

# The Forensic

*of Pi Kappa Delta*

Published since 1915

LIBRARY - OTTAWA UNIVERSITY  
OTTAWA, KANSAS

V.85

#2

## Editor's Notes

## Pedagogical Essays

Gentry, J. But when they shine: Great students in policy debate.

Westfall, Alfred. The judge, the honorable judges, if you please.  
Reprinted and updated from *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 5  
(1919), 3-6.



# Pi Kappa Delta National Forensic Honorary Society

## National Council

---

### SCOTT JENSEN, **PRESIDENT**

*School of Communication, Webster University*  
St. Louis, MO 63119 314-968-7439

### GLENDIA TREADAWAY, **PRESIDENT ELECT**

*Communication, Appalachian State University*  
Boone, NC 28608 704-262-2222

### BILL HILL, Jr, **SECRETARY-TREASURER**

*Communication Studies, University of North Carolina-Charlotte*  
Charlotte, NC 28223 704-547-4217

### JOEL HEFFLING, **IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT**

*Communication, South Dakota State University*  
Brooking, SD 57007 605-688-4390

### MICHAEL BARTANEN, **EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC**

*Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University*  
Tacoma, WA 98447 253-535-7764

### SUSAN MILLSAP, **NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Speech Communication, Otterbein College*  
Westerville, OH 43081 614-823-3386

### MARK HICKMAN, **NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication Studies, West Chester University*  
West Chester, PA 19383 610-436-6942

### EDDIE SKAGGS, **NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication, Cameron University*  
Lawton, OK 73505 580-581-2555

### RICHARD GORKA, **NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University*  
Tacoma, WA 98447

### BROOK SMITH, **NATIONAL COUNCIL**

*Communication, Boise State University*  
Boise, ID 83725

### R. DAVID RAY, **HISTORIAN**

*PO Box 2882, University of Arkansas-Monticello*  
Monticello, AR 71655 501-460-1078

---

## NATIONAL OFFICE - PI KAPPA DELTA

125 Watson St., P.O. Box 38  
Ripon, WI 54971

Phone: 920-748-7533  
Fax: 920-748-9478

Series 85  
Number 2  
Winter 2000

# The Forensic

*of Pi Kappa Delta*

---

## Editor's Notes

### Pedagogical Essays:

- 1 But when they shine: Great students in policy debate.  
JEFFERY GENTRY
- 11 The judge, the honorable judges, if you please.  
ALFRED WESTFALL

The *Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* invites authors to submit manuscripts related to scholarship, pedagogy, research, and administration in competitive and non-competitive speech and debate. The Editorial Board will consider manuscripts employing any appropriate methodology and is particularly interested in historical-critical studies in forensics and forensics education. Manuscripts submitted by undergraduate students and previously unpublished scholars will also receive serious consideration.

The journal reflects the values of its supporting organization. *Pi Kappa Delta* is committed to promoting "the art of persuasion, beautiful and just." The journal seeks to promote serious scholarly discussion of issues connected to making competitive and non-competitive debate and individual events a powerful tool for teaching students the skills necessary for becoming articulate citizens. The journal seeks essays reflecting perspectives from all current debate and individual events forms, including, but not limited to: NDT, CEDA, NEDA, Parliamentary, Lincoln-Douglas debate; and NIET, NFA and non-traditional individual events.

Reviews of books and other educational materials will be published periodically. Potential reviewers are invited to contact the editor regarding the choice of materials for review.

---

All works must be original and not under review by other publishers. Authors should submit three print copies conforming to APA (4th ed.) guidelines plus a PC-compatible disk version. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed pages, exclusive of tables and references; book and educational material reviews should be between 4-5 double-spaced pages. Submitted manuscripts will not be returned. The title page should include the title, author(s), corresponding address and telephone number. The second page should include an abstract of 75-100 words. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed double-spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables should be clearly marked regarding their placement in the manuscript.

Manuscripts should be submitted to the editor: Michael Bartanen, Department of Communication and Theatre, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447. 253-535-7764. BARTANMD@PLU.EDU. Authors will have an editorial decision within three months.

