

Complete Issue 12(1)

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 12(1). *Speaker & Gavel*, 12(1), 1-24.

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.

speaker and gavel

ON HUMANIZING FORENSICS

Recapturing the Rhetorical Dimension: Debating in Campus Forums— <i>Kurt Ritter</i>	1
Toward Humanizing Debate— <i>Randall Fisher and Kassian Kovalcheck</i>	4
Non-SCONPO Forensics— <i>Charles L. Montgomery</i>	6
Rat-a-Tat-Tat— <i>Ralph Towne</i>	8
The Town Meeting Tradition and the Future of Forensics— <i>Herb Jackson</i>	10
Toward a Humanistic Response to the Information Explosion— <i>Warren D. Decker</i>	13

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Theoretical Issues in Academic Debate: The Obstacles to Discussion— <i>David Zarefsky and Elliot Minberg</i>	15
Luther Martin and a Strategy of Defense Against Impeachment— <i>Theodore J. Walwik and Nicholas M. Cripe</i>	17
New Initiates of DSR-TKA 1973-74	22

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 quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer. 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; JOHN MORELLO, 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: CULLY CLARK, University of Alabama

Speaker of the Year Committee: KASSIAN KOVALCHECK, Vanderbilt University

STUDENT OFFICERS

President: MAE JEAN GO, University of Tennessee

First Vice President: HOWARD STEINBERG, University of Massachusetts

Second Vice President: COLE CAMPBELL, University of North Carolina

Secretary: DAVID FARRIS, Mankato State College

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; COLE CAMPBELL, University of North Carolina

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 12

Fall 1974

Number 1

ON HUMANIZING FORENSICS

The six essays in the following symposium explore how we might nurture the elements of human dignity within the forensics enterprise. Nothing stands still; forensics will change. How can we direct this change in ways which will further the humanistic impulse, the vision of the untruncated human being whose moral and intellectual capacities are worthy of respect and development? How can we humanize forensics?

RECAPTURING THE RHETORICAL DIMENSION: DEBATING IN CAMPUS FORUMS

KURT W. RITTER

A few years ago a wag among debate coaches characterized the novice debater with this verse: "Three signs mark the beginning struggler: the screamer, the pounder, and the flow-sheet juggler." Today many "varsity" debaters do not advance beyond such behavior, except that they usually balance their enormous note pads. The reason for this arrested development lies not so much with the debaters as with the "forensic community" which has removed college debate from the hurly-burly world of public controversy to quiet, deserted college classrooms. The disappearance of public student debates from campuses is a recent development in the history of American higher education—and it can be traced to the simple fact that college contest debate, as presently practiced, is irrelevant to the intellectual activities of a university community. Contest debate has evolved into a closed activity, comprehensible only to the initiated and enlightening to none.

What has happened to reduce a once popular public event on campus to a closet activity? College debate simply lost its ability to draw an audience. To regain its important role in undergraduate education, college debate must recapture its *rhetorical dimension*. It must put humans back into debate in place of voice machines and computer judges. To humanize forensics we need to accept the risks of "going public," for along with the audience will come an insistence on rational discussion of human problems and ideals—a quality sorely missing in tournament debates. This call for debating before audiences is not an appeal for non-competitive forensics activities; a debate is inherently competitive. In fact, public debate should encourage competition—a competition of ideas, arguments, and clarity of expression, rather than of "sub-structure," "extensions," and "debate strategy."

Kurt Ritter is Director of Debate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The ills of today's contest debating are merely symptoms of the disease of isolation. Neither the superficial nor the substantive deficiencies of tournament debating would long continue in a series of campus forums. Within its closed environment contest debate has become an elaborate game with pseudo-arguments and specialized tactics which operate to impede, if not prohibit, realistic debate. In the championship debate at the DSR-TKA National Conference a debate team from a major university seriously claimed to be debating about our national energy policy as they proposed a plan for fire sprinklers in every American home—thus, allegedly reducing a waste of energy. Significantly, one member of the judging panel actually voted them the winner. This incident is not unusual; in fact, the problem of irrelevant debate cases has become so widespread that the directors of Wayne State University's excellent audience debate tournament have to warn participants that while "narrow and unusual interpretations of the proposition may be acceptable at standard intercollegiate tournaments," they offend audiences who expect to hear an intelligent debate on the proposition. Such sham debates leave the Detroit audiences "baffled and generally unhappy with the debate program."

Debaters play out a similar meaningless game over the pseudo-argument of "inherency." Here the issue shifts from "should we adopt this policy" to the irrelevant question of whether it is remotely possible to affect the policy "within the present system." Soon the debate centers on the elastic quality of the federal bureaucracy, rather than the merits of the policy. The debaters race "down the flow" disputing whether we could conceivably control energy or end poverty without the particular plan of the affirmative team, while fundamental questions of value and policy go ignored. The comparative advantages case, originally introduced to avoid the unrealistic issue of inherency, has simply generated a whole new set of pseudo-arguments. Freed from any responsibility to an audience, debaters waste their time on such nonsense issues as "uniqueness," "attitudinal inherency," "quantitative significance," *ad nauseam*.

Unfortunately the most frequent criticisms leveled at contest debate deal with superficial problems, but these too would be eradicated by debating before campus audiences. Listeners simply will not tolerate the rapid-fire delivery, the inartistic and repetitious recitation of case outlines, the stilted jargon, and the plain nastiness which typify tournament debates.

On the whole, debate directors seem unusually reluctant to open debates to an audience. The American Forensic Association, for example, resolved at its 1973 annual meeting that "attracting and pleasing audiences is not the sole or primary goal of American educational debate. In fact, to do so at the expense of sound argument, is to be deplored." While the dangers of debaters pandering to listeners' prejudices or by-passing sound reasoning are potential problems in any debate, whether in a tournament or in a campus forum, faculty members who supervise a college's debate activities ought to be able to enforce high standards of argumentation. In any event, the benefits of public debate forums on campus outweigh the risk of shabby practices, for in the public forum the debater must at least pass the test of common sense applied by his audience. Too many debate coaches have accepted the notion that by removing their students from the public view, they can teach "pure," undistorted argumentation. Actually, removing debate from the public forum eliminates accountability for debate programs and creates a private debate world—a tiny sub-culture in American education unconnected with reality.

Despite the set-backs inflicted by tournaments, debate exhibits an irrepressible vitality on college campuses. Public forums continue to respond to pressing issues, whether or not the "debate team" participates. Unfortunately, the level of public discourse at such forums often suffers because the debate coach has abdicated his responsibility for argumentation outside of contests. Extremely encouraging signs, however, are appearing at several colleges. At Western Illinois University the debate team presented three Lincoln-Douglas debates during the 1973-74 school year, including a debate between a nuclear engineer and a college debater on the issue of nuclear power plants. Texas Christian University's debate coach arranged for faculty members to debate issues such as consensual sex, and discontinuance of military support for Israel. At the University of Illinois, the Department of Speech Communication re-established its annual series of campus forums which involved seven major debates on such questions as amnesty, the Equal Rights Amendment, and censorship of pornography. Half of the Illinois forums were intercollegiate events, including public debates with Indiana University and DePauw University. In all, over 1500 students attended the Illinois debates. Similar campus forums are being presented by the debate teams at Mississippi State University, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, and the University of Detroit. Other institutions have a long tradition of campus debating, including Yale University, the University of Pittsburgh and Louisiana State University. No doubt there are many more such schools and their numbers should be increasing. These models will not be appropriate for all campuses—but the opportunity for public debate forums exists at almost any college.

