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PI KAPPA DELTA TASK FORCE

Many of you may already be aware of the creation last year at the Seattle Convention of the Pi Kappa Delta Task Force on Forensics. However, you may not be particularly excited by the announcement that this organization, like many businesses and a myriad of government agencies, has established such a committee. After all, to many of us a task force is simply a group of people who spend a great deal of time studying and investigating something only to announce that a problem everyone was aware of actually does exist. It is hoped that the Pi Kappa Delta Task Force will not be that type.

Last March it seemed only appropriate to establish a committee to investigate the status of forensics and Pi Kappa Delta's role in it. You are no doubt aware that the forensic community is currently engaged in a considerable controversy about what should be the nature and objectives of competitive debate and that in many places debate programs are struggling for survival. Our activity is often held in low regard by other (noncoaching) members of the profession. We hear complaints that academic debate has deteriorated to the level of sophistry, and there is even a growing organization of coaches and sponsors that dubs itself the “reform movement” in forensics. So the time seemed ripe to establish a committee to look at these things. And, thus, the Pi Kappa Delta Task Force was born.

The Task Force was created by dividing the National Council into three subcommittees, each charged with investigating and making recommendations in three separate areas. The Philosophy Subcommittee is composed of Larry Norton, Roselyn Freedman, and Evan Ulrey. Its job is to consider the goals and objectives of our organization, to examine current (Continued on page 14)
THE WEBSTER-CALHOUN DEBATE:
ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN AMERICAN
PUBLIC ADDRESS

Charles W. Kneupper

Though the issue of nullification and secession was ultimately settled in the Civil War, those doctrines received their first serious legislative defeat nearly thirty years earlier with the passage of the Force Bill on March 2, 1833. John C. Calhoun and Daniel Webster, both renowned advocates, were among the most prominent figures in this debate. Though their debate was nominally on the Force Bill, the arguments and clash center on fundamental differences in their conception of the Union and the Constitution. Curiously, this debate has not received the consideration which the significance of the issue, the prominence of the advocates, and the quality of the arguments would indicate it deserves. Even the most extensive available treatment by Robert T. Oliver in his History of Public Speaking in America does not provide a full examination and almost totally ignores Calhoun's second speech, which is the most important speech of the debate. This limited consideration is even more curious in light of the fact that historians of Calhoun and Webster believe that it was abler in "legal and constitutional argument" and "exposed the issues far more thoroughly" than the more famous Webster-Hayne debate. One historian goes so far as to contend that since this debate of February 1833 "no new arguments have been added . . . on the great question of Union and secession."

Such viewpoints of historians should peak our curiosity and justify further investigation of this debate. Yet before examining the debater per se, we would do well to briefly survey the course of events which form the context necessary for an appreciation of the historical significance of this debate.

Background

In 1832 Congress passed "a new and more protective tariff." The South, traditionally opposed to the tariff, threatened resistance. In the presidential election of that year, South Carolina "in protest against the Democratic candidate, Andrew Jackson, and the Whig candidate, Henry Clay, both of whom had declared against nullification, voted for Governor John Floyd, of Virginia, a pronounced nullificationist." On November 24, 1832, the people of South Carolina issued an Ordinance of Nullification against the tariff to be effective February 1, 1833. On December 4, 1832, President Jackson attempted to conciliate South Carolina by urging a reduction in the tariff, but he warned that if the state interfered with the execution of the tariff laws, "measures as may be deemed necessary to meet it" would be undertaken. The South Carolina Legislature elected Robert Y. Hayne governor.

On December 10, 1832, President Jackson issued a Proclamation against Nullification. Referring to the actions of South Carolina, Jackson wrote, "Fellow citizens of the United States, the threat of unhallowed disunion, the name of those, once respected, by whom it is uttered, the array of military force to support it, denote the approach of a crisis in our affairs, on which the continuance of our unexampled prosperity, our political existence, and perhaps that of all free governments may depend." In early January 1833 President Jackson issued a special message to Congress on nullification. It was in response to this message that the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the Revenue Collection Bill on
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January 16, 1833. Called the Force Bill by its opponents, the bill was intended to "facilitate the execution of the tariff laws in South Carolina, by authorizing, in the case of conflict between the Federal officers and citizens, the change of ports of entry and the removal of the customs office from one building to another, and the employment of the land and naval forces of the United States to put down resistance to the collection of duties."8 Webster was a key member of the Judiciary Committee.

Meanwhile John C. Calhoun who in 1832 had been reelected to his third term as Vice-President of the United States resigned his office and returned to South Carolina where he was elected to the Senate. Prior to his resignation, Calhoun's popularity next to that of Jackson was unrivaled in the nation.9 This was a period of considerable emotional stress for Calhoun, as his actions associated him with a highly unpopular cause from a national perspective. Coit supposes that "for a man of his make-up, proud, sensitive, high-strung, only a few years back a popular hero, now little more than a pariah, all his dreams and hopes blotted out—his position must have been intolerable."10 He returned to Washington with the personal emotional stress of having his wife suffering from a "dangerous illness."11 Along his return route he heard rumors that Jackson would hang him. He faced the possibility of a civil war between South Carolina and the United States. It was within this context that the Calhoun-Webster debate took place.

The Debate: Preliminaries

Calhoun introduced a series of three resolutions which he hoped to pass prior to the debate on the Force Bill. From these resolutions he would launch his attack on the Force Bill and defend his position on the doctrines of nullification and secession. While the resolutions are too long to be reprinted here, the first is included because it is a crucial logical basis for the later two. The resolution was introduced as follows: "Resolved, That the people of the Several States composing these United States are united as parties to a constitutional compact, to which the people of each State acceded as a separate sovereign community, each binding itself by its own particular ratification; and that the Union, of which the said compact is the bond, is a union between the States ratifying the same."12

Recognizing that Calhoun intended to use this and the other two resolutions as a basis for his attack on the Force Bill, Calhoun's opponents engaged in some parliamentary maneuvering. Senator Felix Grundy of Tennessee introduced an alternate set of six resolutions tending to support the Force Bill. Senator Grundy's resolutions took precedence in the debate. Calhoun, unable to persuade Grundy to withdraw his resolutions, allowed both sets of resolutions to be laid on the table in order for the Force Bill to be debated directly.

The Debate: Round 1

On February 16 Calhoun rose to address the Senate. "He set the stage dramatically for the great occasion. Pushing some chairs down to both ends of a long desk which stood before the lobby rail, he enclosed himself in a sort of cage where he could pace up and down as he spoke. Close observers saw how rapidly he had aged in the past few months: the chiseled bone structure of his face was clearly visible; the dark lustrous eyes were sunken. His short-clipped hair, brushed back from a broad forehead, was streaked with gray."13

This was the beginning of the "inevitable clash between Calhoun and Webster" that many had been anticipating. "For three weeks the galleries were crowded. . . . The audience always included at least one member of the cabinet, Cass being the most frequently in attendance, presumably to serve as eyes and ears for the President."14 National interest focused on the debate.