---

#### Review Editors

Sandra Alspach, Ferris State University  
David Frank, University of Oregon  
Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College  
Jaime Meyer, University of Mary  
C. Thomas Preston, Missouri-St. Louis

Jeff Gentry, Southwestern Oklahoma  
Glenn Kuper, University of Puget Sound  
Mabry O'Donnell, Marietta College  
Glenda Treadaway, Appalachian State

---

**THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA** (ISSN: 0015-735X) is published four times yearly, Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer by Pi Kappa Delta Fraternal Society. Subscription price is part of membership dues. For alumni and non-members the rate is \$30.00 for one year, \$60.00 for two years and \$75.00 for three years. Second class postage paid at Ripon, WI. Postmaster and subscribers: please send all changes of address requests to: PKD, 125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971. THE FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta is also available on 16 mm microfilm, 35 mm microfilm, or 100 mm microfilm through University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

# Editor's Notes:

The edition consists of one reviewed essay and a reprint of one of the earliest theoretical essays which appeared in the journal. The article by Alfred Westfall, a founder of PKD and a member of the Hall of Fame, discusses the role of debate and the nature of judging. It is interesting in how it sheds light on the evolution of the debate format in the twentieth century and how some issues, such as whether judges should be trained, are ones which have never been completely resolved. There are some obvious anachronisms in the article, but it is worth a quick read.

The inventory of manuscripts for publication is virtually exhausted. Please consider submitting an essay for consideration for publication. Essays from student authors are particularly encouraged. Guidelines for manuscripts can be found at the beginning of the journal.

## Pi Kappa Delta Mission Statement

Forensics, as an extension of the classroom, seeks to create articulate citizens. Forensics participants, as students, and coaches and judges as teachers, seek to encourage an environment where: there is respect for others; there are standards for achievement; there is ethically responsible communication; there is knowledge about important issues; there is intellectual stimulation; and there is nurturing of the general skills of informed advocacy and aesthetic appreciation.

To achieve that outcome, Pi Kappa Delta seeks to:

1. Lead the effort of finding ways for all forensics organizations to work together whenever possible to strengthen the activity at levels and in all forms.
2. Foster the nurturing of the personal and professional lives of forensics educators.
3. Encourage the active and meaningful participation of alumni in the forensics activity, the national association, and the local chapter.
4. Strengthen the ties between forensics and both the communication discipline and the broader community.
5. Provide an environment where learning and growth are seen as equal in value to competitive success.

6. Increase the diversity of the forensics activity and the association. Encourage respect for both the diversity of ideas and life experiences. Enhance the role of forensics as a means of promoting respect for diversity in society.
7. Make forensics relevant and significant to the lives of students.



# But When They Shine: Great Students in Policy Debate

JEFFERY GENTRY

---

*In response to a growing body of criticism of contemporary debate practice in the literature, this paper "accentuates the positive" of intercollegiate policy debate. First, the heavy criticism of debate in recent years is briefly reviewed. Second, the author's "ideal vision" of policy debate is elaborated, including support for the practical goals of responsiveness, depth, and humanity. Finally, a videotaped Lincoln-Douglas debate is analyzed to demonstrate the model. The author hopes that coaches as well as novice debaters can use ideas such as these to shape the future of intercollegiate debate.*

---

Debate coaches are a noisy bunch. Willing to share an opinion on almost any conceivable issue, it is on the topic of debate itself that forensic educators can be at their best or at least loudest. Although critiquing the activity has always been a subject of forensic scholarship, recent years have witnessed an increasing proportion of commentary over theory (Gentry, 1994). However, it may also be productive to "put up or shut up." In other words, rather than simply bemoan what they do not like, coaches should outline what they do want, even acknowledge that much of what is seen in tournament debates is actually quite good. Such is the goal of this paper. First, I will briefly outline the primary criticisms of debate over the last decade. Second will be a theoretical elaboration of an ideal vision of policy debate. Finally, I will analyze a 1998 policy debate that seems to support this vision.