A variety of formats can be used, but the crucial aspect of campus debating is that it must reflect a real shift in priorities within the debate program. A campus debate series is futile if it is added as a cosmetic coating to a debate program primarily concerned with travelling and winning trophies. Public debating should become the model for college debaters. New students should continue to attend local tournaments in order to learn the fundamentals of debate and to acquire experience; but they should debate as if an audience were present. The specialized delivery skills and pseudo-arguments of contest debating would be of no use to these students. A debate tournament, after all, is just a convenient form of intense practice debating—practice for real debates in the public forum.

By returning debate to the public arena, speech departments and debate coaches can also return the debate program to a central place in the intellectual life of their campus. Over 230 years ago a young student debated one of the fundamental questions of his day in a forensic disputation at Harvard College. In that debate Sam Adams prepared for his long career as American spokesman as he argued that "it is lawful to resist the supreme magistrate if the commonwealth cannot otherwise be preserved." Where would Sam Adams debate today?

TOWARD HUMANIZING DEBATE

RANDALL FISHER AND KASSIAN KOVALCHECK

On the first page of his book *Reflections on the Human Condition*, Eric Hoffer argues that "the performance of the expert strikes us as instinctual or mechanical. It is a paradox that, although the striving to master a skill is supremely human, the total mastery of a skill approaches the nonhuman." Those who spend a sizable portion of their lives listening to intercollegiate debates must be struck by the implications of Hoffer's observation. As the number of sample cases and card catalogues expands, as fifth rebuttal response analysis proliferates, as rapid delivery increases, and as simplistic analysis and evidence multiplies, intercollegiate debate and debaters lose their humaneness. As we become more proficient in the narrowing areas of skills open to intercollegiate debate, we lose sight of the broader concerns of communication and humanistic activity. This is neither to condemn debate nor to claim that it has deteriorated. Tournament debate has long been subject to criticism—occasionally even abuse. The fact that it has thrived indicates the probability that debate continues to contain more pedagogical virtues than vices. It is difficult, however, not to deplore the tendency toward simplistic conclusions and sketchy development of complex matters that contemporary rebuttal periods so often provide.

The immediate causes of simplistic approaches to complex problems are (1) the desire to achieve breadth of argument so that when one position fails, victory can be attained through another, and (2) the overwhelming need for efficiency. The ultimate causes are, however, more deeply rooted. Whatever happens in a tournament round is inevitably that which is permitted, if not formally taught, by the judges and teachers of debate. We submit that we have different standards for debate than we have for other speech education. Even if we claim that debate is a special or unique exercise, we would be hard pressed in justifying its divorce from the ethic, the theory, the practice taught in the rest of our curriculum. In the classroom, we have begun to express a deep concern with the nature and effects of nonverbal communication with the realization that we cannot avoid communicating. In the competitive debate, on the other hand, we discipline ourselves so as not to permit our decisions to be influenced by the loud, rapid, high-pitched sounds that emanate from the machines at the lectern. In the classroom, we emphasize the differences between oral and written communication, insisting that the speakers must be aware that large gaps may exist between what they think they've said and that which auditors perceive. In competitive debate, however, we have increased the practice of poring over evidence after the debate is over because we could neither absorb it nor evaluate it during the oral communication.

The narrow specialization—even perhaps inbreeding—of tournament debate has acted to dehumanize debate while the broader discipline of oral communication has become more humanized. Howard Pelham, addressing a similar problem in the Spring, 1974, issue of *Speaker and Gavel*, concluded that changes in format would be a desirable step. Unquestionably he is correct in that certain problems in debate can be approached by mechanical

Randall M. Fisher is Associate Professor of Speech and Kassian A. Kovalcheck is Assistant Professor of Speech at Vanderbilt University.

change. In fact, the inhumanity of debate might be reduced by providing a greater variety of speech activities within its framework. We would be forced to teach a fuller spectrum of the art and science of our discipline, if, occasionally at least, we had tournaments with a to-be-used-once resolution or if we have different formats or if we had different auditors. The tournament director, however, who offered such changes would have few or no entrants. Most coaches recognize current limitations in intercollegiate debate; most would like debaters to develop the best communicative practices, but time spent in varied activity is time taken from preparation for entrance into the National Debate Tournament. This does not suggest that the NDT is an evil force, but coaches and debaters are understandably reluctant to take time away from preparation for the single debate tournament that conveys status.

Any attempt at reform need not reduce either the merit or the status of the NDT; reform should, rather, add status to additional and varied approaches to debate. Under current practices, a debate coach is unlikely to request his or her debaters spend less time in the library, spend less time drilling on argument blocks, spend less time working on efficiency of language (even if that efficiency may lead to superficiality). The best means of promoting instruction in the full breadth of rhetorical theory and skill would be to have multiple debate topics—not a second topic for the second semester. Two topics would simply demand twice the effort to achieve the same level of simplistic analysis. A better approach is to hold single-topic tournaments after the NDT season is over, and this can only be achieved by holding the NDT earlier in the year. If the NDT were held early in February, debaters would still derive the advantages of the thorough and complete examination of a single, broad, critical policy question. Debaters and coaches could devote the needed time for rigorous analysis, drill on arguments, and an examination of a variety of alternatives to the problem.

Simply because a single topic offers advantages in time, analysis, and the opportunity for teaching, this does not mean that those advantages are all inclusive or that we can reasonably expect those advantages to stretch over an eight-month debate season. If we held the NDT earlier, we could, in the second part of the year, provide debate tournaments with different topics, varied formats, and new teaching approaches. The major way to humanize debate is to make sure that debaters and coaches lack the time to make debate mechanical and non-human. Holding the NDT earlier and providing multiple topics for the rest of the season might produce the best of debate experiences: debaters skilled in analysis and research and teachers who maintain the same standards in debate that are normally reserved for their speech fundamentals classes.

NON-SCONPO FORENSICS

CHARLES L. MONTGOMERY

Many commentators on forensics and speech communication have addressed themselves in recent years to issues concerning the relevance, legitimacy, and educational values of intercollegiate debating.

Now it happens that nearly every one of the participants in these discussions describes academic debating at what I will refer to as the Super-Competitive, National Prestige Oriented (SCONPO) level, that is, debating generally found on the "national circuit" and the NDT. Suggestions on how to eliminate debating's shortcomings have mainly centered on the national circuit; few people have taken the time to consider the future of the non-SCONPO forensics program.

It would be impossible for me categorically to define a "non-SCONPO forensics program." Instead, I will present several observations about the status of these programs and, in doing so, define non-SCONPO programs as those that seem to fit into one or more areas of the following generalized description.

1. Most non-national circuit programs concentrate on intercollegiate debating, with individual events and other forensic activities considered outside the main scope of the program.

2. Some SCONPO programs have grown to the point where they can send teams to both championship and local tournaments on the same weekend. Thus success at even local tournaments is becoming more infrequent for the non-SCONPO school.

