The Editor of The Forensic has finally received a report on the biennial convention of Pi Kappa Delta held at Oklahoma A. & M. College last spring. This was the third national convention in which Discussion was scheduled. It had been included for the first time in 1947 at Bowling Green University and again in 1949 at Bradley University.

Although the procedure and rules for the 1951 Discussion event are to be found in the January 1951 Forensic, I shall summarize them briefly in order that the recorded comments of students and faculty observers may be more pertinent.

There were four rounds of Discussion with a maximum time of two hours allowed for each round. The first three rounds were devoted to problem-analysis, problem-solution, and solution, respectively. No outline was furnished the students; only brief suggestions were given as to what might be considered during each round. At the end of round three each group selected a committee member to meet in conference for the purpose of examining all solutions and eliminating duplications. The committee members then reported back to their respective groups for round four, at which time final consideration was given to solutions and resolutions were formulated. All groups then met together in convention for parliamentary consideration of resolutions.

Convention rules permitted one entry from each college, with eight to ten persons per group and chairmanship to rotate among members, so that each chairman should function for one hour. Since there were eight hours of Discussion, the committee assigned eight students to each of seven groups and nine to the remaining four. Three last minute entries made it necessary to enter nine students in seven of the eleven groups for a total of ninety-five entries. Participants were not to be rated, but one point toward the sweepstakes trophy was to be awarded to the school whose entrant participated in all rounds of Discussion. A faculty observer sat with each section. His functions were to check attendance, to serve as a guide in procedure and to record observations. The Observer was provided with an observation chart on which suggested questions were listed as a guide to his comments. For the parliamentary meeting, standing rules were drawn up by the contest committee which also appointed faculty representatives to serve as Speaker, Clerk and Parliamentarian.

The Observers' records were studied and the comments classified and recorded with as much objectivity as possible. No Observer served
more than once, so there were forty-four different faculty members who submitted reports. Actually, there were only forty-three reports since one Observer not only failed to record any comments, but also neglected to check the attendance. A committee member later checked attendance by contacting a student member of that section. With this one exception, however, the cooperation of the Observers was excellent and they, too, deserved at least one point for participation.

A summary of solicited comments from the Observers reveals:

1. Seven groups had perfect attendance for four rounds. Three groups had one absence in the second round. One group had one absence in the first and one (not the same member) absence in the second round. Thus, five out of ninety-five students were absent during one of their four rounds.

2. One-third of the Observers felt that over-participation by one or more members was harmful to group cooperation.

3. One-third of the Observers noted that the discussion centered around the chairman; while twice as many indicated that the chairman was not the focus of attention.

4. Differences were usually resolved by continuing discussion until common ground was reached. Occasionally a summary by the chairman, compromise or a vote was the method used.

5. In answer to the question, "How well does the group work as a team?" the Observers in six groups were unanimous in saying that their group worked "very well" or "good." Three groups were rated "good" to "fair." The Observers in the other two groups recorded more extreme views: four reporting "very well"; one "they didn't"; one "centered on three people"; and one reported "the group divided into two opposing camps."

6. Though the Observers were not inclined to praise any group for its attempt to look at itself objectively and to make improvements upon itself, a majority of them did report "very well." Three groups received a unanimous "very well" from their four Observers. Four groups received a varied but generally poor score on this question and the other four groups were rated "fair" to "good."

7. The relation of the group to Observer was recorded as "no contact" in fifteen cases. Several Observers said this was good. One felt he was "excess baggage." Seven were asked to offer suggestions and make comments. Two reported "side glances." Five reported a friendly, courteous, cooperative relationship. Three reported "excellent" and one reported "poor manners." As a whole, the reaction to group-Observer relations was good.

8. Questions concerning factors contributing to misunderstanding, and special problems encountered by the group produced prolific responses. Thirteen Observers referred to "the weakness of the chairman." Fourteen mentioned "lack of knowledge of discussion." Ten reported "lack of knowledge of the subject" (What should be the responsibility of the Federal Government for the welfare of the people of the United States?). Ten Observers reported "lack of clear definitions."

The records of Observers reveal, in addition to solicited answers, a variety of suggestions under the heading of Additional Comments. The most significant of these, with the number of times they were mentioned are:

1. Students should be rated (4).
2. Students should not be rated (2).
3. Use the same Observer for all four rounds (2).
4. Have a more specific outline (1).
5. The group is too large (1).
6. Well directed by the chairman (3).
7. Good knowledge of parliamentary procedure (1).
8. Poor knowledge of parliamentary procedure (3).
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The Province Of The Pacific

EMMETT T. LONG, George Pepperdine College

One of the founders of Pi Kappa Delta, E. R. Nichols, came West to the University of Redlands in the fall of 1913 and two years later the California Alpha chapter was organized there. Redlands attended the first convention in 1916. The Province of the Pacific has had three distinct phases in its development: the early chapters, the recent additions, and the division from the Northwest group.

After the organization of the first chapter, a second, California Beta, was begun at Occidental College, Los Angeles, about 1916, to be later removed, so that the second chapter in terms of continued existence was formed at the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, when J. R. MacArthur, second national president, came to this institution from Kansas. Two more colleges became PKD schools before 1923, College of the Pacific at Stockton, California, and the University of California, Los Angeles.

A period of almost fifteen years passed before additional chapters were added, these in Arizona at the two state colleges located in Tempe and Flagstaff. As of the Stillwater, Oklahoma, convention only the Tempe chapter remains. In 1941, George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, became California Zeta, the first new chapter in California in eighteen years. San Diego State College is the newest addition, California Eta, added in 1949.

Because of the vast distances in the large western area originally included in the Province of the Pacific, the schools of the northwest and the southwest voted to recommend a division at the 1950 provincial convention in Stockton, California. This was approved, forming the Province of the Northwest, and leaving the southern group with a small number of chapters, seven, located in Arizona and California. These chapters, however, are very active. All, except U. C. L. A., were present at the Stillwater convention, and this school (the largest in Pi Kappa Delta, incidentally) would have been there ex-

(Continued on Page 56)

Emmett T. Long, Governor of the Province of the Pacific, has been Director of Forensics at George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, California, since 1948.

As a student at George Pepperdine College, he participated in forensic activities for four years, placing first in eight major debate tournaments. He had a consecutive win record of forty-three debates and holds the degree of Special Distinction in three orders.

Mr. Long graduated from George Pepperdine College, 1945, with a major in speech; received the B. A. degree from the University of California, Berkeley, 1946, and the M. A. degree in 1948; and has completed advanced work toward the doctorate at the University of Southern California.
Making Debate Democratic

LES NEWVILLE, Wisconsin State College

Every student who goes out for debate at the Wisconsin State College (Delta) at River Falls—and works hard—can be sure of participation in at least one tournament during the year. Moreover, the school’s seasoned debaters look forward to one tournament where they will gain valuable experience as judges.

Sensing the desirability of having more students participate in debate, Dr. Walker Wyman originated the unique River Falls “B” tournament in 1936. Regarding the tournament, Dr. Wyman, formerly debate coach and still chairman of the history department, commented recently, “I wanted to democratize debate and provide a training ground for less experienced debaters and future speech teachers.” Dr. Wyman reasoned that a debater can’t know the thinking of a judge until he tries judging. Consequently, he used student judges.

The present coach, Miss Marion Hawkins, has a similar philosophy of training which she conscientiously follows. Simply winning awards is not her main objective, although as a student she won honors in oratory and debate. To her, the important thing is the training of students for good citizenship in our democracy.

In 1952, for example, many of the tournament details were handled by a student chairman. Only debaters with fewer than five intercollegiate debates could qualify for the meet. The majority of the judges were students, although a few coaches helped out.

Seventeen schools, all within easy driving distance, are invited each year to the one day event. The tournament is small and kept that way. Even so, the River Falls “B” tournament continues to serve its purpose year after year. It makes debate democratic.

THE PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC
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In national convention years, the province sponsors an invitational tournament for the West. It has been held at the University of Redlands for a number of years, but last year was held by California Institute of Technology.

At least three colleges in California are hoping to gain admission to Pi Kappa Delta. Because of the Province’s small size at this time, the member-schools have been encouraging these and other colleges who show an interest, because the life of the fraternity depends to some extent upon its status in the area which each province serves, and status is increased through the addition of schools of high academic standing who support an active and continuing forensic program.

cept for a university rule which prohibits any trip by students representing the school which takes more than three days.

