

July 2018

Complete Issue 8(3)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/speaker-gavel>



Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1971). Complete Issue 8(3). *Speaker & Gavel*, 8(3), 62-88.

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Speaker & Gavel* by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

et al.: Complete Issue 8(3)

SPEAKER AND GAVEL



VOLUME 8, NUMBER 3

MARCH, 1971

SPEAKER and GAVEL

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS
By ALLEN PRESS, INC.

Second-class postage paid at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 66044
Issued in November, January, March and May. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them to: "The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha."

The membership fee is \$10.00. The official key of 10K (size shown in cut on this page) is \$6.25, or the official keypin of 10K is \$7.50. Cut diamond in key is \$7 additional. **Prices include**



Federal Tax. Individual key orders add 50c. The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of SPEAKER and GAVEL. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive SPEAKER and GAVEL for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive SPEAKER and GAVEL may subscribe at the standard rate of \$5.00 per year.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California
Vice President: AUSTIN J. FREELEY, John Carroll University
Secretary: THEODORE J. WALWIK, Slippery Rock State College
Treasurer: KENNETH G. HANCE, Michigan State University
Trustee: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico
Historian: HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: JOHN A. LYNCH, St. Anselm's College; RAYMOND BEARD, State University of New York at Cortland; GEORGE F. HENIGAN, George Washington University; JOSEPH C. WEATHERBY, Duke University; THOMAS LUDLUM, Capital University; VERNON R. McGUIRE, Texas Tech University; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; BERNARD L. BROCK, University of Minnesota; GEORGE ADAMSON, University of Utah; ROBERT GRIFFIN, University of Nevada.

Members at Large: ANNABEL HAGOOD, University of Alabama; PETER KANE, State University of New York at Brockport; LEROY LAASE, University of Nebraska.

ACHS Representative: H. L. EWBANK, JR., Purdue University.

Representative on SAA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: AUSTIN J. FREELEY, John Carroll University.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 46135.

Associate Editors: BERNARD BROCK, University of Minnesota; DON CAGE, Texas Tech University; MALTHON M. ANAPOL, University of Delaware.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 8 March, 1971 Number 3

Editor's Page 62

Debating Ability, Critical Thinking Ability, and Authoritarianism—*Charles R. Gruner, Richard C. Huseman, and James L. Luck* 63
 "The relationship tends to extend to each of the specific critical thinking abilities as measured by the five Watson-Glaser sub-tests."

A Survey of Attitudes on the Spread—*Donald O. Olson* 66
 "As long as judges continue to give high ratings and wins to teams that resort to this practice, we can expect teams to continue spreading."

CURRENT CRITICISM: Old Rhetoric in Old Bottles—*Dan F. Hahn* . . . 70
 "Based upon his political beliefs and personality, Nixon's rhetorical strategies seem to be habitual."

STUDENT FORUM: That Reality Gap and the Rhetoric of Distortion—*John S. Nelson* 73
 "It is the very same rhetoric of distortion now so popular in college debating that has caused protesters to despair of the rhetoric of 'rational discourse.'"

Message To Student Members—*James C. Swartz* 79

Reports of the Regions 80

Minutes of National Council Meetings 82

Chapters and Sponsors 86

LOOK AHEAD!

ANOTHER GREAT NATIONAL CONFERENCE

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, N. M.

March 29–April 1, 1972

EDITOR'S PAGE

The Audience Has Permission

For the second straight issue, we are publishing an essay which is a response to an article which appeared in these pages one year ago consisting of reflections by Wayne Brockriede on "College Debate and the Reality Gap."

These two recent articles do not constitute the only reverberations from Brockriede's provocative remarks which have appeared in print. For instance, the September issue of *Indiana Speech Notes* contained a debate between Nicholas Cripe and Victor Powell on the educational value of tournament debating, and Brockriede's article was cited, approvingly, by both of the disputants. Furthermore, since we are not beyond button-holing people to get reactions to the contents of *Speaker and Gavel*, we know that other responses along the approval-disapproval continuum are in circulation.

All of this points up the fact that *Speaker and Gavel* is addressed to an audience, a relatively specific audience. Although we aspire to certain scholarly standards with their implication of objectivity and impersonality, we have no illusion that we are affecting the lives of all mankind nor a desire to reach some anonymous "to whom it may concern." For the most part we know who you are and in many instances can call you by name.

Thus we all, readers and editors alike, share certain interests which are reflected in the materials of *Speaker and Gavel*. For instance, we think that we join in a common concern for current criticism of the practices and practitioners of the public discourse. We are all interested in the theory of argumentation and of rhetorical theory generally, approached both humanistically and behavioristically. Likewise, the forms and management of educational forensics are in greater and lesser degrees still a part of our lives.

The print media are not particularly conducive to repartee, but an audience implies response. Thus, we have been delighted to see the response to Brockriede's article, and we hope that the dialogue engendered by it goes on and on. Reactions to other items have frequently reached our ears.

It might be noted that some other things which we have published seem to have disappeared without a gluggle. Perhaps only our obliviousness caused us not to note the dialogue which they may have occasioned.

Anyway, overt manifestations of audience response, such as the ones we have mentioned here, are always welcomed by the authors and by the editorial staff. The members of the audience have permission to talk among themselves and to talk back to us.

Robert O. Weiss

DEBATING ABILITY, CRITICAL THINKING ABILITY, AND AUTHORITARIANISM

CHARLES R. GRUNER, RICHARD C. HUSEMAN, AND JAMES I. LUCK

The relationship between debate ability and critical thinking ability has frequently been examined by researchers. One of the earlier studies in this area was undertaken by Howell. He sought to determine the effects of high school debating on the critical thinking gains by high school debaters. Howell found that after the experimental period of six months, debaters out-gained non-debaters in critical thinking scores. However, the critical ratio of the difference in the mean gains was only 1.04. Howell concluded that since a minimum critical ratio of 2.00 was required for significance he could not conclude that high school debaters were certain to outgain non-debaters.¹ In 1948 Brembeck reported the results of his research to determine the possible effects of a college argumentation course on critical thinking ability. Using experimental and control groups at eleven different colleges he found that the students in the argumentation group made significantly higher gains in critical thinking ability than did the control group.² Tame examined the relationship between critical thinking ability and performance in contest debate. He found that those debaters having greater ability in critical thinking ability had demonstrated ability to excel in contest debate.³ Jackson studied 100 debaters and 147 non-debaters from nine colleges and universities. He found that after the test period debaters out-gained non-debaters in critical thinking ability at the .05 level of significance.⁴ And Bradley and Mulvany demonstrated that debaters scored significantly higher in logical reasoning than a control group of non-debaters.⁵ In summary, the above studies and others like them indicate a general conclusion: that frequently there is a significant relationship between debate ability and critical thinking ability.

The purpose of the present study was to again examine the relationship between debate ability and critical thinking ability. Specifically, this study was aimed at finding whether the relationship between debate and critical thinking ability extends to each of the specific critical thinking abilities as measured by the five sub-tests of the Watson-Glaser test. In addition, the present study undertook to examine the relationship of debate ability and "authoritarianism" as measured by the California F Scale.

Mr. Gruner (Ph. D., Ohio State, 1963) is an Associate Professor and Mr. Huseman (Ph. D., University of Illinois, 1965) is an Associate Professor and Director of Forensics at the University of Georgia; Mr. Luck (M.A., University of Georgia, 1970) is Director of Forensics at Texas Christian University.

¹ William S. Howell, "The Effects of High School Debating on Critical Thinking," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1942.

² Winston L. Brembeck, "The Effects of a Course in Argumentation on Critical Thinking Ability," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1947.

³ Ellwood R. Tame, "An Analytical Study of the Relationships Between Ability in Critical Thinking and Ability in Contest Debate and Discussion," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Denver, 1958.

⁴ Ted R. Jackson, "The Effects of Intercollegiate Debating on Critical Thinking Ability," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

⁵ Earl E. Bradley and Annette M. Mulvany, "Logical Reasoning and Success in Speech Contests," *The Forensic*, 50 (October, 1964), 9-15.

Table 1
Means of Four Groups on Authoritarianism and Watson-Glaser Scores
and Sub-scores

QUARTILE:	First	Second	Third	Fourth	F
<i>SCORE:</i>					
Authoritarianism	90.5	98.7	100.0	98.7	2.04
Watson-Glaser:					
Total	80.9	76.6	73.8	69.0	10.19**
Inference	12.9	12.8	12.0	11.0	3.31*
Recognition of Assumptions	13.0	12.2	11.4	10.7	2.68
Deduction	21.6	20.9	19.6	18.3	7.69**
Interpretation of Arguments	21.2	20.0	19.5	18.1	9.09**
Evaluation of Arguments	11.9	10.7	11.2	9.8	5.33**

* = $P < .05$.

