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HERE I STAND

Apparently considerable controversy has been aroused as a consequence of some statements appearing in recent issues of this journal which have been critical of contemporary debate. That is not altogether unhealthy, I believe. Rarely does one side in a dispute have a corner on the truth. Moreover, when it comes to discovering the "Truth" and arriving at sound conclusions there is no better tool than reasoned argument. Surely if anyone should believe that, we should. So I hope to see more discussion and debate about the status of contemporary forensics, and I would hope to see some of that debate, both sides of it, in the pages of this magazine.

However, I do wish to take this opportunity to clarify my position and to correct any false impressions which may have been made by my remarks or by the remarks of others.

First, I want to emphasize that I still believe every word I wrote in my January message. I am troubled by much of what takes place in many of the debate rounds I observe. Furthermore, as president of the nation's largest forensic honorary, I believe that I have an obligation to voice my concerns. I could not in good conscience remain silent. However, in stating my views I hope that I have not given anyone the impression that I presume to speak for every member of Pi Kappa Delta. I certainly do not, anymore than the president of any other organization can presume to speak for every member of it. I encourage those who disagree with me to speak out. I do hope, though, that my position is consistent with the views of the majority of our members. After all, my position was hardly a secret at the time I was elected to this office. But if the majority do not agree with me, I expect to be taken to task. I do not seek to lead Pi Kappa Delta where it does not wish to go. My intention is to raise this issue, tell you where I stand, ask for your support, and wait for your reactions.

I also hope that no one thinks my remarks in the January Forensic were a personal attack on anyone in particular or an indictment of all debaters in general.

(Continued on page 9)
THE ROLE OF SOCIETAL CONTEXT IN PROPOSITION ANALYSIS

James I. Luck, James W. Paulsen, and F. Scott McCown

The learning experiences of thousands of students involved in collegiate debate revolve around a proposition chosen for a full year of examination. Consequently, the meaning of the resolution takes on great significance. Deliberations on what falls within the purview of the question begin with the topic's announcement and extend through the final round of the National Debate Tournament and beyond.¹ What may or may not be argued under a given proposition is an issue that has been labeled "topicality." The Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate of the Speech Communication Association has, beginning with the 1976-77 year, supplied with the topic an official statement of parameters. This decision reflects, at least in part, a dissatisfaction with the current interpretation of resolutions. This article will briefly examine current methods of proposition analysis and propose the use of a neglected concept, societal context.

In overview it may be suggested that there has been a generally unrecognized schism between theory and practice in conceptualization of the function of the national debate resolution. Is it a proposition (defined simply as "a controversy")², or is it a topic? Although the vast majority of debate texts treat the resolution as a proposition,³ ordinary usage (typified by use of the term topicality) seems to treat the resolution as a topic, providing only the general subject for discussion and a direction of change. The implications of this dichotomy cannot be overemphasized. While the former interpretation views the proposition as a conclusion about a controversy, the latter sees it as the starting point for discussion. James Unger describes the practical approach to resolution-as-topic.

Debate is primarily a debate about plans: competing policy systems. It is not a debate about the proposition. . . . If I might analogize to the law court, it seems to me, it is the agreement of the plan with the proposition that gives the affirmative team standing to sue. It is what brings it in acceptably in court. We find out whether in fact this particular case is justiciable or not by determining whether it meets the perimeters of the given law, in this case the proposition that is before us. . . . Once that issue is determined, and it is a critical issue, [then] . . . our entire debate does in fact focus in one way or another on the plan. We do very much, I would suggest to you, for all practical terms bid right by the proposition and we begin the discussion of . . . the need for that particular plan, not the need for that particular proposition.⁴

Bernard Brock added that "the key thing is the relationship between the resolution and the plan . . . After you decide that a plan falls within the resolution, then the debate is over the plan."⁵

To view the matter in a different light, while standard debate texts would advise the advocate to discover through research the general area of controversy which inspired the resolution — and consequently the issues inherent in that area — the resolution-as-topic approach would not seek to discern the context of a proposition but would treat the proposition itself as the context for the plan. While the second approach would place strictures only on the plan, the first might impose requirements on the need area as well.

The most common current approach to discussing topicality issues is that of definition of terms, either alone or in semantic units. A standard reference work, usually a dictionary or legal dictionary, is normally enlisted to furnish the meaning of an individual term in dispute. But defining words in the absence of con-

Mr. Luck is a fellow in communications and public leadership at the Academy for Contemporary Problems; Mr. Paulsen is a teaching assistant in debate at the University of Utah; and Mr. McCown is at the University of Texas Law School. All hold membership in PKD.
text is very unsatisfactory, as "words . . . may have different meanings in different contexts." Ogden and Richards agree, characterizing the dictionary as "a list of substitute symbols. It says in effect: 'This can be substituted for that in such and such circumstances.' It can do this because in these circumstances and for suitable interpreters the references caused by the two symbols will be sufficiently alike.'"

It is therefore vital to establish a context for the words before any meaningful definition can be derived. Ogden and Richards conclude, "All definitions are essentially ad hoc. They are relevant to some purpose or situation, and consequently are applicable only over a restricted field or 'universe of discourse.'"

Therefore, treating the proposition as a topic — a context from which potential plans may be derived — is internally self-defeating. One must define the terms in order to determine the context, but the context must be determined in order to define the terms. The natural result is an uncontrollable crazy quilt combination of isolated words and phrases, fully justifying a description of the process as "an exercise which is no less silly than a Medieval syllogistic debate."

A far more productive method of analysis would result from maintaining the conception of the resolution as a proposition. Not only would recognizing a context and background for the proposition render the process of definition sensible, but the context could itself serve to define the area of controversy. Windes and Hastings have addressed the subject of resolution formation in considerable depth. They suggest that development of propositions follows an essentially similar process that can be observed in the evolution of almost all public controversies. They reduce this process to ten steps, reproduced here in abbreviated form.

1. Individual concern and anxiety over a threat to security.
2. Relation of threat to problem, attachment of causation.
3. Communication of problem to primary groups.
4. Communication by primary groups to others beyond groups; development of opinion leaders.
5. Assumption of leadership by persons not in primary groups.
6. Arousal of public opinion by the mass media.
7. Resumption of face-to-face discussion in multiple groups of original problem placed in larger context.
8. Formulation of individual and group attitudes and opinions.
10. Public debate on the proposition; advocates; resolution of problem; dissolution of public opinion.

In this ten-step process, advocacy in the form of public debate represents the final phase of the evolution of a proposition. Analysis by the debater, then, begins with an awareness of and deference to the context of the proposition as a necessary precondition of any reasonable definition or understanding. Ehninger and Brockriede agree, noting that the advocate's "task is to 'locate' rather than 'invent' [the issues] because they inhere in the proposition itself and are there to be found."

Windes and Hastings elaborate:

Every proposition possesses a background or history all its own; the proposition did not suddenly happen; it emerged from a complex process of controversy evolution. From the inception of a situation which created basic original concerns to the focusing of those concerns through the proposition, this evolutionary development demands the study of the advocate. The advocate must be aware of the evolution, for without the perception and knowledge such a study results in, he would work in an atmosphere of relative ignorance... The evolution of a proposition represents the "plot" for the advocate; his advocacy is only the climax or the final act. Unfortunately, in society there are too many "last-act advocates" who attempt to carry out their responsibilities partially or largely unaware of the "plot" of the proposition they defend. They see only the end product, not the processes . . .

Assuming the significance of context to the defining or understanding of proposition, a critical question in the specialized arena of academic debate is that of the relevant context. Some may argue that the resolution does not follow the Windes and Hastings process of evolution but rather is formulated by a committee and adopted for discussion by the debate
community. Would the relevant context, then, be the academic debate community, the committee charged with wording the topic, or the society as a whole?

Certainly a case can be made for the debate community as the relevant context. Debaters and coaches are the segment of society that actually establishes the proposition, and they are also the segment of society that suffers the consequences of faulty definitions and analysis. A. Tennyson Williams, while not endorsing this view, describes it well:

... perhaps debate propositions should mean what the debate community says they mean. Thus, while indirect legalization of marijuana would not appear to an outsider to be controlling the gathering and utilization of information, it does so appear to the community using the terms... Whether I am a judge concerned with literal definition or with the spirit, I must realize that both derive from the sense of the debate community. If a particular case is accepted by the debate community generally, then I should not decide it is not topical (unless of course there is a winning negative argument to that effect). This may well mean that I may vote against a case on topicality early in the year and reject the same negative arguments at a later tournament, once I find that the debate community has generally decided that this case is a reasonable interpretation of the resolution.14

Whether practiced consciously or unconsciously, this resolutonal context is undeniably in operation. It is axiomatic that interpretations of topicality generally become more standardized and liberal during the course of the year. Brock endorses this contextual approach, arguing that "the debate community has operationalized the language quite well."15 Additionally, one recommendation of the National Developmental Conference on Forensics calls for regional seminars during the year to openly discuss interpretations of the proposition.16

Considering the context to be the debate community has little to recommend it. Briefly, it virtually mandates a degree of arbitrary judging in order to adequately "direct" the topic; it offers no pre factot guides for participants and only the sketchiest of post factot controls; and it does not necessarily serve even to change the attitude of specific teams. Debaters who lose a "topicality ballot" to a "conservative" judge are likely to respond by developing a secondary case just for him and his ilk, "striking" him from panels when possible, or accepting the statistical hazard of a later loss rather than modifying their interpretation of the proposition. Finally, it should be observed that the current, often bizarre interpretations of resolutions have developed despite this framework.

