayed home! He said that we were screwing up his pairings. You see, our debaters took three of the four places in semis! He even had the gall to try to raise our entry fees, due to the fact that we took home more awards than our entry fees covered! But Larry got back at us. When our Readers Theatre and Oral Interpretation Festival rolls around every year, Hayward cleans house. By the way, I tried to raise entry fees on them, too.

Last year the tournament that stands out the most was the PKD Nationals in Philadelphia. Here I served as a voting delegate for Stanislaus and participated in a more professional manner than at the many temper tantrums and tears, mainly over misplaced extemp. files and partner problems. My initial training in debate from AI was only partial; the one who yelled and cajoled and talked is now coaching at Penn State. The confidence Ed Harris (the first president of our PKD chapter) and AI had in me has helped me through every crisis.

Friendships also make the crises less extensive. Perhaps rivalries isn’t the best term for these friendships, but rounds with SCSC and Penn State are the most vivid for their pleasurable moments. Writing jokes on the back of flow pads so the judge doesn’t see them made for hysterical rounds, anything but stodgy ones.

My pet peeve in forensics is the unnecessary rivalries which creep into personal friendships and make one upset at having a judge because of his school. As long as competition exists, bias will naturally be there. I only wish I could be the oblivious freshman once more and not see the extent of the problem.

As an elementary education major, my involvement in forensics can only be an asset. Learning to speak with the ease required in individual events and to be organized and to think on your feet in debate prepares one for the working world. I only wish we received more credit for it!

**CALL FOR MATERIAL**

The editors are now considering manuscripts for the special Bicentennial issue, October, 1976. If you have something important to say about Bicentennial-oral communication themes, send it in writing to:

Carolyn Keeffe  
Editor, The Forensic  
Department of Speech  
Communication and Theatre  
West Chester State College  
West Chester, PA 19380
Ken Adair (Continued)

previous national tournament. We did have our fun, though, and for June, Lisa, Matt, Steve, Steve, and myself it will be a tournament that will live long in our hearts. Need I say more?

In my local chapter I have served as vice-president, president for two years, and Inter-Club Council Representative. I received the 1975 Speaker of the Year Award from Stanislaus, and I now hold the degree of honor in both individual speaking and debate. Due to these accomplishments and more, I have placed in the 1976 volume of Who’s Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities. Through these activities I have had a chance to see the real value of the Stanislaus way of approaching forensics. I have been reinforced in what I already knew — that being proficient in speech will enable one to open the tightest doors. With this background I shall pursue my goal as a lawyer, a profession in which good logical presentation of facts is essential. PKD has helped me develop this tool of effective communication and prepare it for work.

The song “Big Brother” has a new meaning for me now, because I’m one of the “people.”

Dear Editor
(Continued from page 15)

most unfortunate and should be reconsidered.

The functional viability of topic parameters is in grave doubt. All who have decried topic perversion have expressed the wish that affirmatives “debate the resolution.” One question is pertinent: what is the resolution? What does any resolution entail and, just as importantly, what does it not entail? The concept that a group of individuals can brilliantly foresee the viable topic nuances, months before the topic is debated, in delimiting topicality is repugnant to meaningful decision-making, wherein all potential issues must be considered in the render-

ing of a global decision. Topic parameters are a structural contradiction of rational analysis, a perversion itself of the intent of the debate process.

. . . The decision to issue parameters for the intercollegiate debate topic is wholly unjustified, an overreaction to a perceived problem that is more fantasy than reality.

James Edward Sayer
Sponsor, Ohio Sigma
Wright State University

Get-tough judges

. . . How many years have we fought the battle of “clean” debate? I am certain that Pi Kappa Delta has always been in the lead both in tournaments sponsored and in practices of good speaking. Many years ago I wrote that the fault was, basically, with the directors who served as judges and permitted the teams to utilize the tactics which were sometimes evident. If a referee in a sporting event can “get tough” and call a penalty as he sees it without back talk, why can’t we as judges do the same thing? In my long years of experience I could almost name the schools that year after year had the same type of trick cases and the same shady practices. These couldn’t have been blamed on the students for they came and went. I often said, “Well, if I ever got forced into a very crooked deal I would want a law graduate from that school to take my case!!”

Having served as chairman of the national debate question committee when it was purely a Pi Kappa Delta effort, I know that we tried to get plain, well defined resolutions that depended more upon research and argument than upon definition and trick analysis. Why not get back to the fundamental resolutions?