** = $P < .01$.

Procedures

Data-gathering. All data were gathered during the two weeks of the Fourth Annual University of Georgia High School Debate Workshop in the summer of 1969. A total of 128 high school debaters attended, but complete data for this report became available from only 120 of them.

On the first day of the workshop the debaters completed a 28-item version of the California F Scale, which measures "authoritarianism," a trait which is usually described as social and political conservatism coupled with a willingness to accept the prescriptions of authority figures. It is a personality characteristic which correlates negatively with intelligence as measured by paper-and-pencil IQ tests.⁶

On that first day the debaters also completed the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal Form YM. This test yields an overall score specifying "critical thinking ability" as well as sub-scores which the authors assume measure five separate critical thinking abilities: Inference (I), Recognition of Assumptions (RA), Deduction (D), Interpretation of Arguments (IA), and Evaluation of Arguments (EA).

After the workshop, the debate coaches who served as critic-judges for the event's tournament were assembled. They were asked to separate the 120 debaters they had heard debate into four groups of debate ability: those in the top quartile, those in the second, third, and bottom, or fourth quartile. Each debater was placed into a particular quartile only when a majority of coach-critic-judges who had heard him debate agreed upon his quartile standing. This somewhat crude technique was used rather than some form of rating because of the large number of debaters involved, and was preferred over won-lost records because of the impossibility of equating wins and losses with *individual* debating ability rather than two-person *team* ability.

⁶ F. N. Jacobson and S. Rettig, "Authoritarianism and Intelligence," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 50 (1959), 213-219.

Data analysis. Each of the seven sets of scores, the authoritarianism, Watson-Glaser total, and five Watson-Glaser sub-scores, for each of the four quartiles of debate ability were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance in order to determine whether the means of the four groups differed a statistically significant amount. That is, the tests were to determine whether the differences among the means for each set of scores are probably due to the criterion used to group them (debating ability) and not to chance alone. The means of the four groups are presented in Table 1, along with the statistical notations.

A priori reasoning dictated that on authoritarianism the first percentile would score lowest and that each succeeding lower group would score higher. This was not quite the case, but a clear trend toward that distribution is evident. However, the differences between the four means, above, cannot be said to be *not* due to chance alone. The F-ratio of 2.04 does not quite reach significance; an F of 2.68 would be required for somewhat larger degrees of freedom (3 and 125). Thus, although there seems to be a fairly clear trend for better debaters to be less authoritarian, firm proof must await further research of a more precise nature.

The Watson-Glaser data reveals that more positive conclusions can be drawn regarding debating skill and critical thinking ability. It was assumed, in agreement with previous research findings, that the greater mean score would be by the first quartile, the next greatest score by the 2nd quartile, etc. The data in Table 1 show that in only one instance (Evaluation of Arguments) do the means not rank quite as expected, and in only one instance are the differences between the means not statistically significant; the F-ratio for Recognition of Assumptions mean differences is extremely close to being, but is not quite, significant.

A general conclusion to be drawn is that, while debate ability has been shown once again to be related to critical thinking ability as measured by the Watson-Glaser instrument, this relationship tends to extend to each of the specific critical thinking abilities as measured by the five Watson-Glaser sub-tests. And, as mentioned above, the relationship of authoritarianism to debating ability awaits further research, probably utilizing more discriminating measures of debating ability. Future studies examining this notion might also do well to parcel out from authoritarianism scores the influence of intelligence, and use the partial correlation technique, as recommended by Jacobson and Rettig.⁷

⁷ *Ibid.*

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES ON THE SPREAD

DONALD O. OLSON

In the final debate at the Heart of America Debate Tournament at Lawrence, Kansas in 1968 between Loyola University of California and the University of Houston, all three judges in their written critiques criticized quite severely the use of the "spread" or "shotgun" case. Bernard Brock of Minnesota stated, "We have extended the 'shotgun,' 'rapid-fire' style of debate. The result is 'evidence piling' rather than in-depth analysis of a few significant issues." Valgene Littlefield of Northeastern State College commented on the spread in this fashion: "It results in poor communication, and it evolves into superficial argument. . . . Following the 'negative block,' the first affirmative rebuttalist was faced with an almost impossible task—refuting all the arguments now advanced. . . . The first affirmative speaker enumerated twenty-seven arguments in the rebuttal." Mr. Littlefield further commented on why the first affirmative rebuttal speaker tried to meet these arguments. "He probably was afraid to select arguments fearing to lose the judges' ballot for failing to answer some arguments." David Matheny of Kansas State Teachers College stated, "The last three speeches were disorganized and presented so rapidly that it became impossible to evaluate arguments being made. . . . When did debate stop being a persuasive exercise in communication?" Mr. Matheny continued that the speakers were talking at a rate of 156 to 258 words per minute. Only one speaker spoke less than 200 words per minute. From the critiques, the negative seemed to be the guilty party in the use of the "spread," but they also won all three ballots.

It is generally recognized that it is good strategy for the affirmative to narrow the scope of the debate and the negative to expand the scope of the debate, but in present day debate many expansions are excessive and even some affirmatives consider it good strategy to expand the debate.

The critique above of two fine teams, plus repeated comments both ways in regard to the "spread," prompted the preparation of a questionnaire in regard to the attitude of coaches to what was called an "excessive spread." In the accompanying letter the "excessive spread" was defined as "one team or both teams presenting so many arguments that the opposing team just cannot refute them adequately in the time allotted."

(This questionnaire was sent to all sponsors of local chapters of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha in the spring of 1970.) One hundred nineteen replies were received. The discrepancies in the total tabulation for each question were because no question was answered by all the sponsors.

An explanation of what was being attempted and directions in filling out the questionnaire were given at the beginning. It stated: "The following statements are designed to identify the feelings, attitudes or judgments of sponsors in regard to an excessive spread. There are no right or wrong answers. I wish to know how closely each statement corresponds to your feeling or judgment. For each statement circle the answer which best reflects your position." The five choices were as follows: Agree, Agree Somewhat, Undecided, Disagree Somewhat and Disagree.

Mr. Olson is Professor of Speech at the University of Nebraska.

A tabulation of the answers given by the sponsors of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha showed the following results to the listed statements:

1. The excessive spread prevents the development of arguments on the part of both teams.

A. Agree	77	D. Disagree Somewhat	8
B. Agree Somewhat	30	E. Disagree	2
C. Undecided	1		

2. Merely stating an issue and reading a quote is not developing an argument.

A. Agree	102	D. Disagree Somewhat	4
B. Agree Somewhat	8	E. Disagree	0
C. Undecided	3		

3. An excessive spread prevents good communication on the part of both teams and between them and the audience and the judge.

A. Agree	69	D. Disagree Somewhat	4
B. Agree Somewhat	30	E. Disagree	4
C. Undecided	8		

4. The excessive spread prevents the true personality of the debater from emerging. As Brockriede has said, it seems that it is a "contest of computers."

A. Agree	52	D. Disagree Somewhat	15
B. Agree Somewhat	33	E. Disagree	3
C. Undecided	1		

5. A team responsible for an excessive spread should *not* be allowed to win *solely* because the opposition just does not have time to answer all of the arguments.

A. Agree	79	D. Disagree Somewhat	0
B. Agree Somewhat	23	E. Disagree	3
C. Undecided	10		

6. The last affirmative rebuttal speaker should not be required to handle all of the negative excessive spread arguments before resubstantiating his own case.

A. Agree	70	D. Disagree Somewhat	5
B. Agree Somewhat	31	E. Disagree	4
C. Undecided	4		

7. A team that initiates an excessive spread should be penalized.

A. Agree	18	D. Disagree Somewhat	15
B. Agree Somewhat	34	E. Disagree	15
C. Undecided	33		

8. Some method should exist for eliminating excessive arguments from the debate without consideration.

A. Agree	38	D. Disagree Somewhat	7
B. Agree Somewhat	29	E. Disagree	8
C. Undecided	30		

9. Excessive questions are thrown out of the debate by insisting that the questions must be dignified by argument. Excessive argument might be thrown out of the debate by insisting that the team initiating the spread should dignify the argument with some development.

