

Complete Issue 11(3)

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



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

Recommended Citation

(1974). Complete Issue 11(3). *Speaker & Gavel*, 11(3), 66-85.

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 11(3)

SPEAKER and GAVEL



VOLUME 11, NUMBER 3

MARCH, 1974

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.

NATIONAL OFFICERS OF DSR-TKA

President: NICHOLAS M. CRIPE, Butler University
Vice President: GEORGE ZIEGELMUELLER, Wayne State University
Secretary: THEODORE J. WALWIK, Slippery Rock State College
Treasurer: ROBERT HUBER, University of Vermont
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; CLARK KIMBALL, Madison College; JOSEPH C. WETHERBY, Duke University; ROBERT FRIEDENBERG, Miami University; VERNON R. MCGUIRE, Texas Tech University; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; LARRY SCHNOOR, Mankato State College; WAYNE CALLAWAY, University of Wyoming; JOHN DeBROSS, University of Southern California.
Members at Large: KENNETH ANDERSEN, University of Illinois; NORMA COOK, University of Tennessee; DONALD McCONKEY, Madison College.
ACHS Representative: H. L. EWBANK, JR., Purdue University.
Representative on SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: DAVID ZAREFSKY, Northwestern University.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Standards Committee: FORREST CONKLIN, University of Northern Iowa
National Conference Committee: KENNETH ANDERSEN, University of Illinois
Research and Publications Committee: JAMES McBATH, University of Southern California
Distinguished Alumni Awards Committee: ANNABEL HAGOOD, University of Alabama
Speaker of the Year Committee: PETER E. KANE, State University of New York at Brockport

STUDENT OFFICERS

President: STEVE McDONALD, Samford University
First Vice President: GREGORY METGE, Northern Iowa University
Second Vice President: ROBERT TANENBAUM, University of Miami
Secretary: MAY JEAN GO, University of Tennessee

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 46135
Associate Editors: BERNARD L. BROCK, Wayne State University; ROBERT FRIEDENBERG, Miami University; KASS KOVALCHECK, Vanderbilt University; ROBERT TANENBAUM, University of Miami.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 11

March, 1974

Number 3

Editor's Page 66

STUDENT FORUM

Conflicting Assumptions of Modern Debate: A Classic Example—*Ben Jones and Jim Flegle* 67

“It is apparent that the true implications of the hypothetical counterplan were never fully developed in the final round at the Naval Academy. Theoretical implications were never argued, nor were basic theoretical assumptions of the opposing teams.”

CURRENT CRITICISM

The Rhetorical Campaign of One Jesus Person—*William Henderson* . . . 71

“If other members of the Jesus movement work as well as Ron Reed, then one should have little reason to wonder at the prosperity of the movement. His campaign, whether deliberate or accidental, suited the situation at Macalester.”

Pity the Poor First Affirmative—*Howard Pelham* 80

“Because of the effective use of the negative block, the first affirmative rebuttal has become the most frustrating experience in debate for a debater who knows what he is doing and takes pride in doing it well.”

DSR-TKA Committees 83

National Council Minutes, November, 1973 84

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 \$10.50, or the official keypin of 10K is \$11.75. A lapel button is available for \$7.00. **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.

EDITOR'S PAGE

Periodically we express appreciation to those of you who provide us with response and reaction to what appears in these pages. This kind of response becomes especially helpful in a time when the whole purpose and function of this journal are subject to review.

We see substantial changes ahead for *Speaker and Gavel*. The impetus for change will be provided partly by the National Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha as they re-examine the functions of the journal in the light of the organizational and financial exigencies of the society. It will also be provided by the editorial staff as we formulate new goals for the future.

The National Council has discussed changes in the size and frequency of publication of *Speaker and Gavel*. They also have a concern for the place of the publication in the context of the purposes and objectives of DSR-TKA. Obviously, *Speaker and Gavel* is a major instrument in carrying out those purposes. The degree to which it serves as a "house organ," as a medium of communication for the forensics community, and as a journal of general interest to our membership and other individuals, will be determined in this perspective.

From the editor's point of view, we are ready for change because the three major aims we set forth several years ago have been in effect achieved. We wanted to confirm the commitment established by Wayne Brockriede to the publication of significant current criticism, we wanted to increase the amount of student thought and opinion published by *Speaker and Gavel*, and we wanted to improve the "visibility" of this journal in the academic world. The progress made in these areas leaves us open for new objectives.

In the larger view now being taken, it seems to us that *Speaker and Gavel* may well aim to respond to the contemporary ferment in the forensic world. We all need help in implementing programs which will move in the direction of goals generally recognized as desirable, such as, for one thing, the *humanizing* of forensics, and for another, the achievement of greater *out-reach* into the real world. *Speaker and Gavel* may find a new role in leading the way.

In any event, whether *Speaker and Gavel* is to have one issue a year or four, whether it is to be primarily a house organ or aspire to be a scholarly journal, whether it is to assume an evangelical tone or provide a neutral forum for conflicting positions, readers such as yourself can provide some answers by communicating with the editor, the National Council, or your chapter sponsor about what you think *Speaker and Gavel* should be.

Robert O. Weiss

CONFLICTING ASSUMPTIONS OF MODERN DEBATE: A CLASSIC EXAMPLE

BEN JONES AND JIM FLEGLE

The final debate at the 1973 National Debate Tournament on the topic "RESOLVED: That the Federal Government should provide a program of comprehensive medical care for all citizens" was unusual in that basic theoretical assumptions played a fundamental role in the argumentative approaches selected by each team. The purpose of this essay will be to examine those theoretical differences as developed in the debate and in so doing gauge the effectiveness of at least this debate as a forum for arguing theoretical values.

PART I: JUSTIFICATION AND COMPARISON OF POLICY SYSTEMS

Traditionally, intercollegiate debaters and coaches have assumed that all parts of the affirmative plan must be "justified." This is a natural outgrowth of the belief that presumption lies with the present system and that change must always be "justified." Given this, a segment of the affirmative plan for which reasons are not given becomes a request for change at random and as such fails to overcome the presumption of the present system.

Since it is fairly common for affirmatives to have separate advantages stemming from different planks of the plan, the practical effect of this idea of presumption upon debating is the requirement that the affirmative carry enough advantages to have at least one stemming from each part of the proposal. Only in this way could the plan and all its parts be "justified."

The affirmative in our debate, however, proceeds on radically different assumptions. This becomes apparent when the first affirmative constructive presents his plan as "examples of the resolution." This implies that the three advantages of the affirmative and their corresponding plan planks are both separately and totally "comprehensive medical care." Yet, "justification" means that this implies much more. Obviously, the affirmative need only "justify" the resolution once, so if *each* advantage is the resolution, then one advantage standing at the end of the debate justifies adoption (even if two-thirds of the advantages and plan planks are defeated). Conversely, the negative should need only to defeat the resolution once, implying that the defeat of *one* advantage means that the resolution has been defeated.