R. D. “Hap” Mahaffey
McMinnville, Oregon

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR . . .

a forum for observations, opinions, and criticisms.

IT’S YOURS . . .

USE IT!
TOURNAMENT RESULTS

PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS

Sweepstakes
Bethel College, Ottawa University, Hastings College.

Debate
Superior: Dick Smith and Art Chalmers (Washburn Univ.); Excellent: David Abel and Greg May (Bethel), Mark Sewell and Mary Austin (Univ. of Neb. at Omaha).

Oral Interpretation
Superior: Deb Lehman (Bethel); Excellent: Linda Green (Southwestern), Ann Winson (Hastings), Kirk Belt (Univ. of Neb. at Omaha).

Informative Speaking
Superior: Marty Fisher (Hastings); Excellent: Linda Vetter (Bethel), Bob Schrader (Nebraska Wesleyan Univ.).

Extemporaneous Speaking
Superior: Mark Ediger (Bethel); Excellent: Jan Niles and David Abel (Bethel).

After-Dinner Speaking
Superior: Kathy Tucker (Ottawa Univ.); Excellent: Landis Magnuson (Nebraska Wesleyan Univ.).

PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST

Sweepstakes
Carson-Newman College, Mississippi State University for Women, Tennessee Technological University, Middle Tennessee State University, Appalachian State University, David Lipscomb College.

Debate
First: Roller and Barris (Carson-Newman); Second: Hoffman and Smith (Middle Tenn. State Univ.); Third: Bird and Hill (Appalachian State Univ.); Fourth: Roden and Pelham (Carson-Newman).

Debate Speakers
First, tie: Roller (Carson-Newman) and Hoffman (Middle Tenn. State Univ.); Second, tie: Barris (Carson-Newman) and Smith (Middle Tenn. State Univ.); Third, tie: Hill (Appalachian State Univ.) and Pelham (Carson-Newman).

Oral Interpretation
First: McKnight (Tenn. Tech. Univ.); Second: McMullin (Miss. State Univ. for Women); Third: Windham (Miss. State Univ. for Women); Fourth: Cartledge (Maryville); Fifth: Leach (Maryville); Sixth: Ferron (Delta State).

Dramatic Duo Interpretation
First: Brown and Cunningham (David Lipscomb); Second, tie: Whisenant and Sanders, and McMullin and Windham (Miss. State Univ. for Women); Third, tie: McMullin and Shaw (Miss. State Univ. for Women) and Crawford and Warren (Delta State); Fourth: Beach and Bowie (Delta State).

Persuasion
First: Coleman (Carson-Newman); Second, tie: Bush (Maryville) and McSwain (Appalachian State Univ.); Third, tie: Mott (Tenn. Tech. Univ.) and Burris (Appalachian State Univ.).

Extemporaneous Speaking

Discussion
First, tie: Campbell (Miss. State Univ. for Women) and Kumpe (Tenn. Tech. Univ.); Second: Kirby (Tenn. Tech. Univ.); Third, tie: Manley and Sanders (Miss. State Univ. for Women).

PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST

Debate (Extempore)
Superior: Jim Clymer and Joe Fisher (Pacific Lutheran Univ.); Excellent: Ray Streinzi and Lisa Bennet (Linfield).

Debate (Open)
Superior: Paul Meismer and Bob Bump (Eastern Mont.), Pat Olson and Walter Congdon (Univ. of Mont.), Charles Southwaite and Blane Smith (Western Wash.); Excellent: Lund and Jaffe, Daely and Walkowski (Mont. State Univ.), Melton and Mitchell (Univ. of Mont.), King and Stenquist (Univ. of Puget Sound), Anderson and Mulford (Seattle Pacific), Reitz and Parmenter (Pacific Lutheran Univ.), Walsh and Lindsay (Whitman).

Oral Interpretation (Senior)
Superior: Mary Windishar (Eastern Wash. State), Yancy Swareen (Pacific Lutheran Univ.); Excellent: Kim Kradolfer (Mont. State Univ.), Dan Parent (Univ. of Mont.), Chris Schultheis (Boise State Univ.), Linda Osorio (Carroll).

Oral Interpretation (Junior)
Superior: Randy Lund (Mont. State Univ.), Marlys Hansen (Mont. Tech.), Maura Walsh (Whitman); Excellent: Larry Sweet (Mont. State Univ.), Henry Leake and Greg Mullowney (Carroll), Joyce Lappin, Rich Gleason, and Sandy Kovach (Mont. Tech.), Gary Walker (Linfield).