The speech was long and rambling. The debate on the Force Bill had been going for over a month. Calhoun, replying to arguments of several speakers, did not have a tightly organized presentation. Though some of his arguments are interesting, their strength was marred by the lack of pointed organization, a tendency towards digression, and occasional emotional outburst and invective.

His primary constitutional argument rested on the distinction between the
delegated and reserved powers. He claimed that South Carolina "had not claimed a right to annul the Constitution; nor to resist laws made in pursuance of the Constitution; but those made without its authority. She claimed no right to judge of the delegated powers, but of the powers which were expressly reserved to the respective states." Defending the South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification's refusal to submit to court arbitration, he declared, "But it is contended that the constitution has conferred on the Supreme Court the right of judging between the States and the General government. Those who make this objection overlooked, he conceived, an important provision of the constitution, it will be seen that the reservation of power to the States is not only against the powers delegated to Congress, but against the United States themselves; and extends, of course, as well to the Judiciary as to the other departments of the Government." This was an important argument insofar as Calhoun had to show that nullification and secession as urged by his state constituted a constitutional and legal action.

His digression into subtle and powerful ad hominem is perhaps most brilliantly illustrated in his response to the accusation of Senator Clayton of Delaware that he used metaphysical reasoning. Calhoun replied, "If by metaphysics he means that scholastic refinement which makes distinctions without difference, no one can hold it in more utter contempt than he, (Mr. C) but if, on the contrary, he means the power of analysis and combination, that power which reduces the most complex idea into its elements, which traces causes to their first principle and, by the power of generalization and combination, unites the whole into one harmonious system — then, so far from deserving contempt, it is the highest attribute of the human mind. It is the power which raises man above the brute; which distinguishes his faculties from mere sagacity, which he holds in common with inferior animals . . . And shall this high power of mind, which has effected such wonders when directed to the laws which control the material world, be forever prohibited, under a senseless cry of metaphysics, from being applied to the high purpose of political science and legislation." Though the content of the illustration was not objectionable per se, it did little to further Calhoun's cause. At best he scored a few points with partisans for putting Senator Clayton down. This did not win votes.

In the latter portion of the speech he placed the issue into what probably were for him the most cogent terms. He believed that "to maintain the ascendancy of the constitution over the law-making majority is the great and essential point on which the success of the system must depend; unless that ascendancy can be preserved, the necessary consequences must be, that the laws will supersede the constitution; and finally, the will of the Executive, by the influence of its patronage will supersede the laws." To maintain the ascendancy of the Constitution, over the mere will of the majority, Calhoun felt that states must have the right "of interposing their authority to arrest the enactments of the General Government within their respective limits." Calhoun was fighting for his view of Constitution and Union.

The initial reception of the speech was not very positive. "'A total failure' was the summary of the Richmond Enquirer. 'He is too much excited to do even justice to himself.' Accounts generally agreed that he had failed, with the Telegraph pointing out that his mind was 'so much worried.' To Webster even the constitutional argument was inconsiderable. 'There is nothing to it,' he asserted. To a friend he wrote: 'You are quite right about his present condition. He cannot I am convinced make a coherent argumentative speech.'"

While Webster's expectation concerning Calhoun's ability to make a "coherent argumentative speech" was soon to be corrected, his initial response to Calhoun's address was to ignore it. Though he rose to address the Senate immediately following Calhoun, he chose to address himself to the resolutions which Calhoun had previously presented. Webster argued grammatically against Calhoun's use of constitutional compact, insisting that the Constitution is a noun not an adjective. Displaying the
keen sensitivity of a skilled advocate, Webster objected to the substance and strategy of Calhoun’s use of accede in the first resolution. Webster noted that “the first resolution declares that the people of the several States “acceded” to the Constitution, or to the constitutional compact as it is called. This word “accede”, not found either in the Constitution itself or in the ratification of it by any of the States, has been chosen for use here, doubtless, not without a well considered purpose. The natural converse of access is secession; and, therefore when it is stated that the people of the States acceded to the Union, it may be more plausibly argued that they may secede from it.” Exposing this strategy was a masterstroke and prompted Calhoun’s latter rephrasing of his first resolution. From here Webster launched an attack directly at the doctrine of nullification. He argued that “nullification, if successful, arrests the power of the law, absolves citizens from their duty, subverts the foundation both of protection and obedience, dispenses with oaths and obligation of allegiance, and elevates another authority to supreme command. Is not this revolution? And it raises to supreme command four-and-twenty distinct powers, each professing to be under a general government, and yet each setting its laws at defiance at leisure. Is not this anarchy, as well as revolution?”

Continuing his attack on nullification as of a nature to undermine the government, he argued, “The right of State interposition strikes at the very foundation of legislative power of Congress. It possesses no effective legislative power, if such right of State interposition exists; because it can pass no law not subject to abrogation.” Such arguments undoubtedly had a persuasive impact on many members of the general government.

While Webster was clearly the victor in Round I, he also made one crucial error which was to prove his undoing. He admitted that if Calhoun’s first resolution could be established, then the other two would logically follow. This would allow Calhoun to concentrate his clash on establishing this resolution. Also Webster, perhaps somewhat carried away or led into carelessness by Calhoun’s weak presentation, made a number of overstatements and factual errors which were easily refuted.

The Debate: Round II

On February 26 Calhoun arose to address the Senate on an order of special privilege in order to reply to Webster. Calhoun spoke for a mere two hours. But in those two hours he presented what, if not the most eloquent rebuttal, certainly was one of the more powerful refutative speeches in the history of the United States Senate. While such a claim may seem somewhat overdrawn, an examination of the speech reveals a tightly structured, well-documented, point by point refutation of Webster’s arguments. Initially Calhoun accused Webster of engaging in personalities and by innuendo suggested that his motive might have been to make the defense of a weak case appear stronger. Quickly progressing to a defense of his first resolution he dealt with Webster’s objections to the phrase constitutional compact and accede. He quoted a section of the Webster-Hayne debate in which Webster used the very words constitutional compact which he now disputed. In addition to using Webster’s authority against him, Calhoun noted statements of Washington and Jefferson supporting his use of accede. Then apparently after establishing his position, he chose to change the wording of his resolution. Ostensibly, this change was made in order to narrow the ground between Webster and himself, but it was probably motivated by Webster’s astute exposure of implications of the resolution as worded.

The revised resolution read as follows: “Resolved that the people of the several States composing these United States are united as parties to a compact, under the title of the Constitution of the United States which the people of each State ratified as a separate and sovereign community, each binding itself by its own particular ratification; and that the union, of which the said compact is the bond, is a union between the States ratifying the same.” He noted that this revision eliminated Webster’s objections to his language, while retaining the sense that
Calhoun required to serve as the ground of his later resolutions.