Georgetown seeks to avoid this paradox by taking what we shall call the "comparison of policy systems" approach. Under this approach the affirmative maintains that justification is an invalid argument, and that the rational man only requires an assured advantage with no disadvantages to have ample reason to buy the resolution and change. Accordingly, an affirmative using this assumption would claim that justifying specific plan planks is unnecessary as long as there are no disadvantages to the adoption of such theoretical baggage. At the end of the debate one would weigh

Ben Jones and Jim Flegle were members of the winning University of Kentucky Team in Two-man debate at the 1973 DSR-TKA National Conference.

advantages of the plan against whatever disadvantages stand and vote on "comparison of policy systems" rather than whether each part of the plan is "justified" in the case. Let us examine the debate beginning with first negative constructive and watch these two constructs develop.

Mr. Minceberg, Northwestern's first negative, argues justification (specifically dependence of advantages), which he presents in two ways. First he argues that the plan in totality is "comprehensive medical care" and therefore each advantage and its corresponding plan plank is, by definition, only part of "comprehensive care." Therefore, all advantages must be won or the resolution of "comprehensive medical care" is not justified. Then, Mr. Minceberg tells us:

We would suggest a hypothetical counterplan. That is, at the end of the debate, if they (Georgetown) don't carry all three advantages, adopt whatever ones they do carry and use the rest of the money to fund things like tax rebates, pollution control, etcetera. That, we would suggest, would be a superior policy system unless they can carry all three advantages, which is the resolution.

A moment's thought will convince one that this "hypothetical counterplan" is not only a rephrasing of "justification," but is actually the real world value behind justification arguments. Minceberg is pointing out that, in the real world, policy is decided not only by comparing the proposal with the present system but also with all alternatives to the affirmative system. Therefore, if the affirmative has costly and "unjustified" parts of their proposal then we should not buy change on what advantages are left. We should rather devise an alternate system which accrues the advantages without the excess and "unjustified" changes in the plan. The first negative constructive has thus argued that all parts of the proposal must be justified and given a theoretical defense of his position.

Unfortunately, this argument degenerates throughout the remainder of the debate. The second affirmative constructive does not clash with the reason why all planks must be justified. Rather, he does two things: 1) He asks questions about the "counterplan," and 2) He repeats the affirmative assumption that "at the end of the debate you should weigh the advantages of this plan against any disadvantages which still stand."

Opportunity knocks at the negative door. Yet first negative rebuttal does not demand that the affirmative defend the "comparison of policy systems" approach, nor does he note the reasons for requiring "justification" which were presented in his constructive. Because of time—or other pressures—these theoretical positions are dropped and first negative rebuttal extends the arguments that each advantage is only part of "comprehensive medical care." Although this is an important argument, the basic differing assumptions of each team are no longer being discussed or defended. The first affirmative rebuttal also ignores the issue. He deals with the theoretical arguments by saying: "Number one, we give you one policy system. Number two, he does not explain why any particular plank of the case is not comprehensive medical care. He merely asserts that." The last two rebuttals give this issue similar non-treatment, answering the questions, but never attempting to argue either "that you must justify" or that "we should only compare systems."

The conclusion we draw is that even though these two teams were operating under entirely different assumptions as to the burdens of the affirmative in a policy debate, the fundamental differences were never

argued. The theoretical portion of the debate centered on questions such as “which planks of our plan does your counterplan adopt” and other questions which are perhaps significant in the debate itself, but tangential to the problem of what should be required of an affirmative team in their effort to convince us to change policies and systems.

PART II: JUSTIFICATION AND PRESUMPTION

To describe the relationship between “justification” (or, hypothetical counterplan) and “presumption,” one must look closely at the concept of “presumption” and establish precisely what it means. To different theoreticians it apparently means diametrically opposing things.

1. Presumption of the *Status Quo*

To those of the “traditional suasion,” presumption is “with the *status quo*.” In other words, that which is presently standing (or is “in the shade,” as Ehninger and Brockriede suggest) is presumed to be worthy of continuation unless some good reason for disrupting the stasis is presented. This allows the negative the option of “direct refutation,” in which the negative charges that the affirmative does not prove its case for overturning presumption. It also allows the affirmative to charge that when the negative abandons the *status quo* for some more strategic non-topical option the negative abandons “presumption” and must thus defend its position in the same manner as the affirmative.

This position is by far the most common found in debate textbooks.

2. Presumption against the Resolution

A minority opinion on the debate circuit now suggests that presumption is NOT with the *status quo*, but it is with “the position which is contrary to the resolution”—*i.e.*, the negative position. This concept does not force the negative to defend the *status quo* in order to maintain the advantages of “presumption.” It allows the negative to defend any composite of minor repairs, structural changes, and present mechanisms which are not within the purview of the topic. Thus, the negative is allowed the options of presenting hypothetical alternatives to the affirmative position, and the affirmative is obliged to defend its plan/case in light of the presented alternatives. This requires more than just an affirmative response that “the negative does not defend its position, so throw it out.” It requires an affirmative to defend its position—because presumption must be overturned, even with these changes from without the *status quo*.

It is interesting to apply these constructs to the hypothetical counterplan presented by Northwestern. As is apparent, if presumption is with the *status quo*, the negative abandons its presumption if it defends a hypothetical counterplan in an area of the affirmative case. This, of course, assumes that the negative must stake out its counterplan—hypothetical or no—and defend it with vigor, not merely assert that its advantages are apparent.

But, if presumption is against the resolution, it is not abandoned by Northwestern’s presentation. Presumption is now against the resolution, and therefore not only with the *status quo* but also with alternate systems to the *status quo* (the type depending on the outcome of the affirmative harm). If the negative presents these options, defends them as non-topical, and the affirmative does not deny with the necessary proof that these

options are unsatisfactory, negative presumption would carry the decision. This conception of the "resolution presumption" allows the negative much more ground with which to work. By allowing it to defend not only the *status quo*, but non-resolutional alternatives as well, without totally documenting in affirmative fashion the feasibility or desirability of such options, the negative has gained much more strategic advantage within the debate. The concept of "independent advantages" then becomes as much a burden for the affirmative as it is for the negative—unless, or course, all advantages come from the totality of the plan, instead of from separate planks.

We are now left to determine the strategies incorporated in the final round at NDT 1973. It is apparent that "presumption" *per se* was not argued. Second affirmative constructive asserts, "He (Minceberg) abandons presumption." First negative does not respond; neither does first affirmative; neither does second negative. Final affirmative rebuttalist once again asserts "He (Minceberg) gives up presumption in totality." Why? We never know.