For several years now, the provincial convention and tournament has been held at the College of the Pacific, where it will be held this year, April 10 to 12. This event has always been open to all institutions, regardless of forensic affiliation, and has been conducted on an open and closed (PKD schools) basis; in other words, two tournaments in one. This year, however, a new procedure is being tried. On Thursday, the tenth, the seven Pi Kappa Delta schools will hold a one-day tournament and convention. Friday and Saturday will be devoted entirely to an open tournament, with perhaps forty colleges and universities in attendance.
Education And Forensics

CHAS. GRANDY, Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the educational value of forensic activities. In other words what good does it do a student to participate in extra-curricular speech programs. The investigation exploited two sources: previous investigations and articles concerning the subject, and an original statistical study of scholarship by the author. It is realized that statistical information does not of itself assign a cause and effect relationship; however, in several of the previous studies the statistical sampling and the factors involved were controlled so that a real answer could be had to the question under consideration.

The most interesting of the articles read by the author was "An Evaluation of Debate," by Donald O. Olson, University of Nebraska, which appeared in the Summer, 1948, issue of The Debater's Magazine. Professor Olson made his evaluation by obtaining a reflection of the attitude toward debate held by former intercollegiate debaters of the University of Nebraska. The time period covered was from 1895 to 1945 and involved one hundred and sixty-three former debaters. More questionnaires were sent out but not all were returned. Quoting from his article allows a more concise presentation of the evaluation.

A questionnaire of eight questions with a five point attitude scale of "No," "Probably not," "Uncertain," "Probably yes," and "Yes" was developed. The eight questions were designed to evaluate debate on four bases. 1. Has debate an occupational value? 2. Has debate a value in training for leadership? 3. Has debate a cultural value? 4. Has debate had an adverse effect on scholarship? The recipient of the questionnaire was asked to check the term below each of the eight questions that best expressed his attitude toward that question.

The fact that Professor Olson's investigation covered a long period of time allows for some irregularity through changes in coaches and changing attitudes toward decision and non-decision debating which might cause some distortion of his results. However, by separating the time span into five year periods it is seen that each period is represented almost equally, and Mr. Olson evidently feels that this leads to a strengthening of his results in that a large number of the people had been out of school long enough to view the questionnaire quite objectively.

The questions and replies follow:

Question 1. Did your work in debate have a bearing on your entering your present occupation? The answers given indicate that 38.6 percent of those returning questionnaires were influenced in their choice of occupation.

Question 2. Did you take debate because you were planning on entering your present occupation? Fifty and nine-tenths per cent of those returning the questionnaire said they took debate because they were planning on entering their present occupation.

Question 3. Did debate help you in your present occupation? In 95.7 per cent of returned questionnaires people believed that debate had given them some help in their present occupation.

Question 4. Would you advise people entering your occupation to take debate? To this question 93.2 per cent replied "probably yes," and "yes."

Question 5. Did debate help you to take a more prominent place in campus life when you were in school? Over 78 per cent of the peo-
ple thought that debate had helped them in college life.

Question 6. Did your participation in debate affect you scholarship adversely? Ninety-four and four-tenths per cent said “probably not” and “no” debate had not affected their work class adversely.

Question 7. Has your debate training enabled you to take a more prominent place in civic life? As with question 5, 78 per cent felt that debate enabled them to take a greater position of leadership in civic life.

Question 8. Would you advise any interested capable person to take debate? Of the returned questionnaires, 96.9 per cent said they would advise any interested capable person, regardless of occupation, to take debate.

Professor Olson gives the additional information that in spite of the fact that four different forms of management have existed in four different periods, the questionnaire indicated the same attitudes in all four periods. Also the general attitude trend was the same for people who engaged in decision debating as for those who engaged in non-decision debating. An interesting note for future lawyers is that 100 per cent of the lawyers who answered question 4 said they would advise people entering their profession to take debate. Questions one to four indicate that debate had a high occupational evaluation for those who returned questionnaires.

To add weight to the argument in favor of collegiate debating this excerpt is quoted:

Scholastic honors won by University of Nebraska debaters indicate also that debate need not adversely affect one’s scholarship. Four Nebraska debaters have been Rhodes Scholars, forty-seven have been members of Phi Beta Kappa, and thirty-one have won the Order of Coif, given to graduating lawyers who have ranked in the upper ten per cent of their class.

Professor Olson concludes his article with this statement:

This study reveals that we should not curtail debate activities in our schools, but we should develop programs that will enable people to take advantage of this training. This evaluation should make all educators aware that at least for those polled debate had a high educational value.

In a study conducted by John Pratt of Colgate University which was published in an article, “Who Are the Leaders in Permissive-Discussions?” in the May 5, 1951, issue of School and Society, some attempt was made to relate participation in discussion to general academic achievement. The study was made in the human-relations course at Colgate in the spring of 1949. In this course, the students participate in panel discussions with the primary objective of the development of a clinical, syncretistic pattern of thinking and reasoning taking into consideration as many of the facets and details of a situation as possible. A complex criteria was established to determine who were the leaders in the course. From this we may draw the conclusion that the leaders were those most generally accepted by the group because of speaking ability. The details of Mr. Pratt’s study, while interesting, need not concern us now. It is sufficient for our purposes to note his conclusion concerning academic achievement. He reports that the leaders in the permissive-discussion course were generally in the upper quarter of the distribution of general academic achievement.

Another article of considerable interest is “What’s Right With Debate?” by Doctor Henry Lee Ewbank of the University of Wisconsin, which appeared in the April, 1951, issue of The Quarterly Journal of Speech. Dr. Ewbank’s article is very general and summarizes a good many studies related to the educational value of debate. The facts presented here are
not all original with Dr. Ewbank but merely are taken from his article. Those interested in the actual case studies may find the authors, titles, and other information in Dr. Ewbank’s essay.

Dr. Ewbank contends that courses in argumentation, properly taught, and contest debating, properly conducted, provide valuable training for leadership in our society. In support of this, he presents the results of a number of studies.

In a study measuring the effect of listening to a debate on the attitudes of high school students, 40 per cent of 720 listeners registered significant shifts of opinion. Of 213 high school debaters 44 per cent recorded significant attitude shifts. In a different study attempting to evaluate the debater’s ability to evaluate arguments, detect errors in reasoning and draw valid conclusions from evidence, 218 debaters from 25 Wisconsin high schools were compared with a like number of non-debaters, matched as to grades, sex, and year in school. Both groups showed gains; however, the debaters had higher scores to start with and gained more than the non-debaters. Fifty per cent of the debaters were reported as “A” students and 35 per cent had a “B” average. Another study that used the same battery of tests measured the effects of a college course in argumentation on critical thinking ability. Two hundred and two students in 11 colleges and universities were compared with similar control groups. In 10 of the 11 schools, the students in the argumentation classes had the higher scores.

In investigations about what happens to former debaters a study of the careers of 1310 college graduates, at least four years out of college, employed by the Bell Telephone Company, showed that scholarship was the most important single factor. Next in importance was substantial achievement in journalism or forensics. Of the group who had made these achievements (winning an important oratorical contest or membership on an important debate team), 85 per cent received above median salary, while those with some achievement in journalism who earned above median salary came to the 64 per cent mark. Dr. Ewbank also refers to Olson’s study which was discussed earlier in this paper. Dr. Ewbank provides some interesting facts concerning the inclusion of former debaters in Who’s Who in America. Of the 5,500 members of Delta Sigma Rho, national honorary forensic society, who graduated before 1928, about one-ninth or 600 have attained distinction entitling them to inclusion in the publication. These former debaters include 53 college or university presidents; 25 judges, two of them members of the United States Supreme Court; 61 business executives; 43 members of government boards or commissions; 45 congressmen, governors, or United States Senators; 46 clergymen, including 5 bishops; and 32 authors or journalists.

From this evidence (and other not listed here), Dr. Ewbank draws the following conclusions:

1. Debaters have the qualities needed for leadership; they are much better than average students; they rank higher than non-debaters in ability to evaluate evidence, analyze arguments and draw logical conclusions.

2. The survey of Who’s Who in America shows that a great many debaters have risen to positions of prominence.

3. Former debaters are almost unanimous in believing that they learned much of value from their debating experience.

4. Members of high school debate squads tend to out-gain non-debaters in ability to think critically.

5. Students in college argumentation courses usually gain more in critical thinking ability than similar students gain from other courses.

6. Depending on their skill and
the issue, debaters may change the beliefs of from 20 to 40 per cent of their listeners—a fact which should give them, and their coaches, a keen sense of responsibility.

7. Debating is a poor method of producing either radicals or reactionaries. Debaters tend to see both sides, to be less extreme in their views at the end of the season.

8. Discussion and debate are the essential tools of democracy. To train students for citizenship and leadership in a free society is a great obligation and a great opportunity.

The above summaries lend considerable support to the educational value of forensics both in the classroom and in extra-curricular activities. The author is considerably interested in the forensics program and therefore undertook an investigation at Colorado A. & M. College to determine if there was any evidence in support of the positive results advanced by others.

