

## Complete Issue 14(1)

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



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

### Recommended Citation

(1976). Complete issue 14(1). *Speaker & Gavel*, 14(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

The University of Utah, Salt Lake City: Host of the 1977 DSR-TKA Conference .....	1
Debater as Pedagogue: The First United States—CIDD Debate Tour of Japan—John P. Davidson III .....	2
The Survival of Excellence—Nicholas M. Cripe .....	10
Forensics at Central Missouri State University—James J. Floyd .....	15
Forensics at the University of Iowa—Robert L. Kemp .....	19
Minutes of DSR-TKA National Council .....	24

# 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:** GEORGE W. ZIEGELMUELLER, Wayne State University  
**Vice President:** NORMA C. COOK, University of Tennessee  
**Secretary:** BERTRAM W. GROSS, University of Georgia  
**Treasurer:** JACK H. HOWE, California State University-Long Beach  
**Trustee:** WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico  
**Historian:** HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

## REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

**Regional Governors.** RICHARD ROTH, University of Rhode Island; JAMES J. HALL, St. John's University; HALFORD RYAN, Washington and Lee College; JOSEPH C. WETHERBY, Duke University; ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw 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:** NICHOLAS M. CRIPE (Past President), Butler University; BETTIE HUDGENS, Spring Hill College; RONALD J. MATLON, University of Massachusetts.  
**ACHS Representative:** JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California.  
**Representative on SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion:** JOHN GREG, St. John's University.

## COMMITTEE CHAIRS

**Standards Committee:** NORMA COOK, University of Tennessee  
**National Conference Committee:** THOMAS KANE, University of Pittsburgh  
**Research and Publications Committee:** ROBERT COX, University of North Carolina  
**Distinguished Alumni and Service Awards Committee:** CULLY CLARK, University of Alabama.  
**Speaker of the Year Committee:** KASSIAN KOVALCHECK, Vanderbilt University.

## STUDENT OFFICERS

**President:** PETER QUIST, University of Georgia  
**First Vice President:** SUE PROKOP, Ohio University  
**Second Vice President:** JOHN P. DAVIDSON, III, University of Illinois  
**Secretary:** DAVID BOND, University of Alabama

## EDITORIAL STAFF

**Editor:** KENNETH E. ANDERSEN, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.  
**Associate Editors:** BERNARD L. BROCK, Wayne State University; KURT RITTER, University of Illinois; JOHN P. DAVIDSON, III, University of Illinois.

# Speaker and Gavel

---

Volume 14

Fall 1976

No. 1

---

## THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY: HOST OF THE 1977 DSR-TKA CONFERENCE

The University of Utah's Adamson Chapter of DSR-TKA is looking forward to hosting the 1977 Conference and to welcoming all of you to Salt Lake City. We think you will enjoy the trip and the area, which is both scenically beautiful and rich in western history.

Salt Lake City, with a metropolitan population of five hundred thousand, is situated in a broad valley between the Wasatch and the Oquirrh Mountains, with the famous Great Salt Lake to the northwest of the town. In the immediate downtown area you may visit: Temple Square, center of worship for the world's three million Mormons; The Beehive House, home of Brigham Young while Governor of the Territory; The State Capitol Building, picturesquely situated atop the Capitol Hill overlooking the valley; and Trolley Square, a unique collection of shops, boutiques, and restaurants in the converted trolley barns of the city.

All of these are in close proximity to the Little America Hotel, the convention hotel, which is located at the south edge of the downtown business district, just five blocks from Temple Square. The Little America Complex has spacious, beautifully-appointed rooms, as well as the necessary meeting rooms, coffee shop, and other facilities needed for the conference.

The principal site of the conference, of course, will be the campus of The University of Utah, which is located on the side of the foothills east of the downtown area. The University has about twenty thousand full-time students and is perhaps best known nationally for its pioneering efforts in medicine and physics, mining and metallurgy. The Department of Communication, which will help sponsor the conference, offers BA, MA, and PhD degrees in the areas of Speech Communication, Journalism and Mass Communication, and Speech Pathology and Audiology.

Headquarters for the conference will be in the University Union, a building with the unique feature of having four stories—three of them with ground-level entrances. We hope to confine the activities of the conference to the Union and three nearby buildings in order to minimize the necessity of carrying debate evidence too far.

Among the special activities planned for the conference are a brief-but-pleasant "Get Acquainted Meeting" on Wednesday, March 23; a reception for visiting coaches and their spouses at the Fort Douglas-Hidden Valley Country Club on March 24; and a banquet for all conference participants on the evening of March 25. We at the University of Utah hope that you will all plan to have your chapter represented in Salt Lake City this spring!