Neither team argues the idea of presumption with relation to the hypothetical counterplan. Neither argues the philosophical constructs underlying either position. As a result, the items in the debate resolve very little regarding the philosophical/theoretical aspects of the argument.

Although not overtly argued, several levels of presumption were present within the debate itself. For example, it appears that the affirmative "presumed" that presumption was with the *status quo*. Thus, any significant negative aberration from that position automatically gave up the negative's advantageous position of presumption. This concept underlies assertions by both affirmative speakers. The negative presumed that presumption was against the resolution, that any option presented by the negative must be handled by the affirmative in the manner in which the negative must handle defenses of the *status quo*. These two clashes were NEVER debated in the round itself, yet form the philosophical basis for two radically different assumptions implicit in the debate.

CONCLUSION

It is apparent to the authors that the true implications of the hypothetical counterplan were never fully developed in the final round at the Naval Academy. Theoretical implications were never argued, nor were basic theoretical assumptions of the opposing teams. It would seem that this points to one of the major failures of debate in general. We have not adequately discussed and debated the underlying theories, rationales, etc., within our own system. This becomes an acute problem when teams differ greatly on the assumptions incorporated into their positions without discussing the values (or impact) of their assumptions in the debate.

It is equally apparent to the authors that there is now greater interest in debate theory and its application to the debate situation than in previous years. We believe this to be advantageous. It is hoped that it will continue.

THE RHETORICAL CAMPAIGN OF ONE JESUS PERSON

BILL HENDERSON

Ron Reed arrived, preached, and left Macalester College within three months. Ron, a modern circuit-riding minister of the Southern tradition, stops at a college, finds residence within a friendly commune, preaches a fundamentalist brand of faith to available audiences, and then as the developing group begins to prosper, he leaves. Like a modern Johnny Appleseed, Ron plants a simple, non-intellectual seed of faith, hoping that the seed will survive the dual storms of established religion and the devil.

A continuing phenomenon on and around many colleges during the past five years has been the presence of individuals known as "Jesus people." The movement is spreading rapidly. Whether part of the counterculture described by Theodore Roszak,¹ the many "free" churches,² the National Association of Evangelicals,³ the emerging group of young Jewish Christians,⁴ or the campus revolution here described, the Jesus people seem to represent more than a moral fad. Much comment appears in the popular media and in church periodicals. Some comment exists in sociological journals. No articles appear in the journals of rhetoric. And yet, the movement seems essentially rhetorical in its development. An interesting rhetorical campaign conducted by a Jesus person at Macalester College is reported below. Proceeding from an experiential point of view,⁵ the study includes two parts: the rhetorical campaign and an evaluation.

Ron and other leaders in the Jesus-movement face a common rhetorical problem: gaining acceptance for their beliefs. To understand Ron Reed's answer to this problem requires a brief background of the Jesus movement, placing Ron Reed within that movement, comment about Ron's beliefs, and a view of his rhetorical campaign.

Background of the Movement

A minority of the current youth population exhibits its own rebellion aimed at other youths as well as the adult establishment. Finding loftier

Bill Henderson is a member of the Speech Department at the University of Houston.

¹ *The Making of a Counter Culture*, Anchor Books (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968).

² Robert A. McKenzie, "The 'Free' Church of Berkeley's Hippies," *The Christian Century*, 10 April 1968, pp. 464-66; Lawrence E. Davis, "Berkeley Hears Far-Out Liturgy," *New York Times*, 15 June 1969, p. 39; "Hippie Ordination," *Time*, 22 March 1968, p. 63.

³ "Youth is Stressed by Evangelicals," *New York Times*, 25 April 1971, p. 44.

⁴ "Jews for Jesus," *Time*, 12 June 1972, pp. 66-67.

⁵ Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 121-28, 401-407. The writer faced the traditional tensions regarding "typicality" of his subject. Believing Ron Reed worthy of study even if unique within the Jesus movement, the writer suggests that only an accumulation of several studies can eventually advance criticism of this genre. However, the evidence available in the literature does suggest that Reed "fits" current views of campus leaders in the Jesus movement.

goals than elections or hair lengths, this vocal minority seeks eternal happiness through Jesus Christ. Their missionary zeal caused the drug culture to call them "Jesus freaks," and later, the name became the Jesus people. Various estimated as including thousands to hundreds of thousands,⁶ the Jesus people are currently prospering on the campuses of American colleges. Although not sure of the life span of the movement, clerygmen like Houston's John Bisagno say "All I know is that kids are turning on to Jesus."⁷

Beginning on the two coasts, the movement has swelled since 1967. Currently, most college campuses have active Jesus people in their midsts.⁸ The West Coast branch began as "acid graduates, students of smack, mescaline majors, speed freaks—all having forsaken their individual nirvanas for the joys of Jesus."⁹ Their Eastern brothers and sisters flowered under the influences of men like David Wilkerson, an Assemblies of God minister who preaches person-to-person evangelism.¹⁰ Southern evangelism spread from Teen Challenge and similar organizations.¹¹

James Nolan divides the movement into three factions: "the ecstasies, who live in relative seclusion, the do-good evangelists, who run the Jesus crash-pads; and the quasi-politicos, who bait left-wing causes and occasionally disrupt radical rallies and congregations."¹² Morality, a dirty word to college students of 1967, is now called "far-out" in a different way.

Ron Reed, a Jesus Person

To this writer, Ron Reed seems an excellent representative of the do-good evangelist faction described by James Nolan. He has certainly paid his dues. During the past several years Ron has worked with David Wilkerson in New York City, lived in several California communes, worked with students on dozens of college campuses and in their communes, and continues to devote his full energies to "the work of the Lord."¹³ He accepts no pay for his work, but instead, shares the life-style of whatever group

⁶ "The New Rebel Cry: Jesus is Coming!" *Time*, 21 June 1971, p. 58. Hereinafter referred to as "Rebel Cry." When the estimate is as large as hundreds of thousands the figure generally includes those Jesus people who accept established religion, and attend organized churches. By 1971 *Time* estimated that more than 600 communes existed across the United States. Non-commune members of the movement abound at colleges of the United States. On many campuses, students shun standard religions. A *New York Times* writer commented that students "have no interest in trying to reform the churches. If they are religious at all, they tend to indulge in the private forms and practices of their culture." "Campus Religious Fervor Shuns Standard Religions," *New York Times*, 2 November 1969, p. 85.

⁷ "Rebel Cry," p. 61.