A second possible context, and one that received considerable scrutiny this past year, is the intended meaning of the actual framers of the resolution, the Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate. This was done through the attachment of an official context — parameters — to the resolution. The efficacy of formal parameters, on the basis of a year's experience, would seem doubtful. On the strength of personal observation, it appears that the parameters were rarely appealed to, but when invoked they were more likely to be cited by an affirmative team attempting to support a liberal definition of terms than by their opponents. Perhaps a single sentence is not specific enough (Alan Nichols, an advocate of parameters in the 1940's, suggested that a minimum of several hundred words would be necessary17), or perhaps this is a demonstration of the truth of Brock's warning: "No committee can dictate or stipulate definitions or interpretations very well because debaters will shift their attention from the word in the resolution to the stipulation. They would shift the debate from one area to another, so pragmatically it wouldn't work."18

The most telling indictment of official parameters, however, is that they serve to legitimize the notion of the context of the proposition as being within the debate community, rather than in society as a whole. The report of the National Developmental Conference noted that "opponents of the resolution [on parameters] argued that... if the resolution achieved one of its objectives, the responsibility of the debater to analyze the proposition would be usurped."19 Concurrently, the opportunity to use this analysis in a determination of propositionality is also forfeited. The strictures proposed in the suggested parameters for
the 1977-78 resolutions clearly demonstrate this extreme.

Were it not for the fact that an intercollegiate debate proposition is artificially formulated, the obvious "best choice" for an appropriate context would be that of the "real world." It can be posited, however, that the artificial elements of resolution formulation should not serve to bar treatment as a real-world proposition.

First, it would seem that if we were to agree that the resolution is an arbitrary agglomeration of words, understandable and analyzable only in the rarified atmosphere of interscholastic debate, then there could be no rational basis for using statements by authorities and factual material drawn from the realm of public policy-making. Additionally, there would be no justification for the development and application of models of argument based on real-world situations (legislative, judicial, or scientific — or "reasonable man," for that matter), and no reason to analyze the effects of the proposition if enacted in the real world.

Second, although the procedure used by the Topic Selection Committee does not duplicate the process described by Windes and Hastings, it certainly approximates the real world. One need only consider the groundwork involved in determining whether the areas selected for voting represent substantial policy issues (on which a large amount of written material is available) to conclude that even if a proposition does not arise from an actual controversy, it is certainly a conclusion about some real-world issue, with a clear societal context. Most, if not all, of the eight steps preceding proposition development will certainly occur in any adequate selection process.

The content of past topics and the current effort to provide parameters clearly indicate that we wish to address problems which do have societal context. The Topic Selection Committee process might be compared to a Congressional committee which formulates a bill for ultimate consideration by the full Congress. It is the concerns of the populace which are manifested in the process that produces the bill, and it is the intent of the com-
ambiguous. As an example, the “supply and utilization of energy” topic had a relatively clear context. Few would seriously object to a judge or a debater who would argue that during an Arab oil embargo, with natural gas shortages causing mass unemployment, and the words “energy crisis!” screaming from the cover of every major news magazine (not to mention tournaments cancelled because of gasoline shortages), the proposal of a national nutrition program, gun control, returnable bottles, or sodium light bulbs as a crime control device quite probably would be outside the societal context of the resolution. On the “land use” topic, fewer still would accept heroin maintenance, prison overcrowding, or bail reform as being any of the social conditions crying for land use controls. Likewise, the qualifications of ambulance attendants or chiropractors probably do not rank high on the list of action priorities of any of the major consumer product safety organizations. There would certainly be many shadow areas that would leave a great deal to the judge’s discretion. This kind of a priori judgment cannot be defended as a fair or adequate process. But conversely, can any system which not only allows but virtually mandates outré “examples of the resolution” be similarly defended?

Some potential guidelines, however, for specifying the appropriate societal context of a resolution come to mind. A debater could easily demonstrate the relevant context of a proposition by indicating the type of articles found under the appropriate subject headings in social science, legal, government, and popular indices. He might consult speeches by experts in the field. The Congressional Research Service annually publishes a bibliography and list of readings related to the collegiate topic. Certainly the opinion of the policy research arm of the United States Congress might provide a hint of the appropriate context for the resolution.

On the other hand, a simple and effective test might be required of the affirmative team. Do the subject matter experts cited by the affirmative team in defense of their particular policy option perceive themselves as being involved in the controversy surrounding the resolution? On the consumer product safety topic, would the advocates of marijuana legalization see themselves as involved in the product safety controversy or, rather, the illicit drug controversy? Do they contribute regularly to consumer publications? Do they testify at the Senate hearings on the subject of consumer product safety? Would they attend and contribute to conferences and seminars on the subject? In short, do people who talk about the plan or the need it addresses think of it as a problem which would result in the resolution? Should the affirmative be unable to demonstrate that the authorities they cite perceive themselves as being consciously involved in the subject area indicated by the resolution, the approach could probably be safely labeled nonresolutonal.

Certainly this article has not illuminated all of the issues raised by the analysis of a proposition’s societal context; however, the authors hope that it will serve as a stimulus to a thoughtful reconciliation of theory and practice in topicality argumentation. Whatever tools are selected, however, let the end be the training of effective advocates for a future in real-world policy deliberation, not as “last-act advocates.”

NOTES


3For the purposes of this discussion, the question of whether the question is technically a proposition or a hypothesis is not addressed. A delineation of the issues may be found in David W. Shepard, “Logical Propositions and Debate Resolutions,” CSSJ, 11 (1959-60), 186-90, and Alan Lichtman and Daniel Rohrer, “Critique of Zarefsky on Presumption,” in Proceedings of the National Conference on Argumentation (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University, 1973).

4James J. Unger, “Perimeters of the National Debate Resolution, A Forum,” Owen Coon Debate Tournament, Northwestern University, February 10,
President's Message
(Continued from page 3)

They were certainly not offered in that spirit. Indeed, in that column I took pains to try to avoid that impression. I understand, however, that some readers may have been offended not so much by what I said as by what Michael Volpe said in his article which also appeared in the January Forensic. Permit me a few observations about that matter.

The article represented Professor Volpe's position, not necessarily the position of Pi Kappa Delta. Indeed, I cannot agree with everything which Mr. Volpe says. For example, I violently disagree with his statement that today's debaters are ignorant and unintelligent. I simply do not believe that. (I doubt seriously whether Mr. Volpe really believes that.) But that does not mean that such a statement ought never to appear in The Forensic. The pages of The Forensic seem to me to be an appropriate forum for such comments because if, in fact, they are typical of what those outside the forensic community are thinking, we ought to hear them. I think Volpe's article should be required reading for every student engaged in forensics, not because every word he says is true, but because there is enough truth in the article to give us pause. Granted, he may overstate his case. (Hyperbole is one tool in the rhetorical arsenal.) But he says some things which, in my judgment, are worth reading and considering. As to his criticism of specific passages from the official text of an NDT final round, I do not view them as personal attacks. As published utterances they should be able to withstand published analysis and criticism. Perhaps Mr. Volpe's comments are abrasive. No doubt they could have been considerably softened. But it was their very intensity which drew my attention to them in the first place and persuaded me that they should receive circulation among the forensic community. I sincerely regret that anyone found the article personally offensive or threatening, but if he did I encourage that person to speak out in rebuttal. The editor of The Forensic, I am certain, would welcome such dialogue.

In summary, then, I meant nothing personal in my stand against what I perceive to be abuses in academic debate. My comments and, I trust, the comments of Mr. Volpe were not meant to polarize and alienate but to open up discussion and dialogue. I sincerely hope I have not offended anyone. Nonetheless, I stand by my statement in the January Forensic. I hope that we in Pi Kappa Delta can debate this crucial issue openly and rationally without acrimony, for if we cannot, then who can?

The Cover: A modern version of old-fashioned spring rug beating — Robin Weyand, debate coach from Glassboro State (NJ) College, beats dust out of PKD pennants. Editor Keefe got her head together with Brian Walker, speech and drama editor of Prentice-Hall, for this one. Allegra Sensenig of West Chester State College did the photography.
Forensic
Focus on . . .

John Bliese
Marshall University

The Forensic salutes a director of forensics for his constructive response to its criticisms of debate.

The pages of The Forensic have recently been full of criticisms of contemporary debate practices, especially at the national level of competition. The January issue, for example, opens with President Harte calling for reform. A couple of pages later Professor Volpe condemns the practices of debaters. Next, Professor Hufford finds a number of faults. In all, about a third of the issue is devoted to criticism.