3. Topic interpretations, case analysis and argumentation, and tournament jargon advance so rapidly that teams not on the circuit virtually every weekend cannot keep up with the changes. The budget limitations of the non-SCONPO programs keep them from attending tournaments every weekend, so these teams get further and further behind as the season progresses.

4. Scholarships and other recruiting incentives (including the extensive travel and larger budgets offered by the national program) virtually eliminate any chance for meaningful change in the present forensic power structure.

5. Many coaches on the national circuit seem to be becoming elitists—some to the point of downgrading the importance of the non-SCONPO programs. In turn, many forensics directors in the non-SCONPO programs, becoming disgruntled and disillusioned, are beginning to attack the successful coaches, when in reality they would like to be in the SCONPO coaches' places.

It is my thesis, then, that the directors of non-SCONPO programs need to change their basic philosophy towards intercollegiate forensics and mold their programs to fit more closely their own resources and the needs of their students. The best method of meeting our current crisis is through program innovation and re-direction. Let me divide my comments here into two major areas: suggestions for some structural and philosophical changes on the intercollegiate level and then some suggestions for enlarged on-campus activities.

Charles L. Montgomery is Director of Forensics at Clemson University.

1. More emphasis needs to be placed on the development of individual events. More tournaments should include individual events in the schedules; events need to be weighted fairly in granting awards and sweepstakes points, and more tournaments should be designed for events only. In any case, we need to provide opportunities for intercollegiate competition to many more students than we are now reaching. (A short warning: we must not allow our zeal for winning to cause tournaments like the I.E. Nationals to degenerate into the same cut-throat affairs some of our major national debate tournaments have become.)

2. The forensic profession must take the lead in developing and publicizing newer and innovative forms of competition. The Black Hills Debate by Mail, the Southwestern Off-Topic series, North Dakota's Protagoras Memorial Tournament, and the Dippikill Tournament at SUNY-Albany have provided us with some exciting new forms of expression.

3. It may become desirable to divide intercollegiate forensics into different classes of competition, much like the sports divisions of the NCAA and many state high school programs. In this manner schools could compete with other schools on the same general level of competence. The division system will not eliminate all inequalities in the levels of competition, but it could provide students in non-SCONPO programs with a greater chance for achievement.

4. If there is no national effort to equalize competition, individual program directors should sponsor limited invitation tournaments to accomplish the same goal. They would work like the Tournament of Champions or Heart of America in reverse; the championship teams would *not* be invited. Some smaller tournaments are operating on this principle now, but an expansion of this effort is needed to provide more schools with a chance for meaningful competition where none existed before.

While some of these changes in intercollegiate competition may help most non-SCONPO programs, for others the changes will do nothing. A lively on-campus program might be the answer. The non-SCONPO director might consider:

1. A revival of the traditional campus debating society for periodic debates on important campus, community, and national issues can bring many students in contact with debating. These societies would especially attract students who don't have the time or desire to research the national proposition.

2. On-campus platform debates with visiting schools are certainly worth considering.

3. Local speech, oratory, and interpretation contests can provide forensic opportunities for a number of students who are not interested in debating.

4. Sponsoring or jointly sponsoring a mock United Nations, state legislature, or U.S. Senate can provide students with an excellent chance to debate important issues without leaving campus for an entire weekend.

5. A series of public forums utilizing short mini-speeches by interested students and staff can serve as an outlet to campus opinion as well as a worthwhile speaking experience.

6. Finally, the traditional speakers bureau approach can still be used to provide forensics students with speaking experience at campus and community organizations.

In summary, let me make it clear that I am not discounting the worth of the SCONPO approach to intercollegiate forensics. In fact, some of the most successful nationally-oriented debate programs have very active and innovative on-campus activities. In addition, there seems to be some empirical evidence that the SCONPO approach is valuable to those students who are fortunate enough to compete at that level. But that isn't my point.

My point is that the goals and values of the non-SCONPO programs must be considered just as important as the goals and values of the nationally competitive programs. Some programs can operate at both levels, but for those that can't a basic change in philosophy is needed. Directors must realize that an excellent forensics program can be developed on the campus of a school that never attends an intercollegiate tournament. But better still, the non-SCONPO schools with their strength in numbers can mold forensics to fit their own special needs and interests. The time for change is now, and the non-SCONPO directors must take the lead in re-orienting their own programs.

Once this goal is accomplished, and these forensics directors accept their programs as being important, they can stop worrying about their identity, put competition in its proper perspective, and start providing a varied and meaningful educational experience for their forensics students.

RAT-A-TAT-TAT

RALPH TOWNE

Rather than helping the student become "the good person skilled in speech" or even the clever person skilled in argumentation, contemporary intercollegiate debating often seems hell-bent on training students to be the sophisticated computer skilled in spewing reams. While our debate theory would argue for the superiority of quality of argument over quantity of argument, our practice frequently reverses the relationship. Quantity rules quality. And, in the process of this reversal, our debaters (and later I shall argue, judges as well) are forced ever more and more to become machines.

What are some of the current difficulties in debate?

One difficulty with current debate is in the nature of the propositions we select. Given last year's topic, for instance, we either had to require that our affirmative debaters solve the whole complex energy problem in one half-hour of speaking time, or that they select a restricted and "strange" interpretation of the general topic to catch the negative off-guard. That is, the affirmative could "go broad and spread the negative," or they could "go narrow and try to fool the negative."

The first alternative was absurd on the face of it, but if taken, required so much in each speech that only a well-programmed computer could present it. By the time the negative added its plan workability and plan disadvantages arguments to all the arguments the affirmative presented to cover the

Ralph Towne is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at Temple University.

broad topic, the situation for both sides was impossible. It took, and did produce, automatons to debate the many issues advanced.

The second alternative, the strange interpretation, used to work a number of years ago against even the best of negative teams. This is no longer the case. Now, even the slightly better than average negatives can be prepared with enough information to "spread" the affirmative. The same end product results—a debate presented much too fast to evaluate qualitatively and a machine-like presentation of great quantities of yellow slime.

A second difficulty is the use of certain restrictions placed on the debater, like severe time limits, that stem from both tradition and practical reasons. Tradition says we have two people per side who each make a ten-minute constructive and a five-minute rebuttal speech. Practically, this makes sense. How else, unless we limit debates to an hour, can there be enough debates in a day and a half or two to select the best of fifty, seventy-five, or a hundred teams? With this severe restriction of format, along with requiring a debater to participate in as many as five or six rounds in one day, the only option for the debater is to be a well-programmed, well-oiled machine.

A third and more vicious difficulty is the requirement placed on judges. To be sure Tournaments "run on schedule," we force ourselves to render instant judgments. "You can take all the time you want to write criticism, but turn in your white sheet with the win-loss and point decisions immediately at the end of the round."

Surely, it is true that numbers of debates, maybe even most, can be judged quickly. But there are also rounds in the octo, quarter, semi-final rounds along with some rounds in the power-paired preliminaries that cannot be so judged. Many issues with much evidence have been offered. Some time for thought must be available if a valid judgment is to be rendered. Otherwise, the judge, too, becomes an automaton. The decision given either reflects the greatest quantity rather than quality (after all it is faster to count than to think) or it reflects a value judgment on one or two isolated issues. Neither alternative is satisfactory.