Jack L. Rhodes  
Conference Director

**DEBATER AS PEDAGOGUE:  
THE FIRST UNITED STATES-CIDD DEBATE  
TOUR OF JAPAN**

JOHN P. DAVIDSON III

In October 1976, three Americans, Sam Wida, a former debater at California State University-Fullerton, Dr. Thomas Kane of the University of Pittsburgh, and I, participated in a series of thirty-nine debates involving students from over thirty different Japanese universities and colleges. This tour was the first in what the Committee on International Discussion and Debate (CIDD) hopes will become a biennial project. Like all of CIDD's projects, the primary goal of this tour was to promote international understanding.<sup>1</sup> While a number of Japanese publications have sought to bring word of this tour to a wider audience than just the English Speaking Societies who sponsored us (for example, February's issue of *The English Journal*, or the October 30 broadcast of "Tokyo Forum Get Together" on Nihon Shortwave Radio), little mention of it can be found in American publications. Yet international understanding is a two-way street: if it is vital for the Japanese forensics community to be aware of the current practices in America, it is of equal importance that the American speech community become aware of the art as practiced in Japan. This article provides an extended outline of the practice of debate as found in Japan, briefly discusses the possible role of debate in Japanese society, and suggests certain Japanese practices which might prove useful in the United States.

In 1969 and in 1975, two Japanese students debated on a number of American campuses in what were billed as the U.S.-Japan Exchange Debates. The October tour represented the other half of that exchange. Japanese debaters will again be on American campuses in the Spring of 1978 to begin another round of this exchange.

While in Japan, we visited colleges in Tokyo and its suburbs; colleges in many of the other major cities of Japan, such as Yokohama, Kyoto, Kobe, Osaka, Nagoya and Sapporo; and a few colleges in small towns, such as Saitama and Tenri. We debated in what the Japanese refer to as "home and home" debates, but also participated as Chairman or Judge in a debate tournament which had representatives from most of Japan's debate "powers." Thus, our experience covered most of the situations in which the Japanese debate and enough of the country to allow us to observe any geographic differences in style or ability. The observations in this article are based on the assumption that we saw Japanese debate as it is practiced under typical conditions.

---

John P. Davidson III is a senior at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the Second Vice President of the National Student Council of DSR-TKA.

<sup>1</sup> Edward Heath, "Letter to Robert N. Hall of 31 July 1972," *Fifty Years of International Discussion and Debate 1922-1972*, Robert N. Hall and Jack L. Rhodes (New York: Speech Communication Association 1972), p. i.

## Debate in Japan

Collegiate debate in Japan is sponsored and organized by student organizations known as English Speaking Societies (except at Tokyo Woman's Christian College, where the organization is called the Queen's Garden Society). These societies (hereafter referred to as the ESS) are usually made up of five sections, drama, discussion, speech, public relations (or journalism), and debate, although the size and scope of each section depends largely upon the size of the university and the resources of the student body. A recently published survey indicates that eighty-four percent of all Japanese universities have an English-language forensics program.<sup>2</sup>

Debate coaches, in the sense that we know them in the United States as faculty advisors, are the exception rather than the rule in Japan. Each ESS has its own faculty sponsor, but he or she must advise all the sections and thus rarely has time to become actively involved in debate. Where coaches do exist, they are not usually members of a speech department, since speech as an academic discipline is just starting to develop in Japan. Usually they are Americans on campus who participated in speech or debate in high school or college in the United States and who have a large amount of dedication to Japanese students. Typically, the debate section is "coached" by members who are in their senior year and have "retired" from active debating in order to concentrate on finding a job but are still devoted to the success of their society. This lack of coaches who have academic expertise in speech necessarily places constraints upon debate in Japan.

Japanese university students debate primarily for two reasons. The first is to learn better use of the English language. Debate seems to meet this need very well. There is currently much criticism of the English language instruction in some colleges and in most high schools. Yet almost without exception, the members of the debate sections spoke fluent English. The second reason Japanese students debate is to learn what they call the "logical way of thinking," which they see America, and debate in particular, as epitomizing. Many students seem to feel that their own language and culture hinder rational expression as defined in the West, and learn English and debate to overcome this hindrance. When asked why they did not debate in Japanese, many of our hosts expressed amazement at the idea, claiming that their language was not precise enough for such an exercise. Since I am not a linguist, I cannot evaluate this notion; but, upon further inquiry, we discovered that debates have been conducted in Japanese, although infrequently.

