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The President's Message . . .

Tom Harte

LOOKING AHEAD TO ST. LOUIS

In just a few months a unique forensic event will take place. In St. Louis the week of April 8-12, 1979, Pi Kappa Delta will hold its Thirty-First Biennial Convention and Tournament. Now is the time for every chapter to make plans to attend and to be well represented.

A Pi Kap National is unlike any other forensic event you have ever been to. There you will find more than just another tournament, more even than just another “national” tournament. In addition to the customary rounds of competition, an atmosphere of friendliness and good will pervades the convention. Contestants visit with one another between rounds, teams sincerely shake hands at the conclusion of a debate, judges take an active interest in the events they hear, people renew old friendships and make new ones. The schedule, though demanding, is sensible. It permits ample competition in debate and a variety of individual events, leaves time for a little sightseeing, and also allows for the transacting of the important business of the organization—a process in which every student can participate. It is, after all, at the national convention that the significant policies and procedures of Pi Kappa Delta are established and its chief officers elected. Sometimes the debates which take place on the floor of the convention are a good deal more lively and impassioned than those which take place during regular rounds.

So a Pi Kappa Delta National Convention and Tournament is indeed special. And the one next April in St. Louis promises to be superlative. For example, several contest innovations are planned. Students will be able to enter more individual events than last time, a prose interpretation event and an off-topic debate

(Continued on page 15)
RHETORICAL CRITICISM:

THE QUINTESSENTIAL HUMAN ACT

Richard B. Gregg

Kenneth Burke, one of our outstanding contemporary rhetorical analysts, has declared that all of us are critics. In a sense, of course, he is correct. We cannot help but spend a portion of our time every day interacting with discrimination to a multiplicity of phenomena in our environment. We arrive at judgments, formulate values, and rank preferences in ways that few other forms of life appear capable of performing. Notice that these activities which involve the reaching of conclusions in light of conscious reasoning. It is this characteristic which differentiates critical activity from subjective and affective response. To say simply that something is good or bad, beautiful or ugly, desirable or undesirable is to describe ourselves more than the phenomenon evoking our response. But if we provide reasons for our response, based upon an evaluation of some kind of data or evidence, we are engaged in critical activity. My purpose in this brief paper is to outline the major dimensions of the activity we call rhetorical criticism, to discuss the kind of judgment rendered by a rhetorical critic, and to indicate why a rhetorical critic is an educator in the best sense of that term.

A logical starting point would seem to be an answer to the question, “What does a rhetorical critic look at for the purpose of making a judgment?” But there is a hidden trap in the question, for one can easily take it to imply that there are certain kinds of objects or phenomena or events that properly lend themselves to the analysis of rhetorical criticism, and other kinds of objects, phenomena, and events that do not. Thus, some scholars have argued in the past that formally prepared public speeches were the proper materials for critical study, whereas informal conversation was not. Some have declared poetry to be solely within the province of the literary critic and hence outside the purview of the critic of rhetoric. Some years ago, a majority of critics examined only spoken messages to the exclusion of written messages. And until recent years, to think of music or filmic messages or art as rhetoric was clearly an unacceptable idiosyncratic view.

As rhetorical criticism became more sophisticated, these distinctions and dichotomies began to break down. It seems obvious now that all talk, whether it is prepared in advance for delivery in the form of a speech or occurs spontaneously during the interaction of several people, has the potential to persuade. The mere fact that language is put in the form of poetry does not necessarily diminish its capacity to persuade; in some situations its suasive potential is even enhanced. The published newspaper editorial is no less an argument than that presented by an attorney in court. Furthermore, the Charles Manson murders attest to the persuasive power of music; the movie All Quiet on the Western Front had a profound persuasive affect on the American viewing audience just prior to World War II; and Joan Mondale’s public discussion of the political dimensions of art demonstrates the suasive potential of that medium. In other words, what we have come to recognize in recent years is that such phenomena as language, music, art, architecture, dance, etc. are all symbol systems, invented and constructed by humans to serve various functions and accomplish numerous purposes. We further recognize that these symbolic manifestations, or systems, are made possible by a fundamental capacity for symbolic production which is inherent in human
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intellectual capacity. Finally, we are realizing that all symbols have the potential to function rhetorically; that is, we may be persuaded attitudinally and behaviorally by any symbolic manifestation.

One consequence of the perspective I have just outlined is that we now have a clearer picture of what a rhetorical critic examines and thus a more accurate description of the task of the critic. A rhetorical critic may examine, analyze, and judge the suasive function and potential of any symbolic interaction whatsoever. This is to say that a rhetorical critic is not to be identified by the kinds of messages examined or by the analytical methods employed; rather, as The Committee on the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism reported at the National Development Project on Rhetoric in 1970:

Rhetorical criticism is to be identified by the kinds of questions posed by the critic. This position involves a shift in traditional emphases from identifying rhetorical criticism by material studied to identifying it by the nature of the critic’s inquiry. Implicit in this shift of emphasis is an expansion of traditional concepts of rhetorical subjects. We shall no longer assume that the subject of rhetorical criticism is only discourse or that any critic studying discourse is ipso facto a rhetorical critic. The critic becomes rhetorical to the extent that he studies his subject in terms of its suasive potential or persuasive effect. So identified, rhetorical criticism may be applied to any human act, process, product, or artifact which, in the critic’s view, may formulate, sustain, or modify attention, perceptions, attitudes, or behavior.¹

While the phenomena available for study by the rhetorical critic have been considerably extended, it is unreasonable to expect any one critic to become an expert in the analysis of all possible symbolic interactions. There is simply too much expertise demanded by such a task. And there is still good reason to consider the formally prepared public speech the paradigm of rhetorical situations, because it is a message consciously prepared for presentation with a view toward evoking certain kinds of responses in light of particular problems and situations. Furthermore, the message is couched in oral language, which is probably the most versatile human symbolic code. Thus, for the rest of my discussion I shall be assuming a public speaking situation when I refer to a rhetorical situation. But my concern for the suasive potential of such a message is the same as if I were writing of the rhetoric of art or literature or music.

The act of rhetorical criticism may lead to several different kinds of outcomes. The critic may suggest practical guidelines for achieving communication success with audiences or in light of certain kinds of situations as a result of studying successful and unsuccessful rhetorical interactions. By carefully examining all of the major factors interacting in a rhetorical situation, the critic may arrive at new understandings regarding historical events.² The critic’s work may augment our theoretical understanding of rhetorical communication, either by employing some concepts or implications from already developed theory to see whether practical analytical results can be obtained,³ or by arriving at new conceptualizations which have the potential to lead to new theory.⁴

But each of these contributions is derivative from the more fundamental goal of all criticism. As Edwin Black states it, “Criticism is a discipline that, through the investigation and appraisal of the activities and products of men, seeks as its end the understanding of man himself.”⁵ From the rhetorical critic’s perspective, of course, his generic contribution has to do with providing new insights into human rhetorical behavior. Such insights are concerned with the ways humans create rhetorical symbols in light of circumstances and, in turn, respond to them, the ways rhetorical symbols relate to and shape human thought and behavior, and the functions rhetorical symbols play in the cultural life of a society.

Obviously, though the perspective taken by the rhetorical critic does not include all of human behavior, the critic must be willing to use any knowledge at hand to understand the complexities of rhetorical transactions; history, literature, psychology, sociology, philosophy, political science, anthropology, and other fields of study all have the potential to contribute to a critic’s understanding. Obviously too, the critic’s work involves not just achieving new understandings for himself but presenting those understandings so that others may learn from
his work. Thus, the critic’s objective is preeminently an educational one, i.e., to teach those who read criticism about the nature of human rhetorical behavior. Once again, Edwin Black says it very well:

The critic proceeds in part by translating the object of his criticism into the terms of his audience and in part by educating his audience to the terms of the object. This dual task is not an ancillary function of criticism; it is an essential part of criticism.

However esoterically a critic may write, he is always an interpreter, and he means to affect the way in which his auditor will apprehend the object of his criticism.6

The rhetorical critic, then, examines and analyzes rhetorical transactions for the purpose of formulating judgments concerning how humans function and respond in such contexts. Once the critical research is completed, the critic faces the task of presenting his judgments to others so that they might better understand rhetorical transactions from what the critic has learned. Our question now becomes, “In what form does the critic make his judgments public?”