Calhoun proceeded to consider Webster’s other arguments on an individual basis. He progressed in a classic manner, neutrally restating in concise terms the essence of Webster’s argument; he then cogently presented his refutation. Illustrating his technique is the following excerpt: “The next argument which the Senator advances to show that the language of the constitution is irreconcilable with the idea of its being a compact, is taken from the portion of the instrument which imposes prohibitions on the authority of the States. He said that the language used in imposing the prohibitions is the language of a superior to an inferior; and that, therefore, it was not the language of a compact, which implies the equality of the parties. As a proof, the Senator cited the several provisions of the Constitution which provide that no State shall enter into treaties of alliance, and confederation, lay imposts, etc., without the assent of Congress. If he had turned to the articles of the old confederation, which he acknowledges to have been a compact, he would find that these very prohibitory articles of the constitution are borrowed from that instrument, that the language he takes as implying superiority were taken verbatim from it. If he had extended his researches further, he would find that it is the habitual language used in treaties, whenever a stipulation is made against the performance of any act.”

Calhoun caught Webster in a damaging inaccuracy to which Webster could not did not reply.

Another example of Calhoun’s refutation is: “But the principal argument on which the Senator relied to show the constitution is not a compact, rests on the provision in that instrument which declares that ‘this constitution, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, and treaties made under their authority, are the supreme law of the land.’ He asked, with marked emphasis, can a compact be the supreme law of the land? I ask in return, whether treaties are not compacts; and whether treaties, as well as the constitution are not declared to be the supreme law of the land? His argument, in fact, as conclusively proves that treaties are not compacts, as it does that the constitution is not a compact.” Again Webster failed to reply to this argument in his final speech.

Calhoun marshalled an impressive array of documentation to support his contents, quoting or referring to Webster, Washington, Jefferson, Burlamaqui, the Magna Carta, a 1688 resolution of Lords and Commons, the Massachusetts and New Hampshire ratifying conventions, the Virginia Resolution of 1798, the seventh and tenth articles of the Constitution, Blackstone, and Madison. Through the use of such non-artistic proof, he attempted to substantiate his first, second, and third resolutions and to avoid a charge that he was merely engaging in “metaphysical reasoning.”

Upon completion of Calhoun’s speech, Webster rose and gave a relatively brief reply. He completely dropped all arguments on the second and third resolutions, clashing only on the first. He attempted to counteract Calhoun’s use of his own words against him; he charged that he was quoted out of context; and he tried to clarify his meaning in the Webster-Hayne debate. Webster argued that the general government was created by the people, not by the States. He raised logical dilemmas, such as the source of sovereignty of territories that had acquired statehood. Yet the bulk of his speech dealt in patriotic appeals that tended to leave the field of argument.

The Winner

Calhoun’s friends were “perfectly satisfied he was the victor. John Randolph, of Roanoke, sat in the Senate when the great nullifier was replying to his opponent, and a hat on the desk in front of him interfering with his view, exclaimed, ‘Take away that hat. I want to see Webster die muscle by muscle!’” And of Webster’s friends, even the North American Review edited by Alexander H. Everett, brother of Massachusetts Congressman Edward Everett, and one of Webster’s warmest friends, admitted Calhoun’s success.

In a more ultimate sense, Wiltsie notes that “the historical confusion as to the outcome of that famous debate stems largely from the subsequent course of
events. For though he lost the argument with Calhoun, it was Webster’s ideas that triumphed in the end — were in fact well on the road to triumph then. Calhoun based his case on the meaning of the Constitution for those who wrote and ratified it, and in these terms his argument was basically sound, even though nullification itself was drawn from a Jeffersonian gloss rather than from the literal text of the instrument. But Webster’s interpretation was the only one compatible with the existence of a great national state, in a world growing every day more nationalistic.”

Calhoun seemed to recognize this. The Force Bill had been passed, and, regardless of argument, this was a victory for Webster’s interpretation of the Constitution. Calhoun stated, “It would be idle to attempt to disguise that the bill will be a practical assertion of one theory of the Constitution against another — the theory advocated by the supporters of the bill that ours is a consolidated government, in which the States have no rights, and in which, in fact, they bear the same relation as the counties do to the States and against that view of the Constitution which considers it as a compact formed by the States as separate communities, binding between the States, and not between the individual citizens.”

Despite their legislative defeat, Calhoun and the South continued to adhere to their compact theory. It is in the arguments between Calhoun’s and Webster’s conception of government that the rhetorical roots of the Civil War lie.

The Webster-Calhoun debate is a rhetorical paradox. Calhoun won the critical constitutional arguments and yet lost the debate. Though Calhoun’s arguments were historically sound, they were not persuasive to a majority of his audience. Calhoun was a sincere pleader of sectional interests. His views and leadership were widely respected in the South. Yet, in similar fashion, Webster represented the North and West. These sections no longer adhered to the Southern conception of the Constitution, and Calhoun’s historical demonstration did not sway them. Though Webster lost the logically central constitutional issues, his queries and objections to the practical implications of Calhoun’s position reflected the dominant values of the North and West. Though Webster’s argumentation was technically inferior to Calhoun’s in style and evidence, his appeals were better grounded in the current values and the practical political views of the majority of the audience. In the final analysis, it was this grounding which gave potency to Webster’s appeals and ultimately won the votes and thereby the debate.
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In selecting a very specific parameter to accompany this year’s debate resolution, the debate community has opened itself up to division and conflict which has not been witnessed since the discussion over switch-side debating. The anger over the parameters has been just as loud as the applause. A new debate issue has been created, allowing negative teams a new topicality approach and judges a new reason for decision. Yet consideration has not been directed toward determining the effects, if any, of the parameter on affirmative case areas.

In the October issue of The Forensic, Bob Beagle argued that “the rationale for a national parameter is a good one — to limit the boundaries of affirmative cases, thereby improving the chances for a meaningful, substantive debate.” If such analysis is correct, then we should be able to see some difference in affirmative cases under this year’s resolution. Based on my own judging this year, at all levels of competition, it is hard to detect substantial shifts in affirmative analysis. I believe that this is true for several reasons.

1. Affirmative analysis is based solely on interpretation. In considering the notion of topicality, David Thomas concluded that “debate resolutions require interpretation and affirmative teams have the privilege of defining the terms of the resolution.” When affirmative teams define consumer product safety as heroin or land use as being nuclear safety, they reach this analysis from their interpretation of the topic. The parameter statement is also subject to interpretation. A major affirmative case this year has involved the question of mandatory sentencing, a process excluded by the parameters because sentencing does not take place prior to conviction. Affirmative teams are defending this approach, because if mandatory sentencing does work, then the prosecutor will be given greater freedom to investigate and prosecute for he will have more time. Another interesting case has been the one involving the reopening of the investigation into the 1963 Kennedy assassination. Clearly, this is a legitimate approach because it meets all of the mandates of the parameter.