What causes these difficulties?

We are asking the current debaters to debate propositions the quality of which is tested by standards that were established long ago. Further, we are holding rigidly to format and judging patterns that were sensible years ago, but have outlived their usefulness. Third, we maintain a central core of theory about advocacy that has been reasonably unchanged since the 18th century. The world has changed. Debate theory and practice has not.

We live in an age where simple answers to complex problems no longer suffice. Two- or three-minute plans to solve the energy problem in the United States are ludicrous. We live in an age that conceives of causal relations wholly differently than formerly, if at all. Yet, our theory wants inherency in direct causal terms argued, so we wiggle and groan our way through the horrors of "attitudinal inherency" or other such linguistic abominations. We live in an age where even the most unsophisticated undergraduate can have at his fingertips vast quantities of research. Our debaters are now seen pushing their file boxes around in shopping carts.

Our age is one of speed, so we do not mind the debater training to become "super-articulator" able to speak (?) at 750 words per minute. We, as judges, will even train ourselves to "flow" the arguments and rationalize that it is really acceptable as an academic exercise.

What can we do to humanize our activity?

We must begin some vital research, *but in an organized way*. This summer we have started with the National Task Force. That's admirable. We must get to work on our tournaments. If tournaments are to continue, and they most assuredly will (for they are a way for a great deal of experience and professional critiquing in a short time), we must begin to experiment on a regular and controlled basis.

This does not mean to throw out all of the old until we have something to substitute for it. It does mean that an organization like Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha could establish a research board to organize and direct efforts at tournament experimentation. In tournaments run by member schools, various rounds could be modified and evaluations could be made of the results. This should be established on a three- to five-year basis with the modifications of format increasing as data is gathered and lessons are learned.

Finally, national certifying criteria should be established for debate coaches and judges. Ultimately, the quality of debating depends directly on the attitudes and standards of coaches and judges. As we insist on a humaneness to the activity, the students will respond. First, however, data must be collected on what the contemporary debate coach and judge really is like. Then, we can begin to take the steps necessary to move toward a more satisfactory professionalism in our field. We must become professional in the best sense of the word and strive to return to humane problem-solving advocacy.

THE TOWN MEETING TRADITION AND THE FUTURE OF FORENSICS

HERB JACKSON

The present-day American citizen, as numerous polls have testified, feels estranged from his government. Apathy, mistrust, and impotence are words used so frequently to describe the American voter that such phrases have taken on an aura of definitiveness and finality. Generally speaking, we are aware of the emotional void between the government and the governed; we accept that this void is real; and, as if to provide further evidence to this truth, we shrug our shoulders in impotence when the matter of solutions is broached.

To somehow affect the actual political power of the individual citizen to the point where he no longer feels impotent would require fundamental political reform. The tradition of participatory democracy embodied in the town meeting rarely exists outside of nostalgia. There does exist, however, within the changing framework of academic debate a possibility for reviving something of the feeling of self-direction which earlier forums supplied, a possibility for treating the problem of citizen estrangement at least symptomatically. While it is no surprise that large numbers of apathetic citizens

Herb Jackson coached high school debate for two years at Camdenton Senior High School, Camdenton, Missouri. He is presently the Director of Campus and Community Forums at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana campus.

avoid manifesting social or political concern, many Americans actively participate in the programs of such organizations as service clubs, parent-teacher organizations, women's groups and professional societies. Organizations like the Rotary Club, the League of Women Voters, and the Junior Chamber of Commerce have expressed goals that are in keeping with the welfare of their community, state, or nation, and, therefore, represent a vast number of informed, concerned citizens—audiences disposed to hearing a fair assessment of both sides of a given public issue or problem. It is here that college debaters can provide a real service.

The new trend in academic debate, returning to its earliest American traditions, replaces the expert judge with a public assembly acting as jurymen. To persuade, or simply communicate with, a public assembly requires a broad range of rhetorical skills. It becomes necessary then, for the debater to come full circle, to shift from the technical process of tournament debate back to the rhetorical demands of a speaker/audience relationship. Despite such a change of focus, certain features of the debate process do not change. Shifting the debate setting from one of "interscholastic sport" to public oral advocacy, for example, does not alter the fact that academic debate is an inherently competitive process. Neither does returning debate to a public arena lessen the emphasis on sound argument and rational discussion. However, by including an active, participating audience in the debate process, the *scope* of the process becomes much larger, and the *objectives* necessarily broaden to accommodate the added element. When debate is used as a critical instrument to probe public issues in a public setting, with a public assembly functioning as jurymen, then it serves not only to broaden the debater's educational experience but also to prompt citizen participation in important goal-setting and decision-making.

In attempting to operationalize the objectives of the public forum, what specific format will maximize the participation of both speaker and jurymen? Experience with public forums throughout the state of Illinois by members of the University of Illinois debate organization suggests that five conditions facilitate genuine public discussion: (1) choice of topic, (2) form of feedback, (3) character of setting, (4) size of audience, and (5) allotment of time.

Rather than focusing exclusively on the national proposition, different debaters research and analyze a number of different topics. While the list of topics originates from the squad—the quality of debating has often been found to be directly proportional to the involvement of the individual debater—the policy issues selected have had "headline" appeal and have ranged from questions of local to national concern. From the list of topics compiled, audiences select the particular question to be debated, which in turn enhances the saliency of the question. Use of the shift-of-opinion ballot serves not only as a means of obtaining feedback for the debater but also as a formal vehicle for prompting judgmental input and criticism from the audience. While jurymen should be given every possible opportunity for written and oral interaction, the character and amount of oral participation is somewhat dependent upon the last three conditions. In other words, character of setting, size of audience, and allotment of time determine the particular type of debate format that is employed for any particular public forum.

Small organizations like local service clubs typically maintain an informal atmosphere and, in conducting their business, *strict* parliamentary style is frequently suspended. In this type of setting, a modified form of cross-examination debate has proven highly successful. The direct verbal clash

between speakers seems to encourage the same kind of oral responsiveness from the audience. Once the ballot is completed, time must be allowed for a direct "question and answer" session between jurymen and debaters. The audience has now been stimulated for this participation, and experience has shown that they are frustrated if the time element, or some other factor, prevents the debate event from reaching its *denouement*. Often the best debating occurs once the audience joins in the discussion.

With larger bodies, adhering to a manageable parliamentary format in which speakers can be interrupted and made to yield the floor for direct audience response seems to maximize interaction. In this particular situation it is paramount that the speaker be skilled at maintaining contact with an audience. If he slips into a "tournament" style of delivery, it is likely that the audience will find him incomprehensible, and possibly discourteous. Such debating militates against the desired atmosphere of free and open exchange; at best it leaves the audience disinterested—at worst hostile.

The new vision of academic debate, freed from the constraints of the tournament setting, combines the debate process as a critical instrument with the most salient public issues and brings both to the public forum. The speaker benefits because he must acquire a broader range of rhetorical skills and is provided a "real" setting for using them. Similarly, the debate provides the citizen with an opportunity to participate in a group process that is in keeping with the best democratic traditions of the town meeting.