There is general agreement with Wayne Brockriede’s statement that useful criticism must function as argument. By argument, Brockriede means “the act of evaluating or analyzing experience. A person can function as critic either by passing judgment on the experience or by analyzing it for the sake of a better understanding of that experience or of some more general concept or theory about such experiences.” Whether the critic chooses to pass judgment on a rhetorical event or help achieve a better understanding of it, he must present his conclusions in a reasoned manner, supported by data, so that his audience can understand why the critical conclusions were formulated. As another critic puts it, “Obviously, we expect a critical verdict to be in some way conditional upon the reasons offered in its support.”7

The idea that the critic should present his findings in argumentative form is, itself, entirely reasonable because any act of criticism is an act of interpretation and judgment, and to be acceptable the critic must provide the basis for his interpretations and judgments. To say that criticism is argument does not mean that a critic must present his findings in the strict form of a legal brief; in fact, the best criticism will not follow such a conventional and often arid format. In written form, a critical essay should appear as a well-written literary essay; in oral form, a critical presentation should take on the characteristics of interesting and imaginative public presentation rather than the kind of mechanistic presentations debaters and some extemporeaneous speakers are inclined to deliver.

But no matter what style the presentation takes, to function as argument the critic must include consideration and discussion of the following concerns:

1. What is the rhetorical situation being examined; what makes it a significant situation, or an interesting one, worthy of consideration?
2. What is the purpose of the critic’s examination? Does the situation possess unique features; is it an event of significance for some reason; does it promise to reveal interesting insights into human and/or social or cultural life?
3. What kind of critical orientation will be taken? Will the critic examine only the immediate situation or place the event in a broader historical context? Will the critic examine all aspects of the rhetoric or only certain features, such as particular kinds of persuasive strategies or uses of metaphorical appeal? Why?
4. What are the important definitions an audience needs to know in order to better understand the analysis? For example, what does the critic mean by “enthymematic arguments,” or “strategies of identification” or “metaphorical appeals”?
5. What kinds of examples, discovered in the rhetorical situation, typically illustrate what the critic found?
6. What kinds of patterns or categories do the data exhibit?
7. What do the patterns and categories mean? What reasons does the critic have for his interpretation of the meaning?
8. What major conclusions about the rhetorical situation can be drawn based on a careful examination of the data in
light of clearly articulated norms for judgment.
9. What do those major conclusions reveal or “teach us” about human rhetorical behavior?

If the critic answers these questions in regard to the rhetoric he is examining, he will have presented his critical judgments in acceptable argumentative and pedagogical form, and his audience will understand clearly what he has found and why.

There is one caveat we must enter regarding the idea that criticism should function as argument. It is not very helpful to view criticism as we do debate, where there are often clear-cut winners and losers. Criticism does not tend to be true or false, or right or wrong in that sense. It is entirely possible for several rhetorical critics to examine the same event, take different analytical orientations to it, and thus arrive at several differing sets of conclusions about the same event. In a case like this, each critical interpretation may be equally valuable, and we may have a much better understanding of the event as a result of the several critiques. Let me illustrate the point.

On the evening of November 3, 1969, President Richard Nixon broadcast an address to the American people that became known as the Vietnam Moratorium Address. The appellation was appropriate, because the speech was planned by the Nixon Administration in response to a national demonstration called by various peace groups to protest the continuing war in Vietnam. The first moratorium was held on October 15, with a second planned for November 15. Nixon’s address, in which he defends the Administration’s policy, thus falls neatly between the two moratorium demonstrations. Four rhetorical critics studied this event thoroughly. Though their judgments differ according to the perspective they took, each of the four illuminates the speech in a useful way.

Robert Newman examines Nixon’s speech from the standpoint of the major policy positions articulated in it, the rhetorical strategies Nixon used while discussing those positions, the language employed by Nixon, and the responses from differing audiences the speech was likely to evoke. Newman’s conclusions reveal the kind of critical norms he employs. He finds Nixon’s language to be tough and uncompromising; it was the kind of language that painted those favoring withdrawal from Vietnam as extremists and traitors. The argumentative strategies Nixon used were consistent with the language, leading Newman to conclude that Nixon’s rhetoric was the rhetoric of confrontation. Newman judges Nixon’s speech to be a mistake, given the anxious temper of the time, and further concludes that Nixon foreclosed meaningful policy discussion just when such a discussion was called for:

It was not just the speech that was a political tragedy; the speech merely made visible tragic policy decisions — to maintain the goals and propaganda of the cold war, to seek confrontation with those who want change, to go with a power base confined to white, non-urban, uptight voters. Given such decisions, the shoddy rhetoric, the tough talk, the false dilemmas are inevitable.

Karlyn M. Campbell’s rhetorical analysis parallels Newman’s findings to a large extent, though Campbell finds her norms for judgment from within Nixon’s speech itself rather than from external factors. Campbell notes that early in the President’s speech, Nixon told his audience that it must judge the policy he was defending on the basis of truth, credibility, unity, and ethical responsibility. She then applies those very standards suggested by Nixon to the speech itself and concludes that it was so full of contradiction, misrepresentation, and outright distortion that Nixon’s arguments must be rejected on the President’s own criteria. Campbell’s most serious judgment is that Nixon perpetuated a false mythology about America.

Forbes Hill undertakes a criticism of the same Nixon speech but makes clear that his judgments will be less sweeping in scope than those of Newman and Campbell. Hill employs what he calls a strict Neo-Aristotelian approach which calls for a very specific set of judgments to determine “whether the speaker makes the best choices from the inventory of rhetorical choices possible” to get a favorable decision from a specified group.
of auditors in a specific situation.”12 Hill determines that Nixon was not trying to address all possible audiences but that he was primarily trying to persuade those Americans not ideologically committed to opposing or supporting the war at any cost. Given this target audience, Nixon had to choose those argumentative strategies which would best achieve audience identification with the position he was advocating. With these criteria in mind, Hill reaches the following general conclusion:

"The message] operates from the most universally accepted premises of value and prediction; it buries deep in its texture most promises not likely to be immediately accepted.... The goals — life, political freedom, peace, and self-confidence — are those shared by nearly all Americans, and connections of policies to them are tactfully handled for the target group .... In choice and arrangement of the means of persuasion for this situation this message is by and large a considerable success."13

Hermann Stelzner adopts a radically different focus for his analysis of the Nixon speech. He observes that in the address Nixon referred to his "quest for peace," calling to mind the archetypal form of the "Quest story" which appears in literature and which is one of the "oldest, hardiest and most popular" literary forms. The Quest story, while describing a search for something, presents and orders events to offer an "objective experience of the social, political, or moral life. However, to become viable it must interact with the subjective experience of... listeners."14 Stelzner argues that we get useful insights into Nixon's speech by examining it in light of the Quest form. His analysis reveals that in many ways the address followed the structure of the Quest story but that it had serious shortcomings, because at certain strategic points it did not easily allow Nixon's audience to identify its subjective experiences with the objective reality developed in the speech:

Clearly, it will not do to evaluate these four critical essays in terms of whether one set of conclusions is better than another; the critical judgments differ because each of these rhetorical critics has chosen to examine the Nixon speech from a different perspective. And each set of judgments must be accepted as valid if the critic has argued for his or her set of conclusions from a thorough, well-illustrated, and carefully articulated examination of the data found in the rhetorical situation, coupled with a reasonable comparison of the data with explicitly stated norms for judging. If one studies the four critiques referred to above, one must conclude that each offers a useful perspective from which to understand Nixon's address, that they are complementary in that they add up to a synthetic position of general agreement, and that by reading all four of them one gets a richer understanding of the rhetorical situation than is possible from reading any one of them alone.

We can now appreciate another reason for describing rhetorical criticism as a pedagogical enterprise. A rhetorical critic is not out to win anything. The critic's primary task is to argue his case in such a way that his audience can better understand rhetorical events. And just as several teachers may offer various productive perspectives for understanding the same subject (sociologists and psychologists will examine human interaction from different viewpoints, for example), so several rhetorical critics may offer varying judgments about a rhetorical transaction. The key to the evaluation of rhetorical criticism has to do with whether a critic argues his case well. And the criteria for the evaluation of criticism parallel the concerns a critic must have which were stated above:

1. Has the critic clearly identified the rhetorical event to be examined? Has he indicated why the event is worth examination?
2. Has the critic clearly stated the purpose of his or her investigation? What will be asked about the rhetorical situation that might lead to interesting answers?
3. What kind of orientation does the critic

Evaluated in literary terms Nixon's political narrative is obviously not a good Quest story. It is not altogether convincing. There are too many loose ends and too many unanswered questions. It is peopled by flat characters and its language is dull and unimaginative."15
propose to take toward the rhetorical situation?

4. Has the critic clearly defined the important terms and concepts we need to know in order to understand the analysis?

5. Has the critic provided us illustrations of what typifies the rhetorical situation in light of the analytical questions being asked?

6. Has the critic identified and explained the patterns and categories of data which may be found in the rhetorical situation?

7. Has the critic interpreted the meaning of the patterns and categories and also provided reasons for those interpretations?

8. Has the critic articulated the norms to be used for arriving at major conclusions about the rhetorical situation?

9. Has the critic articulated the major conclusions and discussed what those conclusions reveal about human communication behavior?