Yet these approaches do nothing to reduce the unfair burden of preparation placed on the negative teams. As long as any form of interpretation is allowed, the affirmatives will always be able to consider the gray areas of the resolution. Parameter statements only add to their interpretation of the topic.

2. Parameter statements are not meant to be a giant killer. Many people feel that with the parameter statement, we can now get rid of all the squirrel cases. This is not a decision that should be made by a national committee but by the judge and debaters in any given round. We know from experience that judges interpret the topic just as widely as debaters do. If a judge considers a particular affirmative case to be topical, then he should be allowed to vote for it. The parameter statements are meant simply to clarify the expectations and interpretation of the National Topic Selection Committee. That committee did not list the cases they thought were topical; they left that discretion to the individual judge. That is where it should remain.

3. The binding nature of the parameters is unclear. As mentioned before, the
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parameters are only the official interpretation of the topic, but the interpretation is not binding on either the debaters or judges. If a judge does not believe in the parameters, then he will not use them as a reason for decision. If an affirmative team chooses a nonparametric approach, then they will simply argue that the parameters are not binding. The only alternative is for tournament directors to make clear in their invitations that they will consider the parameters as binding on both debaters and judges.

The parameters do not appear to have had much effect on affirmative analysis. But that does not mean that academic debate has emerged into the nightmare claimed in some quarters. Affirmative analysis has become more related to the topic in recent years; any veteran of thirty or more air bag cases last year can testify to that. This year I have heard excellent rounds concerning arson, rape, antitrust, illegal aliens, organized crime, the exclusionary rule. These areas, I think, have direct bearing on the question of law enforcement procedures. We have done this without the aid of specific parameter statements, and I think there are several advantages to keeping it this way.

1. Debate is an educational process. We strive to teach our students the tools of critical analysis and research. We should not try to stamp out any form of original thinking that our students might possess; rather the laboratory nature of debate should be expanded to test new ideas. We have the issue of topicality as a safeguard against outrageous cases. If a negative team does not know how to argue topicality, then they deserve to lose. If they have a judge who does not accept topicality, then the parameters probably will not help them much. As people concerned with education, we should not rush towards ideas that will restrict the thinking of our students.

2. Debate is a self-contained process. By this I mean that the status of debate is a reflection of the people in the activity. Now comparative advantages cases are accepted by the debate community. That same debate community has not as yet given complete approval to the alternative justification approach. The result is its minimal use. The judge’s individual ballot remains the best way of maintaining debate as a viable process. If the judge feels that a case is not topical, then he will vote against it. It is indeed interesting to notice how many teams drop their cases when they are not winning.

3. Parameter statements preclude reasonable approaches. In being too specific, the parameters run the risk of also being too narrow. This year the resolution has been concerned with legitimizing certain investigatory/prosecutorial procedures with regards to felony crime. But if one is to follow the parameters, then what happens if a special prosecutor wants to investigate political abuse, or the IRS wants to look into tax fraud and embezzlement, or someone wants to see arson become a part I felony crime? All of these areas lie outside of a straight interpretation of the parameters, yet these should be legitimate concerns of any debate over felony crime. With parameter statements, we run the risk of being too narrow and shallow in our analysis.

If there is a problem in academic debate, there is no guarantee of solution through the use of parameter statements. Certainly nothing can be done as long as people remain unclear as to the intention of the parameters; that issue must be decided before anything else can be done. In choosing the formula for national topic selection, the debate community has made a commitment to defend the right of interpretation. That is one commitment that we should not relinquish. If the debaters choose to interpret land use as being aerosol cans, then that is their prerogative as long as they can universally defend their case as being a reasonable interpretation of the topic. To put blind faith in parameters is counterproductive to debate as an educational exercise.

Notes
3Beagle, p. 20
4Ibid., p. 21
Is Debate A Game?

Debate is called many things — "mental gymnastics," "intellectual sparring," "the loquacious person's chess," "sound and fury signifying nothing," "method of democracy," "a dance," "a game." In an attempt to discover what the practitioners label it, The Forensic has conducted a selective poll. Five debaters replied to these questions: Is debate a "game"? If you reply "yes," then would you say that the rules are followed? If you reply "no," then what is debate?

Michael Weaver
Tennessee Tech University
TN Delta

Webster defines "game" as "any specific amusement or sport involving physical or mental competition under specific rules." Based on this simple definition, and answering as a true debater, I must reply "yes" and "no." "Yes," because debate is amusing (to say the least) and it is a form of mental competition. "No," inasmuch as the definition mentions "specific rules." In my Speech 362 class, maybe ...

After my first round of college debate, the judge wrote on the ballot that "the affirmative wins due to presumption." Another judge once wrote on one of our ballots that "I will not vote against a good case like this one due to topicality alone." (In this case, extratopicality) What can I say?

Michael R. Keller
North Dakota State University
ND Delta

In theory debate is not a game; in practice it is becoming more and more a test of which team can spread the farthest with no real concern or focus on argumentative speaking in order to resolve one or two truly important issues in the debate. In practice debate is consumed by the debater who best paraphrases a 4 x 6 card in order that he may throw out twice as many arguments as he needs to. The end result is a muddled, nonrational hour of discourse which may certainly be termed the opposite of the art of persuasion, beautiful and just.

Rules are followed, ethics are not. The problem arises from the fact that there are no rules which limit the number of arguments one can present. Thus the debater who can speak very rapidly, regardless of how unpleasant the delivery sounds, is already at an advantage. When you consider the extensive briefs and masses of evidence that are becoming so much a part of debate, you can see that the win goes to those who talk fast rather than to those who think fast.

Beth Wright
University of Wisconsin — River Falls
WI Delta

No, debate is not a game. The principles that are learned in debate can be applied to real-life situations. Being able to support your policies in any situation will enable a debater to be more successful in any profession. Most important is the fact that debate deals with topics that are relevant to today's problems, and this knowledge learned can be used in dealing with those problems.

Debate is a learning experience. It provides people the opportunity to learn to argue and to be persuasive.

Donald C. Smith
Southern Connecticut State College
CN Beta

No, debate is not a game. When one thinks of a "game," one, more oft than not, thinks of an amusing activity. Debate, although enjoyable, is best defined as a sport. "Sport" better denotes competition of which a great deal can be seen during tournaments.

David W. Evans
Wilkes College
PA Omicron

Debate is a game in the same sense that college football and basketball are games: they are meant to be taken seriously. This is not to say that debate is a matter of life and death; still it should not be taken frivolously.