⁸ Phil Tracy, "The Jesus Freaks: Savagery and Salvation on Sunset Strip," *Commonweal*, 30 October 1970, p. 123. Hereinafter referred to as "Jesus Freaks."

⁹ Kneeland, Douglas E., "The Jesus Movement Spreading on Campus," *New York Times*, 26 December 1971, pp. 1, 38.

¹⁰ "Rebel Cry," p. 62.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² "Jesus Now: Hogwash and Holy Water," *Ramparts*, August, 1971, pp. 24-25. Hereinafter referred to as "Jesus Now."

¹³ Ron Reed. Interview of 29 March 1972, Personal files of Bill Henderson, St. Paul, Minnesota. Hereinafter referred to as Interview.

of students that provides his accommodations. He announces to anyone who asks that he is a Jesus person.

The descriptions found in the literature of the movement further identify Reed as typical. Nolan notes that most groups have a "daddy figure who, despite the preaching and soul-saving, really seems to care, and won't make you cut your hair," and adds that these figures support deeply ingrained, evangelical Bible Belt Christianity despite estrangement from the established churches.¹⁴ On consecutive weeks, New York *Times* articles talked of the traditional protestant fundamentalism with literal interpretation of the Bible and suspicions of middle class institutions, including fundamentalist churches, as signs of the Jesus people.¹⁵ These characteristics each fit Ron Reed's beliefs. A *Commonweal* description of a do-good evangelist of the movement and his wife epitomized Ron Reed's relations with the Macalester students: "What seems to have brought most of them into Tony and Susan's orbit is the fact that Tony and Susan gave a shit whether they live or die."¹⁶ Ron's beliefs also fit *Time's* comment on the movement: "The Jesus revolution rejects not only the material values of conventional America but the prevailing wisdom of American theology. . . . The movement's transcendental, personal God who comes to earth in the person of Jesus, in the lives of individuals"¹⁷ is Ron Reed's God.

Son and grandson of Baptist ministers, carrying the wound of his wife and daughter's accidental deaths, ordained minister who gave up his pastorate to seek lost souls for Jesus, Ron Reed is a professional Jesus person. He is part of an ever-expanding group of men who move from campus to campus in search of lost souls for Jesus Christ.

Ron Reed at Macalester

A practical demonstration of the Jesus person at work occurred while Ron was at Macalester College. Ron arrived on the small, church-related liberal arts campus in early February, 1972. A girl living in the commune where Ron had taken up residence mentioned his work in her speech class. Wanting to participate in an actual persuasive attempt, the class invited Ron to speak to them. After an interview with the instructor,¹⁸ Ron spoke on April 4, 1972. As a consequence of the videotaped speech and subsequent interviews with Ron, students who live in the commune, and other Macalester students, the writer accepts the following as an accurate description of Ron Reed's role as a Jesus person.

Reed's speech contained two notions; his views about Christian beliefs and his expectations for students at Macalester College. The first belief places him within the fundamentalist camp of religious beliefs in the Southern Baptist tradition: "First of all, the Christian believes, number one, that the Bible is literally the word of God and literally true."¹⁹ Re-

¹⁴ "Jesus Now," p. 21.

¹⁵ Fiske, Edward B., "Yellow Submarine is Symbol of Youth Churches," New York *Times*, 20 April 1970, p. 23. See also; "Many Youths are Abandoning Psychedelic Drugs," New York *Times*, 26 April 1970, pp. 1, 69.

¹⁶ "Jesus Freaks," p. 125.

¹⁷ Interview.

¹⁸ An additional interview was conducted following the 4 April 1972 speech by the writer with Ron Reed, but is not directly cited in this paper.

¹⁹ Transcript of Videotape, Ron Reed speech at Macalester of 4 April 1972, Personal files of Bill Henderson, St. Paul, Minnesota, p. 1. Hereinafter referred to as Transcript.

jecting all questions related to authenticity and accuracy, religion as Ron Reed sees it is absolute, according to the Bible. He maintained this position of absolutism during the speech, the questioning period which followed, and in interviews with the writer. Both the other three beliefs and Ron's expectations for Macalester seem to flow directly from this central belief. One member of the Tuesday evening sessions at Macalester that developed into meetings with Ron commented later: "The main thing we talked about was how perfect the Bible was."²⁰

The second belief Ron expressed during his speech, that "the Christian believes literally in the second coming of Christ, as explained in the book of Revelations,"²¹ identifies a future event which serves as the terminal point of earthly affairs. When questioned later about the lack of emphasis on heaven in his message, Ron responded that the kids need to concentrate on now, not the future.²² Reed's fourth point, that the Christian "believes that there is a literal, physical hell and that those that don't accept Christ, those that refuse Christ as Lord and Savior, on the second coming of the Lord will be condemned to this hell"²³ stresses what will happen on the future date. If the Bible is literally true, however, both of these points regarding the future must be accepted. Ron's listeners are drawn, therefore, to his third point: "The Christian believes that a person can know the person of Jesus Christ personally just like I'm going to get to know you, and just like you know your closest friend: by simply praying and accepting the Lord, Jesus Christ, as your personal savior."²⁴ Here Ron's belief is focused upon the here-and-now. Here Ron offers an individualized concept of religion which serves as the method by which a non-Christian may become a Christian. The implications of this concept are discussed later in the paper.

Whereas Ron developed considerable detail about the Christian beliefs, his expectations for students at Macalester College were briefly mentioned. After a rambling personal history he said: "I'm here so I can watch Christ turn this campus upside down for him."²⁵ He offered no plans, nor any specific role for himself in the expected changes at Macalester. The work would be done by Jesus Christ, not Ron Reed. When questioned about this apparent denigration of self by Reed, a member of the commune where he lived indicated that this was his usual stance.²⁶

As the twenty-minute speech ended, Ron asked for questions. Here, further tensions between traditional religion and Ron's particular brand of the Jesus movement emerged. When asked why he felt a need for something more than the area churches, Ron responded: "If you'll read in the Bible . . . you'll find that Jesus was against the religious program. . . . So we're not talking about a religious system as such, we are talking about a personal relationship with Jesus."²⁷ Asked who he meant by "we" he answered: "I'm talking about the kids that have experienced a personal

²⁰ Jeanne Westgate. Interview of 18 April 1972. Personal files of Bill Henderson, St. Paul, Minnesota. Hereinafter referred to as Westgate Interview.

²¹ Transcript, p. 2.

²² Interview.

²³ Transcript, p. 3.

²⁴ Transcript, p. 2.

²⁵ Transcript, p. 4.

²⁶ Westgate Interview.

²⁷ Transcript, p. 6.

relationship with Christ. Those kids that have come into the Christian faith."²⁸ This internal consistency to a personal relationship with Christ is verified by each of the interviews conducted by the writer with Reed and those who knew him at Macalester.