If we can give an affirmative answer to all of these questions, we have good reason to conclude that the critic has accomplished a reasonable job. Then we are faced with judgments about critical faculties which are the most difficult to explain but which may make all the difference. Rhetorical criticism is an art, not a science. This means that ultimately the critic must call upon his sensitivity and his imagination, his knowledge about human affairs generally, and his ability to present his thinking to others in order to carry his task to completion. Somehow these characteristics of the individual critic must be brought to bear in the task of analysis and presentation of results if the critic is to achieve more than just a mechanical job. There are no clearly established guidelines for evaluating these characteristics. But most of us can recognize when a critic has so employed his own artistic qualities that the answers he provides are enlivened with his own sense of insight and purpose and when he can so extend that insight and purpose that we may all learn from it. Thus, rhetorical criticism which engages in the analysis of what is most characteristic of human behavior is itself a quintessential human act.

NOTES


"Ibid., p. 6.

"Wayne Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism As Argument," QJS, 60 (April 1974), 165.


"Ibid., p. 178.


"Ibid., p. 384.


"Ibid., p. 172.

The Cover: Backgrounded by the Chase-Park Plaza, the National Council poses in Forest Park, the site of the 1904 World's Fair. Back row, left to right: Larry Norton, historian; Joe Low, local convention officer; Roger Hufford, Council member; Ted Karl, secretary-treasurer. Seated, left to right: Darrell Moore, student member; Jack Starr, vice-president; Carolyn Keefe, Forensic editor. Front row, left to right: Evan Ulrey, past president; Phyllis Bosley, Council member; Roselyn Freedman, Council member; Jill Leuhrman, student member; Tom Harte, president. Photo by Barry Mandel of The Mandel Studio, St. Louis.
The Secretary's Page . . .

Theodore O. H. Karl

Memberships Down — Hopes Up

By the time you read your Forensic, the National Council will have met in St. Louis during the second week of August. On other pages of this issue, many of the decisions regarding the National Convention next April will be discussed. I, for one, am looking forward with much excitement to the St. Louis Convention. The facilities are the best we have had since we moved the convention from the campus to a hotel location. The City of St. Louis is rich in American heritage, with many places, both old and new, to see on the day assigned for that purpose. To make the convention a smooth-running affair, the Council has attempted to make many decisions in the interest of all. Not the least of these arrangements has to do with the host province and their representatives. From the standpoint of this office, never has greater cooperation been offered. Our tasks will be easier to accomplish with the assistance of the Province of the Missouri.

On another page of this issue, the annual audited report of this office will appear, giving the financial status of the organization as of July 31, 1978. At first glance it appears that we are healthy, but please understand that the one item listed under RECEIPTS as interest is received only once in four years. It is the interest earned from our four-year Certificate of Deposit, which we hold in reserve. The checking account balance would, in other years, be about one-half of the figure listed. Aside from this one item, the fact remains that the only real source of income is membership.

During the month of September we send out the Fall Report and the invoice for the annual chapter dues. Most of the chapters accepted the responsibility of payment of these dues as the 1977 National Convention in Seattle instituted, effective August 1, 1977. If your chapter did not respond to the invoice last year, you will find the amount added to your 1978-79 invoice.

As you can well understand, memberships do not arrive in great numbers during the first three months of the school year, and yet it is during that time that

(Continued on page 30)
In the summer of '78 the PKD National Council met and made decisions in the Chase-Park Plaza of St. Louis. For some of the outcomes, see the next two pages.
NEW FEATURES FOR THE THIRTY-FIRST PKD CONVENTION AND TOURNAMENT

JUDGES will judge only events they are qualified by experience to judge. Chapters must bring qualified judges for events they enter. Guest judges, a special feature of the tournament, will judge the kind of competition in which they have experience.

INTERPRETATION will be divided into two events, one for prose and one for poetry. Two programs will be required for each event: one from North American authors and one from non North American authors.

DISCUSSION will consist of two rounds of problem solving (see March 1978 Forensic, pp. 16-17) and two traditional rounds of the topic, “What policy should the United States pursue for its elderly citizens?”

SPEAKING TO ENTERTAIN AND INFORMATIVE SPEAKING will be scheduled during debate rounds so that students entering only individual events may enter as many as four events. Debaters may enter up to two individual events, chosen from extemp., oratory, two interpretation events, and discussion.

INTERVIEWING FINALS will be held in St. Louis (see p. 13 for details).

PARTICIPATION POINTS will be restricted to one for each individual event per school and two for each division of debate entered. They will be awarded only when no entry from the school earns a higher rating.

DEBATE will have three divisions: Championship, Traditional, and Lincoln-Douglas (one person). On-topic debate will seek to enforce the parameter with the following instruction in the tournament rules:

We ask all teams to respect the results of the national opinion poll which determined that 86 percent of Pi Kappa Delta coaches expect affirmative teams to present cases that meet the parameter and that 80 percent of Pi Kappa Delta judges will vote against cases that do not meet the parameter, if the negative carries that argument. We ask all judges to cooperate in enforcing this majority opinion so that there will be agreement on the basic rules under which the competition will operate.

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE will be on two proposition areas:
1. “Resolved: that all United States students should be required to pass a standardized examination to graduate from high school.”
2. “Resolved: that the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment would significantly improve the quality of life for American women.”

We reserve the right to alter final wording (in January) but will not change the areas to be debated. For instance, the ERA question may be reworded as a more specific policy question, or the question of standardized examinations could be reworded as a value topic.

We urge schools hosting tournaments to offer a Lincoln-Douglas division on one of the two topics so that interested students have a full season to prepare for PKD Nationals.

All divisions of debate will use the same format and ballot as the Seattle Nationals. We hope that individual tournament directors will experiment with the ballot that appeared in the May 1978 Forensic and advise us of the outcome. The National Council also welcomes comments on the suitability of the parameter on this year’s topic and/or the off-topic questions that have been selected. Final rules will appear in the January Forensic, and we are prepared to utilize information from early season tournaments to make the St. Louis Nationals an outstanding experience for contestants and judges alike.
ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW:

A Contest Innovation from PKD Historian Larry Norton

This experimental event, approved by the National Council, is designed to combine the development of skills in interviewing with the collection of information and ideas valuable to Pi Kappa Delta in its program for the improvement of forensic activities.

1. THE TOPIC: "The Role of Pi Kappa Delta in Forensic Activities."

2. RULES: There shall be only one entry per chapter. Contestants must be members of Pi Kappa Delta. The contestant may choose to interview either one or two persons selected from one or two of the following categories: 1) student members of Pi Kappa Delta, 2) an active coach, 3) a former coach, 4) a college administrator. The total time limit shall be no more than ten minutes. The interview(s) shall be recorded on one side of one cassette tape. Editing of the tape is permitted. The names of those participating in the interview and the name of the school should be identified and included as part of the interview. Tapes shall be furnished by the contestant and will remain in the permanent file of the Pi Kappa Delta historian.

3. JUDGING: Judges will be advised to include, in their evaluations, such factors as: evidence of planning and preparation, variety and appropriateness of questions, ability to establish effective communication, skill in initiating and terminating the interview, historical value of the interview, and general interest.

4. DEADLINE FOR ENTRIES: The cassette tape must be mailed to arrive by February 10, 1979. Mail to: Dr. Larry Norton, 1010 N. Heading Court, Peoria Illinois 61604. Please include your mailing address.

5. FINALS AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION: A maximum of five top ranking contestants, chosen from those submitting a tape by the above deadline, shall qualify to participate in the final round to be held at the National Convention in St. Louis. These persons will be notified of their selection by March 1, 1979. The final round at the National Convention will be taped and evaluated in an audience situation. Each finalist will interview one past president of Pi Kappa Delta, for a maximum of ten minutes and on the same topic used in the preliminaries.

6. SWEEPSTAKES POINTS: These points shall be awarded to all schools participating, on the same basis as for other individual events held at the Convention.