Thirty students who participated actively in the forensics program were compared with a random group of 30 students enrolled in the college. No attempt was made to control such factors as age, sex, background, religion, etc.; however, the speakers and control group were kept as consistent as possible with respect to the number of individuals from each grade level. There was nearly equal representation in each group from a given trade level. The scholastic averages for the two groups for the fall quarter of 1950-51 were compared. The mean grade average of the speakers was found to be 2.82, and the average of the non-speakers was 2.50. (The grading system is 4.00 for straight "A," 3.00 is "B," 2.00 for "C," and 1.00 for "D.") Using Student's Test of Statistical Hypothesis would reveal the chance element in the difference in the two mean grade averages. The assumption was made that there was no significant difference between the two groups. This hypothesis was tested and rejected at the .01 per cent level of significance. This leads to the conclusion that students at Colorado A. & M. who participate in the forensics program have a scholastic standing several points above the non-participating students. The use of the .01 per cent level of significance means that the hypothesis is correctly rejected 99 times out of 100; thus, the above conclusion has the mathematical probability of .9900 of being correct.

A second study similar to the first was made using twenty-eight speakers and 28 non-speakers. The group of speakers was identical with the group in the first study with the exception of four individuals, but the control group was again picked at random with no regard to possible duplication with the control group of the first study. As before the groups were closely matched in the number of individuals from a given grade level. In this study, the grade averages for the winter quarter of the 1950-51 school year were used as the basis of comparison. The mean grade average of the speakers was found to be 2.95, and the mean grade average of the non-speakers was 2.45. As before the hypothesis that the speakers and the non-speakers were of equal scholastic achievement was tested and rejected. This study also supports the conclusion that speakers have a scholastic standing above non-speakers.

Although no attempt was made by the author to determine the cause of the difference between the speakers and the non-speakers, it is sufficient to note the degree of certainty of the results of the tests. While the exact degree of superiority of the speakers may be subject to some variation and some doubt, there can be very little doubt that the students who do participate in the forensics program are scholastically superior to those who do not. We cannot assign a cause-effect relationship because our figures will not tell us that participation in forensics was responsible for

(Continued on Page 63)
Louisiana Epsilon

WILLIAM S. SMITH, Northwestern State College

Northwestern State College of Louisiana, the home of the Louisiana Epsilon chapter of PKD is located in the oldest town in the Louisiana Purchase. Natchitoches (pronounced Nack-u-tish) has an extremely interesting history dating back to the days of armed conflict between the French and Spaniards in central Louisiana. The city was originally situated on the Red River, but the city and college are located on the bank of what is called Cane River Lake.

Northwestern, as it is commonly called in Louisiana, has its roots in a two-year normal school established in 1885 and originally housed in the buildings of an abandoned convent. In 1918 the two-year Normal became the Louisiana State Normal College, offering four years of work. The functions of the school widened still more through the years, and in 1944 the college embraced, as it does now, the schools of Arts and Sciences, Applied Arts and Sciences, and Education. The college prepares its students for admission to the leading graduate and professional schools of the nation and for full participation in the affairs of the country. The enrollment at Northwestern is approximately 1500 students.

The speech program at Northwestern is handled by three members of the Language Department faculty. Miss Stockwell, who teaches courses in interpretation, speech correction, and conducts clinical work in speech.
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Magic Living With Speech

MRS. HAROLD G. KRIEGER, Macalester College

Practical application of the forensic training received by two alumni of Macalester College (Minnesota Alph) is demonstrated by Marilyn Mason Walchuk, '51, and her mother Marion Daily Mason, '26, in their audience-participation show, "Magic Living," presented each day, 1:00-1:30 p.m., over radio station KYSM, Mankato, Minnesota.

While at Macalester College, both Marion and Marilyn were active in speech activities. As members of PKD, they participated in debate, extemporaneous speaking, and oratory. Marilyn and her partner, Janice Schneiter, '52, won the sweepstakes award at the PKD National Tournament at Oklahoma A. & M. Marilyn was also awarded superior in extemporaneous speaking and excellent in oratory. Just twenty-five years earlier, Marion Mason won first award in extemporaneous speaking at the Estes Park, Colorado, PKD tournament.

Marilyn was also very active in the college radio station and in all phases of college theatre. Both continued their speaking activities upon receiving their degrees from Macalester College. Mrs. Mason, a practicing attorney, has spoken throughout Minnesota for the AAUW and for the League of Women Voters. Marilyn became program director of radio station KYSM following her graduation. It was she who conceived the idea for the program "Magic Living."

"Meet the Masons, Marion and her daughter Marilyn, with a half hour of fun, prizes, and music. . . ." is the opening of the show by the announcer, Bob Gardner, to the background of Enjoy Yourself played on the organ by Bunny Just. Then Marilyn—or Marion, depending upon who can get to the mike first—begins, telling the Southern Minnesota audience about ways to enjoy life, tales of trips to other parts of the country, and about others who have contributed enjoyment to people in life. Drawings for prizes are held each Friday.

Mail attesting the listening enjoyment of the program comes from an increasing number of listeners each week. PKD can be justly proud of the vitality, the capability, the success of these two representatives from Macalester College who did their first practicing in PKD tournaments.

Magic Living on the Air: At left, behind the mike and stands are Marilyn Mason Walchuk and her mother, Marion Dailey Mason—daughter-mother team of their audience participation radio program.
For Better Discussions

DON BACHNER, St. Mary's College, (Minnesota)

Perhaps you, like I, have become somewhat discouraged at the dormant progress Discussion has made in the field of forensics. It appears that discussion groups have subordinated their primary purpose of an intelligent presentation of facts with the view of reaching a logical conclusion to a secondary position. In its place they have substituted a more selfish and less meritorious end of garnering the most points by being the most outspoken member of the discussion group.

Following this new prime purpose, some persons in discussion groups have blocked the efforts of other members to come to a reasonable solution of the problem before them. They constantly seek a monopoly of the floor—disrupting the discussion by attempting through a bombast of words to become the foremost member of the group supposedly followed by a massing of the ever-important points. All this results in little constructive and less intelligent solution of a pressing problem.

Recognition of the situation was evident in the novel management of the discussion events at the last National Convention at Oklahoma A. & M. It was, indeed, a progressive step forward. I would like to present a similar plan for your consideration.

Discussion groups would be organized in the same manner as in the past—but points would not be given to individuals in each discussion group. Instead each group would briefly compile its arguments and solutions. The judges from each group would then meet, consider the briefs from the different groups, and award points to the group (or groups) with the most constructive solutions. Or even a weighted point system could be established whereby points would be awarded individuals in each group as before with the added factor that the group (or groups) with the most intelligent solution would have their points doubled.

The main purpose in this proposal is not to detract from the speaking abilities of any individual in a discussion group, but rather to allow discussion groups to achieve a worthwhile end of permitting some to be heard for the sake of being heard instead of working progressively for a well-founded solution. Here we have replaced individualistic, selfish obstruction with group objectivity.

This proposal is offered in good faith and is certainly open to improvement. But I believe the adoption of this plan or something along that line will prevent the eventual death-knell of a presently lagging phase of forensics.

EDUCATION AND FORENSICS
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the higher scholastic achievement for it is equally likely that students participate in forensics programs because they have higher scholastic abilities.

To attempt to answer directly the initial question, what good does it do a student to participate in extra-curricular speech programs, on the basis on these statistics would be misleading. However, it is readily seen that such participation at least does not do the student much harm relative to the other students in the scholastic program. In view of the other evidence presented in this report together with the local study it appears quite likely that active participation in debating, discussing, public speaking—in short forensics—has considerable value both educationally and professionally and certainly has little or no adverse effect on the individual.
Discussion As An Intercollegiate Activity

JON M. ERICSON, Pacific Lutheran College

Since the merits of discussion, as opposed to debate, are, from time to time, both discussed and debated by my contemporaries in competitive forensics, it is with a degree of pleasure that I state my convictions on the subject without having to anticipate a rebuttal session to follow.

There should be no controversy between discussion and debate. They have different purposes and different places in the speech situation. The fault of many is in thinking that one can take the place of the other.

Discussion should be considered in two classifications: discussion as it theoretically exists and discussion as it exists in competitive tournaments.

The spirit and purpose of a true discussion is found in the interchange of ideas and facts to reach a common level of agreement. The nature of the discussion situation presupposes ideal conditions that are not found in a competitive tournament. A good discussion requires: (1) the participants must be well informed on the topic; (2) the participants must be seeking one goal, a general agreement based upon a synthesis of facts; (3) there must be unlimited time, or at least the meeting must not be hurried; (4) and finally, the participants must assert no convictions at the beginning of the discussion. Seldom are over half of these requirements met in a competitive discussion situation.