The third student question touched the core of Reed's beliefs. When asked to intellectually describe his belief so that the student might discover the personal relationship Reed began: "There's no way I could do it," and launched into an attack upon organized religion as an intervening agent which could block finding Christ. "I can't win anyone to Christ nor can anyone else win anyone to Christ. We just have to let the love of Christ shine through us and let them see Christ in us and when we do have an opportunity to share and let the Lord, this is all we can do."²⁹ The answer continued for another twenty minutes and incorporated personal testimony, a number of examples and illustrations, a blackboard demonstration, and quotations from the Bible. He concluded this answer by noting that only faith, not intellect, could build the personal relationship. He seemed to echo the words of Browne Barr, writing in *The Christian Century* about the Jesus people: "They often accord high honor to Jesus, the gentle teacher, while scorning religion in any organized sense."³⁰

Two additional comments during the questioning period are noteworthy. When asked about the Holy Trinity, Ron said, after several false starts, "that one throws me."³¹ After repeating his original statement that he believed in the literal truth of the Bible, Ron then expressed no concern that portions of the Bible were confusing to him. Another question did worry him. When asked if one might find God through Hinduism or Bahai, he indicated that since the Bible was literally true, such investigations were doomed to failure. As Peter Marin notes about another group of Jesus people facing similar challenges, one had responded "but he wasn't, after all, a true Christian."³² One can never find Jesus without the Bible.

Throughout Reed's stay at Macalester he held firm to his absolute commitment to the Bible. He never claimed any special skill for himself, and in fact, denied such skill. Instead, he emphasized that the Bible was the literal truth, and that the only way to be saved was through a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

The Rhetorical Campaign of a Jesus Person

The speech at the Macalester speech class represented one of Ron Reed's campaign efforts at Macalester. Developed and refined by his past experiences, the campaign followed essentially the same pattern as he had followed at other colleges. He said, "I always work about the same way" in response to the writer's question about his preaching. Here, the rambling personal history given in the speech class reveals Reed's pattern. "When I first came to the campus we talked with as many of the kids as we could. They indicated they wanted more of the program. And in looking at the program, the kids that we talked to, and I'm not knocking your fine chaplain, but the kids were dissatisfied."³³ When asked how many students

²⁸ Transcript, p. 7.

²⁹ Transcript, p. 8.

³⁰ "Beyond Activism," 7 February 1968, p. 160.

³¹ Transcript, p. 12.

³² "Children of Yearning," *Saturday Review*, 6 May 1972, p. 61.

³³ Transcript, p. 6.

he had talked to during his early period at Macalester, he indicated that he couldn't count them, but that he had wanted to talk to all 2,000. Ron met the students in the student union, dining commons, post office—wherever he could find them. The campaign began by getting to know the specific audience.

The campaign proceeded to find an entrance into an already functioning informal group. "I went to a particular meeting of a group of Catholics that have come into the Christian faith and the Christian belief. So I met a young man here that I talked to about Macalester. . . . I started telling him about my experiences, and he invited me to come out for a Tuesday night meeting which I didn't even know existed at that time. So I came out, so they've been asking me to come out ever since, and I've really enjoyed doing it."³⁴

Other aspects of the campaign included moving into a friendly commune, where "evenings tended to become sessions with Ron" according to one member.³⁵ If Ron came home, he usually brought two or three friends he had met during the day at Macalester. If not, he was eating at the commons on someone's meal ticket. He did his part to keep up the commune, however. When the water pipes burst, Ron called for repairs and mopped up the pad. He fixed meals on occasion. And he talked of Jesus Christ.

The details of the campaign read remarkably like any thorough persuasive effort. He met and talked with the various professors of religion on campus. In his speech to the writer's class he could talk of the general discontent of the professors about current religious systems. He carefully sought out the religion majors on campus, and talked with them. Next came the students in sociology and philosophy. Over coffee in the union, on the mall, in the hallways of campus buildings, and in the dormitories, Ron Reed got to know the campus while the campus population came to know him. He was, in general, readily available to anyone who wanted to talk about Jesus Christ.

The Tuesday evening meetings held in one of the dormitories usually had twenty-five or thirty students in attendance. Ron could boast of a number of new Christians at Macalester. Then, suddenly, Ron left Macalester. He told a few close friends that he was going to California, but left no forwarding address for mail, nor any prospect that he would return to Macalester. The new Christians were left to maintain their personal relationship with Jesus Christ without any additional assistance from Ron Reed. The salvation had occurred through personal relationship with the Lord, and that salvation would be maintained by the continuing personal relationship.

Evaluation

If other members of the Jesus movement work as well as Ron Reed, then one should have little reason to wonder at the prosperity of the movement. His campaign, whether deliberate or accidental, suited the situation at Macalester. Not unlike the students at most small liberal arts colleges in the United States, the Macalester students no longer work vigorously on anti-war protests. Instead, they look inward for issues. Courses in religion, humanities, philosophy, and sociology are quite popular.

³⁴ Transcript, p. 5.

³⁵ Westgate Interview.

Similar to the student described by Peter Marin, "every passing idea is turned zealously into a faith. The *I Ching*, the Tarot cards, the *Whole Earth Catalog*, and the ephemerides become fundamental texts."³⁶ Like other college students, their church attendance has declined.³⁷ Reasons offered for this decline seem correct for Macalester students: congregations "organize themselves around the middle-class life style,"³⁸ churches appeal to the intellect, not emotion,³⁹ and do not maintain close contact between church leaders and the membership.⁴⁰ The well-known generation gap exists at Macalester, as elsewhere. The drug culture declining, the student searches for something else at Macalester. That something else for some was the religion of Ron Reed.

In Ron's campaign, the Bible as literal truth served as the major premise for his argument, just as the Bible serves similarly for organized religions. But whereas traditional religion relies upon a preacher or another Christian to help the new Christian implement the conversion, Ron relies upon a personal relationship with Jesus Christ for that conversion. Reed's shift allows three important persuasive shifts which should increase the number of converts among a college population: 1) the student may retain his antiestablishment fervor, 2) the message still relies upon the student's past training that the Bible is literally true, and 3) the message provides a fool-proof solution: "If each of you tries the Christian faith and you find that it doesn't work, you see me and we'll get this same class together and I'll stand up here publicly and call God a liar."⁴¹ He had said that all the student had to do was pray, and the personal relationship with Jesus Christ would begin. Only the student and the mystical presence of Jesus Christ can testify to the success of the relationship. Once the student announces a commitment, then whatever happens thereafter is a product of that relationship. In addition, the oral commitment would seem to make later denial even more difficult. Thus a rhetorical act without a prospect of failure.