Obviously the establishment of trust between politician and constituent, between the government and the governed, is outside the debater's sphere of *direct* influence. It is, nevertheless, no small contribution to the solution of this problem to provide an arena where the ordinary citizen may approach questions of public policy in an active and influential manner.

TOWARD A HUMANISTIC RESPONSE TO THE INFORMATION EXPLOSION

WARREN D. DECKER

The gathering and utilization of information is an integral part of the decision-making process. In as much as debate is a replica of this process it must concern itself with the manipulation of information. Fortunately, the amount of information available to a decision-maker has increased dramatically, but in response to this information "glut" debaters have been forced to make serious and potentially harmful adaptations. It will be the purpose of this essay to discuss the impact of this "glut" on intercollegiate debate.

All or part of the following actions can be seen as reactions to this explosion of information: 1) multiple files, 2) spread debates, 3) low grades, 4) lack of evidentiary evaluation, 5) distorted evidence, 6) exotic affirmative cases, 7) shallow analysis, 8) rapid delivery, and 9) disorganization.

Certain changes could and should be made to mitigate the problems foisted upon debate by the information explosion. Indeed, debate as a legitimate prototype of the decision-making process might readily contribute solutions to this problem wherever encountered in any decision-maker's world. Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor of Law at Harvard, discussed this problem specifically in regard to technical information when he wrote,

It is commonplace fact that ours is a technically specialized society in which the technology is every day becoming more specialized and more intricate. One of the effects of this development is that the technical information relevant to decision-making appears to be accessible to decision-makers with diminishing facility and intelligibility. It might seem to follow from this situation that traditional decision-makers, in both private and public institutions and agencies, suffer the risk of ignoring the technicians or of being displaced by them. At the same time, decision-making may become less and less subject to effective review by those to whom decision-makers are responsible.¹

If debate can respond in a meaningful way to this problem then perhaps that response can be utilized in other areas requiring information handling.

Allow me a word of caution. One justification for debate as an academic exercise is to allow untrained persons an opportunity to learn methods of data handling. Any remedies must, therefore, be tempered to avoid creating a type of debate which sluffs the problem rather than curing it.

Inherent within debate is the adversary method, a method which affords us one scheme by which to improve data handling. Certain arguments as to the quality and quantity of data which have been misused in the past might be reformulated to allow a renewed effort of data control. If a point cannot be quantified, a debate critic must be prepared to listen to the arguments both pro and con. If there is a question of evidentiary validity, we must be prepared to make judgment. The adversary scheme does, however, lend itself to misuse, so caution is essential. Since it is humanly impossible to

Warren D. Decker is a Graduate Teaching Assistant at Temple University.

¹ Adam Yarmolinsky, "Responsible Law-Making in a Technically Specialized Society," in *The American Assembly: Law in a Changing America*, ed. Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 97.

handle even a substantial part of all information, the debater must be carefully instructed, as is the lawyer, as to what information is necessary and relevant to a decision and, furthermore, how to argue that position. The debater should control the information as opposed to the information controlling the debater.

Currently several essentially similar means of information control are being advocated. Definitional constrictions on the breadth of debate topics and the utilization of narrowly worded topics are two positions being considered. Advance notice from tournament directors as to what affirmative approaches will be allowed is another response. These methods need to be carefully thought out before implementation because we run the risk of making debate even less a version of realistic decision-making. The corresponding reduction in student-generated adaptation may lose valuable insight into the ultimate solution to the problem. Also, with the institution of such measures we are allowing the information to control debate, and we lose sight of the fact that there are argumentative tools to prepare us for our response to a broad topic other than just a full file box.

Another alternative urged by some is to limit the number of arguments and amount of evidence in any given debate. The consequences of such a move would be disastrous. Decision-making should attempt to account for as much as possible of the information and argument relevant to a given issue.

A potential approach to the incorporation of all data relevant to a given decision is a systematic approach advocated by highly competent members of the forensics community. The systematic evaluation of information is desirable. Realize, however, that a system is only as good as its information and the human being operating the system. Yarmolinsky in a discussion of the Program Planning and Budgeting System—PPBS, indicates that PPBS has,

. . . built in disadvantages as well as advantages. What can be quantified tends to be more highly valued than what cannot be. PPBS can also result in the fallacy of abstraction—where information in quantitative form is treated as more reliable than it may deserve to be.²

In short the systematic control of information may also be subject to pitfalls.

The problem of information control in debate or any decision-making process must be considered, and whatever is done to eliminate the problem, human considerations must play a paramount role. Collecting information relating to human capacities to gather and disseminate information is as important as the information that is gathered and disseminated. Research hopefully will generate further information that can tell us those human capacities. Once available, that information must be utilized in order to make debate a genuinely human activity.

² *Ibid.*, p. 104.

THEORETICAL ISSUES IN ACADEMIC DEBATE: THE OBSTACLES TO DISCUSSION

DAVID ZAREFSKY AND ELLIOT MINCBERG

The March, 1974, issue of *Speaker and Gavel* includes an essay by Ben Jones and Jim Flegle concerning the final round of the 1973 National Debate Tournament. Jones and Flegle observe that the final debate displayed two very different conceptions of the nature of debate and the obligations of the affirmative and the negative, and they lament the fact that the final debate was not used to discuss the implications of these differences in depth.

The differences in interpretation of the concepts of presumption, justification, and comparison of policy systems, as Jones and Flegle have described them, are accurate. We believe that they have represented fairly the position taken by each team and the theory underlying each position. That "the true implications of the hypothetical counterplan were never fully developed in the final round," however, was the result not of negligence but of a deliberate choice. Two factors dictated that choice.

The first factor involves the predispositions of intercollegiate debate judges. Although we believe that few judges use the debate round to reflect their *a priori* views on the subject matter of the debate topic, we cannot say the same for their views of debate theory. After several attempts at straightforward presentation of "justification" arguments, Northwestern had concluded that many debate judges probably would give little or no weight to them, even if well-developed. This conviction that judges were unwilling to suspend their own beliefs on theoretical matters was substantiated further by the "Booklet of Judges" prepared for the 1974 National Debate Tournament. The booklet is replete with statements of what judges will or will not "buy," irrespective of what occurs in a given debate. Statements that debate inevitably is a comparison of policy systems, that the affirmative and negative each must defend only one system, and that the present system must be defended in terms of its achievement rather than its potential, are illustrative of these predispositions. Often, otherwise excellent judges merely disregard theoretical arguments advanced in a debate if the theory conflicts with their own presuppositions.

If substantial numbers of judges approach a specific debate believing that their theoretical judgments are to be imposed upon the debate rather than derived from it, there is not much benefit in extensive discussion of theory within the round. In the 1973 final debate, therefore, the negative made the judgment that its theoretical position would be acceptable to some members of the judging panel at the level of development that was provided, and that other members of the panel would need to be convinced to vote negative for other reasons, if at all.