Duo Oral Interpretation
Superior: Linda Osorio and Greg Mullowney (Carroll); Excellent: JoAnn Richards and Henry Leake (Carroll), Tom Armitage and Mary Windishar (Eastern Wash. State).

Oratory
Superior: Joyce Lappin (Mont. Tech.), Louis Musso (Eastern Wash. State), Dan Parent (Univ. of Mont.); Excellent: Dan McGowan (Carroll), Sue Diehm (Western Wash.), Amanda Rosenberg and Bill Anderson (Univ. of Mont.), Bob Bump (Eastern Mont.).
FROM THE PROVINCES

**Expository Speaking**
Superior: Kim Kradolfer (Mont. State Univ.), Joe Fischer (Pacific Lutheran Univ.), Mary Windishar (Eastern Wash. State); Excellent: Charles Douthewaite and Blane Smith (Western Wash.), Tom Armitage (Eastern Wash. State), Terry Teichrow and Shelly Waterfield (College of Great Falls).

**Extemporaneous Speaking (Senior)**
Superior: Ray Streinz (Linfield), Louis Musso (Eastern Wash. State); Excellent: Charles Douthewaite (Western Wash.), Bill Anderson (Univ. of Mont.), Howard Werth (Linfield).

**Extemporaneous Speaking (Junior)**
Superior: Tom Melton (Univ. of Mont.), Paul Frantz (Mont. State Univ.), Mike Axline (Idaho State Univ.); Excellent: Kathy Clayson (Idaho State Univ.), Ray Miller (Univ. of Mont.), Russ Stenquist (Univ. of Puget Sound), Tana Johnson and Pat Wise (Mont. State Univ.).

**PROVINCE OF THE COLONIES**

**Debate (Varsity)**
Excellent: Lee Loftus and Jim Weber (Frostburg State).

**Debate (Novice)**
Excellent: Steven Esrick and David Evans (Wilkes).

**Oral Interpretation**
Superior: Regina Wild (Bloomburg State), Michelle Washington (Monmouth), Mary Chris Kenney (Bridgewater State); Excellent: Dave Thayer (Frostburg State), Marcia Stratton (Wilkes), Debbie Bens, Mona Harper, and Dave Nixon (Calif. State), Paul Shine, Tim Anderson, and Jodi Daley (West Chester State).

**Oratory**
Superior: Anne Otto (Bloomburg State), Martin Haberl (Calif. State); Excellent: Marcia Stratton and Kim Withrow (Wilkes), Debbie Bens and Erik Grube (Calif. State), Jan Kratz (West Chester State).

**Informative Speaking**
Superior: Firdaus Kharas (Thiel), Kathy Krauss (West Chester State), Ron Horn (Shippensburg State); Excellent: Anne Otto (Bloomburg State), Anne Wall (Wilkes), Geralyn Mayernick and Jan Kratz (West Chester State), Dave Shumaker and Margie Kuhne (Shippensburg State).

**Extemporaneous Speaking**
Superior: Rich Leeman and Ron Horn (Shippensburg State); Excellent: Gary Prince (N.J. Tech.), Neil Hilkert (Bloomburg State), Marybeth Trapani (Calif. State).

**After-Dinner Speaking**
Superior: Michelle Washington (Monmouth), Ron Horn (Shippensburg State); Excellent: Kathie Steighner and Kim Dilliplane (Bloomburg State), Marcia Stratton (Wilkes).

**Impromptu Speaking**
Superior: Neal Hilkert (Bloomburg State), Rich Leeman and Ron Horn (Shippensburg State); Excellent: Firdaus Kharas (Thiel), John Rodriguez (Frostburg), Mona Harper (Calif. State), Cathy Brennan (Bridgewater State), Jodi Daley and Jo Anna Pahides (West Chester State), Dave Shumaker (Shippensburg State).

Superior Speakers of the Colonies: (left to right)
Martin Haberl, Calif. State:
Michelle Washington, Monmouth; Kathy Krauss, West Chester State; Mary Chris Kenney, Bridgewater State; Ron Horn, Shippensburg State; Firdaus Kharas, Thiel; Neil Hilkert, Regina Wild, and Anne Otto, Bloomburg State; Rich Leeman, Shippensburg State.
PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST

Plattsburgh State, the host school, took top honors in sweepstakes at the tournament and convention on March 26 and 27, 1976. Mansfield State was second; Southern Connecticut was third; and St. Rose was fourth.