For additional information or interpretation of procedure, contact Dr. Larry Norton, historian of Pi Kappa Delta.
New Officers of the Provinces

PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI
Governor — Bruce Garren, Missouri Western State College
Lieutenant Governor — Brad Brann, Southeast Missouri State University
Secretary-Treasurer — Cindy Hoover, William Jewell College
Student Lieutenant Governor — Michelle Humphrey, Missouri Western State University

PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX
Governor — Harold Widvey, South Dakota State University
Lieutenant Governor — C. T. Hanson, North Dakota State University
Secretary-Treasurer — Sandra Madsen, Buena Vista College
Student Lieutenant Governor — Bruce Kinder, Northern State College

PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI
Governor — Jim Dockery, Henderson State University
Lieutenant Governor — Frank Lower, Louisiana State University
Secretary-Treasurer — Don Brownlee, North Texas State University

PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI
Governor — Carol Gaede, Moorhead State University
Lieutenant Governor — Steve Olson, St. Olaf College
Secretary-Treasurer — Hazel Scott, Moorhead State University
Student Lieutenant Governor — Tracy Koester, Moorhead State University

PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST
Governor — Robert Woodland, Tennessee Technological University
Lieutenant Governor — Margaret Greynolds, Georgetown College
Secretary-Treasurer — Jim Holm, Austin Peay State University
Student Lieutenant Governor — Sue Filippelli, Appalachian State University

PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST
Governor — Jim Polsin, University of Montana
Lieutenant Governor — Larry Kraft, Eastern Washington State College
Secretary-Treasurer — Fr. Nicholas Rausch, St. Martin’s College
(Continued on next page)

NEWLY INSTALLED OFFICERS OF THE SOUTHEAST

Left to right: Sue Filippelli, student lieutenant governor, Appalachian State University; Robert Woodland, governor, Tennessee Technological University; Margaret Greynolds, lieutenant governor, Georgetown College; and Jim Holm, secretary-treasurer, Austin Peay State University.
division have been added to the schedule, for the first time debaters will have the option to enter the discussion contest, and tighter control will be exercised over the qualifications of judges. Convention facilities this time should be among the best ever. Not only is the Chase-Park Plaza Hotel superbly equipped to fulfill our needs, but it has made available to us at low cost a large number of one-bedroom suites that can easily double as sleeping and contest rooms. The normal disruptions associated with using hotel rooms for contests should thus be minimized.

And then, of course, there is St. Louis itself. You’ll become infected with some of the city’s excitement the moment you spot the impressive 630-foot steel arch gleaming over the riverfront. Perhaps you’ll find time to ride the train up one of the legs of the arch where, atop this symbolic “Gateway to the West” (the nation’s tallest memorial), you can view the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers where Lewis and Clark departed for the western lands. In the shadow of the arch stands the courthouse where the Dred Scott trial was heard, and nearby is the oldest cathedral west of the Mississippi—the Basilica of St. Louis. Not far away is Forest Park, home of the St. Louis Zoo with its collection of over 3,000 animals, and down the street from the hotel is the beautiful seventy-nine-acre Shaw’s Garden, the oldest botanical gardens in the United States. If you are so inclined, you’ll find lots to do in the time-off between rounds.

I am looking forward to the St. Louis Convention in April, and I hope to see many of you there. I urge you to plan now to participate. You’ll find friendly but tough competition, opportunities to play a decision-making role in the workings of your fraternity, and a pleasant learning experience that you won’t soon forget. Most Pi Kappa Deltans find the national convention and tournament the highlight of their forensic career. I know I did when I was a student, and I suspect that you will too.

FINANCIAL REPORT
AUGUST 1, 1977 — JULY 31, 1978

RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Matured CD, transferred to checking account</td>
<td>$3,995.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Certificates, Decals, and Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>8,924.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Fees</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Fees</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys and Governors’ Rings</td>
<td>798.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Forensic</td>
<td>373.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden Installation Keys and Triangles</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province Certificates and Medals</td>
<td>175.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Balance, July 31, 1977</td>
<td>3,071.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$19,413.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Forensic</td>
<td>5,888.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys and Governors’ Rings</td>
<td>769.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary’s Office and Supplies</td>
<td>3,555.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Telephone, and Printing</td>
<td>1,434.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions Committee</td>
<td>454.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pi Kappa Delta Research Committee</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing Fee</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned NSF Checks</td>
<td>82.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>67.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>30.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Balance, July 31, 1978</td>
<td>6,980.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$19,413.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT OF ASSETS OWNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings Certificate</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings Account</td>
<td>490.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings Certificate</td>
<td>36.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Balance, July 31, 1978</td>
<td>6,980.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$19,507.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Whom It May Concern:
This is to certify that I have examined the books and records of Pi Kappa Delta Forensic Fraternity for the period of August 1, 1977, to July 31, 1978, inclusive.

The foregoing statement is prepared in conjunction with Theodore O. H. Karl, according to established form, and is a true and correct report of the financial status as of this date.

August 28, 1978
Diane Mayhew, Accountant
Forensic Focus on . . .

THEODORE O. H. KARL

Last spring Ted Karl retired from teaching, amid many plaudits for his dedication to Pacific Lutheran University and forensics. The Forensic salutes PKD's secretary-treasurer by reproducing "A CERTIFICATE OF RETIREMENT" which describes some of his accomplishments. It was presented to him by PLU President William O. Rieke who had been honored at the Seattle Nationals with the Distinguished Alumnus Award.

At the retirement ceremony, William Rieke addresses Ted and Betsy Karl. Rieke who studied forensics under Ted Karl at PLU was a championship debater.

Dr. Rieke aids Ted Karl in unveiling the "Theodore O. H. Karl Sweepstakes Trophy" to be awarded at PLU's Invitational Forensic Tournament which Ted started twenty-five years ago. Made by an artist-in-residence at PLU, the rune stone trophy stands thirty-two inches high and weighs thirty-nine pounds.
A CERTIFICATE OF RETIREMENT

honoring

THEODORE O. H. KARL

Today Theodore O. H. Karl completes thirty-two years of service to Pacific Lutheran University and its students. He first joined the faculty in 1940, four years after completing his undergraduate and graduate work at Gustavus Adolphus College. After leaving in 1942 to pursue a variety of other interests, he returned in 1948 to remain at the university for the ensuing thirty years.

When Professor Karl came to Pacific Lutheran University, he was the only member of what was later established as the Speech Department. During many of the early years, he served as producer and director of the plays, designer, and teacher of the courses; in addition, he found the time to establish and direct the forensics activities. Under his direction, Pacific Lutheran University gained regional and national recognition for the excellence of its forensics teams.

Along with his many duties and services to Pacific Lutheran University, including chairmanship of the Communication Arts Department from 1948 to 1975, Ted always has been active in many professional organizations. He served both as President and Secretary-Treasurer of Pi Kappa Delta, the national forensics fraternity, and is currently again its national Secretary-Treasurer. Among a variety of other offices has been the presidency of the Western Speech Communication Association. He has also served as national representative to the Speech Communication Association, as well as regional chairman for the 1976-77 Bicentennial Youth Debates, in which capacity he organized activities for the states of Washington, Alaska and Hawaii.

Ted has served his larger community through membership on boards and committees of the Rotary Club, the Tacoma-Pierce County Mental Health Association, the Allied Arts Council, KCPQ-TV (Ch. 13) Public Broadcasting System, the Tacoma Opera Society, the Oakbrook Golf and Country Club, and other groups.

For more years than most of us can remember, he has been the parliamentarian of the faculty assembly and the grand marshal at university commencements. Among some two hundred faculty members he is the only one who has achieved the unique dignity of being consistently addressed by colleagues and students alike as "Prof."

To Prof. Karl, therefore, we extend our warmest good wishes and most sincere expressions of thanks for almost four decades of loyal and talented service. His place in PLU's annals is both enviable and secure.

William O. Rieke, M.D.
President
May 21, 1978

Office of the President
PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY
Tacoma, Washington
98447/ (206) 531-6900
PROVINCES OF THE MISSOURI AND THE SIOUX

Sweepstakes
Superior: Southwest Baptist College, Evangel College; Excellent: South Dakota State University, Central Missouri State University, North Dakota State University, Missouri Western State College, Southeast Missouri State University.

Novice Debate
Superior: Laval and Mckee (Southwest Baptist); Excellent: Kleinhesselink and Keller (Univ. of South Dakota); Good: Gill and Fiegen (South Dakota State Univ.).

Open Debate
Superior: McDaniel and Hopkins (Missouri Southern State); Excellent: Rohrs and House (Southwest Baptist), Vogt, Borchelt, and Holt (Southeast Missouri State Univ.).

Oratory
Superior: Randy Arnett (Southwest Baptist), Darla Hermanson (North Dakota State Univ.); Excellent: Gregg Miller (Missouri Western), Twila Sollie, Roger House (Southwest Baptist), Jill Thompson (Evangel).

Informative Public Address
Superior: Mark Gideon (Evangel), JoAnn Vogt (Southeast Missouri State Univ.); Excellent: Gregg Mattern (North Dakota State Univ.), Susan Humphrey (Missouri Western), Bob Deason (Central Missouri State Univ.).

Rhetorical Criticism
Superior: Loren Lemon (South Dakota State Univ.), Cindy Hoover (William Jewell); Excellent: Angela Mulkerin (North Dakota State Univ.), Mike Freeman (South Dakota State Univ.), Carla Jordan (William Jewell), Kevin Laval (Southwest Baptist), Darrell Moore (Southwest Baptist), Gordon Paulsen (Buena Vista).