If considered within a traditional paradigm, Reed practices effective persuasion. A number of the previously mentioned strategies of his campaign establish that he employs the tools of persuasion with some skill.

Upon arrival at Macalester, Reed began questioning the students. He met them on their home territory, the campus, and asked them about their religious lives. He questioned them about the churches in the area; he wanted to know what they found unsatisfactory about the religious life they led. He was getting to know his audience. Unstinting of his time, he wished he could have talked to all of the students. Sampling, it would appear, was not a sufficient method for Reed. He continued his investigation by meeting the professors of religion on campus; the religion majors were deliberately sought out also.

³⁶ "Children of Yearning," p. 58.

³⁷ See "Number of Adult Churchgoers Found Continuing to Decrease," *New York Times*, 28 December 1969, p. 56; "Christmas, 1970: Church Crisis," *New York Times*, 25 December 1970, p. 40.

³⁸ Charles W. Estus and Michael A. Overington, "The Meaning and End of Religiosity," *American Journal of Sociology*, 75, No. 5 (March, 1970), 771.

³⁹ "Beyond Activism," p. 160.

⁴⁰ "Rebel Cry," p. 58.

⁴¹ Transcript, p. 12.

Next, Reed made a place for himself amidst the students. Finding a friendly informal group, he joined them. He became a familiar sight in the union, on the mall, in the dining commons, and in the hallways of the campus buildings. Given the complete commitment Reed gave to his campaign, no student who became familiar with Ron could question his motives. Working without pay, available at all hours, and always seeking converts equaled a kind of sincerity quite uncommon to the student population. Ron told stories of other college youths who had found the way to Christ. He had a ready supply of them. He could talk of David Wilkerson and the work with New York gangs. Ordinary in appearance, Ron was extraordinary in his behavior. "I just liked to talk with him," said one interviewed student.⁴²

Familiar with and to his audience, Ron had a message which developed from the deductive generalization that the Bible is literally true. Once verbal commitment was made to that belief by his listener, the other arguments were readily accepted. One could not deny the second coming of Christ nor the damnation of those who refused to accept a personal relationship with Jesus Christ as the way to salvation. Avoiding any diminution of the self-esteem of his audience by placing each individual in a direct relationship with Jesus Christ, Reed also used the general opposition to organized churches as a further reason to accept his brand of religion.

During the later portion of his Macalester campaign, Ron remained available both to recent converts and the doubters of his audience. Willing to rap at length, he stressed that the intellectual doubts were unnecessary for only prayer could provide the connection with Jesus Christ.

The final step of his campaign, the departure, seems crucial to his success. To remain would foster an organized religion. To leave meant individual reliance upon Jesus Christ. Whether the newly generated religious enthusiasm of some Macalester students will continue in the future is problematic. One would expect the emotional fervor to decline with the passage of time. But the movement has not declined during the past five years; an established evangelist, Billy Graham, welcomes the movement,⁴³ a New Jersey Rabbi, Alexander Schindler feels that the movement provides a "religion which sets the soul on fire,"⁴⁴ and must be countered by his community as a long-term threat, and other religious leaders are writing in church periodicals about the phenomenon, but not as a passing fad.

Edward B. Fiske noted about the movement, "Most Jesus People are young rebels against middle-class culture who find that acceptance of Jesus Christ as Savior has given them a whole new purpose in life."⁴⁵ When the movement leaders offer, like Ron, an absolutism at a time when most other values are being questioned, the movement provides a way to give meaning to the students' lives. One would imagine that the methods employed at Macalester would meet with considerable success at many colleges. A more experienced, bit older, friendly person like Ron who has become familiar with the campus and its students, one

⁴² Milree Keeling. Interview of 17 April 1972. Personal files of Bill Henderson, St. Paul, Minnesota.

⁴³ "In a Good Old American Tradition," *New York Times*, 4 July 1971, p. 80.

⁴⁴ "Jews for Jesus," *Time*, 12 June 1972, p. 67.

⁴⁵ "In a Good Old American Tradition," p. 80.

who is readily available for rap sessions and does not object to student ways, should find persuasive success.

When on his way to the speech for the Macalester class, Ron asked a girl he did not know to attend the Tuesday evening rap session. She responded, "Oh, I've heard about those meetings."⁴⁶ If Ron could become the resident Jesus person at Macalester, he could find similar success on other small college campuses. At a large university, where students might well be even lonelier, the appeal might be even stronger. Ron now has a few more stories to add to his collection. These concern Macalester students. He is, undoubtedly, now sharing his experiences with a new group of students. Certainly other Jesus people could employ similar tactics wherever they might be.

The legendary Johnny Appleseed traveled the countryside planting his apple seeds. Striding across fertile lands in a favorable climate, he did not have to remain long at any one place. He just planted seeds and let the Lord do the work. The people who lived in the area were later able to enjoy the fruits of the Lord's work. Ron Reed, a latter-day Johnny Appleseed, travels with equal dedication. His crop at Macalester includes two Jesus communes, continued Tuesday rap sessions, and a few more Christians.

⁴⁶ Transcript, p. 5.

Now Available CURRENT CRITICISM

Twenty essays which appeared in the Current Criticism department of *Speaker and Gavel* between 1966 and 1970 have been reprinted as a paperback book by Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

These studies provide a lively panorama of the significant themes to which contemporary speakers address themselves. The agonies of the Vietnam decisions and the emergence of the "black power" issue strikingly dominate the concerns of speakers and critics alike, but other issues as well are given rhetorical analysis in this volume.

Copies of *Current Criticism* may be obtained for \$2.50 from Theodore Walwik, National Secretary, DSR-TKA, Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock, Penna. 16057. They are also available from the Speech Communication Association, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y. 10001.

PITY THE POOR FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

HOWARD PELHAM

"The affirmative got too far behind after the negative block," is a comment frequently found on debate ballots in justification of negative wins. Other comments illustrative of the same problem: "The affirmative team lost momentum after the negative block" and "The affirmative team dropped too many plan attacks in rebuttal." Each dramatizes the dilemma of even very good affirmative teams when a negative team strategically utilizes the negative block in the debate format.

Perhaps the most eloquent dramatization came when a negative team in a recent elimination round of a nationally ranked tournament used the block to perfection. There were approximately twenty-five arguments left to confront the first affirmative rebuttalist—about two-thirds were plan attacks and about one-third were extensions pulled through from the first negative constructive. I got the impression the debater knew that the tournament might ride on what he did in five minutes with those twenty-five points. He arranged his notes, took a firm stance and a deep breath, adopted a rushed, mechanical rate, and attempted to extend on all points. He finished a few seconds after the stop card flashed. He had managed to say something—never mind the quality—to each point. The face he turned to his coach, who sat in the gallery, seemed to glow with pride in his achievement. He expected high praise.