Debating in Japan seems to attract a cross-section of the student population. The activity seems to attract a number of males and females proportional to their representation in the university. Most of the debaters we met had career plans in which the knowledge of English would be of some importance. They typically majored in literature, language, business, law, education, or economics but students in the sciences, philosophy and history were not uncommon. Almost all students retire from debate (and all other extra-curricular activities) their senior year to seek a job. Knowledge of English is highly regarded by employers in all fields, but especially in large corporations where students often hope to be employed.

<sup>2</sup> Satoshi Ishii and Donald Klopff, "Differences between American and Japanese Forensics," *Speaker and Gavel*, 13 (Fall 1975), 12.

### *Debate Events*

As in this country, the primary debate activity, at least in terms of prestige, is the debate tournament. The differences between countries, however, are significant. First, most Japanese tournaments are small and allow only one team per school to enter. This naturally limits the amount of practice available and in schools which have more than one ESS causes intense rivalry between the clubs. Second, a group of students from the host school selects the topic for their tournament. Each tournament is likely to feature a different topic. Since there is a much smaller number of tournaments per year, this is not quite as unmanageable as we might imagine. However, during our month-long visit we saw debaters working on four different topics. Additionally, a different set of topics is used in the spring. Third, unlike the experience in America, debate tournaments in Japan still attract an audience. In the tournament with which we were involved, even the preliminary rounds (of which there are typically four) had audiences of thirty people or more. This is primarily due to the enthusiasm debate generates on campus, the fact that it does not require a specialized jargon, interpretations of the topics are what the average person would take them to be, if you are capable of understanding conversational English, you are capable of understanding the debate, and it sets a good standard of English for the student to emulate.

Debate activities take two other forms as well. The most important of these are the "home and home" debates which are an exchange between the ESS's of two schools. Usually held in preparation for a tournament, these take the form of a regular debate and are held in a large room with most of the host school's ESS as an audience. They are frequently judged by an impartial sponsor of a third ESS or a well-known tournament judge. Some of these "home and home" debates have a long history and considerable prestige is attached to winning them, especially in the opposing team's home court. The final debate activity is the intra-squad or practice debate. With the restrictions on entries at tournaments, most students get their debate experience here. These occur in very familiar settings, in small classrooms with two teams and either an advanced debater or a senior member as a critic. These too can become hotly contested events, especially when an "Old Boy" (an alumnus) comes in to judge the practice debate which determines what team will represent the university at the next tournament.

### *Five-Man Debate*

An innovation in debate which is uniquely Japanese is five-man debate. I surmise that five-man debate was the invention of Mitsugu Iwashita, who is now the President of the Tokyo Institute of the English Language. Because of the limitations on the number of teams in tournaments in Japan (which is to a large degree due to a lack of qualified judges) Mr. Iwashita reasoned that putting more people on each team would allow more people to get tournament experience. Having five people on the team would allow two fairly experienced students to take the difficult positions (the constructive speech and the summary) while training three freshmen who would take the other positions. Hence, this style is consistent with Japanese culture.

Because Japan is a fairly rule-oriented society, the list of rules for five-man debate is very long (five pages). I can only provide a brief sketch of

the activity here. The debate starts with two ten-minute constructive speeches, first the affirmative and then the negative. Following a three minute intermission the negative cross-examines the affirmative for eight minutes, and then the affirmative cross-examines the negative. During this period at least three different speakers from each side must ask and answer questions so the advanced debaters do not totally dominate. Another three-minute intermission is followed by a rebuttal period of either fifteen or twenty minutes for each team, commencing with the negative and alternating sides with each team member speaking at least once. (There are some complicated rules on speeches lasting only fractions of a minute.) After a one-minute intermission, the debate concludes with two six-minute summary speeches, first from the negative, delivered by any speaker save the one who gave the constructive speech but usually the other advanced student. Summary speeches may contain no new arguments or new evidence.

This style of debate presents a number of challenges which, if mastered, result in a fascinating dialectical process. Two factors are crucial to success in five-man debate, besides the obvious fact that five people must work well together as a team. The first is the use of the intermission period. While intermissions in a debate may at first seem silly to an American, examination of the "ten-minute rule" will show that we have, in effect, institutionalized intermissions in our debates as well. Strategic planning must be done during the intermissions, especially in the ones preceding the cross-examination and rebuttal periods. The second factor is the division of responsibilities in the rebuttals. Perhaps the greatest advantage five-man debate has as a form is the practice it gives the student in rebuttal. However, if the team does not assign and carry out specific duties in each speech, the rebuttal period tends to degenerate into a period of frequent repetition instead of the highly dialectic process which ten speeches in succession have the potential to be.