The rules probably are followed and enforced to the extent that they can be. However, there are no written rules against shotgun attacks or graduate research teams doing research for undergraduate squads; these seem to be ethical rules which everyone agrees should be followed but which will be followed only if they suit one's purposes. And, of course, there is no rule to preclude national debate topics which are so broad that any number of implications can be made and any number of "topical" cases can be constructed. Perhaps rules covering these situations can be written and enforced.
RECORDING THE VOICES OF PKD
Announcing a new event

Larry Norton, Historian

The idea has been circulating for several years. Who originated it and when is already lost in history. Then it was revived last year at the Seattle Convention. Some members suggested that the files of the historian should include cassette recordings of interviews with the veteran coaches in Pi Kappa Delta. Someone suggested that a good place to start would be the provincial level. As discussion continued, plans began to formulate.

In an era when three-fourths of our communication time is devoted to oral language and when our civilization is moving in the direction of a predominantly oral culture, it may be appropriate that Pi Kappa Delta recognize the trend and record some of our history in oral as well as written form.

We note, also, that in recent years the interview form has assumed a more important educational role in oral communication studies. Because it incorporates three essential techniques of interpersonal communication — questioning, answering, and listening — the interview has become a popular and useful type of activity as well as a successful method of teaching basic skills.

Then it was suggested, why not give consideration to combining the educational advantages of the interview with the historical values of perpetuating, in oral form, the experiences, philosophy, and ideals of Pi Kappa Deltans? And if that is worth an experimental effort, why not extend the scope of those to be interviewed to include an extensive sampling of the personal opinions, beliefs, and reflections of students, alumni, coaches, administrators, and other members of the campus-community at the local chapter level as well as at the provincial and national levels? Why not involve students in a realistic, practical activity both as interviewer and interviewee? Why not experiment with the oral history interview as a contest event at some of the 1978 province meetings? It would not be the first time that the interview form has been used as a tournament event. Past President Roy Mahaffey included it in his Tournament of Champions more than twenty-five years ago.

So the discussion progressed to the point of considering some educational responses we might expect from pursuing this idea. In relation to the general field of intercollegiate speech activities, we might find answers to some questions relating to where we are in our forensic thinking, what we really do believe, how strong we hold those beliefs, in what direction we should be going, and just where our values lie. The answers to these and other questions might help to supplement the goals and roles of forensics set forth at the Sedalia Conference and aid us all in restoring a positive educational image to forensic programs.

The leadership of Pi Kappa Delta might hope to obtain deliberative responses from persons with varying degrees of involvement in speech contests concerning the role of an honorary organization in forensic activity. These answers could be useful in the reevaluation of the philosophy, structure, and function of Pi Kappa Delta.

It might be assumed that those who participate as interviewers might increase, through preparation and performance, their understanding of the nature and goals of forensics. They might improve skills in questioning, answering, and listening. In retrospect, they could have the satisfaction of making a worthwhile
contribution to the on-going process of improving intercollegiate forensic competition.

The persons interviewed would have the opportunity to formulate and to express opinions derived from varied experiences with contest speech activities and from a relationship with Pi Kappa Delta. Though the opportunity for expression is always available through other channels, only a very limited number of persons are actually heard and read on current forensic issues.

The areas and topics which could be used in the interviews are limited only by the imagination of the participants. These are but a few suggestions from which specific questions might be developed. What changes in the nature of competitive speech events have you observed in recent years? What are your reactions to these changes? Is judging better or worse now than it was several years ago? Do you have any explanation for this? Does the general public attach more or less value to intercollegiate speech activities now than in previous years? Why? What are the values to be obtained from participation in speech contests? Are participants properly rewarded for their achievements in intercollegiate forensics? Are there unnecessary restrictions upon participation? What observations do you have relative to ethical behavior in forensic activities? Does Pi Kappa Delta serve useful functions in the area of intercollegiate forensics? If so, what are the most important ones? If not, are there contributions it could and should make?

As inferred in the opening remarks, it is hoped that all recorded interviews will find a place in the active cassette file of the Pi Kappa Delta historian.

The President’s Message
(Continued from page 3)

trends in forensics, and to compile membership demographic data. The Function Subcommittee, composed of Jack Starr, Ted Karl, and Roger Hufford, will look into the function of our fraternity, considering such questions as how to implement the Pi Kappa Delta philosophy and what should be the proper relationship of this organization to the rest of the academic community. The Structure Subcommittee, consisting of Phyllis Bosley, Carolyn Keefe, and Jim DeMoux, former PKD vice-president, is charged with making recommendations about the structure of Pi Kappa Delta — its local, provincial, and national organization, its lines of communication, and its finances.

Task Force discussions began in earnest at the SCA Convention in Washington, D.C., last December. The timetable calls for meetings and discussions throughout this year and the next, culminating in a final report to be presented to the convention assembled in St. Louis in 1979. The Task Force will be a priority item on the agenda at the National Council’s summer meeting this August. Much work, of course, remains to be done, but already the Task Force has made some preliminary recom-

mendations. As a consequence, for example, planning is now well underway for a series of early season local experimental tournaments sponsored under the aegis of Pi Kappa Delta. These tournaments, with special rules and regulations, will be designed to foster a style of debate consistent with our motto: the art of persuasion, beautiful and just. You’ll be receiving more information about these tournaments when plans are complete.

The work of the Task Force will take much time and effort. Its ultimate success or failure will depend on each and every one of us because the members of the National Council cannot complete this task on their own. We shall need the advice and cooperation of every member of the fraternity. What role do you think Pi Kappa Delta should play in forensics in the coming years? What do you see as the Pi Kappa Delta philosophy? How might the structure of this organization be improved? Where is forensics heading in the next decade? Where should it be going? Questions such as these might make for lively discussion between rounds at upcoming province tournaments. Some provinces may even wish to place these matters on the agenda. I encourage you to discuss these questions with other students and coaches and let the Task Force know what you think.
As this is being written, the first month of 1978 is just about over. The news from the Midwest and parts of even the South is frightening — extreme cold, snow that is paralyzing the area — and while all of this is happening to many of you, we out here in the Northwest have yet to experience a temperature under 37 degrees. Of course, we have had some rain, but that is welcome after our previous winter of insufficient rainfall. The mountains are heavy with snow, due to all the skiers thinking “snow!”

By the time you read this page, at least some of the provinces will have had their conventions. I sincerely hope that all of them were well-attended or will be well-attended. The province convention and tournament is a very important part of the entire fraternity program. It would be good to know that at least some of the provinces were able to get the information out early enough to allow experimentation with the new interview event. If the innovation is at all successful, it is quite possible that such an event will be a part of the National Tournament in St. Louis next year. As devised by Larry Norton, historian, and Roger Hufford, chairman of the national contests, it sounds most interesting and has much potential. After all, Pi Kappa Delta has been the leader and innovator of things forensic over the years.

The governors should arrange to send the results and the minutes of the province conventions (as well as other matters of general interest to the membership) to the Editor and to the Secretary. One copy should be kept for the province files.