## ANGRY VOICES IN THE LITERATURE

In order to accentuate the positive in contemporary policy debate, it is necessary to provide the exigence of such a call. Complaints about debate in the 1990's, especially evidenced policy debate, are real. The primary targets of criticism include the debaters' manner of delivery, problems in evidence and logic, an over-reliance on procedural issues, and a lack of civility. Delivery, one of the classical canons of rhetoric, is believed to have deteriorated due to an effort to make as many arguments as possible in the allotted time. According to Horn and Underberg (1993), "An emphasis on quantity of informa-

---

JEFFERY GENTRY is Director of Forensics and Instructor of Communication Arts at Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Weatherford, OK. A previous version of this paper was presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL, April 1-5, 1998.

tion has damaged the thoughtful analysis that should characterize a debate. It has caused us to cultivate a style of speech that would repulse a lay audience." (p. 51). Moreover, Frank (1993) reports that no evidence exists that a fast delivery produces better debate than conversational delivery; and Matlon and Keele (1984) cite surveys of former NDT debaters who strongly believe that coaches "should do all they can to teach effective public speaking skills, including a careful choice of quality arguments spoken at a reasonable rate of speed" (p. 201).

The use of evidence and logic are also cited as areas for concern by policy debate critics. A problem with evidence use is that debaters often fail to cite sources properly or disregard the credibility of their sources (Wood, 1992). A greater problem may be that they often present loose or untenable links between their argument claims. Hubbard (1991) uses the phrase "apocalypticism" to refer to the leaps of faith needed for the various links of a catastrophic claim to add up. Similarly, Gentry (1996) uses the term "argument fantasia" to refer to the success of highly unrealistic arguments, such as this hypothetical example:

Consider the links we have proven in this disadvantage against the affirmative. First we demonstrated that pulling out of the U.N. will destabilize the balance of power in Southern Asia. Second, that unstable Pakistan will launch a pre-emptive nuclear strike against India, prompting a collapse in the world chromium market. And finally, that without chromium imports, the destruction of American high-tech industries will trigger a world-wide economic downturn worse than the Great Depression. This is a clear voter. No new 2AR responses (p. 3).

To defend this hypothetical example as no straw-person argument, Gentry cites the "rape is good" position and the "kill all humans" generic counterplan as actual arguments used in policy debates in the 1990's.

Yet another area of concern is a preponderance of arguments over procedural issues rather than those of substance. Ziegelmueller (1990) identifies the emphasis on meta-theoretical arguments as a chief reason for the flight from NDT to CEDA debate in the early 1980's, and for the subsequent dissatisfaction many coaches developed with CEDA participation.

Such argument types include topicality, criteria, whole resolution, paradigms, and generic counter plans. These arguments draw attention away from the actual resolution, reducing student learning about the topic, as well as boxing out newcomers to the activity. Cox and Adams (1993) term such provincialism a "protected arena," in which knowledge about the activity itself, i.e. the debate circuit, is more important than knowledge about the subject being debated.

A final major area of concern for debate coaches has been a loss of



civility among debaters. Bartanen (1993) relates the decline of humanity in tournament debate:

The level of invective was more strident this year. The rudeness and general inhumanity seemed more visible. The number of well-meaning educators who have come to strongly dislike judging, coaching or even listening to CEDA rounds has moved from a few 'discordant voices in the wilderness' to a 'chorus of angry voices.' (N. page.)

A reading of messages posted to the CEDA-L list serve suggests that decorum has slipped even further down the list of priorities among certain policy debaters. On March 11, 1998, several messages revealed that obscenities, usually the "F" word, find their way into almost every CEDA debate. One hopes that these observations are exaggerated, but it is strange to read messages from college debaters accosting judges who lower their speaker points for obscene language.

Complaints about the behavior of debaters are now commonplace in the literature in forensics. The reason that such criticism should be taken seriously is the effect such practices may be having on debate participation. In 1994 a number of programs in the Midwestern states broke away from CEDA to form the National Educational Debate Association. At the same time, large numbers of schools from across the nation turned to documentation-free parliamentary debate. Still others opted for the NFA Lincoln-Douglas format. The effect of these losses on the established debate organizations is that, by all accounts, the 1998 CEDA National Tournament had the lowest number of participants in years, despite the topic merger with NDT that many thought would be a major shot in the arm to both organizations.

Despite the decline in CEDA/NDT participation, policy debate is alive and well in America. In fact, the format has come a long way since the late 1980's, when a small NDT group was the only circuit using a policy format. Since that time, NFA-LD, CEDA, NEDA, and the Great Plains Forensic Conference have established or adopted a policy orientation. Since policy debate continues, it would be fruitful to turn the tables on all of this criticism. It is clear what many disapprove of. Are there at least hypothetical scenarios where debate is everything coaches ask and more?