Gregory Denaro of Southern Connecticut set an all-time record by reaching eight finals in individual events and taking a total of ten trophies, including first place in pentathlon and a speaker trophy in off-topic debate. Denaro won rhetorical criticism, epideictic, and extemp. He was second in impromptu and mixed interp., third in informative and persuasive, and fourth in prose.

Keith Semmel of Mansfield took second in pentathlon, finishing first in four of the five finals he reached: informative, persuasive, after-dinner, and mixed interp. Although teammate John Williams reached seven finals, his only first place was in impromptu, and he took third in pentathlon.

The remaining pentathlon awards went to Crystal Thomas and Richard Higgins of Plattsburgh. Thomas made six finals and Higgins three, but Higgins’ totals included firsts in poetry and in prose.

Plattsburgh won first place in both varsity and off-topic debate. Mike Costello and Tim Hentschel, the winning team, were also the top two varsity speakers. Tom Crosby of Plattsburgh, half of the winning team, was the best off-topic speaker, with his partner, Karen Murphy, third behind Denaro. Robert Steiner and Candace Vessella of Southern Connecticut were the top two novice speakers and also the first place novice team.

Al Montanaro of Plattsburgh is the new province governor. His lieutenant governor is Edward A. Handi, director of debate at Southern Connecticut. John Heim of Mansfield is the new student lieutenant governor. Seth C. Hawkins of Southern Connecticut will continue as secretary-treasurer on a temporary basis until a successor is chosen by province poll.

PROVINCES ELECT OFFICERS
(Four provinces reporting)

Province of the Southeast
Governor: Terry W. Cole, Appalachian State University
Lieutenant Governor: Robert Woodland, Tennessee Technological University
Secretary-Treasurer: Richard Finton, Carson-Newman College
Student Representative: Stan Roden, Carson-Newman College

Province of the Northwest
Governor: Leslie Lawrence, Montana State University
Lieutenant Governor: Harry Smith, Carroll College
Secretary-Treasurer: Marian Gleason, Linfield College
Student Lieutenant Governor: Dan McGowan, Carroll College
Student Council Members: Montana Le Johnson, Montana State, and James Clymer, Pacific Lutheran University

Province of the Northeast
Governor: Al Montanaro, New York State University—Plattsburgh
Lieutenant Governor: Edward Handi, Southern Connecticut State College
Secretary-Treasurer: Seth Hawkins, Southern Connecticut State College
Student Lieutenant Governor: John Heim, Mansfield State College

Province of the Colonies:
(left to right) Harry Strine, lieutenant governor
(Bloomsburg State);
Susan Miskelly, secretary-treasurer (Bridgewater State);
Patrick Miller, governor (Cahi, State); and
Firdaus Kharas, student lieutenant governor (Thiel).
PI KAPPA DELTA MEMBERS WHO HAVE ACHIEVED HIGHEST DISTINCTION

(I - Instruction  CIS - Competitive Individual Speaking  D - Debate)

Name, Chapter
Debbie Hayes, PA Mu (CIS)  Beverly Herzog, WI Gamma (CIS) & (D)
Dolores F. Cikrit, MT Delta (CIS)  Karen Lee Moran, WI Gamma (CIS)
Timothy Anderson, PA Iota (CIS)  Michael William Briegel, PA Mu (D)
Carl D. Kraft, IL Pi (D)

PI KAPPA DELTA MEMBERS WHO HAVE ACHIEVED SPECIAL DISTINCTION
Sherry L. Madus, WI Delta (D)  Kathy White, TN Mu (CIS)
Debra Kiddy, TN Mu (CIS)  William Edmund Bird, NC Epsilon (D)

Why Parameters? (Continued from page 12)

by indicating that a tournament (or a division) will focus on one area that is part of the topic. Alternatively, the parameters may be widened for late season varsity competition. Any team may petition any tournament director to give notice to all participants if they wish to use an interpretation that is questionable or outside the parameters. The director may disclose the case area to all entries and permit or deny permission, depending on the objectives of the tournament.

The parameters represent the beginning of a process of pre-tournament notice of case areas to be argued, not the end. They provide a starting point for a system to keep the research burden manageable and increase the probability of reasonable cases and prepared negative teams providing clash in every round. The prize is worth the time and effort and good will that will be required to win it.