Impromptu Speaking
Superior: Kelli McDaniel (Missouri Southern State), Cindy Hoover (William Jewell); Excellent: David Holt (Southeast Missouri State Univ.), David Hopkins (Missouri Southern State), Bruce Kinder (Northern State), Darrell Moore (Southwest Baptist).

Oral Interpretation
Superior: Ken Pierson (Dakota Wesleyan Univ.), Mary Suing (South Dakota State Univ.), Debra Taylor (South Dakota State Univ.); Excellent: Dan Plato (Central), Isaiah Lewis (William Jewell), Michelle Spies (Mayville State), Jane Braaten (Mayville State), Sandy D’Angelo (Central Missouri State Univ.), Jill Luehrman (Central Missouri State Univ.).

PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST

Debate
First: Clayton and Saunders (David Lipscomb); Second: Haraper and Taggart (Mississippi); Outstanding Debater: Andy Taggart (Mississippi); Honorable Mention: Tony Saunders (David Lipscomb).

Discussion
First: Katie Manley (Mississippi Univ. for Women); Second: Cindy McKeithan (Georgetown); Third: Don Stevens (Georgetown); Fourth: Teresa Davidson (Mississippi Univ. for Women); Fifth: Chester Sumpter (Georgetown); Sixth, tie: Dave Mason (Austin Peay State Univ.) and Robert Paisley (Georgetown).

Persuasion
First: Laura Lee Hendricks (Georgetown); Second: Sue Fillippeli (Appalachian State Univ.); Third: Karen Roark (Georgetown); Fourth: Dave Mason (Austin Peay State Univ.); Fifth: Roy Buchanan (Austin Peay State Univ.); Sixth: Clay Kirkland (Mississippi).

Extemporaneous Speaking
First: Tony Saunders (David Lipscomb); Second: Robert Paisley (Georgetown); Third: David Smith (Georgetown); Fourth: Dave Mason (Austin Peay State Univ.); Fifth: Kate Manley (Mississippi Univ. for Women); Sixth: Gary Brodrick (Austin Peay State Univ.).

Informative Speaking
First: Rick Hurley (Austin Peay State Univ.); Second: Karen Roark (Georgetown); Third: Nancy Newman (Georgetown); Fourth: Dave Mason (Austin Peay State Univ.); Fifth: Roy Buchanan (Austin Peay State Univ.); Sixth: Greg Harper (Mississippi).

Poetry Interpretation
First: Laura Lee Hendricks (Georgetown); Second: Cindy McKeithan (Georgetown); Third: Emily Brown (Georgetown); Fourth: Catrina O’Donnell (Tennessee Tech Univ.); Fifth: Steve Cole (Georgetown); Sixth: Melba Bradford (Georgetown).

Prose Interpretation
First: Catrina O’Donnell (Tennessee Tech Univ.); Second: Laura Lee Hendricks (Georgetown); Third: Cathy Brown (David Lipscomb); Fourth: Scott Gillen (Mississippi); Fifth: Diana Jones (Georgetown); Sixth: Mary Metcalfe (Georgetown).

Duo Interpretation
First: Boyd and McGuire (Austin Peay State Univ.); Second: Paisley and Hendricks (Georgetown); Third: Roark and McAllister (Georgetown); Fourth: Cole and Paisley (Georgetown); Fifth: Ison and Smith (Georgetown); Sixth: Smith and McKeithan (Georgetown).

Dramatic Interpretation
First: Belinda Boyd (Austin Peay State Univ.); Second: Laura Lee Hendricks (Georgetown); Third: Jana Peach (Georgetown); Fourth: Fred Slabach (Mississippi); Fifth: Emily Brown (Georgetown); Sixth: Cathy Brown (David Lipscomb).

After-Dinner Speaking
First: Mary Metcalfe (Georgetown); Second: Gaylen Stanley (Appalachian State Univ.); Third: Pat Paisley (Georgetown); Fourth: Kate Manley (Mississippi Univ. for Women); Fifth: Steve Cole (Georgetown); Sixth: Kathie McCoy (Georgetown).
"Do you think a debater can make a smooth transition to individual events?"

Yes. If he or she has the skills, and if time permits (a key factor that I shall return to), I see no reason why a debater cannot participate effectively in individual events.

In particular, I feel that extemporaneous and impromptu contests, both of which deal with current topics and emphasize the abilities to think and organize on one’s feet, are activities for which a debater should have a natural affinity. In many ways both of these events are extensions of the debating process, and debaters should be encouraged to participate in them as one means of sharpening the skills needed for effective debating.

Persuasive speaking is another area that should attract debaters, again because the topics discussed are controversial and because persuasion should help develop the abilities to organize effectively, to marshall arguments cogently, and to deliver material effectively. Since debate is, in actuality, part of the persuasion process, the two contests should be compatible for a participant. I do suspect, however, that debaters who participate in programs which are geared totally toward tournament competition find it difficult to make the transition to persuasion, since many of the "skills" they are acquiring have little, if any, application to effective communication. Conversely, debaters whose programs involve them in audience debate situations should very easily be able to make the transition to persuasion contests.

Other contests, like oral interpretation and rhetorical criticism, can be handled by a debater if he has the requisite abilities and the interest. Probably the primary reason why we don’t find more debaters participating in these two events is because they have no natural, inherent appeal to debaters. Unlike extemp., impromptu, and persuasive speaking, oral interpretation and rhetorical criticism do not significantly overlap with debate. Similarly, we find that most people in oral interpretation and rhetorical criticism have no interest in debate.

Although I believe debaters can be successfully involved with individual events, we should note two problems that seem to hinder such participation — the debater’s "style" and the time factor. A common complaint (and a valid one) among IE coaches and judges is that debaters have difficulty shaking their "debater’s style" when transferring to another activity. In short, the debater’s voice, delivery mannerisms, method of analysis, etc., disclose his debate tournament background. A debater’s persuasive speech, for instance, often sounds like a tournament-oriented first affirmative policy analysis rather than an audience-oriented message designed to utilize all the relevant means of persuasion. Thus, the debater who wants to participate in other forensic events should be aware of this potential problem and should guard against falling into certain patterns of thought and delivery that are peculiar to a debate round.

Additionally, I believe that time is a major factor which precludes more debaters from pursuing IE work. College debating has evolved into such a specialized, time-
consuming activity that many debaters (remember, they are also students carrying academic loads) simply do not have the time which is needed in order to prepare and practice for IE competition.

Some tournaments further mitigate against students moving easily between debate and individual events competition because tournament directors often schedule both areas simultaneously. Not only are the two activities then separated, but the mistaken notion that debate and individual events are separate parts of a forensic program is further reinforced.

At other tournaments, a debater has such a heavy load of rounds that he is often too physically and emotionally drained to engage in the additional effort that individual events would require. I think it is unfortunate that debaters either cannot, or feel unable to, participate in individual events if they so desire.

I am not suggesting, of course, that every debater can or should participate in IE contests. Whether or not a debater can and does make the transition depends on his own personal skills and interests. I am suggesting, however, that there is nothing inherent in any of these activities which precludes successful cross-involvement, if the ability and desire exists within a student. We should be encouraging more debaters to pursue individual events work, especially extemp., impromptu, and persuasion. AND we should also be encouraging IE students to become involved in debate. Forensics is practice in communication, and we need to promote the total communication experience.

NEW MEMBERS OF PI KAPPA DELTA

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE (PA)
51250 Cathryn M. Bucher
51251 Randall Lynn Frame
51252 Mark A. Rosato
51253 Teresa J. Naus
51254 Lauren J. Barnes
51255 Craig Albert Shoemaker

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
51012 Emily Brown
51013 Nancy J. Newman
51014 Chris McCoy
51015 Elizabeth Ison
51016 Karen Roark
51017 David Smith
51018 Gerald D. Sharon
51019 Jana Peach
51020 Mary M. Metcalfe
51021 Cindy McKeenan
51022 Patricia Kathleen McCoy
51023 Kerry Kraft
51024 Linda Sue Crowe
51025 Robert W. McAllister
51026 Steve Cole
51027 Melba Bradford
51028 Beth L. Beniskesh
51029 Kirk Arnold
51030 Susan Arline
51031 Patrick Paisley
51032 Diana R. Jones
51033 Chester Sump ter

NORTHWEST NAZARENE COLLEGE
51034 David S. Carroll
51035 Tom Penninger
51036 John Rapp
51037 Dennis R. Waller

WEST CHESTER STATE COLLEGE
51038 Thomas J. Taylor

51039 Theresa Lynn Shade
51040 James Shinehouse
51041 Sondra J. Lisse
51042 Steven Applebaum
51043 Kim L. Allen
51046 Rebecca A. Salas
51047 Jane A. Barry
51048 Elizabeth T. Enderlein

OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE
51049 Gordon Matthew
51050 Ray L. Davis
51052 Ray S. Sullivan

SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE
51047 Glenda M. Cowen
51048 Stephen N. Gilpin
51049 Bruce W. Davison
51048 David R. Munton
51049 Kevin Laval
51050 Elizabeth Vincent
51051 Glenn McKeen
51052 Randy Cowling
51053 Leslie B. Frazer

BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE
51049 Penny L. Moyer
51050 Michael A. Goe
51051 Ernestine Patterson
51052 Mark Lucia

TEXAS A & I UNIVERSITY
51053 Kurt Mann
51054 Valerie Kay Martin
51055 Yvonne M. Green
51056 Gary Turcotte
51057 Glynnis Holm
51058 Kristie Bird
51059 John Traylor
51060 Eddy Zamora
51061 Belinda Ebert
51062 Debbie Chapa

NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
51063 Teri Larae Gabel
51064 Paula Curtis
51065 Mark White
51066 Vicki S. Fanoele
51067 Bradford Mayer Gulick
51068 Lori S. Trautman
51069 Gregory Laurence Brown
51070 Boyd Bruce Bolter
51071 Thomas Flohr
51072 Sally Gae Wolf
51073 Leann Bartruff
51074 Daniel Paul Schuttler

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS—FAYETTEVILLE
51075 Barbara Gray
51076 Sheryl Anne Salter

MISSOURI WESTERN COLLEGE
51076 Susan K. Humphrey
51077 Kelly Rene Henry
51078 Diana M. Fuchs
51079 Ron Wagner

WHEATON COLLEGE
51080 David Lawrence Bourne
51081 Robert Charles Bork
51082 Judith Miller
51083 Stephen Allan Town
51084 Paul Richard Code
51085 David Wesley Haas, Jr.
51086 Timothy Ray Coffin
51087 Michael Eugene Smith
51093 Katherine Cecelia Jones
51104 Ruth Lydia Livingston
51105 Catherine Mary Westcott
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51106 Iris Anne Woodruff
51107 Glenn K. Gunderson
51109 Debra Ellen Schaefer
51110 Richard David Morgan
51111 Timothy P. Rumberger
51112 Susan Lynn Sacher
51113 Faith Kathleen Daily

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS
51115 Martin Clifford
51116 Sharon Dale Taylor

MOOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
51117 Tracy Lee Koester
51118 Bohn David Lattin
51119 Randall Craig Arp
51120 Julie A. Nord
51121 Jacqueline Kay Arends
51122 David Schornack
51123 Arlen K. Bolstad
51124 Clayton P. Hage
51125 Coleen Mikesh
51126 Collette Michal

EVANGEL COLLEGE
51128 Kenneth Trujillo
51129 Jennifer D. Price
51130 Robyn Orris Keller
51131 Jill Renee Thompson

EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA UNIVERSITY
51132 Vaughn C. Johnson
51133 Pamela Beed
51134 Mona E. Richardson
51190 Beverly Adelia Biles

CENTRAL COLLEGE
51135 Kathleen A. Koziol

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
51136 Michele LeCoq
51137 Beth Parrish
51138 Michael R. Stidham
51139 Joseph W. Still, Jr.
51140 Cindy M. Langford
51141 Peggy Campbell
51142 Bobby Fogle

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY
51143 Esther McGuire
51144 Judith Ann Milgate
51145 Stanley Stava

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—WHITEWATER
51146 David R. Curtain
51147 Helen Baduch
51124 James S. Boesch
51125 Peggy Eagan
51126 Jeffrey D. Hahn

MIDWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY
51154 Kathy Elizabeth Baird

HARDING COLLEGE
51155 Jonathan Ivan Cloud

WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
51156 Bruce Eckfeldt

51157 Sandra Elizabeth Wicht
51158 Mark Richardson

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—RIVER FALLS
51159 Madonna Jean Koub
51160 Sue Wood
51161 Dale R. Bark
51162 Rae Ann Pelnar
51163 Barbara Schulz
51164 Mark Sikorski
51165 Paula Schanck
51166 Terry L. Paulson
511226 JoAnn Abel

FERRIS STATE COLLEGE
51168 Viva Marie Smith

WINONA STATE UNIVERSITY
51169 Bruce Robert Turnquist
51256 Shelly Lavigne

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
51170 Joseph William Chapman
51171 Jo Carolyn Alexander
51172 Pamela Zaring Blackman
51173 Roberta J. Burnett

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
51174 William J. DeVine
51175 Paul Dipple
51176 Darla Hermanson
51178 Julie Sherman
51179 Connie Strand
51180 Douglas Johnson
51339 Betty Garske
51340 Janis Cheney
51341 John Diepolder
51342 Debbie Wanner
51343 Kent Bronson
51344 Robert J. Zetocha
51345 Gwenn Hoff
51346 Kristy Judd
51347 Kerry L. Griesbach
51348 Patrick J. Morrise
51349 Gregory Wald
51350 Lowell Philip Bottrel
51351 Kevin Michael Korumbo
51352 Carolyn G. Decker
51353 Gregory G. Cichy
51354 Kaila Schmit
51355 Patricia Shipman
51356 Ward Lenius
51357 Blake Miller

MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE
51365 Don Black
51366 W. Edward Burton
51200 Russell F. Faraldi

OTTERBEIN COLLEGE
51187 Stephanie Shaw
51188 Donna Howard
51189 Jennifer Goins

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
51191 Lena Arneson
51192 Janet deCastro
51193 Judy Ann Fellows

51194 Thomas L. Fiegel
51195 Susan M. Gilley
51196 Twila Kunde
51197 Brenda Odle
51198 Mary Suining
51199 Debra Taylor

DOANE COLLEGE
51201 Carol Bosak
51202 Kevin Huey
51203 Terrance L. Michael
51204 Barbara Daro

MISSOURI WESTERN STATE COLLEGE
51205 Gale Humphrey

TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
51206 Sylvia Stewart
51207 Eve Louise Roberts
51208 Martin L. Pierce
51209 Rebecca A. Roberson
51210 Gary D. Barker
51211 David R. Trigg

NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
51212 Tim Gach

HAIGHTS COLLEGE
51213 Larry L. Olson
51297 Donna K. Gayley
51298 Jackie Lockhart

MARIETTA COLLEGE
51215 Maria Clemencia Gomez
51216 Margaret Barker
51217 Mary Nelligan Jackson
51218 Gwen S. Price
51219 Tara Young
51221 Debra Rae Kline
51222 Deborah McHenry
51223 Brad Edward Merritt

OLIVET COLLEGE
51224 Steve Andersen
51225 John O'Grady

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS—MONTICELLO
51227 Karyn Brown
51228 Sherry Kellum
51229 Allen Chandler
51230 John N. Short

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
51231 Joy Turner
51232 Rodney R. Malpass
51233 Cindy Wisz

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
51234 Katherine McQuay
51306 Gary D. Cook

MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
51235 Holly Riedman

ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY
51236 Frani Elefant
51237 Nan Kirkpatrick
51238 Dean Riley
51239 Ann Hargraves

FORENSIC
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
51240 Thomas Erchick
51241 Jerry Wildeboer
51242 Mark C. Buechel

MISSOURI SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE
51243 Linda Gordon
51244 Craig Hutchison
51245 Kim Mailes
51246 Karla Taylor
51247 Mary Lynn Cornwell
51248 Pamela Bryan
51249 Kelli McDaniels

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
51257 Kathi Lynne Chestnut
51258 Robert J. Devlin
51259 James B. Farris
51260 Lisa K. Beaman

RIPON COLLEGE
51261 Janis Holly Blecher
51262 Kent Edwards Menzel
51263 Sharon A. Raupp
51264 Laurie Ann Komberec

MOUNT UNION COLLEGE
51265 Leonard O. Hansen II

CARTHAGE COLLEGE
51267 Timothy Parsons Carey
51268 Cindy Cochran
51269 Michael T. Jennings
51270 John C. Jensen

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
51273 Barbara C. Blake
51274 Robert W. Robertson
51275 Danna DeShong
51276 Michaelle D. Wilson
51313 William H. Klump, Jr.