This does not mean that discussion is not useful to college students; but it does mean that good discussion is limited in a competitive situation, and impossible if we are given controversial topics upon which we have firm convictions. As an example, we can discuss what should be done about moral and ethical standards, but we must debate the problem of the government’s responsibility for its people.

It is difficult for me to justify the discussion enthusiasts’ idea that one must seek a level of agreement while considering any given topic. This philosophy appears absurd if applied to a topic that is dear to us, as our religion, our way of life, or our form of government, or any other matter in which we have beliefs or convictions. As an example, our informed political leaders are now debating certain issues which they present to the public. The public becomes informed by discussing the issues, but when John Q. reaches a conviction, he debates the issues himself. One must use debate techniques to uphold his own beliefs. To understand a problem we discuss it; to solve the problem we debate it. It seems that a man must lack integrity if he will enter a discussion situation in which he has firm convictions, and, for the benefit of the group, gives a little and takes a little until a common agreement is reached.

The whole philosophy of discussion falls in with the doctrine of giving up individual rights for group rights. On too many issues—political, ethical, and moral—this idea brings the common level of thought down to the lowest common-denominator of agreement. Unless the ideal conditions prevail, which I have mentioned, the discussion goal is a level of agreement that is acceptable to the masses. Thought, in a discussion situation, too often is controlled by the hierarchy of rules and regulations that dominate the discussion situation.

In summary, I believe that both discussion and debate should play a role in the thinking of college students. But let’s realize that they should be kept in their places. Let’s not try to discuss topics upon which convictions have been formed, but
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"When I came to college I knew that I wanted to become the best speaker in my class. All of the influence I would ever be able to exert would come through my ability to make others understand my points of view." This morning I was looking over a number of student orations given in past years. I was trying to find one in particular which had won our own Pi Kappa Delta National tournament. I didn't find that oration but I did find one of my own—I have quoted from it. I didn't succeed, but I've constantly tried to get others to succeed.

All of us are in the midst of the tournament season. In this gasping period between two big tournaments I think of the answers I have always given to the critics of such events. Tournaments are fascinating in potential—potential for new experiences, new friends, new ideas, experiments in testing, appreciation of the speaking skill of others, recognition of differences in viewpoints, the sharp shock of opposition, the fun of clash. Where could such a hurricane of "sound and fury" blow to the point of exhaustion and still wreak no lasting harm? Where could hundreds of keenly sharpened wits cut and cross and clash without dis FIGURING and without letting unwholesome quantities of blood? The tournament can be the greatest basic training camp we have. Nationally and internationally opinions battle us from every open chasm, we cannot allow ourselves to become deaf to the quiet, simple voice of "persuasion beautiful and just." Even in the turmoil of tournaments we can perceive the potential for acquiring the "ability to make others understand."

The only budgets which seem to be cut this year are those for forensics. The epidemic appears to be general. It doesn't have any evidences of being fatal though, and with Province tournaments coming in the next six weeks, we should each decide to get there even if we have to go on our own. Your Province Governors are planning for Conventions which will attract and interest everyone. This is your chance to climax the season with all of the spirit of Pi Kappa Delta friendliness and competition. A chapter not in attendance is a "weak-willed chapter with members who have not been pricked with the point of the meaning of Pi Kappa Delta.

Well, let me see what I've said so far—in the first two paragraphs I was semantically obscure, in the next paragraph I was obstinately dogmatic. In this paragraph I should give you the opinion from my side of the desk concerning the report of the Secretary and the status of the next National Convention. As you can see, we are given, by you, the task of getting another location for the 1953 Convention. A little background will post you on this decision by the National Council. In a meeting which we held in Chicago at the time of the Speech Association Meeting we decided that two factors would govern our choice of Convention Invitations. The first was that at least eighty of our chapters would need to be sure of attending, the second was that we would need at least 300 to 350 delegates. This decision was based on the belief that for the morale of our organization we could not afford a meagre attendance and that with a small attendance we would be faced with too large a deficit to keep a sound financial condition for our fraternity. At the time we held this meeting we did not have the results of the referendum; we were trying to think in terms of "the general welfare."

Now what do we do? We have written many letters inquiring about the possible facilities for a group as large as ours. So far every inquiry has met with a delighted response but a negative situation. The time has come for each of you, in your chapters, to get busy and become agents of investigation for us. We must announce the time and place in the May issue of The Forensic. This means that every member will be forced to put this foremost in his endeavor and get all available information to some member of the National Council within two weeks after reading this. This will give us a chance to see where our active people are. Remember, our whole fraternity created the problem, our whole fraternity is concerned, and our whole fraternity must furnish the solution.
From The Secretary's Desk

The 1953 National Convention Poll

One hundred fifteen chapters responded to the request for an expression of opinion on the location of the 1953 convention. The vote summary is as follows:

1. Do you favor holding the 1953 national convention at Pullman, Washington?
   

2. Regardless of your vote above, if the convention is held in Pullman will your chapter be represented?


   Three chapters voted to go to the west even though they voted “no” on question 2, believing that that section of the country should have the convention occasionally. Nineteen chapters voting “no” on question 1, voted “yes” on question 2.

   From the above figures and comments gleaned from the ballots several general observations may be made.

   1. The society is pretty evenly divided on the question of going to Washington.
   2. In general the small colleges with limited budgets were most heavily opposed.
   3. A majority of chapters in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Colorado, South Dakota, and the Northwest were in favor of Pullman.
   4. A majority of chapters in California, Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin were opposed.
   5. Illinois, Missouri and Kansas were evenly divided and the other states contributed only scattering replies.

   6. A convention can be held in Washington but it would be a small one. Many chapters indicating that they would be present said that they would bring small delegations.

   7. Several chapters voting against Pullman did so because they preferred a California location if they were going that distance to the west.

   8. Colorado, Oklahoma and Ohio were suggested most often as preferred sites if Pullman was rejected.

   The National Council is anxious to select a convention location before the close of the college year in June. One or two tentative invitations have been extended but there is little specific information yet. Colorado and Columbus appear to be out of the question. Many chapters would like to return to Oklahoma A. & M. soon but not in 1953. If your chapter wishes to invite Pi Kappa Delta to meet with you, get in touch with some member of the Council at once.

A New Key Order Blank

All requests for key order blanks will be filled with a completely new form developed by the Baltour Company and the secretary. It has many advantages over the old form, chief of which is the fact that the prices of all jewels and other items are printed on the order blank. At first the form may be confusing but if those filling orders will start in column one and add the prices in each column as they apply they should have little difficulty in reaching the correct price. A sample order on the new form is given on the opposite page.

Although four copies of the order will be made up in the national office it will be necessary for the chapter to send but one copy to the secretary. The copy may be any color.
Below are two sample key orders using the new form, which will have four key orders to a page. The first is the most common order: large size, fraternity in debate. The second is more involved: a small key, special distinction, two orders, white gold, with pin attachment. Cost is figured by adding the items checked plus 20% Federal Tax and 2% State Tax. The letters "n.c." mean "no charge."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF:</th>
<th>ORDER OF:</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Total Fed. Tax</th>
<th>Total State Tax</th>
<th>Add Charges For:</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity—Ruby Eye .75</td>
<td>Oratory—Ruby Circle .75</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Bright n.c.</td>
<td>Pin At.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>Handling [x]</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency—Debate—Pearl Circle n.c.</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Dull n.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Amethyst Eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor—Emerald Circle 1.00</td>
<td>Emerald Circle</td>
<td>Miniature</td>
<td>White 1.00</td>
<td>Gold add'l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. Distinction-Dia. Eye</td>
<td>Honorary</td>
<td>Pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Miniature Pin 3.50</td>
<td>Sapphire Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Small 8.00</td>
<td>2 Orders-Turq. Circle .50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Large 10.00</td>
<td>3 Orders-Dia. Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Miniature Pin 3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Small 8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Large 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. and Date: John R. Doe
(To be furnished by Nat'l Sec'y.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF:</th>
<th>ORDER OF:</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
<th>Total Fed. Tax</th>
<th>Total State Tax</th>
<th>Add Charges For:</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity—Ruby Eye .75</td>
<td>Oratory—Ruby Circle .75</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Bright n.c.</td>
<td>Pin At.</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>Handling [x]</td>
<td>17.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency—Instruction—Debate—Pearl Circle n.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Dull n.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Amethyst Eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor—Emerald Circle 1.00</td>
<td>Emerald Circle</td>
<td>Miniature</td>
<td>White 1.00</td>
<td>Gold add'l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. Distinction-Dia. Eye</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Miniature Pin 3.50</td>
<td>Sapphire Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Small 8.00</td>
<td>2 Orders-Turq. Circle .50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Large 10.00</td>
<td>3 Orders-Dia. Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Miniature Pin 3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Small 8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Large 10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. and Date: Mary Roe
(To be furnished by Nat'l Sec'y.)
Intercollegiate Discussion

JUDY GARRETTSON, Mississippi State College for Women

No matter how busily occupied college students are with their academic work and various campus activities, they can always spare a few moments for a good old-fashioned session of discussion whether it be a consideration of the possibility of peace in Korea or the poor quality of the food that is being served on the campus. Speech departments throughout the colleges and universities of our nation have recognized this enthusiasm for talking things over as they have developed discussion into a regular speech activity.