Notes
2Ibid., p. 32.
3Ibid.

FRESHMEN  SOPHOMORES  JUNIORS  SENIORS
As you take off for the farm, beach, camp, factory, mine, store, mountains, or wherever, don’t forget JULY 10, 1976, the postmark deadline for your entry in the Bicentennial Student Cover Contest sponsored by The Forensic.

CONTEST RULES

1. The contest is open to undergraduate PKD members who are full-time students during the 1976 spring semester or term. Members of the editors’ chapters are not eligible.
2. The design must relate to some aspect of the Bicentennial and Pi Kappa Delta. Drawings and/or photographs are acceptable, but they must be done in black and white. The treatment need not be serious.
3. The entire design (drawing, lettering, photograph, etc.) must be the original work of the contestant.
4. The designs will become the property of The Forensic and will not be returned unless adequate postage is included.
5. Judging will be done on the basis of originality, aptness of design, and suitability.
6. The first place design will be run on the cover of the October, 1976 Forensic. The winning designer will be featured in a story and be awarded a certificate. Second and third place winners will be announced in The Forensic and awarded certificates of merit.
7. All contest entries must be postmarked on or before July 10, 1976. Winners will be notified by mail before August 1, 1976.

Send your entry to: Carolyn Keefe, Editor, The Forensic
Department of Speech Communication and Theatre
West Chester State College, West Chester, PA 19380

MAY, 1976
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Marshalling</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TREVЕCCA NAZARENE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Peggy Lynn Jenkins</td>
<td>Stephen E. Phillips</td>
<td>PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Jeff Wiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE</td>
<td>Randy Arnett</td>
<td>Edward G. Schmid</td>
<td>49268</td>
<td>David A. Svaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger M. House</td>
<td>Paul Kevin Shine</td>
<td>49269</td>
<td>Bo Reitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darrell Lee Moore</td>
<td>Denise Elissa Stewart</td>
<td>49271</td>
<td>Paula Jo Povilatsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark Dennis Eyl</td>
<td>Kathleen Mary Downey</td>
<td>49272</td>
<td>Maxine G. Permenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE</td>
<td>Cheryl Threadgill</td>
<td>Jo Anna Pahides</td>
<td>49273</td>
<td>Stephanie Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Gary Burr</td>
<td>Kenna Martha Bratcher</td>
<td>49276</td>
<td>Kenneth M. Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaun M. Maxey</td>
<td>Cynthia Lynn Dayton</td>
<td>49277</td>
<td>Kenneth R. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Saderup</td>
<td>Douglas Enderle</td>
<td>49278</td>
<td>Kathleen Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rene Hopkins</td>
<td>Janice Elaine Glover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. K. Clayson</td>
<td>Mike Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE</td>
<td>Cathy Sue Lucas</td>
<td>Jerry Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry C. Pinson</td>
<td>David Schmitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Sue Klopfenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Kerr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Zweibel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Steve Miklos</td>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>Richard Holden Barnett</td>
<td>49233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Steiner</td>
<td>Brenda Kay Young</td>
<td>49234</td>
<td>Annette Hanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candace Vessella</td>
<td>Steven Alan Burris</td>
<td>49235</td>
<td>Jerry L. Eads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Panthaven</td>
<td>Charlynn Ellis Ross</td>
<td>49236</td>
<td>Jean Ann Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Corwin</td>
<td>Sue Yun Perry</td>
<td>49237</td>
<td>Phillip L. Hoots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY FOR WOMEN</td>
<td>Ruth M. Shaw</td>
<td>CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Karen Hoffmeyer</td>
<td>49244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy L. Sanders</td>
<td>Ann Marie Herlocker</td>
<td>49275</td>
<td>John Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willie Anne Whisenant</td>
<td>Susan Kay Moore</td>
<td>49278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen E. Windham</td>
<td>Laura Dawn McSwain</td>
<td>49280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Gregory</td>
<td>49281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKY MOUNTAIN COLLEGE</td>
<td>Rebecca V. Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td>49282</td>
<td>Thomas Martin Melton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keir Currie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. MARTIN'S COLLEGE</td>
<td>Nicholas Rausch, OSB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Blaisdell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Sharon Beck</td>
<td>OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Dexter Woods</td>
<td>49248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Leon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Diane Oaks Casagrande</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonita L. Douple</td>
<td>NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Nancy Dunbar</td>
<td>49250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Jo Daley</td>
<td>Patricia Abrahamian</td>
<td>49251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet L. Genuardi</td>
<td>David Serres</td>
<td>49252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathryn Krauss</td>
<td>Jan Hubbard</td>
<td>49253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Martucci</td>
<td>Diana Davis</td>
<td>49254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geralyn M. Mayernick</td>
<td>Brenda Hindman</td>
<td>49255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Martin Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td>49256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brigitte Thietje</td>
<td>49257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Gilpin</td>
<td>49258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Ball</td>
<td>49259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Ray</td>
<td>49260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Anthony Brutscher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Yelvington</td>
<td>49261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keitha Sue Griffith</td>
<td>49262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Jane Lucky</td>
<td>49263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERRIS STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Nelson Kevin Bond</td>
<td></td>
<td>49265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randall C. Witherspoon</td>
<td></td>
<td>49266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin F. Wigglesworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>49267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARION STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBRA L. ANDERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM JOHN WALKOWSKI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER NEWS