A. Agree	53	D. Disagree Somewhat	3
B. Agree Somewhat	43	E. Disagree	3
C. Undecided	11		

No attempt is made in this paper to comment on the results obtained from each statement because those results are self explanatory. There were a number of interesting observations made in regard to some of the statements. These comments mostly centered around statements seven and eight. Statement seven, "A team which initiates an excessive spread should be penalized." Statement eight, "Some method should exist for eliminating excessive arguments from the debate without consideration." Both of these statements referred to possible solutions to the problem and will be considered together in this paper.

Some of the observations placed the blame for undesirable practices in regard to the spread on the judge. / As long as judges continue to give high ratings and wins to teams that resort to this practice, we can expect teams to continue spreading. / Some of the representative observations on this point were as follows: A. Tennyson Williams, Jr. of Wake Forest University said, "Perhaps the greatest responsibility for improvement lies with the judge. If the judge decides to ignore arguments which are not presented fully and persuasively, then debaters will be forced to change their tactics." Furthermore Jim Weaver of Iowa State University stated, "As long as we allow those teams who use the spread to win, others will continue to imitate—and 'the spread will spread.'" † Also Ivan H. Rich of the University of Virginia said, "Judges have, in reality compounded the spread problem by consistently voting for this approach. In my view they will continue to do so no matter how much lip service is paid to proposals to disregard or eliminate the spread. Finally, it is worth noting that the best teams are able to both spread and develop arguments."

Some sponsors felt that it really depended upon the debate and how both teams handled the spread. Clayton H. Schug of Pennsylvania State University commented, "This should be handled, however, by the debaters themselves. A competent judge should certainly, in turn, weigh this matter heavily in making his decisions." Shirley A. Eads of Oregon State University observed, "In short, I think a team which initiates an excessive spread penalizes itself. Also, the team which initiates the spread usually does no better at handling those arguments in the rebuttal periods than does the opposing team." Furthermore, Donn Parson presented this difficulty in the following comment: "I guess the hang-up here is that what some judges consider 'excessive,' others do not; and, hence there is difficulty in getting reasonable unanimity of position." † Jack Howe of California State College, Long Beach posed this problem in penalizing a team: "So, the mere fact the affirmative speaks first and thus first 'initiates' the spread should not single them out for penalty if the negative had entered the debate already determined to use the same strategy."

Some of the coaches have suggested several solutions to the "spread." Bernard Brock of the University of Minnesota advocated a new format which gave some of the speakers a greater amount of time. This same suggestion

was made by Mr. Ludlum of Capital University when he made this statement. ["It may be the only answer is to provide more time for the team faced with this problem. It would be interesting to provide the judge with the option of lengthening rebuttal speeches by two minutes."] Another suggestion was made by Edgar E. Macdonald of Randolph-Macon College as a method of controlling the "spread." ["I most fervently feel that cross-examination debate, properly conducted, eliminates many extraneous arguments. I believe that the surest way to pre-empt 'spread' is to encourage more actively cross-examination tournaments."] Robert Kemp of the University of Iowa gave three proposals: ["1. Don't give wins. 2. Rate low on speaking quality. 3. Change our time allotments. Affirmative rebuttalists should be given seven, not five minutes."]

Certainly there is no single answer to this problem. This paper does not present a solution, but it might help to focus attention on some of the undesirable practices resulting from the "spread." Possibly more of us will start thinking in terms of what should be done to eliminate these undesirable practices.

Perhaps David Matheny has the answer. He stated at the end of his critique referred to in the introduction of this paper, "Perhaps some day, a team utilizing good speaking habits, a simple well-defined case and organized, selected refutation will win a tournament. Then debaters, fadistic as ever, will flock to this new, revolutionary approach."

OLD RHETORIC IN OLD BOTTLES

DAN F. HAHN

In September of 1970 Mrs. Binh made a new Communist peace proposal at the Paris Conference. Ambassador Bruce, chief American negotiator, labeled it "old wine in a new bottle." Thus, the scene was set for the Viet Cong reaction to Nixon's October 7th peace proposal: "a bottle that carries the label peace but contains no wine."¹

Without joining in this metaphoric battle, one can conclude that the Nixon proposal is filled with traditional Nixonian rhetoric—in form, content, and strategic patterns.

The form is characteristically Nixonian, whether considered as traditional (if sloppy) debate format, lawyer's brief, or adaptation of Monroe's motivated sequence. The speech could be classified in any of these molds, but it is most easily recognized as an adaptation of the motivated sequence.

On first reading, the speech seems to lack both attention and need steps. Indeed, why include a need step when the necessity for solving the Viet Nam "problem" is obvious? Similarly, an attention step is unnecessary given the importance of the topic and the prestige of the Presidency. Yet, a closer examination reveals the presence of an attention step, and a highly novel one at that. Instead of introducing the speech, the attention step preceded it, in the form of a promo, or (unpaid) commercial, made by Nixon and televised earlier in the day. For the first time in history a President ". . . made what in effect was a TV promotional 'trailer' to publicize one of his speeches."² The medium may not be the message, but it can confound rhetorical expectations when it facilitates the separation of the attention step from the remainder of the speech.

The satisfaction step comprises a majority of the presentation. Five paragraphs are devoted to a visualization of the generation of peace which acceptance of the plan allegedly would produce, while two paragraphs are given to a call for action.

Between visualization and action are seven paragraphs which do not conform to motivated sequence pattern (nor would they fit debate or legal formats). The rhetorical purpose of the extra paragraphs is murky; they seem to be aimed at justifying the visualization (peace) according to traditional American aims, although one wonders at the necessity for justifying *peace*.

Moving from form to content, one again finds traditional Nixon. Although two of the Nixon proposals, the "cease-fire in place" and the Geneva-style conference, are new, in the sense that they had not been introduced previously in the negotiations, both had received a considerable amount of discussion in Washington earlier this year. Further, it was well known that the North Vietnamese already had shown dissatisfaction with the two proposals, and there was little indication that they had changed their position. The

Mr. Hahn is Deputy Chairman of the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, Queens College, Flushing, New York.

¹ Stan Carter, "Reds' Goal is Secret Talks," *New York Daily News*, October 8, 1970, p. 6.

² Ben Gross, "Nixon the One President Who Plugged a TV Stint," *New York Daily News*, October 9, 1970, p. 79.

three other propositions in the "new peace initiative" had been proposed by this country in Paris, and rejected by the Communists.

Two smaller points in the speech betray Nixon's attempt to escape his old rhetorical content: 1) his reiterated belief in the discredited domino theory—"Conflicts in this region [Indochina] are closely related," and, 2) his urge to attack the North Vietnamese by labeling their actions as "aggression" and their diplomatic position as "unreasonable" and "totally unacceptable." The implacable foe of Communism, *circa* 1950's, is found in a muted form in the New Nixon of the 1970's.

Most important, perhaps, is that this speech demonstrates a continuation of Nixon's well-worn rhetorical strategies. Based upon his political beliefs and personality, Nixon's rhetorical strategies seem to be habitual, as they appear over and over in his addresses.

A major Nixonian strategy, designed to enhance his *ethos*, is a demonstration of strong leadership abilities. He utilizes the strategy three times in this speech. First, he points out that it was his policies, the Cambodian offensive and Vietnamization, that made possible the "new initiative for peace." This leadership ploy is obvious; the other two are more subtle.

In *Six Crises*, Nixon contends that a good leader will gather the opinions of as many knowledgeable people as possible before deciding his policy. Nixon's inclusion of the following paragraph in his speech now becomes clear:

In Ireland on Sunday I met with the chiefs of our delegation to the Paris talks. This meeting marked the culmination of a Government-wide effort begun last spring on the negotiation front. After considering the recommendations of all my principal advisors, I am tonight announcing new proposals for peace in Indochina.³

Most subtle of all is Nixon's use of personal and collective pronouns. Each act (proposal, initiation, motion) in the speech is prefaced by "I." Each "We" is used either in the subordinate position of carrying out or in the receptive position of reaping the benefits of the "I" actions. The formula, then, is: "I, Richard M. Nixon, lead with proposals and actions; We, the citizens, follow by carrying into fruition the proposals and receiving the benefits of the actions."

A second Nixonian strategy found in the speech, call it "dread alternative rhetoric," assumes 1) that there is only one "right" way, and 2) that the right way is the hardest. To accomplish any task, to solve any problem, there are many alternatives. All of them, except the one Nixon has chosen, are wrong. How does he know he has chosen the right path? The right path is always difficult; all paths but one are easy; he has chosen the difficult path; he has chosen the right path. This frontier Puritanism has been a Nixonian strategy at least since his days as a second-string football player when he refused to take the easy path and quit the squad.