The Pi Kappa Deltans who are so upset focus on a limited number of things currently done in "big time" debate: the rapid rate of delivery, the massive amounts of evidence gathered and read in each round, and the tendency to run affirmative cases that are at best on the outer fringes of the proposition. While I have found many pages of such criticism in The Forensic of recent years, I have come across very little about other levels of debate and almost no constructive suggestions for improvement. Therefore, I would like to consider the state of debate and to suggest an alternative which Pi Kappa Delta should take the initiative in implementing.

Most of the objections to national debate center around the fact that it is no longer an exercise in communication. President Harte quotes Professor Unger's statement that "you can't invite a large audience to a debate. Debaters live in a world of their own, so to speak." He then calls for reform of our activity. Now, it certainly is true that under the influence of the "national style," debate has become a relatively narrow activity, with no appeal for outside audiences. However, that fact itself hardly establishes a need for reform. We do thousands of things in the academy that are not spectator sports. One need only scan titles of dissertations, journal articles, research projects, and graduate seminars to see that we spend much time and many dollars on activities that could equally be indicted for not "communicating" with the masses. Few dissertations become best sellers, but we do not therefore call for reform of the custom of writing them. The facts that national debate goes at 250 words per minute, requires incredible amounts of research, and is no longer attractive to outside audiences are just that: facts, not indictments.

Much of the criticism is based on very limited knowledge. For example, Professor Volpe's article is a reaction to judging at just one high school tournament and reading the transcript of the 1976 National Debate Tournament final round. Other objections seem to be based on misunderstandings. Volpe does not seem to grasp the strategy of that disadvantage Kansas presented in first negative. (It won them the debate!) Nor does he understand the conditional counterplan. (It is not a "heads
I win, tails you lose" argument.) Harte objects on irrelevant grounds to debaters asking him to "call for the evidence." Why shouldn't a judge see the exact wording of disputed testimony? After all, Harte himself had just previously objected to claims that go beyond the evidence!

Furthermore, some debate practices which clearly merit indictment are never even mentioned in The Forensic. One has only to think of the custom of presenting patently ridiculous disadvantages that are based on a chain of a dozen or so tenuous causal links, all treated as absolute.

Many of the criticisms in The Forensic surely seem to be sour grapes reactions. Are our debaters that much better? Granted, there are national teams that present thirty pieces of evidence and no analysis at all. But I remember a more consistent team, one rated superior at the Philadelphia National Tournament, that not only had no analysis but no evidence as well! If such a team could be rated superior at PKD Nationals, our own debating is hardly without fault.

In themselves, most of the practices of so-called national debaters do not disturb me. But the narrowing of the activity does bother me because it has excluded many bright students from the potential benefits of debate training. It is difficult to train novices and then take them to tournaments: they are almost guaranteed to lose their negative rounds, simply because they have not researched all the nooks and crannies of the current super-broad topics. Naturally, most novices soon get discouraged and drop out of debate. There are also many students who like debate and could benefit from the training four years of competition could give them but who do not want to sell their souls to the activity. They do not want to do research for thirty or forty hours per week in order to be prepared on the negative. All too often they drop out of debate altogether.

It seems to me that we do not need a reform of national debate to make it communicative again, but a supplement for it to broaden the attractiveness of argumentative competition. We need a form of debate in which a mere mortal with limited time can participate, a form such that the relevant arguments can be presented at somewhat slower speaking rates. This means, above all, a narrow proposition. (If it is a policy proposition, it should specify the plan.) It also means that this same narrow topic must be debated at a series of tournaments, not just at one off-topic tournament. Students have no motive to do serious research for just one tournament.

In the West, an attempt has been made to provide such an option in the form of CEDA debate. In October the Cross Examination Debate Association selects a narrow topic. Schools which are members of the Association normally have three debate divisions at their tournaments: varsity and novice (both on the national topic) and CEDA (debating the Association’s topic). CEDA keeps cumulative records of the results of its division, and at the final tournament of the season it awards a national championship trophy.

CEDA debate is thus a supplement for national debate, and, while it is far from perfect, it at least attempts to eliminate those factors which discourage students from participating. Unfortunately, it is only available in the West. Therefore, I propose that we in Pi Kappa Delta go and do likewise — select a narrow topic (perhaps with a relatively short season) and encourage all PKD schools to add a division for this proposition at their tournaments. I suggest that the CEDA topic be adopted for the benefit of those schools in the West.

It is time for us to quit complaining and to do something constructive to restore debate as a viable activity for larger numbers of students.

**IMPORTANT NOTICES**

1. Reminder to Governors: Please make sure that copies of minutes, financial statement, and awards are sent to the National Office.

2. We are still accepting Fall Reports.

3. THIS IS A LAST REMINDER TO SEND IN CHAPTER FEES OF $15.00. Several chapters have not sent in their fees yet.

4. LIFETIME MEMBERSHIP FEES WERE RAISED BY THE 1977 NATIONAL CONVENTION TO $15.00, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1977. We are still receiving $10.00 memberships.

   Theodore O. H. Karl
   National Secretary-Treasurer
The following tribute was written by Marilyn Norris, past governor of the Province of the Southeast and director of forensics at Mississippi University for Women. Dr. Cromwell was her debate coach, teacher, and lifelong friend.

Former National Pi Kappa Delta President Harvey Cromwell died on December 28, 1977, at the M. D. Anderson Cancer Clinic in Houston, Texas, after a brief illness.

Born August 16, 1907, the "farm-boy" from Wanette, Oklahoma, earned his B.S. degree from Oklahoma East Central College, his M.A. from Oklahoma State University, and his Ph.D. from Purdue. As instructor of speech and mathematics in Oklahoma high schools, he launched what was to become a forty-seven year teaching career. During his early years in the profession he served as chairman of the speech department of McMurry College in Texas, coordinator of Instructional Training for the United States Air Force Technical Command, and professor of speech and debate coach at Purdue, where he coached championship men's varsity debate teams from 1944-1949.

In 1949 he joined the Mississippi State College for Women faculty as professor, head of the department of speech, and director of forensics. During his eighteen years in that position, he established the department's speech clinic, founded the state's first campus radio station, directed and emceed a weekly television program, and coached teams which consistently won top awards in national, regional, and state competition in debate and individual events.

Only six weeks prior to his death, Dr. Cromwell was the proud honoree at dedication ceremonies of the Harvey Cromwell Communication Center at MSCW (later Mississippi University for Women) where there is hardly a facet of life that has not been shaped by his twenty-eight years of service. Dr. Cromwell helped to establish the first graduate program and from 1966-74 served as the first dean of the graduate school. He was chairman of the committee which formulated the first honors program and served for three years as its director. He initiated the school's first mini course program and served as the first director of continuing education. Even after his retirement in 1975 as dean of the graduate school, he continued in a part-time position as grant specialist for the University.

Dr. Cromwell's contributions to education are not confined to MUW; they are national in scope. He is the author of five books and coauthor of two books on speech communication, parliamentary procedure, and phonetics. Sixty-five of his articles have been published in professional journals, and he is listed in fourteen international and national biographies. Only a few of the positions in which he served the speech field were those of chairman of the National Speech Association Committee of Discussion and Debate, director of the Southern Speech Association Congress of Human Relations, SSCA Executive Council member, president of the Mississippi Speech Association and a member of its Executive Council for fourteen years, and director of Mississippi Youth Congress.

Dr. Cromwell's awards included citations from the President of the United States and the Governor of Mississippi for his work on national and state committees to employ the handicapped.

Dearest to his heart, though, were the ideals and principles of Pi Kappa Delta. After serving as editor of The Forensic (1951-54) and as governor of the Province of the Southeast, he became a member of the National Council (1955-67), national vice-president (1957-59), and national president (1959-61). He was national convention chairman for the Fiftieth Anniversary Convention in 1963 and at that convention was among those elected to receive the Distinguished Service Award.

It is as a teacher, however, that "Dr. C." made his most lasting contribution. That teaching by no means ended with his retirement from the MUW classroom. Until the summer before his death, he continued to teach the Men's Sunday School Class at Columbus First Baptist Church, where he had been a teacher for twenty-five years.

Ironically, when his students and colleagues think of Dr. C., it is the "C's" which best characterize him.

Concern — His genuine concern for each and every student permeated every minute of his teaching. Regardless of how inundated he might have been with the burdensome details of administering a department, a graduate program, or Pi Kappa Delta
Nationals, Dr. C. always had time to sit and listen and talk with each student about his individual problems, goals, and ambitions.

Communication — He was a master teacher of that most human of all activities, communication. I doubt that any teacher in the country has taught his students so well “the art of persuasion, beautiful and just.”

Curiosity — As important as communication skills are, Dr. C. taught his students knowledge of far greater worth. Through example and precept he instilled within each of us an insatiable thirst for knowledge, the kind of intellectual curiosity that is not satisfied with the superficial who? what? and when?, but is compelled to discover the more important how? and why? not only about one’s field of specialization, but about the entire province of human knowledge.