#### AN IDEAL VISION

Many former debaters like to reminisce on what they feel were the glory days of the activity. For some it is the era in which they themselves competed on the college level. For others it may be their early coaching careers, the first time they coached a team that achieved competitive heights. I harbor no singular illusion of the best of intercollegiate debate. There are examples of great debate from many periods from the audio tape of the 1965 Heart of America final round I had the privilege of hearing, to observing my first high school varsity practice debate in the late 1970's, to numerous debates I have judged

in the late 1990's. All of these positive encounters add up to an ideal vision of policy debate, just as other debaters and coaches uphold their own paragons of rhetorical excellence. A debate ideal is similar to the surfer's "perfect wave": no one debate or debater completely fulfills the vision, but elements of it can be found in championship finals, or when least expected. After 21 years in competitive debate, my criteria for an ideal vision can be expressed in three fundamental virtues: responsiveness, depth, and humanity.

Responsive debate takes place when debaters clash with each other straight-up: not simply ignoring the opponents' contentions and pleading that one's own are more important, but preparing for opposing arguments and discerning the best case against them. This virtue requires several support systems. At the basic level it requires diligent planning and research by the students anticipating opposing arguments and hitting the library. Once hearing the argument, responsiveness means breaking it down, blocking it with thoughtful responses and evidence. However, responsiveness also requires a reasonably narrow topic and community norms on realistic argumentation, two values more common to some debate forums and eras than others. Finally, it requires debaters who really listen to and respect each others' positions. How many ballots were lost because a debater listened to his opponent's argument defensively, not critically.

The critical listener attempts to understand the argument so he or she can find its weakest point. The defensive listener dismisses opposing arguments, as if the judge is serendipitously biased in his or her favor.

The value of responsive debate comes in two respects. First the debaters feel that their hard work in the library has paid off. Debate research is like studying for an examination why bother studying if the material is so vast that one cannot possibly prepare for everything? When topics are extremely broad, or judges place no realistic expectations on argument validity, students resort to generic positions and eccentric arguments. But when a debater has correctly predicted that cutting a certain article would pay off at the next tournament, she feels a special sense of satisfaction when using that evidence to win a point in an actual debate.

The judge and audience are also impressed with responsive debate, as its second benefit is to enhance the intellectual and artistic value of the round. Let me introduce the notion of the rhetorical pendulum. This pendulum represents the judge's (or audience's) view of the debate at hand.

If the first affirmative provides such a compelling case that the judge feels sorry for the other team, the pendulum has swung high to the affirmative's side. But a prepared and responsive first negative can not only bring the pendulum back to center, but swing it high to the other side, making the judge feel that the debate is all but over for the affirmative. A truly all-star debate can thus swing widely back and

forth for several speeches, only settling in the late rebuttals, when the rhetorical pendulum rests on one side or the other. In contrast, an unresponsive debate, with its typically generic and unrealistic argumentation, never moves the pendulum far from neutral. The intellectual and artistic merit of such a debate is minimal compared to the responsive debate.

Our second ideal debate virtue is depth. This means that everyone in the room learns much more about the topic being debated than they would in a superficial debate, such as one stressing procedural issues. But topic focus can strongly influence depth despite the students' best intentions. A clear pattern has developed, in my view, that extremely broad topics are far less memorable than moderately narrow, unidirectional topics. For example, the 1982-83 NDT topic was limited to U.S. military intervention in the Western Hemisphere, a far more vivid and clash-oriented topic than the 1998-99 NFA resolution regulating any electronic communication. In-depth debate results when students can anticipate opposing evidence, identify weaknesses, and produce counter-evidence and even indictments of research methods. There is inherent value in this depth of research and analysis. When students make insightful arguments that the judge couldn't have contemplated, they shine.

Debate at its best produces students that are not only aware of important controversial issues, but take advantage of these issues in shaping their future life choices. A student who debated the abolition of the Central Intelligence Agency now has decided to study international relations in graduate school. During my senior year of high school we debated education policy. My partner and I won the district NFL tournament with a case on high communication apprehension in student, a case that influenced not only my college major, but choice of M.A. thesis and career rack. Therefore, depth is possible in any era of debate, even if some contemporary coaches have not encountered it in some time.