Although not quite a strategy, another pattern of the Nixon Presidency is the tendency to personalize the office, to identify himself with his post. Thus, Nixon's "taking the Government to the People," for example, consists of taking himself to Jaycee banquets. The rhetorical critic cannot help but notice the overburdening use of "I" in the speech (31 times in 15 minutes,

³ All quotations from the speech are taken from "Transcript of President's Address Offering New Proposals for Indochina Peace," *New York Times*, October 8, 1970, p. 18.

slightly more than one every 30 seconds). More important, however, is Nixon's purposeful denial of this personalization, this identification:

Hundreds of thousands of people cheered me as I drove through the cities of those countries.

They were not cheering for me as an individual. They were cheering for the country I was proud to represent—the United States of America.

A man who does not tend to confuse himself with his office does not have to fear that others will confuse the two. The fact that he carefully separates the two here demonstrates that the norm is identification rather than separation.

A fourth traditional Nixon strategy is the retreat into patriotism. It is, therefore, not surprising to find him extolling America as "the land of freedom, of opportunity, of progress." What is unusual is the placement and purpose of the patriotic appeal. Nixon normally relies on patriotism when on the defensive, when his policies have been challenged or criticized.⁴ In this speech the patriotic appeal is utilized to demonstrate that peace is a viable American commodity. Perhaps, considering the pose toward "peaceniks" taken by him and his "alliterate lieutenant," it is understandable that he would be defensive about praising the benefits of peace, but it is a sad commentary on the temper of the times, a temper molded in large part by the Nixon Administration.

The final "old" Nixon strategy found in the "new initiative for peace" is his tendency to substitute rhetoric for reality when reality cannot be delivered. Nixon has utilized the strategy in domestic politics. Unable to make good his promise to slow down integration in the South, he has instead given the South anti-integration rhetoric while continuing to integrate the schools. The "rhetoric or reality" strategy is apparent in this speech as well. Nixon offers five proposals with "no preconditions," a seemingly flexible position. But the rhetoric glosses over reality: he attaches seven "guiding principles" to the five proposals—a precondition by any other name smells mighty like a precondition.

Finally, unable to offer the electorate peace, when that is the prime determinant of their votes, he offers them the rhetoric of peace rather than the reality, less than a month before elections. No new wine. No new bottle. No new rhetoric.

⁴ I am indebted to Robert Cathcart for this insight.

THAT REALITY GAP AND THE RHETORIC OF DISTORTION

JOHN S. NELSON

Wayne Brockriede observed several months ago that "today . . . a serious gap is developing between tournament debating and the realities of public debating."¹ The appearance of his thoughts together with an analysis of a Nixon address on Vietnam, a discussion of the rhetorical tactics of the nation's "household Vice President," and a look at the non-effectiveness of "The Riot Report" was a perhaps ironic coincidence. For these phenomena suggest an important clue for interpreting the "reality gap" phenomenon identified by Brockriede. Focusing on this "reality gap" will provide a descriptive and prescriptive glance at contemporary American culture and contemporary college debating.

Brockriede identifies two trends related to the "reality gap": "(1) tournament debating has developed increased artificiality and (2) public deliberation has changed radically in recent years."²

Maintains Brockriede:

. . . the second reason for the gap is at least as important as the first. Even if tournament debaters have tended to become too jargonated, too efficient, too sober, and too impersonal, that change by itself would not have made the reality gap as large as it has become. No, in addition, the practices of public debating have also made drastic changes, revolutionary changes, in the past five or ten years. And it is the contrast between the changes of tournament debating in one direction and the changes of public debating in the other that defines the reality gap.³

The changes in public debating Brockriede has in mind shift away from "rational discourse" toward "body rhetoric," "the rhetoric of the streets," "the rhetoric of confrontation," "the rhetoric of agitation," "coercive rhetoric," or whatever one chooses to call such militant modes.⁴ Much tournament debating now aims at tripping the right switches in a computer-judge. Much public debating orients itself toward a gross emotive impact on observers. It becomes more and more the case that, in the McLuhanist sense, the "medium is the message" in public rhetoric, particularly in that of the young.

What seem to be involved in Brockriede's "reality gap" are two different estimations of the audience, leading to two divergent modes of communication.⁵ The college debater does indeed approach the judge as he would a

Mr. Nelson is a political science and philosophy major and varsity debater at the University of Kentucky. An expression of special thanks is due Professor Gifford Blyton of the University of Kentucky for his help in the preparation of this article.

¹ Wayne Brockriede, "College Debate and the Reality Gap," *Speaker and Gavel*, March, 1970, p. 72.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁴ For the contexts in which these terms were propounded, see, citations noted by Brockriede.

⁵ The question might be raised whether the audiences are not in fact quite different, thus justifying the differences in estimation to which I have referred. I

computer, albeit a humanly limited one. His highly formal, concise, and rapid speech is designed to “get in” as many “bits” of information per minute as possible. The college protester goes to the opposite extreme, approaching the task of communication as if only the broadest and most sweeping statements have a chance of registering—and then only if they are charged with vast bursts of one-dimensional emotion.⁶

Most of us are quite familiar with the polarity embraced by current college debating. The other end of the spectrum calls for more extensive treatment. The protester possesses and uses two “languages,” one verbal and one physical. Discussing the verbal mode in a *National Review* article, Alexander Louis Theroux contends that:

The disenchantment with a prose too long with us initiates in (Peter) Fonda, as in many another irresistible twenty year old, a conflux of non-denotative catchwords—a sort of Swiftian “little language” replete with canned mottos and collapsed into a syntax built on private interpretation which abhors the bitch language of coherence and analysis as a capitulation to that which forever distorts the beauty of perplexity and wrings the sweet neck of spontaneity.⁷

Fonda is used by Theroux to epitomize “The Inarticulate Hero” whose verbal communications may serve as a reliable barometer for the speaker’s feelings, but are unsuitable for much else.

The drift into physical modes of expression, especially appropriate for strong and basic emotional messages, is hardly to be wondered at. A *Time* essay entitled “Violent Protest: A Debased Language” discusses implications of the observed trend that:

As protests have continued to broaden and increase, dissent has come to be used to describe and defend a wide variety of physical acts, including violence toward property and even toward people.⁸

A measure of truth is conceded by the editors of *Time* to the claim of many protesters that a switch from verbal to physical dissent is justified because “no one pays attention to words any longer . . . society . . . no longer seems to respond to more traditional forms of dissent.” But stern reservations are added:

The fact remains, however, that all too often these days dissent is a matter of arson and rock throwing. The reason may be that protesters have despaired of the efficacy of words before they have really mastered them. It is significant that this generation of dissenters has failed to produce a literature, or even a polemic, that is likely to endure. On the contrary, it has been persistently, even proudly, nonverbal. It has emphasized a communication of feeling rather than of words.⁹

would maintain that there are few important differences in audience in terms of values shared or tendencies to respond favorably to certain types of presentation. But this is really incidental to the main argument, since even if there were substantial differences in these or other areas they could hardly be so huge as to render plausible a justification for the tremendous discrepancies involved in the two polarities of approach under discussion.

⁶ A look at Herbert Marcuse’s *One-Dimensional Man* would be a valuable experience for those who have not yet read it—not that one should subscribe to what Professor Marcuse says, however.

⁷ Alexander Louis Theroux, “The Inarticulate Hero,” *National Review*, February 24, 1970, p. 199.

⁸ Violent Protest: A Debased Language,” *Time*, May 18, 1970, p. 15.

⁹ *Ibid.*

The physical "language" of protesters, then, as well as their verbal "language," seems to have been erected in despair "of the efficacy of words." *Why?* What has happened to speech to render it so fundamentally ineffective and irrelevant to so many? Why, as Franklyn Haiman notes, and after him Brockriede, is "rational discourse" increasingly abandoned? It is in answering these questions that the articles accompanying Brockriede's become significant for the interpretation of his "reality gap."

In essence, the answer is to be located in a credibility gap. Protesters despair "of the efficacy of words" because they do not—and perhaps cannot—trust the alleged truthfulness of "rational discourse" in the contemporary age. Columbia's Gerald Sykes believes that "someday a new Gresham will establish in a scientific law the greater capacity of untrue words, over true, to remain in circulation."¹⁰ Modern societies (particularly the United States) are *characterized* by the systematic distortion of words. Such distortion has unavoidably been present in limited, though large, amounts in every age. However, it has fallen to modern times to make the twisting of rhetoric not merely a national pastime but frightfully close to a way of life.