Of course, he lost. Strategic use of the negative block proved an impossible burden which he literally stood no chance to successfully assume. Because of the effective use of negative block, the first affirmative rebuttal has become the most frustrating experience in debate for a debater who knows what he is doing and takes pride in doing it well. He is frustrated because preparation, intelligence, talent may become even a handicap instead of assuring him of success against a good negative block spread. The reasons are interesting when submitted to analysis.

First, we should review briefly what is effective use of the block. A talented second negative will usually submit three or four areas of argument against the plan. He might begin with observations, move to workability attacks, then uniqueness arguments, and finally disadvantages. All areas may be used, or he might prefer to use fewer areas but increase the attacks in each area. Whatever the case, the attacks will probably number from twelve to sixteen, following which the first negative continues to pile it on for five more minutes. Assuming the first negative to be a talented debater, he will choose the attacks he has already delivered which he thinks have been given the weakest extensions. He pulls as many of these as possible through to his rebuttal. They will average from approximately five to eight major arguments. There may be additional minor ones. Thus at the end of the fifteen-minute block there are usually a minimum of seventeen and perhaps as many as twenty-four attacks demanding extension from a frustrated first affirmative rebuttalist.

The problem assumes additional dimensions when viewed from the perspective of the total debate. We note the obligation of an affirmative team to submit a believable case. Not only must it be believable, it must

Howard Pelham is Director of Forensics at the University of South Alabama.

be significant. Many a tight case has crumbled under the significance criteria. The case, however, must meet these criteria even as it takes as its target the indictment of a complex, unclearly defined, and controversial problem. Not only must the affirmative team indict, however, they must solve. The indictment and the solution are expected within the ten minutes of the first affirmative constructive. This may not be a universal must, but judges react negatively when it is not done.

I hear a great many really credible indictments given. They are tightly edited, of course. They usually occupy about eight minutes of the first affirmative constructive. Sometimes the documentation lacks depth, but the depth is often supplied as the debate progresses. Such is not the case with the plan. It is given in about two minutes of the speech and very little opportunity is found to advance it. Defending it becomes the major problem of the rest of the debate. Advancing the plan and defending it are entirely different processes. It is stretching a point, to say the least, to present as credible a four- or five-point so-called plan as a solution to a problem which meets the criteria of an effective indictment. It is totally inadequate unless the points are related to the indictment. This relating would require more persuasive details of how the plan would work which, in turn, would increase its believability. But there is no time in which to do this.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the burden of the first affirmative is considerably compounded then. Time has not permitted him to achieve credibility in the first affirmative. Certainly the second affirmative has no chance to add anything if responses are to be given by him to an effective first negative attack. So in the first affirmative rebuttal what is probably an incredible solution must be defended against what is many times a carefully thought out, carefully spread ten-minute attack. The defense must be made in what amounts to four minutes at the most. At least one minute must be given to extending case arguments if the speaker is not to be open to charges of "dropping the case." No wonder the poor debater in the opening example felt such a sense of achievement. Just to respond to twenty-five attacks regardless of quality *was* an achievement!

There are additional observations that need to be made about the impact of the block spread. What sort of adapting have first affirmative rebuttalists attempted in response? In a recent national tournament a debater considered to be one of the top two or three in the nation was talking just before the final round in which he was to meet a debater whom it was conceded was one of the other two top debaters. Both debaters are masters of the spread. The question under discussion was what was to be done in the first affirmative rebuttal if the team had to assume the affirmative.

"What do you do," asked the debater, "to offset the block spread other than group?"

There may be no answer to his question. To "group" is the obvious and logical response; but is it a good response? To group may not extend in a direct logical way an argument. It is weak in that its chief value is in the appearance of what it does. So a plan already laboring under the previously mentioned double burden must be defended with a less than adequate device.

First affirmative rebuttalists resort to other remedies. One is the mechanical and very rapid rate. He doesn't stand a chance here, either. Even if he doesn't offend a judge with his style, which he certainly gambles

upon doing, any success is pre-empted by fifteen minutes of attacks using almost the same style.

There is the simplified response. This is a response which is trimmed to its barest. It contains no coloring nor qualifying modifiers. In its purest form it is a simple sentence shorn of any qualification and containing absolutely nothing more than an assertion. The assertion may or may not have been substantiated in previous speeches. Such a technique may work if a judge isn't listening, isn't evaluating arguments, or feels a deep sympathy for first affirmatives in general. A debater requires a certain cast of mind to successfully execute such a technique. He must be an individual who is not aware nor careful of subtleties. If he is, he will take time very often to define and limit and qualify. Such care will lose him the debate for the reasons mentioned in the opening paragraph.

Assuming that many judges do listen to arguments and do evaluate relative qualities of arguments, the simplified response is still not the winning solution. Even if it is not rejected for undesirable reasons mentioned which contribute to dishonesty, its inadequacy as an extension of an argument will be recognized.

There is one sure-fire successful response for an affirmative team to the strategic use of the block by a negative team. The negative team must be caught by surprise. They must be confronted with a case about which they know very little. The affirmative team must choose an area of indictment peripheral to the central area of the proposition. Negative ignorance reduces negative effectiveness in many ways. It practically precludes a first negative spread. The first negative is reduced to falling back on significance. It is also an equalizing force in the negative's utilization of the block spread. A talented second negative will still offer a quantity of arguments. Most, however, will have been forged from thin air. Neat "sluffing" devices within the plan will allow the first affirmative rebuttalist to handle these attacks readily within the time available. Since the first negative is forbidden the origination of new arguments in rebuttal, he has to pull through what he could come up with while he was suffering from shock from the case. In this way the peripheral case utilizes the format, as does the negative team the block, to gain an advantage. It is one sure way in which the first affirmative rebuttalist can emerge victorious. There may even be some justification for his outrage when a judge votes against him on significance considering what he is subjected to when he moves to the center of the proposition, the area in which significance probably is easily achieved.

What then is the solution? Is it more tolerance for peripheral, one-shot cases? Tolerance to an alarming degree for such cases already exists. Any further movement in that direction would stretch credulity beyond acceptable standards. When I hear, as I did recently, a debate team in a national tournament illustrate significance with five thousand and urge adoption of a policy which would curtail the protection of literally millions for the sake of so few, we have already traveled beyond those limits.