Is this organized form of discussion as popular with the students as the traditional “bull sessions?” How much real value and enjoyment are the participants receiving from their discussion activities? Are the students primarily interested in ratings or in an exchange of points of information? These are only several of the questions that come to mind when one is attempting to evaluate the true worthwhileness of discussion. If more students were aware of the need for evaluation and made suggestions as to ways of improving the methods employed in discussion, the caliber of this activity might be increased greatly, and discussion might play an even more important role in the speech program. Perhaps, by examining two types of discussion tournaments, it may be possible to determine some of the values and qualities necessary for effective discussion.

Here in the Southeast, the annual fall Alabama Discussion Tournament has served a very definite purpose in providing debaters with an opportunity to acquire a background of information, interpretations, and viewpoints that will be of help throughout the entire season of debate. Students learn to appreciate the ideas of others and to adjust their own ideas on the basis of the sound proof that is provided by the members of their discussion group. Everyone is more eager for useful information than they are for ratings. However, the awarding of excellent and superior ratings to the top fifteen per cent of the participants motivates each person taking part to put forth his best efforts as regards discussion techniques and contributions of worthwhile, relevant material and personal thoughts. Those students who try to impress the judges and monopolize the discussions are usually in the minority. Alabama’s use of the one-hour round has proved effective in that the participants can maintain their alertness and interest during this length of time.

At the national Pi Kappa Delta Convention in the spring of 1951, another type of discussion was employed as an experiment. In the discussion activities of this tournament, students were not rated since judges visited the groups merely as advisors. It was the general feeling of the group to which I belonged that this absence of rating produced a minimum amount of enthusiasm and motivation for real progress in problem solving. It was felt that participants were not as serious either in their attitude toward the extent of their preparation prior to entering the activity or their individual contributions to the discussion. On the basis of the experiences I had with my particular group, I would conclude that there was a tendency for more monopolizing by a few of the group members and for less organized consideration of the basic issues involved in the question than is usually the case in rated discussions. Both the lack of individual incentive and the extremely lengthy two-hour sessions produced a less satisfactory type of discussion.

(Continued on Page 80)
REPORT ON CONVENTION DISCUSSION
(Continued from Page 54)

9. Good knowledge of discussion procedure (1).
10. The group did an excellent job (5).
11. Let the Observer act as chairman (1).

Recorded student reactions are much less numerous, but not necessarily less significant. The committee selected to represent his group at the conclusion of round three was asked to solicit suggestions from his group members before the end of round four and turn them in to the contest committee. Only six groups sent in reports. All but one of these reports were prefaced with a statement praising the values of Discussion. There were no comments unfavorable to Discussion as an event. Three reports suggested that the committee provide more in the way of an outline and more detailed mechanics of procedure. Three reports favored the non-competitive arrangement and two believed that ratings should be given—at least to the top ten or fifteen percent. It was suggested that the basis for rating be, mainly, that of cooperation and objectivity. The comment was made that the Discussion question was too broad.

Oral comments by students and faculty heard and overheard in the convention halls before, during, and after the sessions do not alter the impressions acquired from the written reports. Several students reported that their attitudes toward the procedure used became more favorable from round to round. This seems to be substantiated by somewhat better reactions of Observers in the later rounds. Of course such a reaction is not unusual as a group progresses toward the solution stage of Discussion.

Your reporter, departing from that role momentarily, believes that the values to be acquired through intercollegiate Discussion are of no less importance than those to be gained from other forensic activities; that a discussion-committee session-legislative assembly sequence is educationally sound; and that the technique, research, knowledge and procedure necessary to implement such a sequence requires and deserves unlimited consideration by student and teacher. But each of these is a point of departure in itself. I am sure that the Editor of The Forensic and the National Council will welcome constructive suggestions for the improvement of Discussion as a forensic activity.

As I look back over the recorded comments of students and observers, it appears that nearly all unfavorable remarks would be eliminated if we could solve the problems of "lack of knowledge of discussion" and "lack of knowledge of the subject." Could there be a more appropriate solution to the problem of Discussion than this—"educate them?"

LOUISIANA EPSILON
(Continued from Page 61)

science, came to Northwestern in 1948 from Wisconsin where she was working on her Ph.D. degree. Mr. Carr teaches courses in drama and directs the college productions. He came from Iowa in 1949 where he completed his M.A. degree. William Smith, the other staff member, teaches courses in public speaking and directs debate. Mr. Smith is the Sponsor of Louisiana Epsilon and is a former member of the Illinois Pi chapter at Northern Illinois from which he graduated. Mr. Smith has an M.A. degree from Stanford University as well as additional work on the Ph.D. He came to Northwestern in 1950 as Director of Forensics.

Forensic activity at the college dates back to 1931. Seven students participated in eight intercollegiate debates that year. The intercollegiate clashes increased each year until 1940 when 29 students took part in 310 contests. Northwestern sponsors two tournaments and one debate clinic annually. The Louisiana Speech Tournament for college stu-

(Continued on Page 74)
So We Blame Discussion!

HUGO J. DAVID, Michigan State College

At debate-discussion conferences one frequently hears widespread dissatisfaction with the technique of group discussion. Frankness demands admitting that this complaining is not confined to debate enthusiasts alone.

It is strange that this should be so, especially when the group discussion method is used very extensively in business and the professions, when professional people highly recommend that college students learn the technique and method, and when such books as The Practical Application of Democracy by George B. de Huszar make such a strong case for it. Why then does this paradoxical situation exist? Is the desire to win so strong that it overshadows (in our conferences at least) the desire to find an acceptable solution to a common problem and the sense of accomplishment in having done so? To the many answers that have already been suggested for this problem in Speech Activities and elsewhere, several additions may not be amiss.

To begin, the definitions given in the standard texts on group discussion agree that it is an effort directed toward the "cooperative solution of a problem." Problem-solving, then, being its purpose, it should be evaluated in terms of its avowed objective, namely, the reasonableness and sufficiency of the solution the group decides to accept. But is this what we do in discussion conferences? Obviously not, for one glance at a number of typical judging blanks used at our conferences usually yields such items as knowledge of the subject, extent of participation, tact, objectivity, attitude, progress of the group toward its objective, and the like, and not one item devoted to evaluating the fundamental objective they arrive at, the solution.

What is the effect of having those items on the rating blank upon the persons being rated by them? Assuming that they want to make a good showing for themselves and for their school in the final tabulation of the ballots, they will want to conform to the pattern they are expected to follow. They sense that they need not be too concerned with the quality of the solution so long as they arrive at one with at least some mention of pertinent facts; they rather become interested in contributing enough information to impress the critic that they have read something, that they are congenial individuals not given to insolence or argument, that they give due consideration for the rights and privileges of others, and, in general, that they maintain good human relations during the session. And when they are through, do they care about the solution? Why should they? The critic doesn't. And when they finally leave the conference room they do it with the inescapable feeling that just being nice in order to fit the standard criteria on the critic's blank is so superficial and inane that they resolve never to participate in discussion again.

If the above analysis is correct, then group discussion surely does not deserve the damnation and ridicule it so frequently receives. Rather the fault lies with those of us who establish the judging criteria. Now, these coaches sincerely believe that since they are asking students to discuss in a conference which seeks to be educational, they are doing it to help the students learn how to solve problems and, therefore, the emphasis should be on the techniques. Actually this is an emphasis misplaced. If a reasonable and sufficient solution is decided upon, it may be through an excellent technique and an adroit handling of well-selected data, or it may be largely through chance. But chance will not hold great odds in this game of solving
intricate social problems. On the other hand, lacking a sufficient solution, the members of the group will soon discover that there must have been something amiss as they attempted to think the problem through. Once they are aware of the inadequacy of their product, a discussion of the shortcomings of individual participants, material, procedure, and technique becomes a meaningful venture. This failure constitutes for them a problem in itself, and because they are personally involved they are motivated to discover the answer to this new difficulty. Otherwise criticism from a judge is relatively meaningless in that it lacks purpose and a clear and significant frame of reference.