Ironically, this rhetoric of distortion has been brought about, more than anything else, by the increased importance of rhetoric itself, an importance related to our budding affluence. A rhetoric of distortion is summoned by the general moral crisis of our era, when the events of the age, the products of human action, are reified as external objects for which we have no responsibility. The American slaughter of buffaloes and Indians with our railroads and rifles—and some would add, of Japanese and Vietnamese with our atomic bombs and M-16's—are symptomatic of the modern tendency to create situations and then blind ourselves to their real consequences. In the face of such disparities as General Motors and the Mississippi tenant farm, the public wants, needs a rhetoric of distortion to comfort and justify its negligence. Since what is good for the peace of mind of the masses does equal wonders for the elites who seek to manipulate them, there is an equal demand for distortion from that quarter as well:

The symbols *must* be misused if they are to achieve their purpose. Truth is too ambiguous to be of help to men of state and men of affairs. If the public received only truth, the new relativistic truth that confuses even the learned, there would be general inaction and apathy. "The wheels of industry would grind to a halt." Truth must be reshaped crudely by those who do not know how to remain long in power (Mussolini, Hitler, and *all* unadaptable persons) and supply by those who know how to endure. The emphasis of democratic survival is always on *adjustment*—of men to reality through words.¹¹

It is this "adjustment—of men to reality through words" that entails and is accomplished by the rhetoric of distortion.

The rhetoric of distortion operates through the fostering in its listeners, and ultimately in its speakers as well, of what Sykes calls "the raincoat mind," the mind which sheds independent thought and moral responsibility like water.¹² This is a condition in which one behaves according to the roles dictated by society, not considering the impact of that behavior on others or its import for oneself. Unfortunately for this mechanistic approach, man

¹⁰ Gerald Sykes, *The Cool Millennium*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, p. 44.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 102.

is inherently an actor, not just one who unthinkingly and unfeelingly behaves according to pre-established paths, but one who behaves in response to others and who responds to his own behavior. Thus the gross inequities of this and every era cannot be totally lost in or on the individual. But through systematic direction of attention away from unpleasant moral incongruities and systematic self-justification on the most superficial—and therefore most fervent—levels, men can fairly competently control their impulse toward moral responsibility.

Given this environment, it should be clear why the protester is inclined to despair “of the efficacy of words.” When a large segment of “the Establishment” utilizes words not as a way to make meaning more plain and exact, but as a way to obscure its deficiencies by twisting meanings, there is good reason for protesters to think that their words will not be taken seriously.

As was indicated at the outset, excellent material for elaboration and illustration of the rhetoric of distortion and its effects may be found in the articles accompanying that of Brockriede. In summarizing their analysis of Nixon’s November 3, 1969, Vietnam speech, Chesebro and Purnell posit that:

Operationally Nixon may have in this speech received political support from the majority by using the minority as a scapegoat or sacrificial lamb to gain the laurels of the majority . . . a critic might argue that Nixon denies the role of dissent in a democracy and minimizes the significance of free communication. Thus, major ethical questions may emerge regarding Nixon as a public speaker.¹³

This Nixon speech, then, provides us with a case study of the rhetoric of distortion. It is important to note that Chesebro and Purnell regard this speech as “persuasive” and conclude that “Nixon did . . . regain his political power base provided by the great silent majority.”¹⁴ Given the clear discrepancies between Nixon’s stated purpose of “unifying the nation” and this “dividing” speech, one could certainly hypothesize this to be a speech successfully serving to reinforce many a “raincoat mind,” to which these obvious distortions went unnoticed.

Brock finds the Agnew rhetoric difficult to accept:

The long-term effects are more difficult to assess. It is already clear that the series of speeches have added significantly to the division in society that is already present—we are now also divided over acceptance of the sources of all public information. And by making the attack so personal and emotional, bitterness has resulted from the ensuing charges and counter-charges.¹⁵

Regardless of how these analysts view it, however, it is apparent that even those who merely watch protesters sympathetically from the sidelines consider Agnew’s rhetoric a prime exercise in distortion.

With such a polluted rhetorical atmosphere, it should not be surprising that rhetoric (at the very least, that of the “rational discourse” brand) is becoming less effective. This is illustrated in a tragic way by the Riot Commission *Report*, as Hess and Harper have pointed out. The phenomenon

¹³ James W. Chesebro and Sandra E. Purnell, “The Rhetoric of Alignment: Can Nixon’s Quest for Power Unite the Nation?” *Speaker and Gavel*, March, 1970, p. 84.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Bernard L. Brock, “Spiro Agnew’s Diversionary Rhetoric,” *Speaker and Gavel*, March, 1970, p. 86.

most impressive to them and also most germane to our argument was capsulized by Charles Dallas on a CBS News Special Report: "The Riot Commission *Report* hasn't changed anything, it was the riots that did the changing."¹⁶

Keeping in mind this paradox of the importance and debasement of rhetoric, we now return to Brockriede's discussion. He proposes that a synthesis of sorts should be made of the polarities of rhetoric exemplified by the college debater and the college protester. College debaters should modify their life-styles and their debating techniques to embody some of the "determination and commitment and personal involvement that characterizes the new rhetoric."¹⁷

Almost implicitly, Brockriede offers an important perspective on this point in calling for less obsession with "the gamesmanlike tricks of winning debates."¹⁸ The basic strategy involved in the rhetoric of distortion, as it is applied to debate in more sophisticated ways than the simple invention of quotations or statistics, is the use of arguments and explanations that are couched in the very vaguest and most ambiguous of terms. This allows the skillful "debater" to backtrack and repair attacked links in his presentation with much greater ease, since he can bend what he has said to provide the needed reply to refutation. This is symptomatic of the overall procedures and ends promoted by the rhetoric of distortion. Rather than clarifying—fostering a more and more exact "fix" on the truth—the rhetoric of distortion operates through the use of obscuring generalities.

The reason that the prevalence of the rhetoric of distortion in college debating is so distressing and deplorable goes beyond concern for the individual ethical problems indicated. Through promoting the practice of the rhetoric of distortion, we are helping to create and/or reinforce the conditions in which "rational discourse" cannot be effective because it cannot be trusted to exist. The very "success" of the rhetoric of distortion arises from its pretense to be "rational discourse."

The demand for the rhetoric of distortion perhaps most squarely faces, of all the groups in our society, college students. The fact cannot be escaped that college debaters, who, through proclivity or training, are more adept in the use of words, experience this demand of "the market" for distortion and the misuse of their talents even more acutely than their fellow students. This is intensified by the tournament debate structure itself.

The current debate tournament format presents the archetypical climate of temptation as Sykes has described it. To the participants the power and prestige to be gained in the form of "winning" are very real and very desirable. The problem is aggravated by the difficulties with current styles of debating that were indicated by Brockriede. The motive for distortion of evidence is measurably enhanced when debating degenerates into evidence-slinging contests. When tiny sub-point after sub-point of argument masquerading as a case or as refutation barrages the judge, the result is almost bound to be the irresponsible distortion of arguments. When debate is taken as a nearly life-and-death struggle, the strategies of deception may more easily seem justifiable.

When we must ask ourselves what the ultimate effects of this sort of cli-

¹⁶ Richard Hess and Paul Harper, "A Kind of Alice in Wonderland: The Riot Report—An Analysis of Its Effects," *Speaker and Gavel*, March, 1970, p. 93.

¹⁷ Brockriede, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

mate are for intercollegiate debating, the connection between Brockriede's two polarizing trends becomes obvious. Through its now widespread adoption of the rhetoric of distortion, college debating has become not only a microcosm of American society, but one of that society's most highly reinforcing training grounds. One should not wonder that a widening "reality gap" appears between the rhetorics of college debaters and the rhetorics of college protesters. For it is the very same rhetoric of distortion now so popular in college debating that has caused protesters to despair of the rhetoric of "rational discourse." Words are only tools to be twisted to reinforce and legitimate it in its most rigid and repressive areas. It may well be true, as *Time* writes, that "the ultimate debasement of language . . . is violence."¹⁹ But it is probably more accurate to say that violence is the inevitable consequence of the ultimate debasement of language. For, as *Time* goes on to note, "violence is, essentially, a confession of ultimate inarticulateness."²⁰ And indeed, what does or can one say when words themselves cannot be believed? Surely this constitutes one of the biggest "credibility gaps" of all.