Moreover, the constraints of limited time also discourage an extended discussion of theoretical questions. With a finite amount of time available, more time to discuss differences in theoretical perspective must be purchased at the cost of less time to discuss the issues in the specific proposition. Such

David Zarefsky is Director of Forensics at Northwestern University. Elliot Mincberg, a member of the 1973 NDT championship team, is a law student at Harvard University.

a purchase, however, well might prove unwise. Had the negative spent several minutes explaining the assumptions underlying the claim that the affirmative must carry each advantage, the arguments developed against each advantage would have had less depth. It would have been easier for the affirmative to respond to the negative attacks, re-establish each advantage, and thereby moot the negative's theoretical position—especially since we believed that most judges would prefer to decide debates based on the balance of advantages and disadvantages deriving from the proposition. It would be a Pyrrhic victory for the negative to establish that all advantages must be carried to justify the resolution, if the negative's paucity of other attacks *enabled* the affirmative to carry each advantage, necessary or not. The relative lack of emphasis given to the theoretical issue in the 1973 debate reflected a cost-benefit calculation about the effective use of the negative's time.

Confronted with these strategic considerations, yet convinced that what Jones and Flegle label the "comparison of policy systems" approach warranted theoretical attack, Northwestern deliberately chose the "hypothetical counterplan" as the vehicle. We believe 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," and hence that all advantages which stem from *parts* of the resolution must be carried in order to justify the adoption of the *entire* resolution. We expressed these beliefs in the language of the hypothetical counterplan in order to avoid the undesirable connotations of the "justification" argument and to conserve time.

We suspect that considerations similar to these would dictate a similar de-emphasis of theoretical issues in most debates. These comments should not be taken to imply disagreement with the concern of Jones and Flegle that "we have not adequately discussed and debated the underlying theories, rationales, etc., within our own system" of debate. If such issues are to be discussed meaningfully in the course of a debate, the continued interest of debaters in theory and an increased willingness of judges to evaluate theoretical disputes objectively would seem to be crucial prerequisites. But perhaps the individual debate round may not be the appropriate forum for this discussion. We hope that the forensic community will encourage the development of all appropriate forums—such as debate rounds, open discussion programs at tournaments, convention papers and programs, student contributions to journals, and so on—in which the conflicting assumptions of modern debate may be more productively discussed.

LUTHER MARTIN AND A STRATEGY OF DEFENSE AGAINST IMPEACHMENT

THEODORE J. WALWIK AND NICHOLAS M. CRIFE

The effort to impeach Richard Nixon forced a reexamination of other impeachment attempts. Of particular interest to rhetorical scholars is the impeachment trial of Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase in 1805. The successful strategy of defense developed by Chase's chief defense lawyer, Luther Martin of Maryland, is a brilliant example of legal rhetoric and is especially interesting in that there is some analogy to be drawn between the effort of Martin and the more recent appeals of James St. Clair, President Nixon's counsel. This paper will consider the work of Luther Martin in his speech before the Senate.

In 1801, Thomas Jefferson was elected President of the United States, and his party also commanded decisive majorities in the Congress. The Federalists, although generally without power in the executive and legislative branches, were able to retain control of the judiciary by creating a number of new judgeships and then, just before President Adams left office, filling them with the party faithful. The Democratic-Republicans were anxious to gain control of the judicial branch, but to do so they had to find a way to get rid of some Federalists. A special target was Samuel Chase, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. A decision was made to attempt to remove Chase by impeaching him. Eight specific articles were drawn alleging that, on various occasions in the year 1800, Chase allowed his political loyalties to dominate his judicial function. Three specific trials were involved and all concerned persons charged with treason or seditious libel pursuant to the Federalist inspired Alien and Sedition Acts. In essence, Chase was charged with conducting the trials in such a way that the political interests of John Adams and the Federalists would be protected. More to the point, Chase was "peculiarly obnoxious to the Republicans," having predicted "that under Jefferson, 'our republican constitution will sink into a mobocracy, the worst of all possible governments.'"¹

Chase chose Luther Martin as his chief defense attorney. Shortly after admittance to the bar, Martin had married a daughter of the celebrated Indian fighter, Colonel Cresap. The Cresap family was extremely bitter toward Thomas Jefferson for unjustly accusing Colonel Cresap of murdering the family of the famous Indian Chief Logan. This family animosity was doubtlessly transferred to Martin whose entire career was tempered by his contempt for Jefferson. Martin's most severe denouncement of any man was to indicate that he was "as big a scoundrel as Tom Jefferson."²

In 1774, Martin was appointed Commissioner for his county to oppose the claims of Great Britain. In 1778, on the advice of Samuel Chase, Martin

Dr. Walwik is Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech and Theatre, Slippery Rock State College. Dr. Crife is Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech, Butler University.

¹ Samuel Eliot Morison. *The Oxford History of the American People*, (Oxford Press: New York, 1965), p. 363.

² H. P. Goddard. "Luther Martin: Federal Bulldog," *Maryland Historical Society Publication*, Vol. III (1887), no. 24, pt. 1, p. 13.

was appointed Attorney-General of Maryland, an office he held until 1805.³ His tenure was marked by vigorous prosecution (almost persecution) of Tories. After serving in the Continental Congress in 1784 and 1785, Martin attended the Constitutional Convention, but left without signing the document.⁴ The highlights of his legal career were his successful defenses of Samuel Chase on the impeachment trial in 1804 and of Aaron Burr in his treason trial in 1807.

Joseph Story, a contemporary of Martin and an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court described him as “. . . about the middle size, a little bald, with a common forehead, pointed nose, inexpressive eye, large mouth, and well formed chin.”⁵ He appeared generally unkempt and slovenly. He wore large ruffle and lace cuffs, even though they were out of style, which were frequently very dirty. Chief Justice Roger Taney noted in his memoirs that Martin “. . . seemed to delight in using vulgarisms which were never heard except among the colored servants or the ignorant and uneducated whites . . . He seemed to take pleasure in showing his utter disregard of good taste in his dress and language . . .”⁶ Story noted, “nothing in his manner, voice, action, or language impresses. Of all men he is most desultory, wandering, and inaccurate. Errors in grammar, and, indeed, an unexampled laxity of speech mark him everywhere.”⁷

A characteristic of his speeches was their extreme length. He frequently gave speeches lasting three hours and containing twenty-seven thousand words or more, using long explanations and proofs. This habit was especially trying to his contemporaries. William Pinckney, another outstanding lawyer of the day, said that Martin was “remarkably redundant” and “remarkably deficient” in that he had “resorted to authorities without number to support what nobody denies.”⁸ Martin read a great deal, possessed a highly retentive memory, and seemed unwilling to allow even the most minor point to slip by without clinching the argument then and there from his vast store of information. At least that seems to be the implication of remarks by Chief Justice Taney who commented on Martin: “He never missed the strong points of a case; and, although much might have been generally omitted, everybody who listened to him would agree that nothing could be added . . .”⁹ Taney also noted, “He introduced so much extraneous matter, or dwelt so long on unimportant points, that the attention was apt to be fatigued and withdrawn . . . But these very defects arose in some measure from the fullness of his legal knowledge. He had an iron memory, and forgot nothing that he had read; and he had read a great deal on every branch of the law, and took great pleasure in showing it when the case did not require it.”¹⁰

Martin’s success evidently did not come from his appearance or his power as an orator, but rather from his keen mind and seemingly inexhaustible

³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁴ H. H. Hogan. *Eight Great American Lawyers*, (Oklahoma City: Harlow, 1923), p. 8.