Challenge — In teaching us intellectual curiosity, he challenged each of us to be self-actualized people, to become all that we could be, for he endeavored not so much to impart wisdom as to educate us, in the true sense of the word, by leading each of us to the threshold of his own mind.

Courage — It takes a special kind of courage to risk the potential for failure inherent in the undertaking of innovative academic programs such as those which Dr. Cromwell initiated. In his personal life, especially in the long year during which his first wife suffered from a brain tumor and in the weeks preceding his own death, Dr. C. displayed that unique courage which, according to Tennessee Williams, elevates only a few “to that high station in life earned by the gallantry with which appalling experiences are survived with grace.”

Concern, communication, intellectual curiosity, challenge, courage — these are the qualities which marked him, and these are the gifts which he shared with his students and colleagues.

It is with great sorrow and yet a deep sense of gratitude that all who knew him pay tribute to Dr. Harvey Cromwell, that rarest of beings: a truly great teacher whose contributions so significantly affect our professional and national fraternity, but, most of all, the thousands of individual students and colleagues in whose lives he wrought a permanent change because he taught and lived as though “someone’s soul is always listening.”

---

**Student Lieutenant Governor Steve Beckley Speaks Out On President Harte’s Remarks and On “East Coast” Debate**

Having just returned from the Junior Varsity National Debate Championships at Canton, Ohio, we had the unique opportunity to participate in the eastern, or national competition, style of debate. We found that there are some tremendous differences in the competition, depending upon your geographical location. Tom Harte, president of Pi Kappa Delta, in the January issue of *The Forensic*, presented some very serious criticisms of college forensics. After reading the article, I felt that his indictments may be valid in some limited instances. I was indeed surprised to find that this is not the case. After reviewing a few of our ballots from the tournament, I was shocked to find that we had lost one debate because we had been too persuasive, and topicality was not a voting issue. And this is not just true of a few judges; the tendency is to award decisions on the fastest, most unintelligible form of delivery possible and to present an outline structure that starts out at subpoint A. and ends somewhere around big 1. under little c. under big 3. This is not to say that we did not enjoy the competition — we just had trouble comprehending the purpose of it and all those cases dealing with abortion, drunk driving, and reopening the J.F.K. assassination case. My partner and I began wondering just how far-out you could get with this year’s resolution. The answer came when we heard that a school from the east coast was running “God,” the ultimate law enforcement agency! After having experienced the east coast style of debate, I am indeed happy to be in the Northwest. And I agree entirely with the President of Pi Kappa Delta, when he said, “In my opinion it may well be the greatest challenge ever facing this organization — the challenge to restore sanity to intercollegiate forensics.”

(Reprinted in substance from the Newsletter of the Northwest Province)
CALL FOR MEMBERSHIP RESPONSE ON PROPOSED DEBATE BALLOT

How can Pi Kappa Delta more effectively promote the educational values of debate?

If we are dissatisfied with abuses we find in current practice, we need methods to curb those abuses. The only feedback currently available in tournament debating is the ballot (critiques are as common as the whooping crane), so perhaps we need to restructure the ballot to provide continuing feedback to discourage unsound practice.

I hope debaters are not so callous that they ignore every critical response as long as they win the round. The proposed ballot gives judges an opportunity to provide feedback quickly and easily on the skills we seek to promote.

The proposed ballot provides for (and should encourage) judge feedback on several dimensions. Would judges use the opportunity to try to discourage undesirable practices? Would debaters respond with changed behavior if the negative feedback was not in the form of a lost round? Would judges occasionally vote against a team for stated reasons other than analysis and evidence? How would the activity be changed if they did? Would these changes be for the better, or would they be detrimental?

We invite our members to send us their reactions to the proposed ballot, and suggestions for improvement. Finally, tell us if you would like to see it used.

Dr. Roger Hufford
National Council Member
Pi Kappa Delta
Clarion State College
Clarion, PA 16214

---

PI KAPPA DELTA BALLOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Affirmative #</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Negative #</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Debaters should meet high standards for ethics and effective communication as well as for research and analytical skills. Please give team rankings for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis:</th>
<th>Case Area</th>
<th>Meet Parameter</th>
<th>Delivery:</th>
<th>Effective Rate</th>
<th>Effective Impact</th>
<th>Evidence:</th>
<th>Sources Clear</th>
<th>Presentation:</th>
<th>Interpooration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mark (X) in the appropriate box:

1 = No Problem   2 = Questionable   3* = Objectionable   4** = Decisive

* Teams "objectionable" in 3 or more areas may be awarded losses, regardless of other considerations in the debate.

** Teams may lose because judge finds practices totally unacceptable ("X" in box 4).

Please give individual ratings and rankings to each speaker below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Aff</th>
<th>2nd Aff</th>
<th>1st Neg</th>
<th>2nd Neg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rank the debaters from 1 (best) to 4 (worst). Do not award tie ranks.

Decisive Issues (Reasons for Decision):

Suggestions:

I award the decision to __________ from __________ (Aff or Neg) (School) (Judge's Signature)

---

ANNOUNCING THE NEW DEBATE SERIES SPONSORED BY PKD

October 20-21, 1978, Southeast Missouri State University

November 10-11, 1978, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

February 9-10, 1979, West Chester State (PA) College

PLAN NOW TO ATTEND.
"With all the attacks being made against academic debate, do you think reforms will occur?"

Not in the near future, and the parameter concept is a case in point. As you may recall, my October column, while defending the notion of topic parameters, decried the inability of the debate community to take them seriously. I argued that the parameter statement should be adopted as a policy and should be enforced, and I expressed the hope that the 1977-78 debate season would see the parameter curbing the squirrel case.

My hope has not been fulfilled. The parameter statement has not been accepted and applied. Squirrel cases have proliferated again this year. And worse yet, our National Topic Selection Committee issued a midyear statement reminding us that parameter usage was a discretionary matter, an option to be picked up or discarded by each individual tournament. Apparently some members of the Committee felt compelled to issue this statement because of the confusion which exists concerning whether or not the parameter is mandatory.*

It seems to me that all the recent criticisms levelled at academic debate by people both within and without the activity, the area most frequently and vigorously attacked is the area of affirmative topic analysis and case construction. Sensible people have clearly recognized that much of what passes for topic analysis during a debate round would be ridiculed out of existence (and rightfully so) in a public discussion of the same topic. Sensible people have also discovered that an “almost anything goes” view of the topic places such an undue burden on negatives that many students, guided only by educational desires and no financial incentives, drop out of the activity because it becomes too time-consuming and frustrating.

But despite the obvious need for reform and the widespread clamor for it, the debate community refuses to respond. The National Topic Committee’s midyear statement was a clear reminder that we are free to disregard the one meaningful attempt at reform that we have made in recent years. Ironically, at the same time, critics of parameters keep arguing that parameters don’t work and therefore ought not be used. Of course they don’t work. Everyone knows that a policy doesn’t work when it is left at an optional stage and only half-heartedly tried. The debate community’s behavior here is akin to baseball officials deciding to adopt foul lines as a means of imposing boundaries on the playing field, but then saying that use of the foul lines is at the discretion of the home team. Such a position would be utter nonsense, and yet that is what we in debate are doing.

Obviously, the debate community is waffling and thereby showing that it cannot commit itself to reform. There is a growing suspicion within debate circles that the high-powered programs (the ones with the hired mouths and the 7,600 evidence cards) do not want reform. The people in these programs see debate as a specialized game to be played by a specialized few in a specialized way, no (Continued on page 18)

* Roger Hufford, PKD’s representative on the Committee, did not approve the midyear statement.
Memories of PKD Nationals... Memories of PKD Nationals...

Sandy Barefoot Bump, Thiel College: “Extemp. finals in Congress Hall and the formation of the Colonies” (Philadelphia)

Lisa Bacon, West Chester State College: “I second Sandy Barefoot Bump’s remembrance. Let us not forget, however, our long enjoyable evenings at the Knightcap Club!” (Philadelphia)

Regina Wild, Bloomsburg State College: “Being caught in a blizzard on Mt. Rainier” (Seattle)

Mary Foley, Bridgewater State College: “Salmon, mountains, ocean, finally honest, fun competition”

Neil Hilkert, Bloomsburg State College: “The Spanish Lounge” (Seattle)

Geraldine, getting ready

Carolyn Herman, California State (Pa.) College: “Divorce Court U.S.A.” (Seattle)

David Evans, Wilkes College: “A great city, and the tournament was a unifying experience. All in all, it was better than Baskin - Robbins ice cream!” (Seattle)

Bob Derryberry, Southwest Baptist College: “The convention not only introduced our PKDers to ‘unusual’ attractions, but the competition and fraternity fellowship became firm memories.” (Seattle)

James McAllister, New Jersey Institute of Technology: “Nice people, one of the few times in life to make real friends and see people as they really are” (Seattle)

Bruce Garren, Missouri Western College: “As our first direct association, we most enjoyed the people to meet and talk to. The trip was fantastic.” (Seattle)

Jan Kratz, West Chester State College: “The spirit of brotherhood shown at Pi Kap Nationals, even to the extent of limiting our enjoyable activities in order to preserve the floorboards of the Knightcap Club!”