Instead of educating many debaters to help to eradicate the rhetoric of distortion, it seems that we are training many to promote it. What, then, can be done to reverse this tendency? One way to begin is to not reward such rhetoric with wins and high points. Only debate judges have the power to make this approach an element of the solution. But some changes must be made by the judges themselves if they are to recognize the rhetoric of distortion for what it is. At the heart of these changes is more familiarity with the topic and its chief resource materials. Judges must stop depending on their own teams' cases or those which they may have heard during the season to inform them. Many a judge is unable to see through the rhetoric of distortion because he has relied on the "analytically fudged" arguments of his own teams for his education on the topic. Judges also need to be much more alive to the possibilities of distortion than they are now. Deciding if there was intent to do so behind the garbling of an opponent's argument in a complicated debate is difficult (and the teams should always be given the benefit of doubt), but very often obvious incongruities—even when they are highlighted by the opposing team—are ignored. Education and attention, then, are the two factors which need to be up-graded in judging. Hopefully, if the judges can discover distortion—and penalize it when uncovered—debaters will soon find the rhetoric of distortion less attractive.

This discussion has sought to highlight an imminent danger implicit in the "reality gap" deplored by Brockriede. Tournament debating is growing in artificiality, but so also is the rhetoric of American society. Unless we are able to remove the decayed pillars of distortion which now undergird so much of our society and replace them with foundations of a "rational discourse" unalloyed with the misuse of symbols, protesters will continue to renounce verbal language for the rhetoric of violence. And ultimately, violence cannot be a form of rhetoric or communication at all, since it is the one type of action capable of destroying speech.²¹

The editors of *Time* close their essay by declaring: "Now is the time for dissenters to assert their own dignity and maintain their tradition by uphold-

¹⁹ *Time*, *op. cit.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958, pp. 155–223.

ing the ultimate value of the word.”²² In so saying, *Time* has the prescription for the protesters; Brockriede likewise has the prescription for the debaters. But before either prescription can be effected or effective, interconnection of the two must be recognized.

The “synthesis” indicated by Brockriede does embrace the key aspect for closing this credibility gap. That aspect is the restoration of personal and moral emotion to debate and societal rhetoric. Personal and moral emotion is fundamentally incompatible with the “raincoat mind” nurtured under the rhetoric of distortion, since the “raincoat mind” typifies an inadequately moral condition. While it may be true that there will always be gross moral inequities of some kind, it is mandatory that we continually strive to recognize and rectify those of our era. For if we do not, the rhetoric of distortion and its incipient credibility gap will destroy hope of “rational discourse” and lull us into the self-justifying and self-destroying trap of violence.

²² *Time*, *op. cit.*

MESSAGE TO STUDENT MEMBERS

Fellow Student Members of DSR-TKA:

The winds of change have finally stirred the sails of our organization. At the National Council meetings held in New Orleans during the convention of the Speech Communication Association several steps toward meaningful student participation were taken:

- (1) The National Student Council President will nominate a student member to all committees where possible under the constitution.
- (2) Important and significant changes in the banquet were approved by the National Conference Committee.
- (3) A general meeting of all society members, faculty and students, has been called for Terre Haute.

The purpose of the general meeting will be to discuss what we think ought to be the future of the organization, what structure can best serve these goals, and to consider what changes we want in the National Conference. **IT IS CRITICAL THAT YOU THINK IN ADVANCE AND BE PREPARED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISCUSSION.** It is my intention to appoint a joint student-faculty task force to evaluate and propose changes in all aspects of DSR-TKA. I urge you to be thinking about the type of organization you want DSR-TKA to be and come prepared to offer suggestions for implementing your ideas.

James C. Swartz
National Student President

REPORTS OF THE REGIONS

At the meetings of the National Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha in December, Regional Governors presented their reports of activities of the year. Three of these reports included items of special interest.

Region II

Participation of DSR-TKA chapters in Region II activities has increased this year. Thirteen chapters were represented at the Region II tournament at Susquehanna University November 6-7, 1970. The following chapters participated: Bucknell, Delaware, Dickinson, Elizabethtown, King's, Lehigh, U. of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State, Rutgers, St. John's, Susquehanna, Temple, and Westminster.

Seven chapters shared in the Region II DSR-TKA trophies awarded at Susquehanna. Bucknell, Delaware, Dickinson, King's, Pennsylvania State, University of Pennsylvania, and St. John's shared first place in various individual events and in debate.

Attendance by 13 chapter sponsors made the business meeting the largest since the merger in 1963. Plans were made to increase attendance and participation at next year's business meeting, which will be held again at Susquehanna on November 5 and 6, 1971.

Raymond S. Beard, Governor

Region III

The annual conference of Region III met November 13-14, 1970, at American University, Washington, D.C. Dr. Jerome Polisky, A.U. chapter sponsor served as host and directed the conference events.

Four-man debate competition was won by Washington and Lee University. George Washington University won the top affirmative team award and the University of Maryland had the best negative team record. Theresa Pistolessi of George Washington was the best affirmative speaker and Ellen McCarthy of Maryland was the top negative speaker. John Stevens of Maryland won the extemporaneous speaking contest for the second successive year. First place in persuasive speaking was won by Gar Dennett of Madison College.

Dale Houff, Bridgewater College, was elected Student President, Region III, and John Stevens, Maryland, representative to the National Student Council.

By unanimous vote of chapter sponsors present at the November Region III Conference, a traveling trophy named in honor of the late William Chafin, former chapter sponsor at Washington and Lee University, will be awarded to the winner of Four-Man Debate at the Regional Conference. The trophy will be purchased from contributions by the Region III chapters.

In April, 1970, the chapter at Fairmont State College, Fairmont, West Virginia, was formally installed and charter members were initiated. Installation of the chapter at the U.S. Navy Academy was held in late January, 1971.

George F. Henigan, Governor

Region VII

In lieu of a regional meeting or tourney, Wichita State University this year for the first time gave its "Shocker" meet a DSR-TKA flavor by awarding trophies in debate to the top schools having a chapter of the honorary. The practice will be continued next year. Twenty-six DSR-TKA schools participated in this annual tournament.

The winning schools were as follows: Sweepstakes—(1) Southwest Missouri State, (2) University of Denver; Senior Debate—(1) Southwest Missouri State, (2) University of Denver; Junior Debate—(1) Texas Tech, (2) University of Denver. Sweepstakes included competition in individual events.

Region VII will launch a membership campaign early in the new year.

DSR-TKA Regions

Inquiries are occasionally made about the territories which comprise the various regions of DSR-TKA. The chart presented here should solve that problem for everyone except chapters located in the State of Kentucky. Listed are region number, name of governor, and the names of the states which are included in the region.

- I (John A. Lynch, St. Anselm's College) Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
- II (Raymond S. Beard, SUNY-Cortland) Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania
- III (George F. Henigan, George Washington University) District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia
- IV (Joseph C. Weatherby, Duke University) Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
- V (Thomas Ludlum, Capital University) Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio
- VI (Vernon R. McGuire, Texas Tech University) Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas
- VII (Melvin Moorhouse, Wichita State University) Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska
- VIII (Bernard L. Brock, University of Minnesota) Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin
- IX (George Adamson, University of Utah) Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming
- X (Robert Griffin, University of Nevada) Alaska, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington

MEETINGS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

Jung Hotel, New Orleans, La.

December 27, 1970

Members present for all or part of the meeting: Freeley, Walwik, Hance, Moorhouse, McGuire, Weiss, Swartz, Kane, Adamson, Beard, Phifer, W. Eubank, Huber, Ludlum, Laase, Henigan, Cripe.

Vice-President Freeley called the meeting to order at 4:10 P.M.

Minutes of the Spring 1970 meeting were approved as printed in the May 1970 *Speaker and Gavel*.

Report of the Secretary, Theodore Walwik:

1. Applications for membership are coming in very slowly. Chapter Sponsors and Regional Governors must give attention to the problem of decreasing membership.
2. Motion: Walwik; Second; Moorhouse: Secretary authorized to attend Conference on Federal Tax Problems of Non-Profit Organizations to be held in Washington, D.C., February 18-19, 1971. Expenses are to be shared with AFA, DSR-TKA's share not to exceed \$100.00. *Passed*.
3. Motion: Weiss; Second; Moorhouse: The National Council approves the election of Thomas F. Owens, Jr., Hanover College, as a member-at-large.

Report of the Treasurer, Kenneth Hance:

Our financial situation is a matter of serious concern. Decreasing applications for membership is the heart of the problem.