Five-man debate is the most popular form of debate in Japan today, at least in terms of numbers of tournaments. Despite the lack of experience Americans have with this type of debate, we were asked to participate in a number of five-man debates on our tour, all on the topic "Resolved: That the Ministry of Education's Textbook Approval System should be Abolished." Imagine the difficulty Sam and I had trying to do research on a relatively minor aspect of a foreign country's educational system, all the while trying to envision what five-man debate might be. (I suspect the Committee on International Discussion and Debate didn't know, and was afraid to ask!) Imagine our surprise when we arrived at the scene of our first five-man debate to discover, as we had suspected but refused to believe, that indeed we were three men short. The fact that we had to speak twice as often as our opponents did not seem to bother our hosts, since, after all, we were "championship" debaters from the United States and could adapt to such minor changes. Over the course of our trip, we got used to and even began to enjoy five-man debate. What we never figured out was how to take a "flow" of a five-man debate.

### *Debate Practices*

Unless otherwise noted, the comments below deal with two-man debate. The debaters we met were quite fluent in their use of English. However, the debaters from areas which had a high concentration of schools in a small area, such as in Tokyo or Osaka-Kobe, were noticeably better, both in their



confidence in using English and their general abilities in debate. This, of course, is tied to the greater opportunities to practice.

The delivery of a debate speech in Japan is highly conversational. Organization is noticeable, especially in the speeches of better debaters, but is always developed subtly. Since English is their second language, rapid-fire delivery is absolutely incomprehensible and is not rewarded by the judges. All the debates in which we participated included cross-examination periods, and these were frequently well-handled. Women debaters were especially adept at this difficult skill, which may be due to a cultural factor I cannot identify. Where difficulties arose, it was usually in asking obvious questions which did very little to advance the argumentative position of the team.

One interesting stylistic device which Japanese debaters use frequently is charts. These charts, hand made and displayed by the partner during the debate, are especially useful for economic questions, but have a variety of uses, including the visual presentation of a complex chain of reasoning.

One element of style, however, remains the same around the world. After a good debate, the Japanese students, like their American counterparts, like to go out and have a good, strong drink (or two), rehash the issues, or discuss more interesting subjects.

Evidence is not given nearly the emphasis in Japan that it is in tournament debating in the United States. Most of the evidence we heard being used was from newspapers. Books were the second most frequent source, with magazines and journals playing a relatively minor role. What seems to be almost completely absent is the use of government documents as sources of information. I am not sure if this is because the Diet, Japan's highest legislative body, does not use the extensive system of hearings which Congress does, if government documents are just not as prolifically published, or if Japanese students have not discovered their utility. Whatever the reason, they use few governmental documents. Documents from our government (which might have been useful on the two-man topic, Resolved: that Japan should Extend Diplomatic Recognition to North Korea) are not available.

An interesting practice the Japanese debaters have is translating evidence from Japanese to English. This is a natural practice since it greatly expands the available information and gives the debaters valuable practice in direct translation. Some people claim, however, that it results in questionable translations—questionable only if you speak Japanese. In one round on the education topic, I asked my opponent to read one of the pieces of evidence he had cited in his speech. He did, and I stopped him half-way through and asked him if the quotation had said "government" (which it had), or "federal government" (which it had not), believing, of course, that I was scoring an impressive point by using his own evidence against him. I was informed that indeed the quotation had said "government," but that it was a translation and the word in Japanese was used only to refer to the federal government. Such are the risks of cross-cultural communication!

In terms of affirmative analysis debate in Japan is about where it was in 1960 in the United States. The need-plan case is by far the most common, with the comparative advantage case slowly taking hold, although not always understood or accepted by the judges as *prima facie*. Due to the influence of Professor Donald Klopff, who brings a team from the University of Hawaii to a couple of Japanese universities every summer, the "alternative justifications" case is being used by one or two teams. I am not sure

Professor Klopf explained it sufficiently for the people who use it to understand all of its ramifications. I think the Japanese use it primarily because it is new and American—and most negative teams treat it like any other case.