Lisa Jeitz, Linfield College: “It was incredible to see debaters from all over the country come together in friendship and become less fiercely competitive.” (Seattle)

Elaine Murphy, Thiel College: “The Tillicum Island trip was great!” (Seattle)

Clarence Johnson, fraternal atmosphere (Houston)
MEMORIES OF PPA DELTA NATIONALS

James Floyd, Central Missouri State University: "In spite of trudging up the hills, we loved Seattle. Philadelphia's historic attractions were fantastic." (Seattle)

Mary Foley, Bridgewater State College: "Salmon, mountains, ocean, and friends — finally honest, fun competition!" (Seattle)

Geralyn Mayernick, West Chester State College: "Baked Alaska — getting a 1-100 in the Dessert event!" (Seattle)

Sue Waters, Bloomsburg State College: "Avalanche conditions at Rainier, my first national tournament — and I was impressed." (Seattle)

Nonna Dee Dalan, Evangel College: "Our room in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel was by elevators and when the noise quieted down about 1:00 AM, the staff filled the pop machines from 2:30-3:00 AM. At 6:00 we were called to clear our rooms for 8:00 rounds." (Philadelphia)

David Evans, Wilkes College: "A great city, and the tournament was a unifying experience. All in all, it was better than Baskin-Robbins ice cream!" (Seattle)

Kelly Klopfenstein, William Jewell College: "The combination of unique sites in Seattle and the warmth and welcome from the host chapters made for a truly enjoyable and memorable tournament." (Seattle)

Bruce Garren, Missouri Western State College: "As our first direct association with PKD, we most enjoyed the people we were able to meet and talk to. The trip to Blake Island was fantastic." (Seattle)

Linfield College: "It was nice to see debaters from all over the country together in friendship and fierce competition." (Seattle)

Clarence Johnson, New Jersey Institute of Technology: "My first experience of the friendly, fraternal atmosphere of PKD was in Houston — and I haven't missed a convention since." (Houston)

Martin Haberl, California State (Pa.) College: "The best time of my life: a true, fraternal convention" (Seattle)
matter how irrelevant or absurd. If that is true, then fine, let them play their game. As for those of us who disagree with this approach and who favor such needed reforms as the parameter, let us stop our griping and start to seriously pursue alternatives.

Specifically, let us stop attending tournaments that refuse to utilize the parameter statement and that are filled with squirrel cases. In the January Forensic, President Tom Harte strongly expressed his dissatisfaction with a national high-powered tournament that he had attended. I suggest that next year Tom should not take his team to that tournament. In short, let's boycott tournaments that we feel encourage noneducational objectives. Our continued presence at such tournaments only provides tacit support for the things we disapprove of. If enough of us were to boycott such activities, things might eventually change. At the very least, we would be rightfully abandoning such tournaments to those who want to pursue the surreal quality of debate.

As a corollary to the boycott, we need to have an increase in both sponsorship of and attendance at tournaments hosted by schools wishing to eliminate the abuses in today's debate. By now you have probably heard that Pi Kap is encouraging its members to sponsor educationally-oriented tournaments, ones which would, among other things, apply the parameter to the national topic. Some of these tournaments are already operative, but we need more.

Pi Kappers, myself included, are fond of complaining about the objectionable trends in today's debating, while continuing to participate in tournaments that reinforce those trends. Obviously, mere talk is not promoting reform. Maybe action will.

NEW MEMBERS OF PI KAPPA DELTA

WINONA STATE UNIVERSITY
50798 John N. Karnick

FERRIS STATE COLLEGE
50799 Cynthia Louise Stevens
50800 Timothy William Tipton
50801 Mary Lynne Mittlestat
50803 Bronwin L. LaClair
50804 Cindy Jo Heikkenen
50805 Michael David Cody
50806 Joseph D. Casey
50815 Rebecca Bigford
50816 John Warren Billett
50817 Lewis Davis
50818 Michael Galazin
50819 Rudy Fred Perhalla
50820 Galen D. Smith
50821 Phillip Botham

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
50807 Lori Henricksen
50814 Robert Lee McGaughy, III
50832 Robert R. Martin
50846 Stephen Lee Beckley

MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE
50809 John Frail
50833 Brenda C. Myers

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS—FAYETTEVILLE
50810 Valerie L'Allier
50811 Joseph William Childers
50992 Douglas M. Carson
50993 Odellivia V. Watson

TEXAS LUTHERAN COLLEGE
50812 Donald W. Olson

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—WHITEWATER
50813 Steven A. Dunbar
50933 Maria Lo
50934 Allan J. Alt

HARDING COLLEGE
50822 Donna Coker
50823 Pam Ellington
50824 Carolyn Wright
50825 J. D. Hobs
50826 Robert C. Chandler
50827 Philip Gould
50828 James Dal Narimore
50829 Lloyd Thoburn
50830 David Satterfield
50831 Ernest C. Umberger, III

CULVER-STOCKTON COLLEGE
50834 Jo Ann Thomas
50835 Kathy Gore
50836 Cherilyn Worm
50837 Richard Berube
50838 George Richardson
50839 W. Alex Koch
50840 Cheryl B. Clark
50841 Judith A. Brumley
50842 Keith Elliot
50843 Karen Grider

ST. MARTIN'S COLLEGE
50844 Bruce J. Morris
50845 Theresa M. Pecnick

MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE
50847 Gregg Harper
50848 Andy Taggart
50849 Don Slabach
50850 Scott Richard Gillen
50851 Fred Slabach
50852 Jane Hicks

GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
50851 Walter Fowler
50852 Cathryn Stockridge

CLARION STATE COLLEGE
50853 E. Curtis Hanna
50854 Patricia Clare Curry
50855 Kellie Marie Panella
50856 Joseph Patrick Colligan
50857 Ronalyn Gore
50858 Sharan K. Peters
50859 Luanne Gregor
50860 Ann Marie Sheets
50861 Randy Davis
50862 Ami S. Weekley
50863 Susan A. Weinheimer
50864 Tim W. Anderson
50865 Elizabeth J. Lacko
50866 Donna Marie Dougherty

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
50867 Janet Graber

18 MAY 1978
50868 Robert Lesh
50869 Irene Lewis
50870 Michael Cupp
50994 Linda Bays
50995 Carol Proctor

MONTANA COLLEGE OF MINERAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
50871 Grant P. Beagles

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—EAU CLAIRE
50872 Jeff R. Skochil
50873 Pamela Ann Mendenhall
50874 Laurel Lynn Priefert
50875 Robert Hempelman
50876 Lisa K. Huber
50877 Julie Ann Larson
50878 Janet Koss
50879 Carol Marefka
50880 Ken Thames

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
50881 Cynthia Lynn Aldridge
50882 Barbara Sue Love
50883 Gaylen Leigh Stanley
50884 Harold Lee Kirkman, Jr.

MISSISSIPPI UNIVERSITY FOR WOMEN
50885 Teresa D. Davidson

EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
50886 Katherine S. Forney
50887 Craig Van Tine
50888 Sidney A. Micholson
50889 Mary Catherine Moore
50890 Susan J. Breslin

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
50891 Marilyn Lee Willett
50892 Linda Marie Hoekel

OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY
50893 Ronald V. Ladvig
50894 Michael G. Braddock
50895 Charles Jack Fishman
50896 Steven Guido
50897 Ted Eugene Hill
50898 Mary Jo Kerns
50899 William A. McGlothin
51000 D. Wesley Newhouse, II
51001 Melody Stone
51002 Cindy D. Swetlie
51003 Martha R. Meyer
51004 Samuel Meyer.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
50905 Jon Capecci
50906 Christopher J. Jadick
50907 Carl Jeffrey Josie
50908 Rita Fay McPeak
50909 Janet Kay Newcomer
50910 Margaret Ann Senzarino
50911 April D. Sutton
50912 Barbara Yablonski
50913 Andrew S. Rancer
50914 Rebecca Jo DeHoff
50915 Zachary Mark Edmonds
50916 Christine Mack Schettino

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
50917 John Carsaden
50918 Mary Lynn Logsdon
50919 Gary Brett
50920 Monica Louise Newman
50921 Lisa Poschol
50922 Lee Ann Hancock

BUENA VISTA COLLEGE
50923 Raileen Peterson
50924 Mary Massa
50925 Brian Mathers
50926 Bill LaBaume
50927 Lori Van Osbree

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
50928 Danny A. Dutton
50929 Oliver F. Marson
50930 Sharlene Maria Long

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS—MONTICELLO
50935 Karen Omohundro
50977 Gary McAlistier

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS
50936 Leonard Higgins
50937 James Davis Holland

UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND
50938 Lisa Snyder
50939 Brenda D. Vasser
50940 R. Paul Kay, Jr.
50941 Gary Dennis Long

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
50942 Mark A. Sieffert
50943 Marc Randal Strahn
50944 Russell William Crawford
50945 Deborah Swart
50946 Desiree L. Hayes
50947 Lisa M. Bergum
50948 Sharon Suzanne Funkhouser