⁵ W. W. Story. *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*, (Boston: Little and Brown, 1851), Vol. I, pp. 163-164.

⁶ S. Tyler. *Memoir of Roger Brooke Taney*, (Baltimore: Murphy, 1872), pp. 65-66.

⁷ Story, p. 65.

⁸ Goddard, p. 30.

⁹ Tyler, p. 66.

¹⁰ Tyler, p. 67.

knowledge of the law. This conclusion is supported by Goddard, who wrote, ". . . Martin won more by weight of precedent and by knowledge of law than by personal eloquence."¹¹

The Senate of the United States met on Wednesday, January 2, 1805, to try Samuel Chase. After hearing a statement by Justice Chase, a postponement was granted until February 4, 1805, and on that date the trial began. Sessions were held intermittently through the month of February and the final vote acquitting Chase came on March 1, 1805.

The key to Chase's defense was the speech of Luther Martin on February 23, 1805. In defending Chase, Martin faced two severe problems. First, his client was probably guilty of the acts which formed the basis of the Bill of Impeachment. He had spoken intemperately from the bench, and that could not be denied. Second, the Senate, sitting as a jury, was politically hostile to Chase. The Federalists were outnumbered in the Senate twenty-five to nine. Thus, Martin had to develop some strategy that would succeed in overcoming the political advantage of the Jeffersonians while, at the same time, asking for a favorable verdict despite the facts of the case. And, of course, through it all, Martin was obliged to offer specific refutation to the charges of the prosecutors.

Martin approached this task from a position of considerable personal strength. As has been noted, he was a lawyer with a wide reputation for his power and effectiveness. Regarding the specific matter of impeachment, he had been present at the Constitutional Convention and was, therefore, fully aware of what was intended by the framers with respect to the impeachment provision. At the outset of his speech, Martin took care to remind his audience of his own direct knowledge of the Constitution by referring to his presence (as well as that of at least two members of the Senate) at the Constitutional Convention. This personal authority was a key to the whole strategy of defense developed by Martin.

Central to the defense was the partisan nature of the matter. The charges had been brought largely as an expression of political hostility between the Jeffersonians and the Federalists. Martin attacked the matter by taking issue with the assertion of the prosecution that the Constitution placed responsibility for conducting impeachment trials with the Senate because "if any other inferior tribunal had been entrusted with the trial of impeachment, the members might have an interest in the conviction of an officer . . . in order to obtain his place; but that no Senator could have such inducement."¹²

Martin responded indignantly that:

. . . I hold in contempt the idea, that the members of *any* tribunal, would be influenced in their decision by so unworthy, so base a motive; but what is there to prevent this Senate, more than any other court, from being this influenced? Is there anything to prevent any member of this Senate, or any of their friends, from being appointed to the office of any person removed by their conviction?¹³

Thus, Martin declared that political considerations were a potential influence in this trial. In so doing, he made the politics of the matter an

¹¹ Goddard, p. 29.

¹² *Report of the Trial of the Honorable Samuel Chase*, (Baltimore: Butler and Keating, 1805), p. 173.

¹³ *Report of Trial*, p. 173.

issue and, therefore, placed the Senators somewhat on the defensive. Then, invoking his personal authority as one “in the convention in 1787” who, therefore, knows “why this power was invested in the Senate,” Martin assured the Senators that:

In their integrity I have the greatest confidence. I have the greatest confidence they will discharge their duty to my honourable client with uprightness and impartiality.¹⁴

Finally, Martin concluded this argument by assuring the Senate that “I perfectly concurred” in the decision to make the Senate responsible for impeachment trials because “this power could no where be more properly placed”¹⁵

In his attack upon the prosecution’s explanation of the reason why the Senate was charged with responsibility for the trial, Martin was clearly attacking something of a straw man. His excursion into the irrelevant was a shrewd one, however, for it gave him the opportunity to assert his personal authority with respect to the nature of impeachment and to introduce directly the political issue without charging the Senate with impropriety. While it certainly did not remove all political considerations from the trial, the Martin strategy did serve to force the Senate to stand down a bit from any overtly political action.

The second great strategic problem facing Martin was the fact that Chase had spoken intemperately from the bench. If this was true, then how was impeachment to be avoided? Again, Martin invoked his personal authority and presumed knowledge of the intent of the framers with respect to impeachment.

Referring to the constitutional stipulation that impeachment is “for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors,”¹⁶ Martin proceeded to claim that impeachment must be for an indictable offense.

There can be no doubt but that treason and bribery are indictable offenses. We have only to enquire then, what is meant by *high* crimes and misdemeanors. What is the true meaning of the word “crime?” It is the breach of some law, which renders the person, who violates it, liable to punishment. There can be no crime committed where no such law is violated.¹⁷

The thrust of this argument was that the prosecution must show, and Martin contended they had not, that Chase had broken some law and was, therefore, guilty of an indictable offense.

Martin then extended his case by declaring:

. . . while I contend that a Judge cannot be impeached except for a crime or misdemeanor, I also contend that there are many crimes and misdemeanors for which a judge ought not to be impeached, unless immediately relating to his judicial conduct.¹⁸

Martin offered a specific example, suggesting a judge might be moved by a person’s insolence to strike that person. Although the act would constitute

¹⁴ *Report of Trial*, pp. 173–174.

¹⁵ *Report of Trial*, p. 174.

¹⁶ *Constitution of the United States*, Article II, Section 4

¹⁷ *Report of Trial*, p. 175.

¹⁸ *Report of Trial*, p. 176.

an indictable offense, it would not be impeachable because it did not impair the judge's ability to perform his judicial function.

Martin offered one further extension.

I am ready to go further, and say, there may be instances of very high crimes and misdemeanors for which an officer ought not to be impeached and removed from office: the crimes ought to be such as relate to his office or which tend to cover the person who committed them with turpitude and infamy; such as shew there can be no dependence on that integrity and honor which will secure the performance of his official duties.¹⁹

Thus, Martin charged the Managers for the Prosecution with the responsibility of showing not that Chase acted unwisely, intemperately or politically, but that his actions were indictable crimes which directly compromised his ability to perform the judicial function entrusted to him.

Having thus narrowed the acceptable basis for conviction, Martin proceeded to examine exhaustively each of the acts Chase was alleged to have performed, arguing that they were not illegal and that they did not constitute an improper exercise of his office.

Luther Martin's strategy was successful in gaining acquittal for Justice Chase. Of the eight articles of impeachment, none were sustained by the necessary two-thirds vote and on only three articles was even a majority of guilty votes registered.²⁰

In the trial of Samuel Chase, the Senate made one of its first attempts to come to grips with the meaning of the impeachment clause of the Constitution. As the principal defense attorney, Luther Martin set forth what remains the classic strategy for defense against impeachment. First, the attempt to impeach should be represented as a politically partisan move and an appeal made for votes against impeachment on the grounds that surely the Senate should not succumb to such base motives. Second, despite whatever wrongdoing is imputed to the accused, the question remains as to whether the acts are properly impeachable acts. In other words, the prosecution must be forced to extend its burden of proof to include more than evidence of inappropriate, unwise, or even illegal acts. The accused must be shown to be totally unfit for office and a threat to the system of government. Those who followed the defense of Richard Nixon surely recognize that these basic strategies have not lost their usefulness.