Debaters in Japan seems to place very little emphasis on the plan. Even though most of their topics are questions of policy, there were several debates in which we did not hear a specific plan, or had to ask for it in cross-examination. This may be cultural as well: a society based on consensus decision-making may be accustomed to having discussions of problems out of which a solution naturally emerges, rather than specifically identifying a problem and an exact solution to it at the beginning of the process of decision-making. Since there is little emphasis on the plan, we heard nothing of affirmative fiat, self-perpetuating boards, or “means most consistent with the economy.” Japanese debate in the future may move toward more development of the proposed solution and experimentation with different types of cases. Of particular usefulness would be the goals or criteria case which allows for focusing on the values underlying the debate: values and value questions are of great interest to the Japanese. °

Arguing on the negative is the area of major weakness of Japanese debaters in general. In a society which stresses consensus and cooperation, directly challenging an opponent's position is rather alien. Only rarely did we hear evidence challenged, either as to the credibility of the source or the inference from the data. Minor repairs were virtually unheard of. Just as the affirmative does not develop the plan, so too the negative concentrates very little attention on plan objections. There is little of the division of labor between first and second negative which characterizes debate in American tournaments. The first negative speaker advances most of the negative arguments, which usually consist of a statement of philosophy, a defense of the status quo, a few points of direct refutation and a “workability argument” if a plan is evident. The second negative speaker only rarely advances new arguments, usually devoting the time to rebutting the affirmative responses to the original arguments advanced in the first speech.

Obviously, negative analysis and argumentation is the area in which Japanese debating can make the greatest improvements. As soon as the students become aware of the importance of the minor repair, attacks on significance, the use of disadvantages and “plan meet-need” arguments, the negative teams will begin to win a much larger percentage of the debates. This in turn may lead to further developments on the affirmative side, especially the further development of the plan. Japanese debaters are very good at using arguments from sign. This type of argument, if properly applied, can lead to very powerful plan disadvantage arguments. Many of these things will be developed in time and molded to fit the Japanese experience. More exposure to American debate texts would be valuable in developing Japanese debate.

The rebuttal also is a weak point among Japanese debaters (as with Americans), but it is a problem which has been recognized and for which corrective means exist. While serving as a chairman in six debates at the Sophia University Invitational Debate Tournament, I noticed that no matter how well arguments had been developed in the constructives, they seemed to disappear magically by the last two rebuttals. When Japanese debaters learn to develop or extend arguments in rebuttals instead of just repeating them and they learn the importance of argument selection in rebuttals, these

things will improve. Certainly the five-man debate style presents a valuable tool to use in practicing rebuttal speaking.

#### Debate in Japanese Society

What role does debate play in Japanese society? I can only speculate. It certainly develops members of the society who can use the English language as an effective tool in communication. Since English is pretty well accepted as the *lingua franca* of the world, and certainly the Pacific, this is no small accomplishment. To the extent that Western and particularly American culture does have a rational component, it does help these students to understand that aspect and thus to better deal with those "silly foreigners."

Despite the emphasis on consensus decision-making, debate may be a useful tool in Japanese social interactions as well. We spent the better part of an afternoon watching the proceedings of the Diet on television, and, while we could not understand the language, something very close to a parliamentary debate certainly seemed to be occurring. Debate may train future members of the Diet. Finally, debate can function in Japanese society as good debate can function in any society, independent of culture or language. It can lead to the perspective that one way to come closer to truth is to juxtapose ideas against each other and defend them until one emerges as superior. If an institution is advancing truth or knowledge, to whatever slight degree, it is fulfilling a useful role in society. Debate seems to be doing at least this much in Japan.

Forensics in Japan, and debate in particular, has been profoundly influenced by debating in the United States. In fact, of all the countries in the world that practice debate, the Japanese debate most like we do. The most frequent question we were asked was, "How is this and so done in America?" The stereotype of the Japanese is that they adapt many things from other cultures, perhaps we should ask what we could adapt from Japanese debate.

#### Implications for United States Forensics

The most obvious thing for us to adopt would be the five-man style of debate, not as a replacement but as an addition to our current tournament formats. Certainly for inexperienced debaters, five-man debating offers a convenient means of learning such difficult skills as cross-examination and rebuttal. In these times of reduced budgets, expanded entry fees and outrageous judging fees, five-man debating might have a financial appeal as well.