Report of the Trustee, Wayne C. Eubank:

1. Dividends from investments during the 1969-1970 year:

Broad Street Investing Corp.	\$ 370.76
Anchor Income	946.92
Putnam Fund	1,431.88
Selected American	720.00
	\$3,469.56
TKA Royalty	\$ 891.92
2. Due to market conditions, the value of our investments has decreased sharply. Two years ago we were worth about \$85,000. Currently, we are worth about \$65,000.
3. Dividends are low. Perhaps it is time to think about shifting out of funds into some other type of investment.

Report of the Chairman of the Speaker of the Year Board, Gregg Phifer:

1. The selection process for 1971 is proceeding smoothly.
2. There is a need to establish definite limits to terms of membership on the Speaker of the Year Board.

Report of the Editor, Robert Weiss:

1. Work is continuing on a statement of permissions for *Speaker and Gavel*.

2. Report on the disposition of *Speaker and Gavel* by libraries which receive it has been completed.

Reports of Regional Governors:

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| I no report | VI V. R. McGuire |
| II Ray Beard | VII Mel Moorhouse |
| III George Henigan | VIII no report |
| IV no report | IX George Adamson |
| V Tom Ludlum | X no report |

Report of the representative to the SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate, Austin Freeley:

Motion: Freeley; Second; Adamson:

1. That DSR-TKA appropriate \$150.00 annually to the SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion for purposes of research, and
2. That the payment of this sum be contingent upon all other organizations represented on the SCA Committee making an identical appropriation, and
3. That any research funds not expended during a calendar year shall be returned, on a pro rata basis, to the participating organizations, and
4. That research papers prepared for the Committee on the proposition chosen as the national intercollegiate debate proposition shall be made available to the Editor of the *Speaker and Gavel* for possible publication.

Passed.

Ray Beard read a letter from Jobie Riley, Sponsor, Elizabethtown College. The matter was referred to the representative to the SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion.

Report of the Chairman of the Alumni Awards Committee, Robert Huber:

1. Selection of recipients for 1971 is underway.
2. There is a need for nominations from chapters.

Report of the Chairman of the National Conference Committee, George Adamson:

1. 1971 Conference preparations are progressing on schedule.
2. 1972 Conference is set for the University of New Mexico, Mar. 29-April 1, 1972.
3. Motion: Adamson; Second; Kane: Approve proposed budget for 1971 Conference. *Passed.*

PROJECTED BUDGET 1971 NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Anticipated Income

500 registrations @ \$5.00	\$2,500.00
375 student meal tickets @ \$15.00	5,625.00
125 faculty meal tickets @ \$14.00	1,781.25
Indiana State subsidy	2,000.00
National Council subsidy	800.00

Total	\$12,706.25

Anticipated Expenses

Awards	\$ 600.00	
Student entertainment	350.00	
Guest judges	500.00	
Legislative Hearing	350.00	
Meals—375 students at \$12.50	4,087.50	
Meals—125 faculty at \$11.00	1,375.00	
Banquet—500 @ \$4.75	2,375.00	
Faculty dinner—125 @ \$5.00	625.00	
Transportation	750.00	
Secretarial	150.00	
Photographs	50.00	
Supplies (includes program)	400.00	
Postage	100.00	
Total		\$12,362.50
Anticipated surplus		343.75
		<hr/>
		\$12,706.25

Report from President of the Student Council, Jim Swartz:

1. There is some sentiment among students for movement away from the "honorary" concept toward a "union" of forensics people. For example, the initiation ceremony is regarded as an anachronism.
2. The division between faculty and students in DSR-TKA is unrealistic and inappropriate. Students should serve on all committees of the Society.
3. We must improve the involvement of the students in the Society's decision making process.

Motion, Weiss; Second, Kane: The National Council recommends that the President appoint students, from nominees submitted by the President of the Student Council, to all committees for which it is constitutionally possible to do so.

Passed.

Meeting adjourned.

December 28, 1970

Members present for all or part of the meeting: Freeley, Walwik, Kane, H. Ewbank, Adamson, Beard, Swartz, Ludlum, Henigan, McGuire, W. Eubank, Laase, Weiss.

Vice-President Freeley called the meeting to order and announced the birth of a daughter to President and Mrs. James McBath.

Freeley reported that President McBath had agreed to follow the following procedure in appointing students to committees (as recommended by the Council):

1. The President will designate those committees where it is constitutionally possible to appoint student representatives.
2. The President of the Student Council will submit to the President the names of a nominee and an alternate nominee for each appointment.
3. Student representatives to committees will serve at no expense to the Society.

Motion, Eubank; Second, Kane: At the Indiana State University National Conference in April an open meeting should be held to which all persons attending the Conference will be invited for the purpose of discussing the problems facing the Society. *Passed.*

Report of the Chairman of the Standards Committee, Henry Ewbank:

1. Chapters at Waynesburg, Arkansas, and Morehouse have been deactivated.
2. Motion: Ewbank for the Standards Committee: The National Council grants a charter in DSR-TKA to the University of Toledo, Donald Terry, sponsor. *Passed.*
3. Interest in charters has been indicated by Madison College, Shaw University, SUNY-Oswego, and University of North Carolina-Greensboro. These colleges should be invited to the National Conference.

Motion, Weiss; Second, Ewbank:

1. DSR-TKA authorizes publication of a paperback volume of studies in Current Criticism which have appeared in *Speaker and Gavel*, and
2. Preparation of the volume will be undertaken by Bernard Brock and Robert Weiss, and
3. Distribution will be arranged through an agency equipped to handle it, and
4. The project will be designed to be self-supporting. An amount of \$500.00 may be drawn to help pay for printing costs. The total financial obligation of DSR-TKA is limited to a maximum of \$500.00, and
5. A report on the status of the project will be presented at each meeting of the National Council.

Passed.

Motion, W. Eubank; Second, Ewbank:

The National Council of DSR-TKA at its annual business meeting held in New Orleans, Louisiana, December 28, 1970, empowers the Finance Committee of DSR-TKA composed of President James McBath, Treasurer Kenneth Hance, and Trustee Wayne C. Eubank to buy, sell, trade, invest, and reinvest at its discretion the entire capital of DSR-TKA now consisting of shares in the following four holdings:

Broad Street Investment Corporation
Anchor Income Fund, Incorporated
Selected American Shares
Putnam Income Fund

This power will remain in force until abrogated by the National Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

Passed.

Motion, Laase; Second, Ewbank: The Secretary will prepare a list of chapters that have not initiated for two years. *Failed.*

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Theodore J. Walwik
Secretary

Chapters and Sponsors

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Alabama, University, Ala.	Annabel D. Hagood
Albion, Albion, Michigan	Jon Fitzgerald
Alma, Alma, Michigan	Kenneth Plaxton
American, Washington, D.C.	Jerome B. Polisky
Auburn, Auburn, Ala.	Frank B. Smith
Ball State, Muncie, Ind.	David W. Shepard
Bates, Lewiston, Me.	Thomas Moser
Berea, Berea, Kentucky	Margaret D. McCoy
Birmingham-Southern, Birmingham, Ala.	Robert A. Dayton
Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.	E. F. Evans, Jr.
Bridgewater, Bridgewater, Va.	Roger E. Sappington
Brigham Young, Provo, Utah	Jed J. Richardson
Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N.Y.	Donald Springen
Brown, Providence, R.I.	Jim Townsend
Bucknell, Lewisburg, Pa.	Frank W. Merritt
Butler, Indianapolis, Ind.	Nicholas M. Cripe
California State, Long Beach, Calif.	Jack Howe
Capital, Columbus, Ohio	Thomas Ludlum
Carlow, Pittsburgh, Pa.	William Barnett
Case-Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio	Donald Marston
Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	Richard L. LaVarnway
Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio	Donald Shields
Clemson, Clemson, S. Carolina	Arthur Fear
Colgate, Hamilton, N.Y.	H. G. Behler
Colorado, Boulder, Colo.	George Matter
Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.	James A. Johnson
Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.	Joseph Seacrist
Cornell, Ithaca, N.Y.	Arthur W. Rovine
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa	Walter F. Stromer
Creighton, Omaha, Nebraska	Rev. H. J. McAuliffe, S.J.
C. W. Post College of L.I. Univ. Greenvale, N.Y.	Arthur N. Kruger
Dartmouth, Hanover, N.H.	Herbert L. James
Davidson, Davidson, N.C.	Rev. Will Terry
Delaware, Newark, Del.	Patricia Schmidt
Denison, Granville, Ohio	W. R. Dresser
Denver, Denver, Colorado	Glen Strickland
DePauw, Greencastle, Indiana	Robert O. Weiss
Dickinson, Carlisle, Pa.	Herbert Wing
Duke, Durham, N.C.	Joseph Cable Wetherby
Eastern Kentucky State, Richmond, Ky.	Aimee Alexander
Elizabethtown, Elizabethtown, Pa.	Jobie E. Riley
Emerson, Boston, Mass.	John C. Zacharis
Emory and Henry, Emory, Va.	H. Alan Pickrell
Emory, Atlanta, Ga.	Glenn Pelham
Evansville, Evansville, Ind.	Lynne J. Mlady
Fairmont State College, Fairmont, W. Va.	Suzanne Snyder
Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	Donald E. Williams
Florida State, Tallahassee, Fla.	Gregg Phifer