Humanity is the final virtue in this ideal vision. Since the Classical period, scholars in ethics have pointed to the need for mutual respect in argument exchanges. Brockriede (1972), based on the works of Plato (1965), identifies three ethical types: the rapist, seducer and lover. The ideal debater obviously should serve as a lover of wisdom: one who does not treat her opponent as a means to an end, does not view the debate as a fight, who has enough self-confidence to give straight answers in cross-examination. It is easy to see if a debater is enjoying himself or herself in a round. Through positive verbal and non-verbal communication, the debater validates his or her opponent, the judge, even audience members.

Unlike the vulgar exchanges apparently common in CEDA/NDT debate (Treadaway & Hill, 1999), other contemporary circuits and previous eras have enjoyed a less hyper-competitive environment. At a 70-school NDT tournament in 1982, a coach grew frustrated after judging several rounds of "dour debate." He stopped a debater in mid-

cross examination and said, "Ask him out. Show that you're friendly." The young woman declined, but understood the point: debate is far more watchable when the students treat each other as people, and respect each others' ideas. A 1997 graduate of Oklahoma Panhandle University exemplifies this ideal. Todd Thummel was a successful Lincoln-Douglas debater who exuded sincerity. He used phrases such as "Eric makes a good point, but on the other hand....", and "I could be wrong, but it seems ...." It was almost funny to watch blustery opponents try to corner him in cross examination. In response to a "gotcha" question he sometimes responded with, "I can see that"; leaving the opponent speechless, and usually on the losing end after Thummel's carefully-reasoned rebuttal. Debate can and should be a forum in which such individuals excel.

Responsiveness, depth, and humanity, basic as they are, constitute my ideal vision of intercollegiate debate. Note that I do not uphold speaker delivery as a special virtue. This is because it should be a given. Coherent presentation is, or should be, only a minimum requirement of public discourse. No one should win a debate merely on delivery. When students are provided education-minded incentives, such as documentation standards and diverse audiences as critics, delivery thrives. But when the dominant paradigm rewards "scorched-earth" spread tactics, delivery naturally suffers. With one coach's ideal vision of debate in mind, we shall turn to a videotaped debate and evaluate how effectively the students upheld our three criteria.

### CRAIG VS. KELLEY

At the 1998 Cedric Crink Classic at Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Sunny Craig, a senior at Southwestern Oklahoma debated sophomore Amber Kelley of Cowley College, Kansas, in round six on the topic of abolishing the peer jury system. The audience-centered style of debate embodied in this round is somewhat rare today, but is embraced in different ways by the National Educational Debate Association, the Great Plains Forensic Conference, and National Forensic Association Lincoln-Douglas debate. Craig had placed first in Lincoln-Douglas at two National Educational Debate Association year-end tournaments, and Kelley had recently gone undefeated to place first at a tournament held at Northern Oklahoma College. The round was judged by a retired high school speech instructor, and was videotaped for analysis. Craig debated on the affirmative. Her case focused on juror incompetence to justify the abolition of the peer jury system.

Responsiveness was a strength for Kelley on the negative, initiated by her turning around one of Craig's own sources. Craig cited Massachusetts Supreme Court Justice Hillar B. Zobol to prove the superiority of judges to jurors in accurately deciding criminal cases. But Kelley pointed out that Zobol ultimately advises against replacing jurors with judges, which was Craig's plan. This is the kind of direct

clash that puts the audience on notice that the debate is on. A later example of clash came when Craig argued that the public had lost faith in the jury system, specifically that 4/5 of those surveyed felt that the system should be scrapped. Kelley countered with a survey of jurors, 75% of whom stated that, if accused, they would prefer a jury trial to a bench trial.

Craig also displayed effective clash with Kelley's arguments. An example was Kelley's evidence that jurors generally understand and appreciate the seriousness of their role. Craig responded by pointing to survey results that over half of jurors in capital cases do not even listen to the details of the trial, instead relying on their first impressions of the case. The critic was clearly pleased with the level of clash, praising Kelley for being a well prepared negative: "Very good [case analysis and use of evidence]. . . Excellent [delivery]." Craig also received high marks from the judge: "Well organized and developed [case]; clear and easy to follow. . . good reasoning. . . Impressed by cross-exam of negative. Excellent defense. . . Excellent [delivery]." When handing in her ballot, the judge said that she was very impressed with both students for sticking to the issues, alluding to some negative experiences she had had when judging high school debates in recent years.