Another interesting practice of the Japanese which the American forensics community might consider is the position of chairman. Every debate in Japan, be it in tournaments or in home and home debates, has a chairman whose role is to introduce the speakers, conduct the debate according to the rules, attend to the judges and ask for appeals at the conclusion of the debate. Given the widespread recognition of the problems of highly competitive tournament debating, including recent criticisms made by the President of the American Forensic Association,<sup>3</sup> an active chairman might be able to prevent some of these transgressions. Supporters of tournament debating claim that the means to combat this evil is the judges; if the

<sup>3</sup> James F. Weaver, "Comments from the President," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 13 (Fall 1976), 63.

judges reward such practices, they will continue. Obviously, a chairman who could step in and rule out of order a team which presented a bizarre interpretation of the topic or reprove a speaker who spoke too fast would solve some of the problems while still allowing the judge to adjudicate the debate on the basis of the issues presented. The practice might not be too popular, but it would surely be good for debate.

A third idea we might borrow from the Japanese is the "appeal to the judge." One of the functions of the chairman, as mentioned above, is to call for appeals on the rules from either team. While I never heard an appeal, and while American debate is not very rule bound, the idea certainly has possibilities. If one side believes that a new argument has been brought up in rebuttal, this can be brought out in the appeal. If the negative thinks the judge should consider a particularly important piece of evidence in light of the second affirmative rebuttal, this would be their opportunity, where before, none existed. While the potential for abuse is present, the idea of appealing to the judge seems to have advantages worthy of consideration.

In terms of humanizing American forensics, we might also consider encouraging audiences to attend debate tournament rounds as the Japanese do. Some of the uncommunicative practices of modern tournament debating might have to be revised to hold the audience's attention. In one of the preliminary rounds of the recent University of Illinois Intramural Debate Tournament with an audience of 150 students, a speaker began to talk too rapidly, noticed the audience was losing interest, slowed down and went on to win the debate on the issues as decided by the judge. Rapid delivery is not required for good debating. In instituting this practice, we would not have to go as far as Wayne State University does in organizing its outstanding audience debate tournament. We could do such simple things as encouraging students in basic speech classes to attend as observers those tournaments which their school hosts. If the art of rational communication is being practiced and refined in the best tournaments in the nation, certainly these students could benefit from observing the practice.

During the stay in Japan, the members of the United States International Debate Team performed a pedagogic function. We in effect instructed the Japanese in the art of debate as practiced in America in a manner which was understandable and useful to them. This essay seeks to extend that pedagogic function one step further. If this essay serves to further the process of international understanding, if it sparks sufficient interest to motivate a school to invite the Japanese debaters to their campus in the Spring of 1978, or if it encourages someone to apply for the next American exchange in Japan, then its purpose will have been fulfilled.

## THE SURVIVAL OF EXCELLENCE

NICHOLAS M. CRIFE

Most people in the teaching profession profess a high regard for the concept of excellence. They frequently use the term in expressing an objective for a course of study or as a purpose for being as does Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha in its constitution: "To promote interest in and to award suitable recognition for excellence in forensics and original speaking."<sup>1</sup> Yet, more frequently it seems the word excellence is being used to bemoan its absence from whatever is being commented upon, be it the presidential candidates or a classroom lecture. Excellence may not be extinct today, but it might well be placed on the endangered species list.

I define excellence not merely as *Webster's Third International Dictionary* does: superiority, pre-eminence, of the highest quality. Rather, I see excellence as the philosopher Ortega does: as the qualities to be found in a man defined as excellent. "The excellent man is constituted by an intimate need to appeal from himself to a standard above him, superior to him, to which service he freely puts himself . . . for excellence is synonymous with a life of exertion, always dedicated to outdoing oneself to transcend what one already is."<sup>2</sup>

If excellence is to survive, man must be dedicated to being excellent: we must be dedicated as a society, we must be dedicated as individuals. But we are not dedicated to excellence, neither as a society, nor, by and large, as individuals. John Gardner, while Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may have described our society well when he said:

An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.<sup>3</sup>

This seems an apt description because ours is a society that exalts the college degree with all too little attention as to its excellence. Never has such a large proportion of a population held a college degree as is true of the United States today; yet, there has been no proportionate surge of excellence in this degree-worshipping society. This is not to argue that there is no excellence today, obviously there is. Rather it is to contend that too many of these graduates could not be defined as excellent either by a dictionary or a philosophical definition.

The blame can be placed squarely upon the colleges and universities. During the past few decades college faculties, administrators, and students

---

This article is an edited version of a speech delivered at the national conference of the National Honor Societies, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 28, 1976. Dr. Crife is immediate Past National President of DSR-TKA and chairman of the Department of Speech at Butler University.

<sup>1</sup> Constitution of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, 1.