MONMOUTH COLLEGE (NJ)
51277 Michael J. Compoly
51278 Vincent S. O'Connell
51279 Kathleen Beck
51280 Andrea L. DeSarno
51281 Joan H. Gunin
51282 Carol Anne Bennett
51283 Robert S. Rouse
51284 Paula Rosenkranz

ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY
51287 Steven J. Jones
51288 Paul DeGraff Stanton
51289 Yugonda Bird
51290 Roger C. Wetzel
51291 David B. Stoltje

SOUTHWEST STATE UNIVERSITY
51294 Debra Bradley
51295 Deborah J. M. Knutson
51296 Constance McGovern

BETHEL COLLEGE (KS)
51299 Kenneth Stewart
51300 Gail Niles
51301 Craig A. Becker
51302 Douglas Devin Goodfellow
51303 Ardie Schroder
51304 Bryan Reber
51305 Vance Unrau

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
51307 Kathleen Foltz
51308 Phyllis Ann Johannes
51309 Kathleen Maria Urquhart

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
51310 Andrea Lynn Lester
51311 Michael Scott Schwartzberg
51312 Steven Kent Griesinger

HEIDELBERG COLLEGE
51315 John Sawicki
51316 Mary J. Lawrence
51317 Timothy F. Wetzel
51318 Theresa Pancoast
51319 Natalie Johnson
51320 Robert James Orr, III
51321 Cynthia Heininger
51322 Mary Denise Hartman

NORTHEAST LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
51323 Jack Dean Wilson

EASTERN NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
51324 Marty L. Lowery
51325 Ellis Vickers
51326 E. Gail Crider
51327 Celia Trumble Welch
51328 Lynda Fisher
51329 Phillip A. Bustos
51330 Kris Fickling

GREENVILLE COLLEGE
51331 Richard Stephens
51332 Mark Scandrett
51333 David Housworth
51334 Denise Helene Wright
51335 Robert E. Rose
51336 Robert C. Shermer

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
51337 Rhonda Mattingly
51338 Donna Sue See
51339 Sylvia LaVan Ramsey

HONORS CONFERRED ON PKD STUDENTS AND FACULTY

Highest Distinction
Ward Smith, MO Kappa (D)
Alan Lewis Pogue, AR Zeta (CIS) & (D)
Nancy Iuchs, MO Eta (D)
Daniel J. Parent, MT Eta (CIS)
Jan Kratz, PA Iota (CIS)
Bob R. Derryberry, MO Sigma (I)
Roger M. House, MO Sigma (CIS) & (D)
Darrell Lee Moore, MO Sigma (CIS) & (D)
Elaine Murphy, PA Mu (D)
Catrina Margaret O'Donnell, TN Delta (CIS)
Carl V. Holden, AR Theta (CIS)
Robert Ridley, MN Mu (I)
Margaret Tillemans, MN Mu (CIS)
David Engebretson, MN Mu (CIS)
Pamela Campbell, MN Mu (CIS)
Carolyn Jane Dillon, MD Beta (CIS)
Kenneth J. Hirte, WI Delta (CIS)
Dean M. Ammerman, WI Delta (CIS)
Paul W. Oehlke, WI Delta (CIS)
Rick E. Borchelt, MO Iota (CIS) & (D)

Special Distinction
Marty Brutscher, AR Theta (CIS)
Lynn Lumpkin, TX Alpha Epsilon (CIS)
Julie Tansil, TX Alpha Epsilon (CIS)
Joseph N. McKnight, TN Delta (CIS)
Mabry Miller O'Donnell, OH Zeta (I)
Chris Mills, PA Mu (CIS)
Ted Hoagland, PA Mu (CIS)
M. Theresa Mann, MO Tau (D)
Bruce Garren, MO Tau (I)
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Twenty-Seventh Annual National Contest in Public Discussion, outranking teams from twenty-six other colleges and universities in the United States. Participants had a maximum of twenty-five minutes to answer, via tape, the 1978 national topic, "To what extent should pornography be excluded from Constitutional guarantees of free expression?"

The tape competition at William Jewell was a winterim project directed by Barry Salsbury, instructor in communication and director of forensics. As reported in The Liberty Shopper News, he commented, "Traditionally, Jewell has done quite well in this contest, but this is the first time, we've been the national winners. This is definitely one of the proudest moments of my professional career. The group was tremendous, and even though we worked hard, we had fun, too."

Standing, left to right: Barry Salsbury, coach; Keith Kopp, and Duane Reed. Seated, left to right: Mary Bledsoe and Karen Kerr. Not pictured is Tim Mensendick who did the taping and editing.
This past year has proved to be the most successful in the one hundred years of intercollegiate forensics at Wheaton College. Incidentally, Wheaton and North Central Colleges, both Pi Kappa Delta schools, hold the honor of sponsoring the earliest known judged intercollegiate debate in America, held November 20, 1878. With North Central on the affirmative and Wheaton on the negative, the topic was “Resolved: that religious freedom should be tolerated in the United States.” The judges felt that North Central had the stronger arguments but that Wheaton did a better job debating, so the debate was declared a tie. A follow-up debate, scheduled in February of 1879, was won by Wheaton.

To round out the centenary, the Wheaton squad won 151 awards for the 1977-78 season, an all-time record at the college. There were sixteen students competing in debate and twenty-one in individual events. Senior Butch Maltby set a record by winning fifty-nine awards for one season, including two national championships. His four-year all-time record is 117 awards, including six national championships and five state championships. This year Wheaton tried something new in debate competition — participation in a few Cross-Examination Debate Association tournaments. Having to travel to the western half of the United States, Cheryl Smith and Butch Maltby, who competed in only four CEDA tournaments, ranked seventeenth in the final standings of the total of more than twenty tournaments involving sixty-two colleges and universities. Of schools participating in four tournaments or less, Wheaton ranked first. It is the opinion of the Wheaton squad that CEDA provides a very healthy and competitive alternative to the type of debate associated with NDT; moreover, CEDA serves as a remedy to the excesses and harms ($) of NDT type debate. Wheaton hopes that CEDA will continue to grow and expand, especially in the eastern half of the United States.

For the second year in a row, Wheaton ranked among the top ten colleges on the basis of overall season records in debate and individual events. In the two national individual events championships, Wheaton qualified for both the AFA and NFA tournaments. At the AFA in Normal, Illinois, Wheaton was represented by Cheri Coons, Butch Maltby, Celeste Roney, and Cheryl Smith. Maltby took first in extemp. and fourth in oratory. Smith was semifinalist in informative speaking. In sweepstakes competition Maltby took eighth and the team tenth. At the NFA in Monmouth, New Jersey, Wheaton was represented by Bob Bork, Cheri Coons, Tim Coffin, Ruth Livingston, Butch Maltby, Celeste Roney, and Cheryl Smith. Maltby took second in extemp. and in impromptu and was semifinalist in rhetorical criticism and quarterfinalist in persuasion. He also took fifth in pentathlon. In the National Taped Individual Events Tournament, Maltby took first in persuasion and second in rhetorical criticism.

It will be difficult to beat the 1977-78 record, but Wheaton has thirty tournaments planned and expects to travel from coast to coast in 1978-79.
Association Contest," commented Grace Walsh, director of forensics.

Rick Hudson also moved into the semifinals at the Interstates.

Brenner also reached the quarterfinals in extemporaneous speaking at the National Forensic Association Individual Events Tournament.

Brenner's win marks the sixth time UW-Eau Claire has won the championship at Interstates. Previous winners were Joan Reedy (1953), Ralph Zimmermann (1955), Jocelyn Gilbertson (1956), Richard Duesterbeck (1961), and John Rindo (1976). Duesterbeck was Brenner's speech coach at Durand High School.

A banquet for members of the Eau Claire forensic teams was sponsored by the Pi Kappa Delta chapter. Trophies were awarded to the students by Walsh and Robert Lapp, instructor of speech and debate coach. Walsh noted that this has been the most successful year in forensic history at the University.
Enjoying the gains of Eau Claire's highly successful forensic year are (left to right) Rick Hudson, Janet Koss, Mike Wartman, Lisa Huber, and Ronny Greaney.

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY

Reporter: Lawrence E. Woodard

The "continued, if modest, progress" predicted in the October 1977 Forensic for Southeastern Louisiana University was realized in 1977-78. Fifteen different students won trophies in debate or individual events: Lisa Amacker, Connie Berthelot, Randy Duncan, Cherie Hutchinson, Ed Loughlin, Christyn Raby, Barry Drufner, Dennis Dunn, Mike Ferbosses, Phil Secord, Neil Richardson, Craig Passman, Terri Miller, Charline McMillian, and James Edmonston.

The top debate team of Secord and Drufner won first place open division at Southern University in February. They not only went undefeated in preliminary rounds but had impressive wins over excellent teams (Middle Tennessee and Scranton) in elimination rounds. Drufner and Secord also competed at the NDT Qualifier at Houston in March.

Our chapter entered the maximum entry at Pi Kappa Delta Provincials in Arkadelphia and sponsored an invitational tournament at Mardi Gras which attracted schools from California, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Kansas, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

Mr. Secord, our chapter president, was very active on committee work at the Provincials, and Mr. Drufner, our debate captain, was chosen as the Louisiana ambassador to Pi Kappa Delta. In April, Dr. Lawrence Woodard, SLU's Pi Kappa Delta faculty advisor, was elected president of the Louisiana Forensic Association.

In addition to the serious business of competitive forensics, our chapter has an annual banquet and semiannual picnics in which the touch football games are traditional, if not spectacular.