This office has received ninety-two Fall Reports so far. Some arrived too late for the Directory, but each report will help to bring the chapter files up-to-date, as well as to provide an opportunity to order the supplies needed for initiating new members this spring. This office really does need the Fall Report. We have also been receiving outdated copies of Form A, as well as $10.00 memberships rather than the $15.00 fee which went into effect August 1, 1977. There are a number of changes in chapter sponsors, and we need
to know this in order to have a current mailing list.

To date we have received ninety-four assessment fees from the chapters. For those chapters who have not paid, an additional billing will be necessary. The National Convention in Seattle passed this assessment, which is annual and continuous until some convention in the future changes it. It would be of great service to the national organization if this fee would be paid at the beginning of the year, thus saving both time and money.

It is our hope that you will have or have had a successful province convention and tournament. The Northwest Province Convention will be held at the Empress Hotel, Victoria, British Columbia, among our neighbors to the North. We expect to accomplish much and to also have a good and relaxing time. We wish the same for you.

Please Note: The annual chapter assessment is $15.00; an individual membership is also $15.00. Fees are payable to the National Secretary-Treasurer.

New Look for Old Event

Tired of progressing orderly (more or less) through discussion stages?

Definition and Delineation Stage

Problem Analysis Stage

Solutions Stage

Report Writing Stage

Ho, hum, John Dewey, brilliant and useful, step aside while Pi Kappa Deltans consider another type of discussion. Don't go far — we may return after exactness bores us more than probability.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROGER HUFFORD'S NEW LOOK FOR DISCUSSION

It has been proposed that part of the discussion competition at the 1979 Nationals be solving problems with right answers. The winning group would be the group that got the most right answers, and no group could blame judge prejudice if they lost. There comes a time, too, when verbal skill is not enough and when proposals have to be implemented and tested. These problems do not represent harsh reality but are just for fun. Can your group get the right answers?
GROUP DISCUSSION PROBLEMS

1. PSYCHIC DETERMINATION: Anna, Bella, Carla, and Donna try the psychic determination test. They put the four aces and joker from a standard deck of cards face down on a table, then try to guess which is which. Nobody got them all right, and nobody got them all wrong, and at the end no two persons had the same number right. WHAT WERE THE CARDS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Card</th>
<th>Second Card</th>
<th>Third Card</th>
<th>Fourth Card</th>
<th>Fifth Card</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Joker</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Joker</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Spade</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Joker</td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Spade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. THE ORATORY CONTEST: Art, Bob, Carl, Dick, and Ed agree to take part in an oratory contest judged by Fran, Ginny, Helen, Irma, and Janet. Each girl ranks the five speakers from 1 (best) to 5 (worst) with no ties. The ranks are added, and the speaker with the lowest total wins. There are no ties. From the given information, determine WHO SHOULD GET THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD PLACE TROPHIES?

1. Everyone except Carl received at least one first and one last.
2. Art got one more first place than anybody else.
3. Bob’s total of ranks was 2 better than Ed’s and 2 worse than Dick’s.
4. Fran ranked Dick above Carl, and Carl above Ed.
5. Ginny ranked Art 2 places ahead of Bob, and Carl 2 places ahead of Dick.
6. Fran ranked Bob last.
8. If Dick had received first from Helen instead of last, his total would have been 10, and he would have been a clear first (assuming the others did not have their totals altered by the change).
10. Janet liked Dick best and Ed least (and ranked them accordingly).
11. Irma did not rank Bob third.

3. CONFUSION CRESCENT: Three married couples live on Confusion Crescent. The wives are all housewives, and their husbands work as the town butcher, baker, and candlestick maker. The strange thing about the couples is that all six of them have first names that are sometimes given to males and sometimes to females. To add to the confusion, one of each couple always tells the truth, and the spouse always lies. The following remarks have been faithfully recorded, and we can assure you that nobody mentioned his/her own spouse’s name. DETERMINE EACH MAN’S JOB AND WIFE.

Fran: 1. Bobby is married to Kim.
Jan: 2. Lynn is not the candlestick maker.
Kim: 3. Bobby is the baker.
Bobby: 4. Fran is the butcher.
   5. Carroll is not the butcher.
Carroll: 6. Kim is not the baker.
Lynn: 7. Jan is the butcher.
   8. Fran is not married to the butcher or the baker.

The right answers will appear in the May issue of The Forensic.
provinces of the Missouri

SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE

Reporter: Les Frazier

Missouri Sigma chapter started off the forensic year by hosting its first tournament on September 23-24. Although the date was early, the tournament was well attended. Dr. Bob Derryberry, forensic coach, hopes to make the tournament an annual event.

The debate squad had its first outing on October 13-14 at the Louisiana Tech tournament. The squad came home with second place in sweepstakes, aided by a first place in extemporaneous speaking by junior Darrell Moore.

On November 10-11, the team traveled to William Jewell's Blizzard Tournament. There the squad finished third in sweepstakes, with a first place in debate by senior Randy Arnett and junior Darrell Moore. Novices Randy Cowling and Kevin Laval also finished first.

The squad is looking forward to the Missouri State Tournament in March and the bipros in South Dakota in April.

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

Reporter: Kurt Stadtwald

Delta chapter has brought home awards from each of the five tournaments in which squad members have competed.

In September the squad traveled to Southwest Baptist College where Kelly Klopfenstein returned with a first place trophy in extemporaneous speaking. Carla Jordan was awarded first place in informative and third in oratory, while Karen Kerr received fourth in prose and Isaiah Lewis fourth in storytelling. In junior division debate, Chris Hunter and Greg Cyr placed fourth. The squad ranked third in sweepstakes.

At the University of Western Illinois, Cindy Hoover and Donald McCall reached quarterfinals in junior division debate, while at Oklahoma Christian College they finished as octafinals in junior division debate, and Carla Jordan brought home second place in oratory and extemporaneous speaking.

Jewell's efforts were crowned with victory at Johnson County Community College. Cindy Hoover advanced to extemporaneous finals and Carla Jordan placed second; Kelly Klopfenstein finished third in oratory; and Ike Lewis and Duane Reed placed first and third respectively in interpretation. In debate the teams of Dale Phelps—Mike Retherford and Kelly Klopfenstein—Kurt Stadtwald both advanced to octafinals in junior division debate. Kurt Stadtwald won the third place speaker's gavel.

To cap the first half of the season, the squad participated at Wichita State University. Cindy Hoover placed first in extemporaneous speaking. In interpretation four of the six finalists were from Jewell, with Duane Reed bringing home first place honors, followed by Mary Bledsoe, Karen Kerr, and Ike Lewis. Carla Jordan advanced to oratory finals.

The chapter sponsored the annual Blizzard Tournament and the Missouri State Debate Tournament.

The squad is proud to report that Kelly Klopfenstein, a graduating senior, was honored by her peers in being selected lieutenant governor of the Province of the Missouri and is also serving as president of the chapter. Dale Phelps is vice-president, Cindy Dayton is secretary, and Kurt Stadtwald is historian-reporter.
BUENA VISTA COLLEGE

province of the sioux

Reporter: Dan Lintin

The Kappa chapter at Storm Lake, Iowa, wishes to announce that their program is back on its feet and is enjoying a very successful semester.