<sup>2</sup> José Ortega Y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses*, (New York: W. W. Norton, 1957), p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> Alan Monroe and Douglas Ehninger, *Principles of Speech Communication*, Sixth Brief Edition (Glenview: Scott, Foresman, 1969), pp. 141-142.

seem often to have lost sight of the fact that the job of the college is to educate the student, to give him or her a sense of dedication to continued learning. Today, the emphasis seems to be on the number seeking the degree, not the excellence of the education for which the degree should stand. In higher education today all too many schools are caught up in the numbers game. The emphasis seems to be on enrolling as many students as possible, not on educating for excellence. We all know of schools where departments with low enrollments have been abolished, no matter their excellence; of courses with low enrollment that are no longer offered. In most universities the criterion for promotion and tenure is not excellence of teaching, but the number of books and articles published. The ironic comment "publish or perish" has literally become an academic way of life.

In the 1960's when students rebelled and demanded more meaningful courses, many faculties capitulated by doing such things as dropping the foreign language requirement and substituting "comic book literature" for Faulkner. For many students RELEVANT became the key word. For others, it became the letter "A" as it dawned upon them that they would be accepted into graduate school primarily upon their Graduate Record Examination Score and grade point average, not on the breadth and depth of courses taken. Today, the mark of excellence for many is the degree; for the select few it is high grades that lead to a higher degree. If high grades define excellence, there is no problem as to survival of excellence. Excellence as designated by a grade point average has survived and is flourishing. But if excellence is as Ortega says, "outdoing oneself to transcend what one already is," then the evidence is overwhelming: the colleges and universities are not preparing their students, the average ones or the superior ones, for a life dedicated to excellence. The emphasis is on the symbol of measurement, not the content supposedly measured.

One area in which dedication to excellence among college graduates seems to have been neglected is in the average graduate's use of the spoken and written word. I contend that a person's excellence may be lessened or increased by the competency achieved in oral and written expression. How well we comprehend that which is communicated to us by others depends to a large extent upon our language comprehension. How well we communicate our thoughts to others depends to a large extent upon our command of the written and spoken word. If we are to have excellence of thought, we must continuously strive for excellence of language. As George Orwell so aptly put it in his essay, "Politics and the English Language," "sloppy language makes for sloppy thought."<sup>4</sup>

Colleges and universities are not producing students dedicated to a continued love of language. The proof is the inability of so many graduates to use the spoken and written word with the degree of competence one might reasonably expect from the holder of a college degree. Today, those who aspire to leadership in almost any field are college graduates. Is it a mere coincidence that when we need excellence of thought and leadership as much as we ever have in our history, there should be such a dearth of excellence with the written and spoken word among those who would lead? Where are the Jeffersons and the Hamiltons with the written word; the Lincolns, the Roosevelts, the Stevensons with the spoken word? Where are the Learned Hands in the law, the Clarence Randalls in business, the

<sup>4</sup> In Robert L. Scott, Ed., *The Speaker's Reader: Concepts in Communication*, (Glenview: Scott, Foresman, 1969), p. 158.

Martin Luther Kings? Excellence of language among those who would lead does indeed seem to be an endangered species.

And what of the language used by the non-leaders, that vast majority of this society that spends billions annually to educate its children in schools staffed by the graduates of our colleges and universities?

In a 1969 nation-wide survey involving uniform writing exercises given to some 86,000 children aged 9, 13, and 17 in 2500 schools in every section of the United States, some interesting findings evolved:

Nine year old Americans showed almost no command of the basic writing mechanics of grammar, vocabulary, spelling, sentence structure and punctuation. Even the best of the 17 year olds seldom displayed any flair or facility by moving beyond commonplace language.<sup>5</sup>

The results of a national follow-up study recently completed are much the same: *Newsweek* reports the 9 year olds are not any better and the 13 and 17 year olds are worse. Our educational system from first grade through high school is not educating students for excellence in the use of the language. Could it be because our colleges and universities did not instill a dedication to excellence in language in the teachers when they were undergraduates?

Rudyard Kipling, addressing the Royal College of Surgeons in London, said: "I am by calling a dealer in words, and words are, of course, the most powerful drug used by mankind. Not only do words infect, egotize, narcotize, and paralyze, but they enter into and colour the minutest cells of the brain. . . ."

As a teacher of speech communication, I too, am a dealer in words. I am convinced that words are one drug with which today's students are not experimenting. Today's faculties are not guilty of pushing this drug. Every student body has a few addicts who are hooked on words. And it was usually some faculty pusher who got them addicted. But the majority of students are not language conscious. They show it every time they speak and in every paper they write. Perhaps one of the biggest problems facing our students is that even when they have something to say, they do not know how to say it.