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA
50949 Damon Beyer
50951 Cynthia Marie Sawyer
50952 Julia Dorothy Cowan
50953 Suzanne Parker
50958 Karl Lee Kimber
50959 Mary Ellen Roy
50961 John P. Wolf, III

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
50950 Van Kierstad
50951 Cynthia Sue Hinton
50952 Karl D. Vogt
50953 Anne Lindsey
50954 Trudy McDaniel
50955 Christopher Mervyn Ridinger

CARROLL COLLEGE
50956 Shannon McGuire
50957 Mary Helen Bowen
50958 Gregory Mark Schwab
50959 Robin F. Rung
50960 Mark Wesley Lang

LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE
50961 Charles A. Blanchard
50962 Mike Alberty
50963 Joe M. McCartney
50964 Wendy Coppert
50965 Sheryl Denise Gillilan
50966 Mike Allen
50967 Kellee Vandehey

LINFIELD COLLEGE
50968 Larry K. Skinner
50969 Janine Sarti

WHITMAN COLLEGE
50970 Francis Dominic Degnan
50971 Diane Echelbarger
50972 Susan Kon
50973 Tim O’Connell
50974 Brent Stratton
50975 Donald W. Taylor
50976 Brian K. Tomkins

WILKES COLLEGE
50978 John Charles Lambert

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
50979 Christopher Ortega
50980 Randall W. Smith
50981 Ernest McKee Smith, III
50982 Sharla Miller
50983 Francene Faith Foster
50984 Virgil L. Vahlenkamp, Jr.

OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
50996 Loretta Bienhoff
50997 Randy Gibson
50998 Timothy Tyrone Malone

PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY
50999 Kris Weatherman
51000 Debra DeGrosse
51001 Santha Oorjitham
51002 Sandra Braaten

CAMERON UNIVERSITY
51003 Charles W. Cantrell
51004 Marty McKellips
51005 Jay Roderick Stephens
51006 Peggy E. Green

HASTINGS COLLEGE
51007 Kristeen L. Chapman
51008 Beth Marie Hansen
51009 Ellen Kathleen Lahr
51010 Pamela Johnson
51011 Susan M. Wesc

Answers to Group Discussion Problems, March Forensic, Page 17
1. Club Joker Heart Diamond Spade
2. Carl was first; Dick was second; and Art was third.
3. Kim tells the truth, is the candlestick maker, and is married to Lynn. Bobby lies, is the baker, and is married to Jan, who tells the truth. Carroll tells the truth, is the butcher, and is married to Fran.
## PROVINCIAL RESULTS 1978

### PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS
at Nebraska Wesleyan University, March 24-25, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Superior/Excellent or Place</th>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORATORY</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Wayne Holznagel</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gail Niles</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Greg Brown</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vance Unrau</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Ardie Schroeder</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Loretta Bienhoff</td>
<td>Ottawa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Robert Sterup</td>
<td>Hastings College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Jim Goering</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>David Abel</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gail Niles</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Robert Sterup</td>
<td>Hastings College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Ken Stewart</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Craig Becker</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATIVE SPEAKING</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Babette Wolensky</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gail Niles</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Wayne Holznagel</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Jan Niles</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Randy Gibson</td>
<td>Ottawa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Pamela Johnson</td>
<td>Hastings College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Ardie Schroeder</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POETRY INTERPRETATION</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>John Juhnke</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Kirk Belt</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Vance Unrau</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Kim Larsen</td>
<td>Midland Lutheran College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bryan Reber</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Brian Conover</td>
<td>Midland Lutheran College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Sheri Nun</td>
<td>Midland Lutheran College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROSE INTERPRETATION</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Kirk Belt</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>John Juhnke</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Kim Larsen</td>
<td>Midland Lutheran College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bryan Reber</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Kristeen Chapman</td>
<td>Hastings College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Brian Conover</td>
<td>Midland Lutheran College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHETORICAL CRITICISM</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Wayne Holznagel</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Loretta Bienhoff</td>
<td>Ottawa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Ken Stewart</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Scott Schuppan</td>
<td>Hastings College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Ken Stewart</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Randy Gibson</td>
<td>Ottawa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Greg Brown</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBATE</strong></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Ken Stewart and Jim Goering</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Craig Becker and Barbara Unruh</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>David Abel and</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Name of Student</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior/Excellent or Good</td>
<td>Doug Goodfellow</td>
<td>Kansas State University—Pittsburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEEPSTAKES</td>
<td>Becky Martin and Richard Medved</td>
<td>Bethel College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Lutheran College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVINCES OF ILLINOIS AND THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSUASIVE SPEAKING</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Hudson</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl Smith</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—LaCrosse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butch Maltby</td>
<td>Moorhead State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X. Krusins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Oshkosh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tricia Jones</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butch Maltby</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Hempleman</td>
<td>Ripon College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Pohland</td>
<td>Winona State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROMPTU SPEAKING</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butch Maltby</td>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn Aiken</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Bork</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Coffin</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kayele Jones</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL INTERPRETATION OF PROSE</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Slivinski</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheri Coons</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Bork</td>
<td>Moorhead State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy Pistulka</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—LaCrosse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochelle Rusch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth Place</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Whitewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATIVE SPEAKING</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Siegel</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Hudson</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butch Maltby</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl Smith</td>
<td>Moorhead State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Western</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Slivinski</td>
<td>Moorhead State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Leonard</td>
<td>Winona State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ross Willoughby</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Mendenhall</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Oshkosh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL INTERPRETATION OF POETRY</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl Smith</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Whitewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Whitewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allan Alt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Superior/Excellent or Place</td>
<td>Name of Student</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAMATIC DUO</td>
<td>Third Place</td>
<td>Kent Menzel</td>
<td>Ripon College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Leonard and Pistulka</td>
<td>Moorhead State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td>Austin and Karnick</td>
<td>Winona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Place</td>
<td>Howitt and Siegel</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Place</td>
<td>Riska and Gwilt</td>
<td>Winona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBATE: TEAMS</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Haney and Cigal</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Stevens Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td>Olson and Zelinsky</td>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Place, tie</td>
<td>Taylor and Bartholomew</td>
<td>Illinois College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graber and Black</td>
<td>Illinois College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBATE: SPEAKERS</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Denise Wright</td>
<td>Greenville College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td>Lois McElroy</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Whitewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Place</td>
<td>John Black</td>
<td>Illinois College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Place</td>
<td>Cathy Olson</td>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEEPSTAKES</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Place</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moorhead State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST**

at Empress Hotel, Victoria, British Columbia, March 21-24, 1978

**ORATORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Gleason</th>
<th>Montana Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gillian</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td>Carroll College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Sarte</td>
<td>Linfield College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>University of Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Bourhis</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td>Whitman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Muhrein</td>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Congden</td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Strahn</td>
<td>Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Albertz</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPOSITORY SPEAKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>University of Puget Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Whitman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Leininger</td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Tibbets</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORAL INTERPRETATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Walsh</th>
<th>Whitman College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>McCartney</td>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Jaeger</td>
<td>St. Martin's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Leininger</td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Excellent/Excellent or Place</td>
<td>Name of Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUO INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Schwab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Henton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Waggoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Jaeger and Pecnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Lang and Schwab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Hartsfield and Tanasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>McCartney and Waggoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Montney and Vanderhey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Smith and Tibbets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTEMPORANEOUS DEBATE</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Lund and Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Sweet and Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Wishart and Stratton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>O’Connell and Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR DEBATE</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Congden and Robuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Albertz and Montney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Rapp and Tfenninger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Short and Beckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Rasset and Mayhew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Walker and Hochberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Long and Schmitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Kay and Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Strahn and Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Anderson and Degnin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Richardson and Eckfeldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Rung and Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. MAHAFFEY</td>
<td>OUTSTANDING CHAPTER TROPHY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVINCE OF THE COLONIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the Governor Carver Motor Lodge, Plymouth, Massachusetts, April 6-8, 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORATORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Excellent/Excellent or Place</th>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Marcia Stratton</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Donna Korba</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Carolyn Herman</td>
<td>California State (PA) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Geralyn</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Mayernick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Ann Sharkey</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Superior/Excellent or Place</td>
<td>Name of Student</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Lisa Bacon</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Sue Waters</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>David Evans</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Regina Wild</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Penny Moyer</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATIVE SPEAKING</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Regina Wild</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Donna Korba</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Dorothy Langton</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Penny Moyer</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Davida Roberts</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Sandy Matchica</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Geralyn Mayernick</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Jodi Daley</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Cheri Furr</td>
<td>East Stroudsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Pat Crough</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Davida Roberts</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Marcia Stratton</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Ann Sharkey</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Sue Waters</td>
<td>California State (PA) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Carolyn Herman</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gert McGoff</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Bob Pacilli</td>
<td>Thiel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Sue Waters</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Joe Poplawski</td>
<td>Shippensburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Carolyn Herman</td>
<td>California State (PA) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Marcia Stratton</td>
<td>Wisconsin State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Donna Korba</td>
<td>Wisconsin State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Davida Roberts</td>
<td>Wisconsin State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Angie Russo</td>
<td>California State (PA) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place, tie</td>
<td>David Evans</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jodi Daley</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROMPTU SPEAKING</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Joe Poplawski</td>
<td>Shippensburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Kevin Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Jack Lambert</td>
<td>Wilkes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Penny Moyer</td>
<td>Bloomsburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Dorothy Langton</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Carolyn Dillon</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Mary Lynn</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Logsdon</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Jodi Daley</td>
<td>York College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gary Kolczynski</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBATE: TEAMS</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Gary Brett and</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monica Newman</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Lisa Paschal</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Lynn</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Lisa Bacon and</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Barry</td>
<td>York College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBATE: SPEAKERS</td>
<td>First Place</td>
<td>Gary Brett</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Place</td>
<td>Monica Newman</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Place</td>
<td>Lisa Bacon</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Place</td>
<td>Elaine Murphy</td>
<td>Thiel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Place, tie</td>
<td>Lisa Paschal</td>
<td>Frostburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Shinehouse</td>
<td>West Chester State College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provincial election results and further tournament results will appear in the October Forensic.
CHAPTER NEWS
Edited by Ada Mae Haury