Were this approach used, the learning situation would be more meaningful to the discussants and they would not so readily resort to condemning group discussion as "tea time" or a "pooling of ignorance." Group discussion would then rightfully be taught as a problem-solving process rather than just a human relations technique.

A second difficulty seems to lie in the way "objectivity" is conceived. The fact that conference discussants do not concern themselves with substantial facts and only infrequently disagree on relatively insignificant matters leads one to believe that objectivity is thought to mean the complete absence of argumentation or weighing of evidence for opposite points of view in a discussing group. Rarely do they thoroughly weigh the merits of a point of view, thoroughly air and evaluate the support for those points, much less get to the basic reasons for the differences. Again, it is probably due in part to the items on the critic's blank, but, and more significantly, to the understanding the discussants seem to have of the term, "objectivity" — that they must first of all be nice to everybody and only incidentally hope that their efforts will be fruitful in terms of a solution.

Perhaps if we look briefly at the process of solving social problems, we shall see that objectivity, at least as described above, is neither possible nor desirable. What we consider the problem is usually a clash of ideas as to what is desirable. Someone believes the status quo satisfactory; reform elements regard it far from satisfactory and so want to establish a different and conflicting goal so that the goal is really the point at issue. To resolve such a conflict requires some means that will satisfy adequately both contending parties or that will reconstruct the beliefs of one or both parties to the conflict so as to make a common solution possible. In order to do that, however, we cannot omit from consideration those basic values each contending party holds and which compels him toward a particular goal, for it is just those values that guide and direct the course of his life. And those values come fundamentally into question when a course of action is to be decided upon; they predispose the person who holds them to a specific course of action, and a threat to them constitutes for him a threat to his ego and to his sense of security. And to the extent that this takes place—and it will except in matters of indifference to him—he can have no objectivity of the kind described above. Agreement short of agreement based on these fundamental values is no agreement at all.

In determining what is to be done in a question of policy, assuming we have described the symptoms of a problem, we need then to establish agreement on what our mutual goal shall be. Here lies the difficulty, for each of us is a different person, each has an individual background of information, experiences, meanings extracted from those experiences, preferences and prejudices, standards of value or philosophy of life. These dictate our choices as to what we regard desirable in action, because they constitute the principles which describe what we individually deem acceptable conduct. In disagreements, then, about what should be done in a given situation, we must
go back to these underlying assumptions as to what is desirable, examine them and the support for them, evaluate and compare them, try to establish common ground among them, sometimes perhaps try to reconstruct our own or those of a fellow discussant, in order to arrive at a common starting point from which we can work toward a really acceptable solution.

If we accept a proposed solution without agreeing on these basic principles, we accept a compromise or we just submit and "go along." Unfortunately neither of these is satisfying. Compromise is essentially a balance of power with neither side satisfied with the outcome, and it will probably last only as long as this balance of power lasts. As soon as one side believes it can force the other to accede to their demands, the ostensible peace no longer exists. Submission, too, fails in that those who submit do it involuntarily; it, therefore, begets disgruntlement and bitterness. In either event the discussion has failed. Yet is it not what discussion groups do when they believe that argumentation and evaluation of competing positions are ruled out by a misunderstanding of "objectivity"? Do they then blame the stupidity of other discussants or the "tea time" technique of much small talk about nothing?

One or more of the texts in group discussion points out that objectivity is more of an ideal to be striven for than something easily attained. Yet if some kind of objectivity is a required characteristic of those engaged in problem-solving discussion, it cannot mean deliberately refraining from presenting opposing points of view and of settling conflicts between basic principles. If it does mean that, either we have no objectivity as people today are, or we have no real solving of problems involving people who have private value-systems. Not to examine the basic and guiding principles of individuals is to freedom any discussion of means to failure, barring accident; to examine them is to clash, probably, and to argue and, in a judged conference, get a low rating on the judging blank. What, then, might objectivity mean?

Perhaps it should be defined as a willingness to give different points of view a hearing, to admit the cogency of contrary, well substantiated arguments, to present one's own reasons for group scrutiny, and to try to see them as others see them. Negatively, it should then mean refraining from bickering about minutiae of definition, refusing to let an opposing argument be introduced, arguing just to be arguing, getting even with someone who disagreed with us before, becoming highly emotional about one's beliefs when these are under examination, side-tracking the discussion so as to circumvent the real issues, or trying tooth-and-nail to inflict our own point of view upon others whether they want it or not.

If this kind of examination of basic assumptions is fruitless and no agreement or reconstruction can be accomplished, then the difficulty will have to remain temporarily unsolved; perhaps time will enable one or the other of the parties of the conflict to adapt his ideas sufficiently to permit agreement to come about in a future conference. Agreement on a less substantial basis than that will be only superficial at best; and anything less than real agreement will not result in a constructive program of action which all will wholeheartedly support.

DO YOU KNOW—

1. The meaning of the Greek phrase Peitho Kale Dikaia?
2. How many states have PKD chapters?
3. What degree and order are indicated by a key with a diamond set in the eye and a pearl set in the upper center?
4. How many classes of membership there are in PKD?
5. When and where the first chapter of PKD was established?
Ridin' The Provinces

It's with a great deal of pleasure that this issue of The Forensic includes a number of articles written by student members of PKD. It is my belief The Forensic should promote PKD, and foster improved forensic ethics. While I hope The Forensic under my editorship will not be considered a mere gossip sheet, I believe one of the best ways to promote our speech honorary is for its publication to contain information about chapter activities and personnel. In regard to improving forensic ethics and standards, the many favorable comments received on the debate articles contained in the January issue indorse the belief that we are moving in the right direction. I hope the student articles by CHARLES GRANDY, DON BACHNER, JON ERICSON, LES NEWVILLE, AND JUDY GARRETSON (two others were promised but didn't arrive) will stimulate you to put your ideas in print. The closer The Forensic comes to being a part of you, the better it becomes for you!

SEEN HERE AND THERE—

On January 14, I had a had a very pleasant visit with DR. and MRS. FREDERICK B. McKAY, retired members of the Speech Department of Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Michigan. They were on their way to Florida and stopped in Columbus to visit our college. Dr. McKay was chairman and professor of speech at Michigan State Normal College from 1911-44, received the first Ph.D degree in speech from Michigan University, established the Michigan Epsilon chapter in 1921, served as Governor of the Province of the Lakes during the '30's, and was director of oratory of the Michigan Intercollegiate Speech League for six years.

Paul Billing, Hiram College (Ohio, '47); M. A. degree, University of Alabama; past coach of debate at North Texas State College (Eta); now director of forensics at Mobile Center of the University of Alabama. Paul and his debaters were attending the Deep South Debate Conference Tournament, University of Mississippi, February 18.

Dr. B. L. Parkinson, honorary member of PKD, has announced he will retire, after 20 years service, as President of Mississippi State College for Women at the end of the present school year.

I HEAR—

I am including part of a very interesting letter I received which I think many of you will enjoy.

"I have been interested in PKD ever since about 1924, when I began handling the job of printing The Forensic. I supervised the printing of the magazine for about 20 years. One of the editors during that time persuaded the fraternity to give me the degree of honorary member, in appreciation for the assistance I had been giving the editors. I prize the honor very highly. Anyone who has been in business as long as I have has a high appreciation of the work being done by PKD. The ability to "stand up on your hind feet and say what you have to say" without using the maverick words "er" and "uh" is so rare that I wish there were ten thousand chapters of PKD. As for my schooling: Five years of my life were spent in school. I ended up just barely inside the eighth grade. The only "honor" I remember is that of receiving a note to my father that if I did not "leave the books alone" (that year the grade I was in was being accommodated in a library) I would be expelled. (What an opportunity that teacher missed to really introduce me to books and encourage reading!)

Yours truly,
W. A. BERRY
825 West Olive Street
Fort Collins, Colorado."

Colorado State College of Education (Beta): ARDAITH EVANS PIERCE, '33, head of the department of speech and director of debate and dramatics, Duncan U. Fletcher High School, Jacksonville Beach, Florida. She writes, "I feel intercollegiate forensics was excellent training for me and perhaps my most valuable college experience. I am equally enthusiastic about what a good program may achieve for high school students."
North Texas State College (Eta): past director of forensics and sponsor of the PKD chapter, MRS. OLIVE M. JOHNSON has retired. J. REX WEIR is the new director and sponsor.

Carroll College (Wisconsin Beta): GARRET DETTMAR, '50, has been stationed in Korea for fourteen months as a member of the Marines; DAVE ZIEHM is a pharmaceutical salesman for a druggist's supply house and travels Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

Bradley University (Illinois Delta): JOE SMITH, past president of local PKD chapter is now teaching speech and coaching debate for the American Institute of Banking in Chicago.