Depth of argument was also a strength of this debate. Neither Craig nor Kelley invoked a single procedural issue, such as topicality or prima facie. This would not seem so remarkable to a NEDA-style coach today, or an NDT coach in 1960. But for a veteran of college debate in the 1980's, the lack of superficial argumentation might seem nearly miraculous.

And the immediate educational fruits of this focused debate? Both Craig and Kelley showed themselves to be well read in the Constitutional right to trial by jury. The students gave detailed accounts of salient cases, such as the Terry Nichols verdict and the Rodney King aftermath. Overall, their command of issues central to the topic was impressive. Can we expect non-debate undergraduates to learn any more about important national issues than these practical rhetors?

Humanity is the final feature of our model. Those familiar with the audience-centered debate model understand that ethical discourse is a fundamental part of its "macro-narrative" (see Treadaway & Hill, 1999). However, even students trained in civil discourse aren't perfect. It is beneficial to assess when students uphold our lofty expectations and when they do not. In this debate, Sunny Craig and Amber Kelley behaved as adults. In fact, Kelley opened her negative rebuttal with particular class. Smiling, she said: "First of all, I'd like to thank everyone for coming and watching Sunny and me today. There's been a lot of good ideas presented, and it's made for a good debate." In fact, both speakers referred to each other by name rather than the generic pronoun "she." This small detail serves to acknowledge the inherent worth of the other speaker, even while keeping the persuasion focused

on the judge and audience.

Finally, this round provided other encouraging signs about contemporary debate. Neither speaker used all of her preparation time, which reminds us of the days when debaters didn't need extra time just to understand their opponents' arguments. Both spoke with effective vocal inflection, at a conversational rate of speech, and with an attention to stylistic choices. In short, I believe any forensics director would be happy to allow college administrators, prospective coaches, and new debaters watch this videotaped debate.

This essay has sought to acknowledge the "glass is half full" side of intercollegiate policy debate. We have seen that students from various eras have carried the torch of public advocacy with responsiveness, depth and humanity. In both Lincoln-Douglas and team debate, I hope that formats continue to exist that allow students to enjoy the intellectual excitement and humanizing force that evidenced debate can serve. Although such tournaments are not as easy to find as the CEDA/NDT circuit, audience-oriented debate survives at the end of the 20th Century. Despite the frequent criticism of contemporary debate, some recent trends may force a re-evaluation of our propensity toward debate denunciation.

#### REFERENCES

- Bartanen, M.D. (1993, April). The future of CEDA: A pessimistic assessment. *CEDA Executive Secretary's Report* (N. pag.e).
- Brockriede, W. (1972). Arguers as lovers. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 5, 1-11.
- Cox, E.S. & Adams, W.C. (1993). An answer to the call for experimentation by the CEDA Assessment Conference: A descriptive study of a peer-judged round. *CEDA Yearbook*, 14, 34-53.
- Frank, D.A. (1993). Debate as rhetorical scholarship: Changing delivery practices in CEDA. In D.A. Thomas & S.C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings* (pp. 75-95). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Gentry, J.J. (1994, November). Who is in charge? Can directors continue to lead? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Gentry, J.J. (1996, November). Expanding the range of logos in debate practice. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, CA.
- Horn, G. & Underberg, L. (1993). Educational debate: an unfulfilled promise? In D.A. Thomas & S.C. Wood (Eds.), *CEDA: 20th Anniversary Assessment Conference Proceedings* (pp. 37-74). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Hubbard, M. (1991, November). The negative effects of using apocalypticism on debate. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta, GA, November.
- Matlon, R.J. & Keele, L.M. (1984). A survey of participants in the National Debate Tournament, 1947-1980. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 20, 194-205.
- Plato (1965). Phaedrus. In B.J. Jowett (Transl.) *The dialogues of Plato* (pp. 107-190).
- Treadaway, G.J. & Hill, B. (1999). Constructing narratives: Organizational and individual stories about intercollegiate debate. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 84, 1-24.

Ziegelmueller, G. (1990). Policy debate: A retrospective and prospective view.  
*Argumentation and Advocacy*,27,26-31.