Edited by Ada Mae Haury

SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE
Reporter: Donald Harris

The Missouri Sigma chapter began the 1975-76 academic year with a number of new faces, new travel plans, and projects. After a rewarding 1974-75 season with six sweepstakes trophies and a superior rating at the PKD Nationals, the chapter lost debaters Clyde Elder, Tim Triplett, Ann Stuttsman, and Carl Camden to graduate schools.

New students have contributed strongly to individual events, and beginning debaters (some "brand new" to the debate world) looked forward to the spring semester's schedule.

Fall highlights included second in total sweepstakes at William Jewell and a new tournament venture to the University of Montevallo.

CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Douglas Duke

Oklahoma Iota chapter of Pi Kappa Delta has had a very active forensic year. Besides tournament travel, the school has been involved in hosting college and high school tournaments as well as being active in the local, district, and sectional levels of the Bicentennial Youth Debates.

The annual Broncho Forensic Tournament has been renamed in honor of Central State's retiring vice-president of academic affairs, Joe C. Jackson.

Many members and supporters of Pi Kappa Delta will remember Dr. Jackson as the debate coach at Central from 1948-1956. During this time his teams were champions at the Pi Kappa Delta Nationals twice and were finalists at the national tournament at West Point three times. At the province meeting in 1954, under Dr. Jackson's guidance the CSU students won every event in both men's and women's divisions. The CSU program will miss the guidance and support offered by Dr. Jackson.

HARDING COLLEGE
Reporter: Evan Ulrey

Arkansas Zeta opened its season by traveling to a workshop held at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock where Richard Paine and Joe Cardot presented

province of the missouri

province of the lower mississippi

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Mary Beth Hughes

The Pi Kappa Delta team at Illinois Wesleyan University has had a productive year. Past events include participation at the Illinois State University and Bradley University contests, a children's reading tour, a religious reading hour, a readers theatre production of "Rhythms of America" edited and written by Marie J. Robinson in honor of the Bicentennial year, and various campus performances. Dr. Marie J. Robinson, governor of the province, was so well received that she was asked to present her program again. It consisted of oral interpretation selections from prose, poetry, and drama. Darryle Moore, recently awarded the degree of proficiency, read
the negative side of a demonstration debate and three Harding teams participated in workshop rounds. The season has reaped such awards as a semifinalist in impromptu (Mike Pullara), a fifth in duet acting (Gloria Shoop and Tom Lawson), three third places (listening, Bonnie Ulrey; extemp, Joe Corum; storytelling, Linda Tipton), a second place in drama (Richard Paine), and a first in listening (Anne Ulrey). In debate Kregg Hood and Danny Gerlach reached quarterfinals at Oklahoma Christian; Paine and Cardot reached semifinals at Louisiana Tech; and Joe Corum and Bob White were finalists at Tech.

Harding was chosen as the site for the sectional level of the Bicentennial Youth Debates, and the debate team was deeply involved in the contest. Five of the six local winners were members of the debate team, and at the district level Corum took first in extemp; Tipton took first in persuasive speaking; and Paine and Cardot received first and second, respectively, in debate. Joe Cardot won first place in the sectional in Lincoln-Douglas debate.