At the University of Wisconsin at Whitewater, Dan Lintin, Gordon Paulsen, Renee Schmidt, and Mary Massa placed eighth in novice debate, while at Creighton University, Raileen Peterson ranked fourth in humorous impromptu. Lori Van Osbree placed first in group discussion and parliamentary debate; Dan Lintin placed second in group discussion and parliamentary debate; Gordon Paulsen placed second in extemporaneous speaking; Bill LaBaume placed third in interpretation of prose; and Raileen Peterson placed fourth in humorous impromptu.

The Mankato State University tournament found Buena Vista’s Gordon Paulsen and Dan Lintin placing sixth in beginner’s debate, Dan Lintin ranking fourth in rhetorical criticism, and Gordon Paulsen qualifying for semifinals in extemporaneous speaking.

At the Nebraska Wesleyan tournament, Raileen Peterson and Bill LaBaume placed fourth in duet acting; Renee Schmidt qualified for finals in after-dinner speaking; and Bill LaBaume and Lori Van Osbree qualified for semifinals in interpretation of prose.

Our plans for next semester include hosting the Japanese debaters, an initiation banquet for the new Pi Kappa Delta members, and six tournaments.

---

Trophies Acquired by Buena Vista At The University Of Nebraska At Omaha

Left to right: Lori Van Osbree, first place in group discussion and parliamentary debate; Bill LaBaume, third place in prose interpretation; Dan Lintin, second place in group discussion and parliamentary debate; Gordon Paulsen, second place in extemporaneous speaking; and Dr. Sandra Madsen, director of forensics.
The province of the lower Mississippi

The University of Arkansas—Fayetteville
Reporter: Mary Ingalls

Across the mountains, over the plains, and back to the hills we came, proudly bearing our Charter #382—Arkansas Iota, and determined to do or die for Pi Kappa Delta. The University of Arkansas at Fayetteville may not have set the whole world on fire, but we are somewhat proud of the record we made during the fall semester and hope to be able to build on it during the spring. Our activities included attendance at the annual Debate Rally at the University of Arkansas in Little Rock, The Oklahoma Christian College Tournament, The University of Kansas Tournament, the hosting of our own six-state, six-hundred-student tournament for high schools, plus participation in the Arkansas Speech Communication Association Student Congress at Little Rock, and the Louisiana State University at Shreveport Tournament. We are especially proud of being able to elect Doug Carson as president of the Senate, nineteen separate awards, and the title of Best Delegation at Student Congress, plus the sweepstakes award at L.S.U.S. Our overall squad debate record is now 60 percent, with teams having reached semis twice and quarters five times. Individual awards include two first places, two seconds, and four finalists.

Our officers for the year are Jo Carson, president; Roland Depew, vice-president; Leslie Lane, secretary; Bill Putman, treasurer and assistant coach; and Karen McCaulley, reporter. Keith McCommom is also a returning active member, and the list of new pledges includes Doug Carson, Joe Childers, Tom Fox, Carol Goforth, Valerie L'Allier, Sheryl Salter, Eric Van Scyoc, Eric Vaughn, Mike Waltman, and Velina Watson.

We are now setting our sights on second semester, sending out invitations to our Razorback II Tournament for colleges and universities, scheduled for February 17 and 18, and planning all sorts of money-raising activities from selling Christmas trees to Social Security cards to finance tournament attendance.

We are anticipating attending two tournaments, in addition to the State Speech Festival and, of course, the Provinceals at Arkadelphia. We are even looking ahead to renewing friendships in St. Louis in 1979.

The province of the southeast

David Lipscomb College
Reporter: Kenneth Schott

The Tennessee Theta chapter competed in eight debate tournaments during the fall quarter, breaking into the finals in every tournament. The greatest victory of the fall season was winning the Wake Forest Tournament on October 30. Winning debaters were Bruce Clayton and Mike Buchanan. The chapter has the following members: Tony Saunders, president; Karen Horn, vice-president; Leslie Bridges, secretary; Robert Whiting, David Sampson, Gary Pearson, Mike Cunningham, Bruce Clayton, Tim Dance, Karen Nichols, and Cathy Brown.

New members applying this quarter are: Kathy Jones, Nels Grubb, and Mike Buchanan.

Ohio Northern University
Reporters: Steve Swartz, Ralph Harris, and Vern Rudder

In fast-paced verbal action, the Xi chapter competed in tournaments in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Virginia, and Ohio. Consistent with our philosophy of providing debate experience for a large number of students, Ohio Northern entered sixteen debate team members and an additional sixteen argumentation students in competitive debate rounds this term.

Between tournaments we hosted the First Annual Cornstalk Invitational Debate Tournament, a novice event which provided beginning debaters with the chance to practice debating skill. In October, Northern debaters challenged two Oxford debaters to a debate on the merits of pornography or censorship.
Our chapter is pleased to announce an additional sponsor, Gary E. Bayliss, who will share responsibility with Elizabeth Roberts, currently secretary-treasurer of the Province of the Lakes. In addition to her PKD activities, Ms. Roberts is director of the Communication Skills Center at Ohio Northern. We also warmly welcome Chuck Johnson to the coaching staff of our team.

Future plans include a winter PKD initiation, several fund-raising projects, an intersquad debate tournament, a Florida debate tour, and the province convention.

BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Cindy Fissel

Pennsylvania Delta chapter reports many new forensic members this year. Susan Waters has won an award in poetry interpretation, while Mark Lucia has won an award in persuasion. Anne Otto and Regina Wild are student teaching this semester but will join the squad in January. Our new Pi Kappa Delta officers are Mary Fowler, president; Sherri Reichard, vice-president; Cindy Fissel, secretary-treasurer; and Gert McGoff, pledge mistress. Neil Hilkert is our advisor.

We have traveled to five tournaments this semester: Prince George’s Community College, Shippensburg, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Frostburg, and Penn State University. Also we hosted the Ninth Annual Mad Hatter Tournament early in November.

WILKES COLLEGE

Pennsylvania Omicron chapter is gaining fame not only on the Wilkes campus and area communities but also among other colleges. Although it is one of the newest chapters in Pennsylvania, it is indeed on the move in competition.

The chapter which calls itself “Kinney’s Kids” (named for their coach and director) have won over twenty-six major awards this year. Next semester promises to be even a bigger success for the debaters as they attempt to break the college all-time winning record.

In addition to engaging in intercollegiate competition, the Union provides instruction in forensic skills for ten to fourteen-year olds in the “College for Kids” program. The past two summers these workshops have been very successful. Now each semester the Union will offer workshops and visitations to local high schools to increase interest in forensic activity. Plans are underway for five new members to be taken into the chapter ranks.