province of the plains
KEARNEY STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Ed Hill
The Kearney State College debate team of Jim Green, freshman from Hastings, and Dan Scarborough, freshman from Grand Island, placed second in the junior division at the University of Nebraska's Cornhusker Debate Tournament, February 23-26. Eighty-six debate teams from forty-five colleges and universities from ten states participated.

Jim Berger, sophomore from Omaha, and Larry Peterson, sophomore from Kearney, finished ninth of the thirty-four teams in senior division. Also representing Kearney State College were Perry Holmgren of Kearney and Vaughn Gangwish, a transfer student from Brown University in Rhode Island.

The debate program has received $1000 as a debate scholarship from James and Sharon Knapp.

province of the missouri
SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE
Reporter: Les Frazer
The Missouri Sigma chapter has had a busy year. In September, Southwest Baptist College hosted its first invitational tournament with fourteen colleges and universities attending. Our squad then traveled to Louisiana Tech where we were able to place second in sweepstakes, and Darrell Moore won first in extemporaneous speaking.

At William Jewell's Blizzard Tournament, the team of Randy Arnett and Darrell Moore ranked first in open division debate, while the novice team of Kevin Laval and Randy Cowling took first in that division. Southwest Baptist broke three teams into quarterfinals and placed third in sweepstakes.

After being "weathered in" for the entire month of January, the squad traveled to the Mississippi University for Women.

The Kearney State College Debate Team

Left to right: Dan Scarborough, Jim Green, Cornell Loschen, Larry Peterson, Jim Berger, Ed Hill, Mark Larson, and Nancy Fleming.
The team of Arnett and Moore ranked second; Roger House, Arnett, and Moore took third, second, and first place debate speaker, respectively; and Arnett also took first in extemporaneous speaking. Thus the squad finished first in sweepstakes.

The next trip was to the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville’s Razorback II Tournament where the squad again finished first in sweepstakes. Arnett and Moore again took second in debate; Arnett ranked first in oratory; Shelly Sublett won first in prose; and Kevin Laval finished first in television speaking.

Southwest Baptist will participate in the Missouri State Tournament and the Pi Kappa Delta Biprovincial. At the end of the season, the squad will lose three dedicated seniors: Roger House, Shelly Sublett, and Randy Arnett.

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
Reporter: James J. Floyd

During the first two-thirds of the 1977-78 academic year, the Missouri Eta chapter has enjoyed a successful forensic season, having won a total of sixteen trophies in debate and individual events at ten tournaments.

Debaters have won nine trophies ranging from first to fourth place and including individual speaker awards. In individual events the squad has won seven trophies.

We also held our annual high school tournament in February, with 650 students representing twenty-six schools.

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Roberta Broeker

Snowed out of two consecutive tournaments in January, the Missouri Iota chapter is back on the road anxious to make up for lost time. Two recent activities included a tournament at DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana, and an audience debate tour in nearby Illinois. At DePauw the Indians managed to capture a second place trophy for the four-man unit of David Holt, Rick Borchelt, Jo Ann Vogt,

The Southwest Baptist College Forensic Squad, 1977-78

Back row, left to right: Professor Eric Moore, Bruce Davison, Les Frazer, Roger House, Shelly Sublett, Darrell Moore, and Professor Bob Derryberry. Front row, left to right: Steve Gilpin, Elizabeth Vincent, Kevin Laval, Glenda Cowen, Glenn McKee, Alvin Rohrs, Randy Cowling, David Munton, and Randy Arnett.
and Randy Hagan. The two-man team of Roberta Broeker and Steve Dunaway was the top ranked negative team with an undefeated record.

Later in the week, SEMO debaters clashed with teams from the University of Illinois in a series of twelve audience debates. Overall, more than 1,200 persons attended the debates which saw the SEMO squad victorious (according to shift-of-opinion ballots) in ten of the twelve. Highlight of the series was a parliamentary debate held on the Illinois campus. The SEMO squad next journeys to St. Joseph, Missouri, for the annual state tournament. In the meantime, the chapter will host its annual high school debate tournament and assist with the state-sponsored district speech festival on campus.

The Individual Events Festival at San Marcos was UAM's next goal. The team placed seventh of thirty schools and compiled eleven excellent and superior ratings.

Not only was the squad successful on the road, but they managed to find time to produce and direct the "UAM All Campus Talent Show" as a moneymaking project, with various campus organizations furnishing the talent.

After the Christmas holidays, the squad placed first in sweepstakes over eleven other schools at the Mardi Gras Invitational Debate and Forensic Tournament at Southeast Louisiana University in Hammond, Louisiana. The victory consisted of eleven finalist awards, one third place award, four second place awards, and one first place award.

The Theta chapter has also entered the National Cassette Tournament and the National Contest in Public Discussion.

Also included on the agenda is the Pi Kappa Delta Provincial Tournament of the Lower Mississippi and the Individual Events Festival at Steven F. Austin at Nacogdoches, Texas.

The squad consists of Travis Berry, Marty Brutscher, Allen Chandler, Naomi Freeman Martin, Tom Harden, Carl Holden, Sherry Kellum, Karen Omohundro, Kathi Pitts, Sarah Mauney, Gary McAllister, and Barbara Metcalf.

The Louisiana Tech Forensic Squad shows off their first place sweepstakes trophy won at Southern University of Louisiana's Mardi Gras Tournament. Left to right: Judy Milgate, Sherry Davidson, Ron Pittman, Ted Luquette, Mike Cook, and Esther McGuire. (Story on next page)
LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Marty Beasley
Louisiana Tech University has been pleased with top honors at their last two tournaments. At Southern University's Mardi Gras Tournament, Tech won the sweepstakes award for first place, along with a trophy that dominates the display space in the University president's office. At that tournament, they were invited to dine with the State governor and enjoyed lunch and conversation with the Honorable Edwin Edwards in the formal dining room of the mansion.

At the University of Southern Mississippi's tournament, Tech enjoyed competition with the University of California, whose debaters were very adept at the experimental CEDA debate which was first tried by Tech, as well as by area schools, at that tournament. Seven Tech squad members won eight trophies.

Tech's chapter has been engaged in a massive spring recruiting mailing, making public service announcements promoting their community's anti-litter campaign, and giving speaker's bureau programs for area organizations.

BUENA VISTA COLLEGE
Reporter: Dan Lintin
The Iowa Kappa chapter was honored to host the Japanese debaters on February 13 and 14. They debated the topic, "Resolved: that the United Nations should establish an international agency to control multinational organizations." The Japanese debaters were on tour in the United States under the sponsorship of the Speech Communication Association, and the debate at Buena Vista College was the only stop in Iowa.

Plans for the future include attending the Province Convention at South Dakota State University at Brookings, election of 1978-79 officers, and our annual initiation banquet.

DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Peggy Tomscha
Our Pi Kappa Delta chapter is alive and

Tetsuro Toyoda, second from right, was presented a birthday cake following a debate at Buena Vista College on his birthday, February 13. Toyoda debated with Gordon Paulsen, right, senior from Charlotte, Iowa. The opposing team was Dan Lintin, left, senior from Soldier, Iowa, and Shigeru Matsumoto.
well! Some of our activities include: two "speak-easy" reading hours; a readers theatre program, "A Trifle of Shaw-foolery," adapted by our advisor, Sandy Moses; a tour of South Dakota high schools with a program of oral interpretation and a readers theatre production of Ray Bradbury's "Wake for the Living;" and hosting the 1978 South Dakota Intercollegiate Forensic Association Tournament.

FERRIS STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Bronwyn LaClair

Our forensic and debate teams with our coach Bronwyn LaClair have traveled to such schools as Ball State University, Ohio University, and Wayne State. Expanding their membership to eighteen participants, our speakers have claimed honors in all tournaments where they have been represented.