Missing



# The Judges, The Honorable Judges, If you Please

ALFRED WESTFALL

Judges for a debate are a necessary evil. They exist because, so far, we have been unable to discover any other method of determining the winner of a debate. Their service is frequently unpleasant both to the judged and the judging. Since we must have judges, we are naturally interested in finding out what people make the most satisfactory judges.

A number of methods of judging a debate have been suggested and tried at different times. The usual method is to select three well-known men who render their decision individually or as a committee after a conference. Sometimes the debate coach of a neighboring institution is called upon to select the winning team. There is one triangular league in which all the teams go away from home, so that the two teams debating are at the third institution. In this way a neutral audience is secured. All the members of the faculty of the neutral institution who are present act as judges so that there may be twenty or thirty judges. Neither of these plans is very satisfactory. A one person decision is never pleasing. Where the debate is at a neutral institution there is not much interest shown.

Professor Pease, of the University of Wyoming has proposed a novel but not very practical plan. His plan is to have a vote given by every one present. The people are to be divided, however, into three classes, those who know nothing about debating, college students who have studied argumentation, and teachers of argumentation. Every class will be given one vote. If the majority of the general public vote for the affirmative that will constitute one vote for the affirmative. A majority vote among the students for the negative would constitute one vote for the negative. The vote of the debate coaches and teachers of argumentation would constitute the third vote. There are a number of objections to this plan, besides the difficulty of carrying it out.

All in all, the old fashion system which employs three judges is the

---

ALFRED WESTFALL was one of the founders of Pi Kappa Delta, and is a member of the PKD Hall of Fame. This article originally appeared in *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 5 (1919), 3-6. The article has been slightly updated by altering the use of the male pronoun when the alteration will not change the original meaning. In 1919 it was the usual practice use the male pronoun inclusively to refer to both men and women.

least objectionable. The entertaining institution generally submits a list to the other team which has the right to protest any or all names on the list. This tends to insure fairness. But there are methods of evasion. The only real assurance of fairness lies in the desire of all parties concerned to conduct the debate honestly and fairly.

The question then is what people are best fitted to act as judges. Before we can answer this we must determine the function of the judge. But before we can agree to this, we must be agreed as to the purpose of the debate and the function of the debater.

First, the debate. It should be a practical discussion and not an artificial contest. If it is an artificial contest carried out under fixed rules then only those familiar with the rules, such as debate coaches or old debaters, would be eligible to act as judges. We see this exemplified in football. The football official is an old player. He has to be.

However, to be of any value, debating should be training in methods that the debater can employ after he or she leaves college. The debater should not discover later that the methods that won college contests are valueless in influencing the opinions of his or her fellows and establishing leadership. A debate should not be judged upon the technical principles laid down in treatises on argumentation, such as steps in analysis, definitions and technical points in delivery. A debate should be judged as to its power to convince and persuade. Technique will help in accomplishing this, in fact, is necessary.

The purpose of the debater should be to set forth the truth or falsity of the question at issue. Too often the debater neglects this in a desire to win. He or she generally weakens their case in so doing. There is nothing so belief-compelling as truth. No person speaks so convincingly as the man or woman who has the confidence of the audience in his or her sincerity and integrity.

If we can agree that the debate is a practical and not an artificial contest and that the purpose of the debate is a practical and not an artificial contest, and that the purpose of the debater is to set forth the truth or falsity of the question, we are ready to proceed in our discussion of judges.

I would like to make the proposition that that person is most desirable for judge who is most like the average, intelligent individual in his or her estimation of a speaker and reaction to a spoken argument. It seems to me that this is the only fair way to judge a debate, by the effect it would produce upon the mind of the average citizen. A debater or teacher of argumentation might object to a lack of certain technical principles; but if the debater has enough native vigor and homely common sense to produce conviction in the minds of his hearers, he or she deserves to win over an opponent who has a great deal of method but lacks content.

I have heard debates in which the team with the weakest argument and the strongest delivery won. Some are inclined to criticize the

judges. This is not fair. The judges were only reacting as the average person reacts. Human beings are influenced not by what reaches their ears but by what penetrates their comprehension. Instead of complaining of the stupidity of the judges, the debater should learn by what means people's convictions are formed. If the debater is certain of the logic and the power of his or her argument, that debater should endeavor to discover why he or she failed to make the hearers appreciate it. It is not enough to have good argument. The argument must be presented so that it will be comprehended. A person who puts up a wind mill where the wind can not strike it has no right to complain of the stupidity of the wind. The person who fails to convince their audience has no right to complain of that audience.