Southwestern Louisiana Institute (Gamma): DR. ROY D. MURPHY, past associate editor of The Forensic, writes he is back at work after several days in the hospital following a bus accident in which he and his debaters were riding on their return from the Millcaps Debate Tournament, Jackson, Mississippi.

I wonder where the Beta PKD's from Arizona State College and Wheaton College (Illinois) Mu members went on their trips, who they debated, and what happened?

McPherson College (Kansas Omicron): DALE M. STUCKY and DONALD R. NEWKIRK have been admitted into the partnership of the law firm of Fleeson, Gooing, Coulson, and Kitch of Wichita, Kansas. Both Stucky and Newkirk are charter members of Kansas Omicron. Both are graduates of the University of Chicago Law School, Stucky was editor of the Chicago Law Review, Newkirk was on the Board of Editors. ROY McAULEY, debate coach, has been appointed acting head of the English department. WAYNE GEISERT, charter member of the Omicron chapter, is teaching in the economics department at Manchester College. He received his Ph.D. degree from Northwestern University last summer.

Most of the PKD Province Tournaments will be held during March and April. Will you make it possible to include the results of those tournaments in the May issue? Copy is due in the hands of the printer on the first of the month, so send your results immediately following the close of your tournament! We would also like to see who won what.

Well, we at MSCW have just tied up the sixth Magnolia Speech Tournament for college and university women. We had a good time, the grass was green, the weather warm, and the camellias were in bloom; but a deadline is a deadline, and this is March 1, so here goes the March issue to Birmingham with 'thanks for again filling the ole mail pouch' and making the Ridin' easier and newsier.'

Your Editor.

LOUISIANA EPSILON

(Continued from Page 69)

dents was first held in 1936 and has been repeated each year since that time. The Seventeenth Annual Louisiana Speech Tournament will be March 20-22 this year.

In 1938 Northwestern began sponsoring the High School Speech Tournament and has continued it also throughout the years. This year it will sponsor the 15th Annual High School Tournament February 8 and 9. In another effort to stimulate speech work in the high schools of Louisiana, Northwestern held its fifth annual Debate Clinic on November 10.

The Northwestern squad has attended the East Central tournament at Ada, Oklahoma and the Millcaps College tournament at Jackson, Mississippi, this fall. Other tournaments on their itinerary include speech meets at Louisiana State University, Baylor University, and the Province Tournament of PKD. Northwestern received its chapter of PKD last summer and has not attended any of the fraternity tournaments. The members of the local chapter are looking forward to meeting other members of PKD at the Province this year and at the National next year.
CHAPTER NOTES

NORTH CAROLINA BETA
Wake Forest College began its 1951-52 debating season by sponsoring a one-day tournament and workshop for inexperienced debaters from schools in the Carolinas. First place awards went to South Carolina, Davidson, Duke, and Wake Forest.

At the Florida Invitational Tournament held in Gainesville, Wake Forest affirmative team composed of Virgil Moorefield and Kay Arant was rated the best affirmative team in the tournament and received the honor of participating in a radio debate with Mississippi University who had the best negative team.

At the Miami Invitational held in Miami, Florida, February 7-9, Wake Forest negative, composed of Clara Ellen Francis and Joe Mauney, was undefeated in seven preliminary rounds and the finals to take first place honors over Florida State University's affirmative team.

Debaters Kay Arant, Glenn Garrison, and Roger Cole have qualified for membership in PKD. Second semester plans include attending the South Atlantic Forensic Tournament, Hickory, N. C., and the tournament director of debate Franklin R. Shirley, governor of Southeast Province of PKD, is planning for the bi-annual province tournament.

WISCONSIN ZETA
One of the newest chapters of PKD has had a most interesting program of speech activities recently. At the request of the commanding officer in charge of recruiting for Northern Wisconsin, the sergeants who visited high schools throughout the state were brought to Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire for a speech session of training sponsored by the Eau Clair PKD group. In cooperation with the Blood Program Committee of the Eau Claire Chapter, American Red Cross, PKD members volunteered to supply speakers to appear before any civic gathering requested by the Red Cross. Another community service of the Eau Claire chapter is in connection with the Chippewa Valley Forum, one of the well established and nationally recognized community forums. The members of PKD donate free usher-
ing service for each meeting of the forum. PKD members also assist with the judging of high school speech affairs throughout the area.

The Wisconsin Zeta chapter members have also been active in inter-collegiate forensics. At the Bradley University tournament, they were awarded five superior and 19 excellent certificates. Superior awards went to one undefeated debate team, Roy Allen for after-dinner speaking, Roma Kranzfelder in oratory, and Joan Reidy in extempe speaking and folktales. At the Red River Falls tournament, Eau Claire won the second sweepstake award with a first (Kranzfelder and Reidy) and third in B Division debate, Kranzfelder a second in oratory, and Reidy a first in impromptu speaking. At the Iowa State Teachers’ College tournament, Cedar Falls, two debate teams consisting of George Gerner and Ron Allen and Norbert Tiachac and Dick Whalen were undefeated; Reidy and Kranzfelder won three of four debates; freshmen debaters Ralph Zimmerman and Mary Ellen Jenks won three of four debates; Gerner, Reidy, and Allen received superior ratings in discussion, and Gerner, Jenks, Kranzfelder, and Reidy received superior ratings in extempe speaking.

MINNESOTA BETA

St. Olaf College debaters placed second in the annual Red River Valley Tournament at Moorhead, Minnesota, and first in A Division debate and second in B Division at the Eighth Annual Eau Claire Speech Meet. Anita Erickson placed first in oratory and Ruth Michaelson was second in impromptu speaking at the Red River Valley Tournament. Sweepstakes honors at the Eau Claire tournament also went to St. Olaf. David Hardy and Roy Peterson were the debaters who won first in A Division.

MINNESOTA BETA

On February 8-9, students of the College of St. Catherine participated in the annual Red River Valley Tournament at Moorhead State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minnesota, with Barbara Seng and Nancy Adams winning four of six debates, and Patricia Reding placing fourth in oratory. On the following weekend, the squad took high honors in the Wisconsin State College speech tournament at Eau Claire. Seng won top honors and the trophy in discussion; Lael Dudley placed second in extempe; Patricia Reding, third in oratory; Adams and Mary Lou Falvey, fifth in after dinner speaking and folklore, respectively; and Dudley and Seng, fifth in debate to compile a third place tie for sweepstakes honors. Dudley and Seng were named to the All Discussion team. St. Catherine was the only all girls school among the 29 colleges and universities who participated in the Eau Claire tournament and the only school to place finalists in all individual events.

WASHINGTON GAMMA

So far in 1951-52, Washington State College has engaged in two tournaments. At the regional tournament in Spokane, two Washington State College women’s teams tied with a team from Seattle University for first place and won the women junior division in the Inland Empire Tournament. To date, Washington State College has won 76 debates and lost 49.

IOWA BETA

Central College held its six-school central Iowa practice tournament on February 12. Representatives from Coe College (Theta), Drake University (Mu), Grinnell College, Iowa State College, Simpson College (Epsilon), and Central College (Beta) participated in the tournament.

Central debaters who participated in the meet included Shirley Kooistra, John Korver, Alvin Poppen, Geraldine Punt, Geraldine Van Houweling, and Ron Zoutendam.

The Central forensic program for the spring includes attending the University of Nebraska tournament, the Iowa Forensic, and the PKD Provincial at Cape Girardeau, Missouri.
OHIO IOTA

Top laurels at the Tenth Buckeye Tourney were shared by Case Tech of Cleveland and Kent State University, the host school. Each team won seven out of eight debates; both suffered their only loss in the last round. Twenty-eight colleges from six states vied for the championship. The top debaters received certificates of merit. Seven colleges ended up in second place with six and two records. The victories boosted Kent State’s record to eighteen wins in 22 varsity debates. Kent State has one first and two seconds in three tournaments this year.

Future tourneys are the Men’s Ohio Conference Tourney in Columbus, the Mt. Mercy Tourney in Pittsburgh, the Northeastern Ohio District Varsity at Kent, the Great Lakes at Bowling Green State, and the Pi Kappa Delta provincial tournament. The Ohio Iota Chapter is planning for the annual initiation which will be held early in March and for the annual recognition banquet which is scheduled for May.