At the Cardinal Novice Debate Tournament at Ball State University, Mike Cody, Galen Smith, Phil Botham, Tim Tipton, Mike Galazin, Rebecca Bigford, Rudy Perhalla, and John Billett won eleven debates and lost five. The affirmative team of John Billett and Rudy Perhalla went undefeated against competition such as the University of Illinois, Ohio State, DePauw University, and Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology.

In November at the Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League Tournament at Central Michigan, our debaters (judged on individual speaker points this time) again did very well. Rudy Perhalla received sixth place speaker in the tournament out of fifty-six contestants and a superior speaking certificate.

At the Henry Ford Community College (Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League) Tournament and Interpretative Reading Festival on November 18 and 19, Mary Mittlestat, Mike Galazin, Sherry Watson, Larry Putvin, Joe Casey, Cindy Heikkinen, and Cindy Stevens participated. In the tournament section, Mike Galazin and Mary Mittlestat placed third in their divisions of extemporaneous speaking and original oratory, respectively.

At the Charles G. O'Bleness Forensic and Debate Tournament at Ohio University, Rudy Perhalla again took first place speaker, while John Billett placed third speaker on the negative. Thirty-three schools were represented with over 1,200 entries in both individual events and debate. Cindy Heikkinen placed eighth in serious interpretation of poetry at this event.

On January 20 our debate team competed at Wayne State University. Negative team Mike Galazin and Mike Cody went 3-1, while Rudy Perhalla won first place speaker, and Lou Davis, a newcomer, also did very well.

At St. Clair Community College in February, Viva Smith took first in persuasive speaking, Mike Galazin placed fourth in extemporaneous speaking, and Debra Erickson placed tenth in expository.

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Raymond Yeager

The Ohio Eta chapter had a very successful weekend on March 2-4. The individual events team won first in sweeps at Wright State University and garnered twenty-one awards. This is the fourth team championship this year. Deb Ballard and Mike Schwartzberg each won four awards. Chris Collier and Mark Ferguson won three (Chris was first in informative and Mark was first in sales); Stephanie Fraim won two awards; and Judy Bajec, Andrea Lester, Howard Lester, Kim McDonald, and Janice Porter each captured one award.

The previous week, Mark Ferguson and Judy Bajec won the state championship in dramatic duo.

The individual events team will be attending the National Forensic Association Tournament in New Jersey in April. They placed seventh in the nation last year and will be trying to better that record.

The debate team of Stephen Griesinger and Richard Usmiller won the Butler University tournament defeating Bradley University. The team won eleven debates while losing only one, with Rich receiving fourth speaker award. This is the third time in the past four years that a
BGSU team has won the Butler tournament. Griesinger and Usmiller have a 66 percent winning record, having been second at Ohio State and semifinalists at Miami. The district contest comes at the end of final exams, and this team should make it to the National Debate Tournament in Denver in April.

The debate team of Iona Evans and Carol Geringer previously won the Appalachian State University tournament in November.

Emmons and Mark Chapin. They went undefeated to cop the title in the varsity division, while the junior novice debaters, Bob Hempelman and Tony Krall, won second in that event.

As this article goes to press, the chapter has added eleven new members to its Pi Kappa Delta roster. Eau Claire will be attending the provincial tournament, as well as the AFA Nationals (two entrants) and the NFA Nationals (fourteen entrants). Coaches are Grace Walsh and Robert Lapp.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—EAU CLAIRE
Reporter: Grace Walsh
Wisconsin Zeta
#296 of Pi Kappa Delta, one of the largest and most successful of the nation's chapters, has a perfect record of attendance at all national and provincial tournaments and conventions since the charter was granted.

The promotion of speech on campus for this year has included a high school forensic conference, a debate clinic, a high school forensic tournament, the 34th Annual Speech Tournament (one of the nation's oldest), and the official Wisconsin Forensic Association High School District Contest. The sponsorship of an annual banquet for its members is a very important social event on the campus every year.

In competition, this is the chapter that finished fourth in the nation in the sweepstakes compiled by Dr. Jack Howe for 1977.

The Wisconsin Collegiate Forensic Association held its Eighth Annual State Tournament, open to all colleges and universities in Wisconsin, in Stevens Point on the weekend of March 9 and 10; the winner by a large margin was Eau Claire, the winner for the past eight consecutive years. They won the state championship in six major events. Ruth Brenner, winner of last year's persuasive speaking championship, won first place in the state oratorical contest and also in extemporaneous speaking. Ella Howitt won first place in rhetorical criticism, and Jodene Hrudka won first place in both prose and poetry. In debate the number one and two top speakers were Eau Claire debaters Paul

BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE
Reporter: Cindy Fissel
This year our forensic program has grown to include twenty active members. Our Mad Hatter Individual Events Tournament attracted twenty-five schools from five states. Clarion State College took the first place sweepstakes trophy. Early in February we hosted the Ninth Annual James J. O'Toole Memorial I-80 Debate Tournament. Eight schools were in attendance.

Presently we are conducting pledges for our new pledges: Michael Goc, Ernestine Patterson, Penny Moyer, and David Pautsch. We have also invited seven people from our campus and town to become honorary members this year. They are Dave Eberly, Mr. Richey, Mr. Vass, Dean Drake, Mr. Nash, Mr. Farr, and Father Casey of St. Columba parish.

Also Bloomsburg is directing the Pi Kappa Delta Provincial Tournament of the Colonies in Plymouth, Massachusetts. The host school is Bridgewater State College.

This semester we attended tournaments at the University of Maryland, Catonsville Community College (where we captured eleven trophies with seven members), and Luzerne County Community College. We will be going to Shippensburg State College and the Pennsylvania Forensic Association Tournament hosted by Luzerne Community College. In April we'll be traveling to Monmouth College in West Long Branch, New Jersey, for NFA Nationals for which eight of our members are qualified.
Pennsylvania Iota at West Chester State College began its tenth year as a chapter in Pi Kappa Delta in somewhat unique fashion. In collaboration with the West Chester College Foundation, Pennsylvania Iota sponsored early in the fall term a speech contest, which attracted twenty or so contestants. The two winners of the contest, Kim Allen and Theresa Shade, both became so interested in competitive forensics that they joined the Forensic Society at West Chester State and were subsequently elected to the competitive individual speaking order of Pi Kappa Delta in time for the spring initiation ceremony.

That spring initiation was held this year at the Sykes College Union Building on the West Chester State campus. Besides the Misses Allen and Shade, others inducted into CIS were Sondra Lisse and Rebecca Salas. Steven Applebaum, James Shinehouse, and Thomas Taylor joined the order of debate. At the same meeting it was announced that Janice Kratz had been promoted to the degree of highest distinction, competitive individual speaking; Henry Gentry had been raised to the degree of honor, competitive individual speaking, and Dorothy Langton had been raised to honor in both debate and competitive individual speaking.

At a business meeting subsequent to the initiation ceremony, President Kathy Krauss conducted the election of officers for the 1978-79 school year with the following results: president, Henry Gentry; vice-president, James Shinehouse; recording secretary-treasurer, Theresa Shade; and corresponding secretary-historian, Sondra Lisse. Present at the meeting were several guests and also four sponsors of Pennsylvania Iota: Diane Casagrande, Saundra Hall, Carolyn Keefe, and A. G. Kershner.

The same evening the Forensic Society, of which the PKD chapter is an adjunct, elected Jodi Daley, president; Sally Painter, vice-president; and James Shinehouse, secretary-treasurer.

The speech team and debate team have had a very busy and successful year. Ten students have qualified for the NFA Nationals at Monmouth College, with Jodi Daley a pentathlon entrant and Geralyn Mayernick competing in four events.

**A Word From The Editor . . .**

**The Benefit of a Doubt**

Direct as well as grapevine reports have led me to the not unexpected conclusion that the January issue provoked the old debate spirit among the fraternity. It was designed to do just that, not for the sake of restating old arguments and arousing new hostilities, but to bring about ameliorative action. The current issue reports the beginning of that action.

Long before I sent that issue to press, I received National Council permission to do a hard-hitting attack on current debate practices. I felt that such consent was necessary, for while I do not flee from a one-woman stand on my beliefs, I am fully aware that my editorship is not an appropriate soapbox for personal causes.

As editor, however, I have had the distinct pleasure of sitting out here in eastern Pennsylvania and receiving written comments of both reasoned support and reasoned dissent. Each has a place in The Forensic. All who know my dedication to debate — both oral and written — should not have been surprised when in March I ran David Congalton’s position against mandatory parameters.

One letter I wish I could have included in its entirety came from Bob Payne who heads the speech department at East Central University in Ada, Oklahoma. He concludes in this way: “Whatever the vituperation hurled at you by those whose verbal orgies have been attacked, I wish to go on record as saying, ‘Bully for you.’ Even if you personally support current practices, as an editor you are to be commended for letting those voices be heard. Thank you!”

And I thank all those who, like Bob, have given me the benefit of a doubt.

Carolyn Keefe