Unfortunately there is no method of determining what individuals most nearly approach the norm in their response to speakers. To reduce the probability of error the judges should be selected from different occupations and different localities.

Certain people are known to vary from the average. Some are narrow minded. Certain types of business people who have no interests outside of the immediate business, and who have succeeded because they stick to one thing in a bull-headed manner, are not good judges because they have become so set in their opinions that they are really not open to reason. An individual who is an extremist along one line, as government ownership, religion, labor, etc. is apt to have prejudices on other lines, and so does not approach the medium.

People of certain profession are peculiarly fitted or unfitted by their professions. This is certainly true of the man or woman of public affairs. He or she has to be interested along many lines. That individual has to be open to reason. He or she has to study people and learn their processes of ratiocination. The lawyer has to have opinions and defend them. He or she is engaged in moulding the opinion of average citizens in their work before the jury. The lawyer learns the methods that convince. The lawyer unconsciously looks for those things in the speeches of others and is influenced by them.

In my experience I have found teachers the most satisfactory judges. They are generally more given to reasoning than the average business person and are more acquainted along public lines. They are used to basing their beliefs on evidence and are more open to argument. They are less apt to have political and economic interests and prejudices which bias them in their judgment on public questions.

To my mind the ideal set of judges would be a college professor, preferably a professor of science or possibly history or economics, but not of English, argumentation or public speaking; a lawyer who is something of a public man, one who has done considerable public speaking other than legal; and a business person who has a broader outlook than his own business, an individual who is a leader in public affairs, broad minded and progressive.

There is one other question which should be considered here. It is

the question of instruction of judges. Should judges be instructed to consider certain items, as logic, teamwork, delivery, refutation, etc.; should they be told to value argument at 75 per cent and delivery at 25 per cent, or in some other proportion, or should they be allowed to come to their own conclusion by other own methods?

I am convinced that is folly to prescribe that argument shall be valued at a certain percentage and delivery at another and so on. In the first place, I don't think it is possible to value them in that way. Good delivery enhances good argument. How can you value the argument apart from the delivery, or the delivery apart from the argument? A judge should be allowed to cast his or her vote for the team that he or she believes has made the best debate. I know of one judge who kept a lot of percentages and averages under such a system and said afterwards that he gave his decision to the negative although he thought the affirmative won the debate.

Good argument creates belief. The lack of it fails to bring conviction. Good delivery insures the full comprehension of the argument advanced. The lack of it prevents this. If one speaker proceeds to prove again what his or her colleague has just attempted to prove, that debater weakens their case. If a debater does not reply to an opponent's argument, a supposition that the argument cannot be met is created. Why try to instruct the judges to consider these things? They are bound to affect the minds of every one who hears the debate. The judge would have to consider these and other points, even if instructed not to. If instructions must be given, they should not go farther than to mention some of the commonest and most apparent qualities which will always create belief, and to ask the judges to consider them in such proportion as they shall deem proper.

I favor merely this: cautioning the judge to judge not the merits of the question, but rather the merits of the debate, and to cast their vote for the team that makes the best argument.



# The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta

## LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

(copy and forward to your library acquisition officer)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Please enter a subscription to **THE FORENSIC** at the subscriber rate of \$30 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription is for a complete series which begins July 1st of each year. At the time of subscription, you will receive all previous issues that have been published during the subscription year.

Check one:

One Year \$30     Two Years \$60     Three Years \$75

On subscriptions outside of the United States, add \$12 per year for foreign postage.

Prices effective through June 30, 1998

Make checks or money orders payable to PI KAPPA DELTA NATIONAL

Order from your subscription agent or directly from:

Pi Kappa Delta National Headquarters

125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38

Ripon, Wisconsin 54971

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through the National Headquarters

THE HISTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA by Larry Norton

\_\_\_\_\_ copies @ \$10/each

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1989 DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

edited by Robert S. Littlefield - \_\_\_\_\_ copies @ \$5/each

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1995 DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

edited by Scott Jensen - \_\_\_\_\_ copies @ \$5/each

Articles from past issues of THE FORENSIC are available upon request.