WASHINGTON EPSILON

Pacific Lutheran College debate squad attended the Western Speech Association Tournament at Fresno, California, and the team of Jon Ericson and Bill Rieke, both Special Distinction members of PKD, won first in senior men’s debate with seven wins and no defeats. Bill Rieke won first in senior men’s impromptu, and Alan Hatlen won second in senior men’s extempe. PLC, having no women entered, won second place in sweepstakes. In the junior division, the girls’ team of Joanne Schief and Janet Carson won four out of six debates. Schief won first in junior women’s extempe and John Osburn won second in men’s extempe, junior division, totaling for third place sweepstakes, junior division.

Pacific Lutheran College was host, January 12, to the visiting team from Australia. The question debated was, Resolved: That Federalism is more of a good servant than it is a bad master.

On January 14 and 15, Ericson, Hatlen, and Rieke were representa-

Royce Hanson and C. H. Spearman (third and fourth from left) of Oklahoma Central State College receive men’s championship trophy, Millsaps College Debate Tournament, from director, Dr. E. S. Wallace. Second place winners (at left) are Mike Earney and Maurice Schnorr of North Texas State College.
tives at the Vanport Town Meeting Tournament. They spoke before audiences in the discussion form of presentation and were judged by the audiences. Ericson won first place for the second consecutive year being the first man to repeat this win. Hatlen won second place and Rieke, seventh; the three combining to win the sweepstakes by a comfortable margin for the second consecutive year.

ILLINOIS PI

The forensic students at Northern Illinois State Teachers College opened their 1951-52 intercollegiate season by attending the Bradley University tournament, November 16-17, where Patricia Schofield and Gladys Anderson were undefeated in debate, and Schofield was one of five to receive a superior in discussion. Results of members of the squad who received excellent ratings were Virginia Kirby and Lois Nordboe in discussion, Herbert Hadesman and Charles McNames in debate, and McNames and Anderson in extempe speaking.

On December 15, McNames, vice-president of PKD chapter, assisted the speech faculty in its annual Clinic and Forensic Tournament for high schools.

As a part of the intra-mural speech program, an extemporaneous speaking contest was held January 29, and the Selke Oratorical Contest on February 4.

WASHINGTON BETA

Seattle Pacific College sent three debate teams to the Western Association Teachers of Speech Tournament at Fresno, California, during Thanksgiving week. The junior women's team of Esther Pearson and Ilys Klopfenstein placed first in their division.

The second annual Northwest Invitational Speech Tourney was held at Seattle Pacific, January 4-5, and was sponsored jointly by the local chapter of PKD and the forensic department. Competition was held in junior, senior, and one-man debate, oratory, impromptu, interpretative reading, and extempe. Unusual shows shortly before the tourney opened reduced the participation to twelve colleges, Whitworth (Washington Delta), Centralia J. C., Seattle University, Pacific Lutheran (Washington Epsilon), St. Martin's, The College of Puget Sound (Washington Alpha), Conzaga University, Everett J. C., Western Washington College of Education (Zeta), Northwest Bible Institute, and Seattle Pacific. Trophy winners were: junior debate—Shiela Ryan and Madean Taylor, College of Puget Sound; senior debate—Arlis Johnson and Larry Grotz, College of Puget Sound; one-man debate—Hugh Haefker, St. Martin's; impromptu—Hugh Haefker, St. Martin's; extempe—John Rydgren, Pacific Lutheran; oratory—John Rydgren, Pacific Lutheran; and interpretative reading—Weldon Ferry, Whitworth.

ILLINOIS CHI

Nine colleges from Missouri, Indiana, and Illinois attended the Greenville College debate tournament December 8. Wheaton College (Illinois Mu), with a record of eight wins and no losses, took home the trophy.
WISCONSIN BETA

The Carroll College chapter of PKD has been very active this year, both in participating in tournaments and sponsoring meets and social functions on the campus in order to enlarge the chapter and its budget. The debaters have participated in tournaments at the University of Illinois at Navy Pier in Chicago and at Whitewater, Wisconsin, and expect to attend tournaments at Eau Claire, the University of Wisconsin, and the PKD Provincial at Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

This year, for the first time, the Beta chapter sponsored a high school invitational debate tournament in the early part of January. Schools were invited on the basis of successes in state and district tournaments so that only the outstanding seven high school teams were represented. The young people came to the college on Friday and remained until Saturday noon. The program included four rounds of debate, two elimination rounds of after dinner speaking, a banquet Friday evening, and free movie tickets. Many Waukesha firms donated banquet favors such as pencils, flash lights, and rulers. On Saturday, awards were presented to the winning team, the outstanding debater, and the winning after dinner speaker. Eugene R. Moulton, Head of the Speech Department, directed the meet and was assisted by Annette Avers as student director.

On March 15th, the Beta chapter sponsored the Coffier-Miller Marionettes in their presentation of Sheridan's "The Rivals." The money raised will be used to help pay expenses to the National PKD Convention next year.

ILLINOIS SIGMA

In the Fifteenth Annual Intercollegiate Debate Tournament held at Eastern Illinois State College at Charleston, February 2, five of forty teams went through the tournament undefeated. These teams, each winning all four debates, represented the following schools: De Pauw University, Illinois College, Principia College, University of Illinois, and the University of Illinois (Navy Pier).

Other schools participating were: Bradley University, Eastern Illinois State College, Greenville College, Millikin University, Illinois State Normal University, Southern Illinois University, and Western Michigan College of Education.

Henry Lee Ewbank, Jr., who joined the speech faculty at Eastern Illinois this year, is director of forensics.

Ralph Zimmerman (right), Eau Claire State (Wis.), first place winner in after dinner speaking, receives congratulations of Eugene Isaacson, River Falls State (Wis.), second place winner.

ILLINOIS DELTA

Bradley University held its fifth annual Speech Tournament, November 16 and 17. Despite a major snowstorm from out of the north, thirty-six schools were represented from eight states. Twenty-four were PKD schools. Tau Kappa Alpha was represented by Cornell College and Western Michigan. Northwestern, Illinois, Carleton, and Knox upheld the honor of Delta Sigma Rho.

Certificates of award for Superior and Excellent performance were given in debate, discussion, oratory, extempore, after dinner speaking, radio newscasting, and folklore telling. St. Olaf, the only school to win all of its debates, received two superior awards in that event. Colleges receiving the greatest number of awards in all events were: Eau Claire, Illinois, Northwestern Schools, Notre Dame, and Bradley.
The tournament was sponsored by the Illinois Delta chapter and was directed by Joan Severns, chapter president. More than two hundred students worked on committees and served as chairman and timekeepers.

KANSAS ACTIVITIES

Wichita University had the only undefeated team at the McPherson College (Kansas Omicron) Economy Debate Tournament, January 12th.

The Kansas Intercollegiate Debating League Tournament was held at Betheny College (Kansas Mu) March 15. The State Province oratory and extemore contests for men and women were held in conjunction with the Debating League Tournament.

McPherson College is sending a full entry list to the PKD Provincial Tournament, March 27-29.

MISSISSIPPI GAMMA

Seventy representatives from colleges and universities from four states participated in debate, extemopaneous speaking, discussion, oral reading, and original oratory at the Magnolia Speech Festival for Women, Mississippi State College for Women, February 29 and March 1.

The debaters from Purdue University won top honors with seven wins out of eight. The tournament was sponsored by the local chapter of PKD and was under the direction of Valerie Threlkeld, president of the gamma chapter.

INTERCOLLEGIATE DISCUSSION

(Continued from Page 68)

However, I would like to mention the successfulness of the final round which was in the form of a convention with all the groups participating. At this meeting, the students were given an opportunity to present speeches of advocacy for the resolutions adopted by their groups. A vote was taken to determine the final decision of the entire discussion tournament.

After examining these two types of discussion, one becomes more aware that discussion still lies a great distance from a state of perfection and is at best a synthetic situation.

Perhaps a new method of discussion could be experimented with in which the purpose of discussion, to provide training in the techniques of individual and group consideration of a problem, could be more satisfactorily accomplished. The first two rounds might be devoted to viewing the problem and determining the criteria, and the last three rounds might be spent in considering three previously announced possible solutions to the question and concluding with an expression by the group of the solution they felt to be most advantageous. It would be permissible for any of the groups to amend the original form of the submitted solutions to meet their specific ideas. Then, too, besides the rating given each individual on the basis of that person’s abilities, a separate rating could be given the entire group as an indication of the ability of the group to work closely together as a unit. By also grading the group, each person would be more conscious of his individual responsibility to the group.

We, as speech students, can contribute our share toward the development of a more profitable form of discussion by evaluating discussion as it exists today and by experimenting with discussion as it may exist in the near future.

DISCUSSION AS AN INTERCOLLEGIATE ACTIVITY
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let us benefit from good discussions before convictions are established. Perhaps we can learn from our collegiate experience with both, that if you want to win friends, discuss; if you want to influence people, debate.