Other activities included the Arkansas State Student Congress where Cardot, White, Paine, Butch Dulaney, and John Jordan combined to win ten awards with Dulaney being elected to the position of senate clerk; the hosting of Harding's annual high school debate and individual events tournament; and the planned presentation of a public debate against a team from the east coast.
province of the upper mississippi

MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Jean Farrand

Minnesota Kappa chapter at Moorhead State University had more than fifty students participating in its 1975-76 forensic program.

The squad began the season by attending the annual Yellowstone Valley Speech Tournament at Eastern Montana State College in Billings. Jane Lembke placed third in oral interpretation; Mark Ellingson and Connie Schwantz were finalists in extemp. and oratory.

At the River Bend Tournament at Mankato State University in Mankato, Minnesota, Nancy Wolterstorff reached the semifinals in oratory, and Chris Corbett reached the semifinals in extemp.

Trophy winners at the University of South Dakota Tournament in Vermillion, South Dakota, were Joyce Holte, second in extemporaneous interpretation; Arvel Gray, third in extemporaneous interpretation; Connie Schwantz, second in oratory; Nancy Riesterberg, fourth in serious interpretation; LuAnn Peterson, second in beginning debate, and Maureen Zimmer, honorable mention.

Kappa chapter also attended an oral interpretation festival at Eau Claire, Wiscon-

Greg Denaro of Southern Connecticut State College looks over a few of his 119 trophies. Story on next page.
sin, and hosted a high school speech tournament attended by approximately 500 participants.

Kappa chapter is advised by Mrs. Hazel Scott, Dr. Timothy Choy, and Dr. Carol Gaede.

province of the southeast

DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE
Reporter: Kenneth Schott

Tennessee Theta added twelve new members during the year. New chapter officers include president, Robert Whiting; vice-president, Gary Pearson; secretary, Christine Gates; treasurer, Leslie Bridges; and historian, Kathy Brown.

province of the northeast

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Seth Hawkins

At approximately 6:15 p.m. on Saturday, March 13, 1976 (during the awards ceremony of Great Eastern Tournament #5 at Suffolk University), an historic milestone in forensics was reached. A veteran competitor was called up to receive his second trophy of the day, a first place in impromptu, and at a pre-arranged signal, a film crew from Emerson began to roll the cameras, and a dozen champagne corks went off all over the auditorium. Gregory Denaro of Southern Connecticut State College had just achieved something that no one in forensics had ever done: won the 100th trophy of his career.

Greg is not exactly an obscure figure on the individual events circuit. The usual question asked of him in the last two seasons is, “Haven’t you graduated yet?” Finally, this May, he does, after having reached finals in almost every forensic event known to humanity, including extemp., impromptu, after-dinner, informative, persuasive, rhetorical, epitomizing, prose interp., mixed interp., humorous interp., interp. of Scripture, original poetry, and improvisation pairs. He has even taken an award in discussion and recently added a speaker trophy in off-topic debate to his varied collection. A quick rummage through the collection in the SCSC trophy case reveals that twenty-two of Denaro’s 119 trophies to date have been in pentathlon, while at least twenty of the remaining awards are first places in finals.

Clearly, to make the big run for the record, Greg had to be versatile and successful at the same time. Although the twenty-two pentathlon trophies are computed on the basis of one’s best five events in a given tournament, the minimum Greg entered in any tournament was six; the normative number was seven; and the maximum was nine. Despite the logistical matter of often having three events in an hour bracket, Greg managed to improve his performance, not lessen it. Prior to senior year, he had made four finals in a tournament five separate times. At George Mason in November, 1975, he tied a record established only two weeks earlier by Randy Farrar of Genesee by reaching six finals, although Greg had entered only seven events (as opposed to Farrar’s ten). In the Suffolk tournament where the magic number of 100 was reached, Greg, making sure that he didn’t back into the record, hit five finals and took first in pentathlon. The very next week, Mike Rowan of George Mason broke the Farrar-Denaro record by reaching seven finals in seven events at New Jersey Tech. That record lasted exactly one week. Denaro entered nine events at Pi Kappa Delta provincials, made eight finals, including three first place trophies, obviously won pentathlon, and added a speaker trophy in debate for a total of ten awards in a single tournament.