Is there a solution? There are some suggestions which may be offered tentatively. The most obvious and logical, if my analysis of the block use by negative teams is accurate, is to balance the time allotted in the block and first affirmative rebuttal more equitably. Allot the second negative eight minutes and the first affirmative a seven-minute rebuttal. The first affirmative constructive might be allotted additional time, say two minutes,

to achieve plan credibility. Could this be achieved, at least the second negative would not begin with an edge when he attacks the plan.

An additionally helpful move might be to re-introduce the second affirmative rebuttal into a respected place in the debate. It certainly does not enjoy universally such respect now. Judges, working under the pressures of a limited amount of time to arrive at a decision, fill out a ballot, get it to headquarters, pick up another ballot, and get to the next debate, understandably may begin to tune out and not give the second affirmative rebuttal his entire attention, reaching his decision on the basis of what has transpired prior to it. Debaters, aware of this, feel a compulsion to cram more and more into first affirmative rebuttals. This is illustrated by comments on ballots to the effect that affirmative responses were given too late for negative teams to assess them. Sometimes there is even the judgement that to save a response until the final rebuttal is unfair to the negative team. Were judges to give their entire attention to the final rebuttal, reaching their decision only after having done so, and were they to act on the assumption each time that the final rebuttal is required before affirmative teams have been given their equal time at bat, considerable burden might be shifted from the first affirmative. It could be shared by his colleague.

Any or all of the suggestions might be a proper response to the effective and talented use of the fifteen-minute block by negative teams. Perhaps then we might not need to pity the poor first affirmative.

DSR-TKA COMMITTEES

National Conference

Kenneth Andersen (Ch.), Illinois
James Hall, St. John's
Cully Clark, Alabama
James Benson, Ball State
Steve McDonald (Student President)
Samford

Research and Publication

James H. McBath (Ch.), USC

Distinguished Alumni Awards

Annabel D. Hagood (Ch.), Alabama
Wayne Callaway, Wyoming
Mike Cronin, Vermont
William R. Dresser, Denison
Jack Rhodes, Utah

Constitutional Revision

Gifford Blyton (Ch.), Kentucky
Patrick Micken, William and Mary
Jack Rhodes, Utah
Gerry Sanders, Wooster
Kenneth Andersen, Illinois
George Ziegelmueller, Wayne State

Standards

Forrest Conklin (Ch.), Northern Iowa
Jack Howe, Long Beach State
Ron Matlon, Massachusetts

Speaker of the Year

Peter Kane (Ch.), SUNY Brockport
James Golden, Ohio State
Eugene Vasilew, SUNY Binghamton
Joseph O'Rourke, Wabash
Ruth McGaffey, Wisconsin-Milwaukee
George P. Lamb, Washington, D.C.
Bernard Brock, Wayne State
Robert Friedman, Oregon
Dean Ellis, Hawaii
Clark Kimball, Madison
David Strother, Washington State
Gregg Phifer, Florida State
Owen Peterson, L.S.U.
N. Edd Miller, Maine-Bangor
Jack Howe, Long Beach State
David Vancil, Indiana

NATIONAL COUNCIL MINUTES, NOVEMBER, 1973

DSR-TKA National Council
New York, N.Y., November 8, 1973

Members present for all or part of the meeting: Cripe, Walwik, Callaway, Kimball, Friedenber, Schnoor, Beard, Cook, McGuire, Conklin, Wetherby, Ziegelmüller, McConkey, Moorhouse, Weiss, McBath, Hagood.

Convened at 7:20 p.m. by President Nicholas Cripe.

Minutes of April, 1973, meetings approved as distributed.

Report of the President—Nicholas Cripe

Distributed copy of committee assignments (appended). Read letter from Jack Rhodes requesting designation of the Utah chapter as the George and Lucille Adamson Chapter of DSR-TKA.

Motion: Ziegelmüller/McGuire. The National Council approves local chapters taking name designations of distinguished alumni. The society will continue to utilize institutional names for purposes of common identification. *Passed.*

Read letter from Brad Bishop, Chairman of the National Debate Tournament Committee, explaining the revised bid system of N.D.T. which does not provide a bid for DSR-TKA representative. Cripe responded with a letter expressing our regret that this decision had been made.

Reported that, as instructed by the Council, inquiry is being made about the feasibility of S.C.A. assuming a larger share of the expense of the Committee on Discussion and Debate.

Proposals for Members-at-Large

Butler University proposes James Hawker of Jefferson High School, Lafayette, Indiana, as a member-at-large. Motion to approve: Conklin/McGuire. *Passed.*

Duke University proposes Larry Gostin as a member-at-large. Motion to approve: Wetherby/McConkey. *Passed.*

Madison College proposes Earle J. Maiman as a member-at-large. Motion to approve: McConkey/Kimball. *Passed.*

Wichita State University proposes Donald Swender as a member-at-large. Motion to approve: Moorhouse/McGuire. *Passed.*

Report of the Secretary—Theodore Walwik

The fall mailing to chapters will go out shortly. Noted the passing of Otis J. Aggert, sponsor of the Indiana State University Chapter, on October 1, 1973.

Report of the Vice-President—George Ziegelmüller

A continuing effort is being made to identify chapter sponsors. Reports from chapters indicate a number of inactive chapters.

Report of the Standards Committee—Forrest Conklin

Motion: McConkey/Cook. Recommend to the Standards Committee that the president of the institution be contacted when a chapter appears to be delinquent. *Passed.*

The committee recommends that a charter be granted to East Tennessee State University; Richard Dean, chapter sponsor. *Passed.*

The committee has received an application for reactivation from Morehouse College. The committee recommends the application be denied at this time and that the National Council encourage the interested parties at Morehouse (1) to qualify additional students for membership, (2) to gather evidence from the speech department and/or college administration that Morehouse has a long-range commitment to an active forensic program, and (3) to resubmit an application for reactivation at the earliest possible date. *Approved.*

Motion: Kimball/Conklin. Treasurer be instructed to provide an invoice each year to chapters who owe money to the society. Such an invoice should be sent about October 1. About January 1, a report should be sent to regional governors concerning financially delinquent chapters in his region. *Passed.*

Report of the Editor—Robert Weiss

Motion: McGuire/Hagood. Include in the *Speaker and Gavel* the name of the director of forensics when it differs from the chapter sponsor. *Passed.*

Motion: Ziegelmueller/McGuire. Restore the 1973-74 budget for *Speaker and Gavel* to \$3900, authorize four issues, and instruct the editor to continue to explore methods of cost reduction and of increasing income. *Passed.*

Constitutional Revision

The Council discussed informally the draft constitution submitted by the Committee on Constitutional Revision.

Adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theodore J. Walwik, National Secretary

NOTICE

This issue of *Speaker and Gavel* does not carry the usual list of chapters and sponsors of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. You may consult the January issue for this list. It will also be published again in the May issue.

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.