CHAPTER NEWS CITATIONS

The following chapters are commended for their cooperation in reporting their forensic activities. Each chapter has sent in news at least twice since August 1, 1975, when the current staff assumed their duties.

BETHEL COLLEGE, KS XI
BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE, PA DELTA
BUENA VISTA COLLEGE, IA KAPPA CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, PA ZETA CENTRAL COLLEGE, IA BETA DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE, TN THETA ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, IL ALPHA HARDING COLLEGE, AR ZETA LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY, LA DELTA MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY, MN KAPPA MOUNT UNION COLLEGE, OH MU OTTAWA UNIVERSITY, KS ALPHA SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY, MO IOTA SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE, CT IOTA SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE, MO SIGMA UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-FAYETTEVILLE, AR IOTA UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-CLaire, WI ZETA WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE, PA IOTA WILKES COLLEGE, PA OMICRON WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE, MO DELTA

Send Chapter News to: Professor Ada Mae Haury, Associate Editor, The Forensics, Bethel College, North Newton, KS 67117.
NEW MEMBERS OF PI KAPPA DELTA

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS
50549 Karl M. Sherwood

TENNESSEE TECH UNIVERSITY
50577 Michael Mark Kingsbury

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
50721 Larry Litton

WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
50730 Paul Amundson
50731 Thomas P. Gillespie

TEXAS A & I UNIVERSITY
50742 Roger C. Bunch
50743 John Brooke
50744 Brenda Faye Holt
50745 Michelle Mew

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—EAU CLAIRE
50746 Mary Boos
50747 Marie Ann Jensen
50748 Lois J. Krajnak
50749 Mary Larocque
50750 Brad Waller
50751 Michael M. Walsh
50752 Michael Symons

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
50753 John Randall Keck
50754 Steven Louis Keck

TEXAS LUTHERAN COLLEGE
50755 Scott Wyant

50756 William F. Shupe
50764 Elizabeth Ann Reader
50765 Mark K. Mathyer
50772 Karl Alf

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
50757 Karen Leigh Langhart
50758 Deborah Bullock Nault
50759 Cherie Hutchinson
50760 J. Michelle Amacker
50761 Dennis Dunn

KEARNY STATE COLLEGE
50762 Larry L. Peterson
50773 Nancy Jolene Fleming
50774 Mark Larson
50775 James William Green
50776 Daniel S. Scarborough

WESTERN STATE COLLEGE
50763 Paula Randolph

SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
50766 Chris Lee Stickney

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—WHITEWATER
50767 Darlene Klaehn

CARTHAGE COLLEGE
50768 Heather Jewell
50769 Carol Ruyle
50770 Laura Saari
50771 Dee McDavid

NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
50778 Chris Shapcott

DEFIANCE COLLEGE
50779 Desireé L. Angeli
50780 Robert J. Fournier
50781 Gary R. Brackle
50782 Anne R. Schultz

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS—FAYETTEVILLE
50783 Tom Fox
50784 Carol Rose Goforth
50785 Michael Scott Waltman
50786 Eric Randall Vaughn

QUACHITA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
50787 Beth Patterson
50788 Cheré Sneed

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
50777 Tim R. Edwards
50789 Matthew E. York
50790 Roy T. Weiss
50791 David J. Whalen
50792 Eileen M. Edwards
50793 Linda S. Carlson
50794 James S. Rice
50795 Carl Edwin Spradlin

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS—MONTICELLO
50796 Thomas E. Harden
50797 Travis R. Berry

A Word From The Editor . . .

“Talk Is Cheap”

“Talk is cheap” is a saying too common to show up in an impromptu round where points are given to contestants who can meet the unexpected unexpectedly well. But it suits my editorial purpose this March of 1978.

This three-word aphorism describes the talk of too many of us forensic professionals. For years we have been “long in the tooth” about the dreadful state of intercollegiate debate. We deplore case proliferation, the ten-minute rule, canned evidence, canned analysis, file systems on wheels, rapid delivery, lack of audience adaptation, and numerous other so-called abuses. But when we are given the chance to effect change, we cling more strongly to the status quo than does a negative team.

In “Shall We Dance? A Comment on Contemporary Tournament Debate” (The Forensic, January 1978), Michael Volpe attributed the causation of the problems to debate judges and suggested that the solution was theirs too. I believe that he is right. Debaters come and go, but we who teach, coach, and judge debate may hold out a generation or more. We are the style-setters who make fashions out of fads. And the current debate line is about as serviceable to speech communication as flip-flops are to track.

Let us suppose for a moment that a state department of education official were to
observe a debate tournament in order to evaluate the academic value of the activity. Working inductively from observable behavior, the official might well conclude that the competencies being taught would read something like this:

The student will be able to participate in eight rounds of switch-side debate on the national proposition by developing an affirmative case so unique that the opponents have no evidence to refute it; by presenting a negative spread of at least fifteen points so that reasonable affirmative refutation would take no less than thirty minutes; by speaking at a rate so rapid that neither the judge nor the opponents can take a flow sheet; by having at least 2,500 evidence cards on file; by mastering seventy-five terms of debate jargon and inventing ten terms not found in an unabridged dictionary; by adapting evidence to either side of the proposition, without attention to original intent. Competency will be determined by a 4-4 or better win-loss record.

Contemporary debate practice, thus reduced to measurable behavior, would not gain the approval of any sane curriculum committee or state educational official.

But we forensic educators continue to give competency ratings to debaters who demonstrate these behaviors. Yet in our speech communication classes we lecture about vocal and conceptual clarity, sufficient amplification of ideas, audience adaptation, mental contact with listeners — and we reward students who apply these principles and give low grades to those who violate them. Why this duplicity? Is rhetorical theory so narrow that it does not encompass debate? If so, what rhetorical theory is operable for debate and where, if anywhere, is its application?

Once I thought and taught that debate found its model in the courtroom and legislature and, to a lesser extent, in the town meeting and public forum. But I know now that nothing outside the forensic circuit looks or sounds like the ludicrous mutation known as intercollegiate debate.

Many of us in Pi Kappa Delta feel that the time has come to end this exclusivity. We forensic educators have brought it about; we must now cease our cheap talk and take constructive action by offering students intercollegiate debate competition that rewards thorough, reasonable analysis and pleasing, impressive delivery. Under the leadership of President Tom Harte, the National Council is making plans for a series of debate tournaments at which any fairly intelligent observer will be able to find behavioral competencies worthy of being taught.

---

**Call for Articles**

How do you carry out the educational goals of forensics? in coaching? in a course? in field work? in community service? Please describe your program in 800-1,000 words and send to the Editor. Deadline for submission is June 15, 1978.

---

**MAY — THE ISSUE OF THE PROVINCIALS**

Contest Winners
Election Results
Photographs
Plus —
More on debate from Beagle

**COVER PHOTO:** Allegra Sensenig, West Chester State College