Another of Greg’s records involves the Great Eastern Tournaments: he is the only person to have won two cumulative pentathlon trophies, computed by adding the totals of all those who compete in pentathlon in the six-tournament series. In his junior year, he was first out of 109 cumulative pentathlon contestants, so far ahead that he did not even need the points he earned in the sixth tournament, even though he gave everyone a handicap by missing one of the tournaments. This year things were more difficult, and Greg took a respectable third behind Rowan and Farrar but ahead of 142 other students.
Probably the most esoteric achievement of Denaro's is taking consecutive first places in one event with two different speeches. Greg grew tired of his epideictic on Casey Stengel and decided to retire it in December, even though it had just won a first place in finals. His brand-new epideictic on Louis Armstrong took a first place in finals at the very next tournament.

All of Greg's quantitative achievements are also the sign of some more important means and goals: intellectual curiosity, an interest in versatility, and just plain fun. Only in individual speaking events could Greg consider his close friends as archrivals and yet root for them. When friends as Farrar, Rowan, or Keith Semmel and John Williams of Mansfield did well, he was glad, whether they were ahead of him or behind him in pentathlon. His afterdinner speeches explored the almost forgotten art of parody: Chris Collins of George Mason was so flattered by Greg's ADS parody of Chris' persuasive speech that he asked Greg for a text of it. Everything from doing an informative speech on choosing wines to an impromptu speech on a limerick was a source of pleasure. No one else would bother to write an informative speech on the history of Halloween to use at only one tournament, a tournament that began on October 31.

Greg Denaro has been so captivated by the forensic world that he intends to go into coaching so that he may teach what he has learned. If all goes well, he will have a graduate assistantship, probably at his old coach Hawkins' alma mater, Bowling Green State University in Ohio. A retiring student lieutenant governor, Greg says that he would consider it a great honor to begin his new career working for Past National President Raymond A. Yeager. Maybe we can begin to wonder who will get that first 1-100 from Greg, after all of the ones he's received.

WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: A. G. Kershner, Jr.

Pennsylvania Iota initiated a record number of new members this spring. The eight-year-old chapter inducted fourteen persons, six more than had ever been admitted at one time. An honored guest for the occasion was the president of West Chester State College, Charles Mayo. Dr. Mayo's appearance also constituted something of a record: the presence of the college president at a local Pi Kappa Delta induction ceremony.

Mrs. Diane Casagrande, director of debate, was initiated into the order of instruction. Initiated into the order of debate were the following: Kathleen Downey, Janet Genuardi, Joseph Martucci, James Nicholas, and Edward Schmid. Joining as members of the order of competitive individual speaking were Heather Jo Daley, Bonita Double, Kathryn Krauss, Geralyn Mayernick, Jo Anna Pahides, Stephen Phillips, Paul Shine, and Denise Stewart. Announcement was made of President Tim Anderson's promotion to the degree of highest distinction; Vice-President Donna Waniewski, Secretary-Treasurer Janice Kratz, and Lisa Bacon were all elevated to the degree of honor.

In the business meeting that followed the initiation ceremony, Tim Anderson and Jan Kratz were reelected, respectively, president and secretary-treasurer for 1976-77. Next year's vice-president will be Stephen Phillips; next year's secretary-historian will be Gerry Mayernick.

Also in attendance were Dr. William Morehouse, chairman of the speech communication and theatre department, and three sponsors of the West Chester State College Chapter — Mrs. Saundra M. Hall, Mrs. Carolyn Keefe, and A. G. Kershner.

Chapter News deadline for the October issue is August 7. Any material received after that date will be held over for the next issue. Please type (double space) all reports. Clear black and white photographs are welcomed. Send chapter news to: Professor Ada Mae Haury, Associate Editor, The Forensic, Bethel College, North Newton, KS 67117.
Reflections of a Senior in Late May

My study-sparkled days and nights
have fluttered together like uneasy geese
knowing the way but flailing under wind-force,
each drop visible, yet not mattering,
the wing-set still ahead, still tracing
the unmarked line from there to here.

But unlike geese, I do not travel the cloud-filled lanes
where necessity precludes reflection.
I sense the end before it starts,
not as mandated but willed, each juncture
both less and more of me as between-points
assume shape, bend to my hand,
and make me wonder at the tiny, four-year enormity.
I have learned the texture I am,
and the earth's too from whence I sprang
unfettered, First-Will begotten, kind after kind.
The late May gift of drifting is mine to decide.

C.K.
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL
THE FORENSIC EDITORS
OFFICERS OF THE TWELVE PROVINCES
CHAPTER SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

CONGRATULATE THE GRADUATING SENIORS
AND WISH THEM CONTINUING SUCCESS
IN THE YEARS TO COME.