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
George Washington, Washington, D.C.	George F. Henigan, Jr.
Georgia, Athens, Georgia	Richard C. Huseman
Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa	William Vanderpool
Hamilton, Clinton, N.Y.	J. Franklin Hunt
Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, Va.	D. M. Allan
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	Sidney Parhan
Hanover, Hanover, Indiana	Stanley B. Wheeler
Hartford, Hartford, Conn.	Joyce Milliken
Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	Dean Ellis
Hiram, Hiram, Ohio	W. Keith Leonard
Howard, Washington, D. C.	Noel Myrick
Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	Tom Jennes
Illinois, Champaign, Ill.	Joseph W. Wenzel
Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.	E. C. Chenoweth
Indiana State, Terre Haute, Ind.	Donald J. Shields
Iowa State, Ames, Iowa	James Weaver
Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	Robert Kemp
John Carroll, Cleveland, Ohio	Austin J. Freeley
Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas	Donn W. Parson
Kansas State, Manhattan, Kansas	Vernon Barnes
Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky	Gifford Blyton
Kings, Wilkes Barre, Pa.	Robert E. Connelly
Knox, Galesburg, Ill.	Tom Crabtree
Lehigh, Bethlehem, Pa.	H. Barrett Davis
Lincoln Memorial, Harrogate, Tenn.	Earl H. Smith
Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, La.	Harold Mixon
Loyola, Baltimore, Md.	L. Morgan Lavin
Loyola, Chicago, Ill.	Elaine Bruggemeier
Manchester, North Manchester, Ind.	Ronald L. Augst
Mankato, Mankato, Minnesota	Elizabeth Morehouse
Marquette, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	John Lewinski
Maryland, College Park, Maryland	Bonnie Buenger
Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.	Ronald J. Matlon
Memphis State, Memphis, Tenn.	Erma Clanton
Mercer, Macon, Georgia	Gerre G. Price
Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	J. Robert Olian
Miami, Oxford, Ohio	Robert V. Friedenberg
Miami, Middleton, Ohio	Sue DeWine
Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan	C. William Colburn
Michigan State, East Lansing, Michigan	Donald P. Cushman
Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota	Bernard L. Brock
Missouri, Columbia, Missouri	James Gibson
Montana, Missoula, Montana	Robert Boren
Morgan State, Baltimore, Md.	Harold B. Chinn
Murray State, Murray, Kentucky	James Albert Tracy
Muskingum, New Concord, Ohio	Judson D. Ellerton
Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska	Donald O. Olson
Nevada, Reno, Nevada	Robert S. Griffin
New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.	William O. Gilsdorf
New Mexico, Albuquerque, N.M.	Wayne C. Eubank
New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, N.M.	Walter F. Brunet
New York, (University Heights) New York, N.Y.	Norman Puffett
New York, (Wash. Sq.) New York, N.Y.	David Leahy

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina	Bert F. Bradley
North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.D.	Wm. Semlack and Bernard Brommel
Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa	Lillian R. Wagner
Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.	David Zarefsky
Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.	Leonard Sommer
Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio	Daniel J. Goulding
Occidental, Los Angeles, Cal.	Gary K. Paben
Ohio, Athens, Ohio	Ted J. Foster
Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio	Don Stanton
Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio	Ed Robinson
Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma	Paul Barefield
Oregon, Eugene, Ore.	C. Richard Keil
Oregon State, Corvallis, Oregon	Thurston F. Doler
Pace, New York, N.Y.	Frank Colbourne
Pacific, Forest Grove, Oregon	Albert C. Hingston
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.	Stephen Miller
Pennsylvania State, University Park, Pa.	Clayton H. Schug
Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas Kane
Purdue, Lafayette, Indiana	Henry L. Ewbank
Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.	Howard I. Streifford
Randolph-Macon, Ashland, Va.	Edgar E. MacDonald
Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.	Richard W. Roth
Richmond, Richmond, Va.	Max Graeper
Roanoke, Salem, Va.	William R. Coulter
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y.	Joseph Fitzpatrick
Rollins, Winter Park, Fla.	Dean F. Graunke
Rutgers, New Brunswick, N.J.	H. James Godwin
St. Anselm's, Manchester, N.H.	John A. Lynch
St. Cloud State, St. Cloud, Minn.	William R. McCleary
St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y.	James Hall
St. Lawrence, Canton, N.Y.	Joan O. Donovan
Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.	Brad Bishop
San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif.	Henry E. McGuckin, Jr.
University of San Francisco	James Dempsey
University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.	Kathy Corey
South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama	Howard Pelham
South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.	Merrill G. Christophersen
South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.	James Lancaster
Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.	James McBeth
Southern Methodist, Dallas, Texas	Richard Sinzinger
Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, Mo.	Richard Stovall
Spring Hill, Mobile, Ala.	Bettie Hudgens
Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.	Kenneth Mosier
State Univ. of N.Y. at Albany, Albany, N.Y.	Jeanine Rice
State Univ. of N.Y., Harpur College, Binghamton, N.Y.	Eugene Vasilew
Susquehanna, Selinsgrove, Pa.	Larry D. Augustine
Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y.	Paul Ray McKee
Tampa, Tampa, Florida	Hugh Fellows
Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.	Ralph Towne
Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee	Norma C. Cook
Texas, Austin, Texas	John Schunk
Texas Tech, Lubbock, Texas	Vernon R. McGuire
Tulane, New Orleans, La.	Ralph Calderaro

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
U. S. Naval Academy	Phillip Warken
Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.	Joseph E. Vannucchi
Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	George Adamson
Utah State, Logan, Utah	Rex E. Robinson
Valdosta State, Valdosta, Ga.	Helen Thornton
Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.	Kassian Kovalcheck
Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	Robert Huber
Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.	John Graham
Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, Va.	E. A. Hancock
Wabash, Crawfordsville, Ind.	Joseph O'Rourke, Jr.
Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, N.C.	Merwyn A. Hayes
Washington, Saint Louis, Mo.	Herbert E. Metz
Washington, Seattle, Wash.	Dr. Donald Douglas
Washington and Jefferson, Washington, Pa.	Russell Church
Washington and Lee, Lexington, Va.	
Washington State, Pullman, Wash.	John Schmidt
Wayne State, Detroit, Michigan	George W. Ziegelmuller
Weber State, Ogden, Utah	John B. Heberstreet
Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.	Marguerite G. Petty
Western Kentucky State, Bowling Green, Ky.	Randall Capps
Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, Michigan	Charles R. Helgesen
Westminster, New Wilmington, Pa.	Walter E. Scheid
West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.	James E. Pirkle
Whittier, Whittier, Calif.	Gerald G. Paul
Wichita State, Wichita, Kansas	M. P. Moorhouse
Willamette, Salem, Oregon	Howard W. Runkel
William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.	Patrick Micken
Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin	David L. Vancil
Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Raymond H. Myers
Wittenberg, Springfield, Ohio	Ernest Dayka
Wooster, Wooster, Ohio	Gerald H. Sanders
Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming	B. Wayne Callaway
Xavier, Cincinnati, Ohio	Mark A. Greenberger
Yale, New Haven, Conn.	Rollin G. Osterweis
Yeshiva, New York, N.Y.	David Fleisher

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha National Council has established a standard subscription rate of \$5.00 per year for *Speaker and Gavel*.

Present policy provides that new members, upon election, are provided with two years of *Speaker and Gavel* free of charge. Life members, furthermore, who have paid a Life Patron alumni membership fee of \$100, likewise regularly receive *Speaker and Gavel*. Also receiving each issue are the current chapter sponsors and the libraries of institutions holding a charter in the organization.

Other individuals and libraries are welcome to subscribe to *Speaker and Gavel*. Subscription orders should be sent to Allen Press, P. O. Box 368, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.



SPEAKER and GAVEL

Allen Press, Inc.
P. O. Box 368
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Return Postage Guaranteed

Second Class Postage Paid
at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.