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

Reporter: Marty Beasley

Ted Luquette, left, president of Pi Kappa Delta, and Judy Milgate, right, vice-president, present books and toys to Professor Guy
Leake, center, director of the speech and hearing therapy clinic at Louisiana Tech University. The books and toys were originally presented to members of Pi Kappa Delta as "gag awards" at the annual barbeque supper. Initiation of new members and installation of officers were also held at the event which took place at the Louisiana Tech camp on Lake D'Arbonne.

Other new officers are Stanley Stava, external vice-president, and Esther McGuire, reporter-historian. New members are Stanley Stava, Judy Milgate, Esther McGuire, Steve Frybarger, Brenda Carter, Marianne Frazier, and Robert Alums.

WILKES COLLEGE
The date was 1948, the place Wilkes College, and the event the formal establishment of debate competition on the campus of Wilkes College. Thirty-one years have passed, and the tradition established those many years ago continues to grow. The Wilkes debaters have completed the best season ever for the institution. Having traveled over 5,000 miles while attending twelve tournaments, the members of Pennsylvania Omicron brought back to Wilkes-Barre the outstanding number of seventy-five honors/trophies. They soundly smashed the old record which had stood for some twenty years.

The forensic unit has been unbelievable growth. Started just two years ago, it is one of the largest squads on campus. Wilkes has traveled to many high schools and has served both as observers and participants in assemblies and tournaments. In addition the chapter hosted the successful "College for Kids — Debating Made Fun — Program" for the past three summers.

With many members graduated, the 1978-79 season appears to mark the beginning of a building period; however, a full schedule is being developed and freshman recruitment is in full swing. St. Louis, here comes Pennsylvania Omicron!
"Hardware" Won by Pennsylvania Omicron in '77-'78

NFA Hosted by New Jersey Alpha (see story)
MONMOUTH COLLEGE
Reporter: William Yaremchuk

Dr. William A. Yaremchuk, director of forensics at Monmouth College, New Jersey, presents the first place pentathlon speaker award to William Allen Young of the University of Southern California. Mr. Young set a new National Forensic Association record for speaker points with 83. He took first place in impromptu, informative speaking, and poetry interpretation and sixth place in prose interpretation.

The Eighth Annual NFA Championship in Individual Speaking Events was hosted by New Jersey Alpha, April 20-24, 1978.

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE
Reporter: Steve Hunt

Oregon Beta chapter had an outstanding year in 1977-78; and we are looking forward to 1978-79.

Lewis and Clark finished third in the nation for colleges of its size in Jack Howe's National Sweepstakes in 1977-78. Accomplishments of which we are particularly proud include: best overall showing at the Province of the Northwest Tournament held at the Empress Hotel, Victoria, B.C., second consecutive winning of District II NDT, eighth place overall at the AFA National Individual Events Tournament, and seven firsts or seconds in sweepstakes during the year.

Lewis and Clark would like to see a revival in debate to match the upsurge of individual events. We feel that every forensic program should have debate, individual events, and a public forum of some kind.

CHAPTER NEWS

The Local Chapter's Opportunity for National Exposure

Let the rest of the fraternity hear about your doings. Send news reports to:

Ada Mae Haury
Associate Editor
The Forensic
Bethel College
North Newton, KS 67117

Please type (double space) all reports. Clear black and white photographs are welcomed.

Announcements About The Topic Selection Committee

- The permanent mailing list for the Topic Selection Committee is kept by Jack Rhodes, Department of Communication, University of Idaho, Salt Lake City, UT 84112. Write him if you are not on the mailing list and would like to be (one ballot per school).
- The chairman of the Committee for this year is Carl Flaningam, Department of Speech, West Virginia Wesleyan University, Buckhannon, WV 26201.
- Pi Kappa Delta’s representative is H. Francis Short, Kansas State College, Pittsburg, KS 66762. Send him your ideas for topics before February 1, 1979.
many of the supplies and printing must be ordered for the convention, with payment due within thirty days of delivery. We want to keep our credit healthy and to operate on current funds. These additional costs, together with the cost of The Forensic, will be paid for with the chapter fees. We sincerely hope that as students become eligible for membership their applications will be sent to this office for early processing before the preconvention work commences.

Memberships this past year have been the lowest in many years. There are some obvious reasons for that, such as cancellation of tournaments because of the horrendous weather of last winter and spring, but we are looking forward to a reversal of that trend. We reiterate again: the local chapter is the heart and soul of Pi Kappa Delta, and the forensic squad and the sponsor/coach have the power to make the national forensic honorary a vital, exciting organization. In order for students to find out what Pi Kappa Delta is all about, attendance at province and national conventions is a must. There is competition, but there is also fellowship and camaraderie not found in many other organizations. We as an honorary have a reputation for being innovative, and we have proven it over the years. We want all of you to be a part of new beginnings, to keep the things of the past which are good, and to use these skills in whatever endeavor you choose to pursue. Winning the debate at all cost, regardless of means, does not typify the goals of the late seventies, and we hope not of the eighties.

There are many ways a chapter can raise money to go to St. Louis next spring. Now is the time to plan and work for such financial necessities. Perhaps through the tournament which is being held on your campus you can raise some of the money for Pi Kappa Delta, instead of simply adding the national convention to your debate budget.

Read The Forensic and find out what is new and what others think. Send in your memberships and chapter fees.

At the PKD National Convention the business of the fraternity is transacted, with each individual having a voice and each chapter having a vote in the proceedings. If you want change, be present and be heard. With enthusiasm, work, and creativity, it is probable that we shall see you in St. Louis in April at what we hope will be one of the largest and most successful conventions in our history.

---

STOP...

A NEW VISION

STOP... Do you want to know —

When the St. Louis PKD Nationals will be held?

What’s unique about a PKD Nationals?

What contest innovations are planned?

What hotel will host the convention?

What there is to do in St. Louis?

THEN, READ PRESIDENT HARTE’S MESSAGE!

The Gateway Arch
SAINT LOUIS
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A Word From The Editor . . .

Forensic Planning — Commitment to PKD

One of the necessary obsessions of modern life is that of short and long-range planning. We plan, among other things, cities, forests, parenthood, obsolescence, health, retirement, and death. Some teachers, like those in my institution, are required to set five-year goals for themselves, and at the end of the period they must indicate in writing their success or failure in carrying out their plans. Every student who is preparing for teaching knows the ring of the two words lesson plans.

Forensics, along with other cocurricular activities, demands careful planning. The first fall tournament has scarcely arrived before school funding agencies require that projected forensic budgets be submitted, some with line items, even though a Nobel prize economist could not accurately predict the percentage rise in rooms, food, travel, and registration fees. With the summer delivery of the AFA calendar, planning takes on a specific dimension as available funds are divided by x tournaments and x contestants. Invariably when goals and hopes are confronted by dollars and cents, practicality wins out. "If only . . ." is heard more frequently than "we can." But eventually a schedule is worked out, and then sloth, extenuating circumstances, emergencies, and disaster begin their power-play against dependability, persistence, discipline, and follow-through. Even the most carefully planned forensic program undergoes some adjustment.

One situation which minor changes cannot rectify is the failure to allocate funds for the PKD Nationals. Unlike the low budget, nearby tournament the biennial convention cannot be slotted on the spur of the moment; its high cost in time and money precludes incidental planning. Instead, the entire chapter must make a definite commitment to the concept of habitual attendance at the nationals.

I say the entire chapter because that is what it takes to sustain support for this selective activity. Unless the convention is held within one’s province, only a small number — sometimes one or two students — can be financed to the conclave. This means that most of the members will be denied this privilege. Such exclusivity can generate jealousy in the group, and the many may not be willing to forego what only a few can have.

Only once have I personally encountered this problem, and when it arose I eventually had to take an adamantly stand on my own commitment to PKD. As director of forensics I felt that it was my responsibility to see that our chapter met its obligation for regular attendance at the nationals and that no faction, not even the chapter itself, had a right — short of withdrawing from the fraternity — to decide that we would stay home from a nationals. To show my support for the concept of a national fraternity I put my forensic future on the line. The residual loyalty to PKD arose in the group, and Pennsylvania Iota was represented by three people. My experience, I am sure, is not unique.

Unless a chapter has an unlimited financial reserve (and I have never come across one that had), there is an urgent need to plan no later than now for the upcoming St. Louis Nationals. In April most financial resources will have run out and only allocated money will be available. Then, too, time itself may be scheduled beyond adjustment. Only if the sponsor and students now commit themselves to the 1979 Nationals will anyone from their chapter have the privilege of an unforgettable mid-April in St. Louis. And unless a significant number of chapters respond to their responsibility, the fraternity itself will lose some of the vitality which has made the past nationals such memorable experiences.

Carolyn Keefe
Doodles by
Vice-President
Jack Starr,
drawn at the 1978
Summer Meeting
of the PKD
National Council