In successfully defending Chase, Luther Martin did the Republic a great service in that he helped stabilize the political system. As Samuel Eliot Morison observed:

Had Chase been found guilty on the flimsy evidence presented, there is good reason to believe that the entire Supreme Court would have been impeached and purged. As it was, this trial proved to be the high watermark of Jefferson's radicalism. Under Chief Justice Marshall conservatism rallied, and from the Supreme Court there developed a subtle offensive of ideas—the supremacy of the nation, the rule of law, and the sanctity of property.²¹

Luther Martin was uniquely suited to assume the burden placed upon him. Through his personal credibility and his considerable intellectual

¹⁹ *Report of Trial*, p. 176.

²⁰ *Report of Trial*, p. 268.

²¹ Morison, p. 363.

power and ability to persuade he was able to win his case and, in so doing, to serve his country well. His personal influence in the matter is indicated by Henry Adams who, in his *Life of John Randolph*, compares the effect of Martin and his chief opponent.

If any student of American history, curious to test the relative value of reputations, will read Randolph's opening address, and then pass on to the argument of Luther Martin, he will feel the difference between show and strength, between intellectual brightness and intellectual power. Nothing can be finer in its way than Martin's famous speech. Its rugged and sustained force; its strong humor, audacity, and dexterity; its even flow and simple choice of language, free from rhetoric and affectations; its close and compulsive grip of the law; its good natured contempt for the obstacles in its way—all these signs of elemental vigor were like the forces of nature, simple, direct, fresh as winds and ocean²²

²² Henry Adams. *Life of John Randolph*, (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin Co., 1898), pp. 145-146.

NEW INITIATES OF DSR-TKA 1973-74

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Teresa Ann Cissell

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

Steven Kent Cole
 Nannette Friedley
 Stephen Lloyd Hammer
 Robert Wayne Harbin
 Frank Lee Hawkins
 Camilla Nell Hinshaw
 Linda S. Hodge
 Richard Allen Isenhour
 Susan K. Maitlen
 Suzanne McCorkle
 Patrick Harold Meagher
 Jefferey Michael Pavlovich
 Nancie Lea Poppema
 James Edward Ringenberg
 David Frederick Snively
 Michael E. Stroup
 Ann Christine Weaver
 Steve A. Wilcox

AT-LARGE MEMBERS

Thomas Victor Colonna
 Celia A. Dorris

Douglas Benjamin Rosentrater

Donald Jacob Sharp

UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT

Michael Jairam
 Michael B. Rosen
 Janet Scarpone

BUTLER UNIVERSITY

Michael Ray Gibbons
 James F. Hawker
 Jeanne Anne Hoffmann
 Cindy Ann Proctor

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY— LONG BEACH

John Frederick Briscoe, Jr.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY

Thomas Michael Fischer
 Warren Oscar Wright
 Mark Howard Zietlow

DAVIDSON COLLEGE

John Thomas McElveen, Jr.
 John Warner Munce

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Bonnie Jean Knoll
Robert Allan McNeese

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY

Robin Lynn Andres
Kathryn Mary Bachman
Steven Lee Lakes

DUKE UNIVERSITY

Lawrence O. Gostin

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Janice Lamarr

**EAST TENNESSEE STATE
UNIVERSITY**

Lloyd Pierce Carson
Albert Lee Chase
Richard Lawrence Dean
James Ronnie Greer
Kenneth Hill
James Reggie Lett
Valerie Lois Schneider
Alan Sheets
Paul A. Walwick

EMORY UNIVERSITY

Lawrence Kurt Nodine
Timothy Joseph Warfel

FAIRMONT STATE COLLEGE

Thomas Ellet Marlowe
Twila Paknik

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Clarence William Chandler
Domenic Louis Massari
Paul Edmond Rosenthal
Warren A. Wilson, III

HAMILTON COLLEGE

Paul Vincent Curcio
Louis Levenson

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN**

Robert J. Adams
Michael K. Brandwein
Pamela S. Hollis
Gail M. Lovinger
Kurt William Ritter
Peter D. Skaperdas
Edward M. Wiley

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Patrice Marie Bailey
Rickie Earl Crosslin
Clovilla Joy Gordon
Max Alan Hoke
Harold Michael Lawson
John Richard Luther, II
David Ross Stark

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Ray Rezner
Roger Stetson
Frank Taylor

KING'S COLLEGE

Michael Kolesar
Richard A. Nestor

MADISON COLLEGE

Jennifer Marie Goins
Earle J. Maiman
Janice Sidney Mottley
Marcia Anita Slacum

MERCER UNIVERSITY

Scott Arnold Edson
Gregory Lewis Hammond

MIAMI UNIVERSITY

Paul Bryan Fishburn
Douglas Russell Nelson

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA—
LINCOLN**

Thomas Karl Kauf
James Kenneth Say
Steven B. Shively

**NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS
UNIVERSITY**

Louie Anthony Gallegos
Viola Ann Martinez

**THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH CAROLINA**

Linda F. Jones
Angelia P. Travis

**THE UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH DAKOTA**

Clay L. Boelz
Elyce Kae Dronen
Anthony Lane Rustad

PACE UNIVERSITY

Donald Scott Small

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Kenneth Michael Kalumuck
Michael David Wurzman

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

George F. Bradley
Stephen H. Burke
Elizabeth Ann Marchak
Christopher Guyen Willard
Mary Ella Wims

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND

Roger Eugene Early
Michael Brandon Hawkes

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

Michael K. Tomenga
Michael J. Yaworsky

SLIPPERY ROCK STATE COLLEGE

Donald Alex Bentley
David N. Descutner
Margaret A. Gray
Janice E. Keffer
Anthony W. Thomas

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

David Patterson Broome
Robert Payne Shepard
Kenneth O'Neal Simon

SOUTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

Carson Wayne Elliff

SPRING HILL COLLEGE

Joseph Anthony DiVito

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA

Michael Gary Bernstein
Marna Mary Dillane

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Lewis Latane Cobb
Richard E. Igou
Billy Paul Sams
Dickie Lynn West

TULANE UNIVERSITY

Jeffrey Roy Lewis
Jon Robert Phillips

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Lawrence Cobb Doton

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Claudia Anne Elliott
Geraldine W. Finn
Colan Theodore Hanson
Charles Wayne Juntikka
Neil Joel Kurzman

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

David Alan Lanphear
Marc H. Levy
Jill Marie Metz
James Leonard Mignerey

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

Barbara Ann Barley
William Frederick Segelken

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Don Wesley Swender

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

Lawrence Ross Greenfield

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MILWAUKEE

Vincent Anthony Piekarski

YALE UNIVERSITY

David L. Applegate

STUDENT SPEAKER OF THE YEAR

Information concerning nominations for DSR-TKA Student Speaker of the Year nominations will be sent to all chapters soon. The standards and procedures may be found in the March, 1969 issue of *Speaker and Gavel* (pp. 96-97), and questions about the award may be referred to Howard Steinberg, C/o Dr. Ronald Matlon, Department of Communication Studies, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01002, or Mae Jean Go, c/o Mrs. Norma Cook, Department of Speech and Theatre, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37916.

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.



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.

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.

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.