Somewhere along the way too many students have not learned to use the English language. They have not learned to speak and write because they have not had to do so. Professors have long since ceased being surprised when an advanced student complains about writing a term paper because it is his first one and he is not happy about the assignment. All of us are aware of the fact that with large classes "multiple guess" quizzes are much easier and more quickly graded than bulging bluebooks, and term papers take an inordinate amount of time to read and correct. But if we do not insist that students learn to use the language correctly and well in college, when will they learn? It is the obligation of every faculty member, no matter what the discipline to insist on effective language. The job cannot be done by the speech professor and/or the English professor in the one or two classes most students have in these areas.

Not the least cause for the problem is the example we professors set for students in our use of the spoken and written word. What of our excellence in the use of language? A common complaint of students is the dullness of the lectures of many of their professors as they sit slouched behind a desk

<sup>5</sup> "Why Johnny Can't Write," *Newsweek*, December 8, 1975, p. 58.

droning from yellowed, dog-eared notes or stand mumbling to a blackboard. After seven years as a college student and twenty-seven as a college professor, I am firmly convinced that some of the worst public speaking in America takes place in the college classroom.

Nor can it be denied that some of the poorest teaching of students in the use of the spoken word is being done by faculty members involved in intercollegiate debate. Debaters have developed a definite language style designed to say the most possible in the least number of words. When national champion debaters are introducing fifty pieces of evidence into a ten minute speech and averaging 245 words per minute, obviously little attention can be given to the beauty of language or to the nuances of delivery.<sup>6</sup> Nor is this rapidity of rate something new in debate. Giffin and Warner were reporting average rates of 193 words per minute in 1962.<sup>7</sup> It seems that many forensics directors presently are not heeding the advice Wayne Thompson offered to debate coaches in 1944: "Instructors should continue to teach good delivery and effective rhetoric, factors which continue to be virtues unless they obscure ideas or serve as substitutes for ideas."<sup>8</sup> However, if excellence in debate is to be measured by the trophies won, then there is no need to be concerned over the lack of excellence with the spoken word, excellence in forensics has been achieved.

Nor do we professors set a much better example for our students with the written work as exemplified in much of our so-called scholarly writing. Melvin Maddocks in his essay, "The Limitations of Language," calling the problem "semantic aphasia," defines it as "that numbness of . . . mind and heart . . . which results from the habitual and prolonged abuse of words." Orwell says it results from staleness of imagery and a lack of precision brought on by the use of dying metaphors, pretentious diction, and meaningless words. He illustrates the contention with a parody which he believes is not particularly exaggerated. First he gives us a well-known verse from Ecclesiastes:

I returned and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all.

Orwell then translates the verse into modern scholarly English:

Objective consideration of contemporary phenomena compels the conclusion that success or failure in competitive activities exhibits no tendency to be commensurate with innate capacity, but that a considerable element of the unpredictable must invariably be taken into account.<sup>9</sup>

This is not an extreme example; it is only too typical of much of the writing we find in journal articles. Too many college professors are not excellent examples of how to use the spoken and written word.

If college graduates are not dedicated to continued growth in their use

<sup>6</sup> Stanley G. Rives, Ed., "1976 National Debate Tournament Final Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 13 (Summer 1976), 47-49.

<sup>7</sup> Kim Giffin and Donald Warner, "A Study of the Influence of an Audience on the Rate of Speech in Tournament Debates," *The Speaker*, 45 (November 1962), 13.

<sup>8</sup> Wayne N. Thompson, "Discussion and Debate: A Re-Examination," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 30 (October 1944), 299.

<sup>9</sup> Scott, 163.



of the language, it is because they were not inspired to become so by their teachers. This situation places Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha in a unique position to contribute to excellence in language. Ours is an organization dedicated to recognizing excellence in forensics. Although some seem to have forgotten it, forensics is, always has been, always will be basically an activity in reasoning presented by the spoken word. Forensics, by its very nature, attracts the best and brightest students. Colleges and universities are not meeting the challenge of excellence in language. If organizations such as our honorary will not accept the challenge, what is the future of excellence as exemplified in the use of the spoken and written word? Probably it will be analogous to the passenger pigeon that became extinct because of the careless slaughter by a society which did not seem to realize what it was doing.

### 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 Bert Gross, National Secretary, DSR-TKA, Department of Speech Communication, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602. They are also available from Kenneth E. Andersen, Editor, *Speaker and Gavel*, Department of Speech Communication, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

#### 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.

## FORENSICS AT CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

JAMES J. FLOYD

The forensics program at Central Missouri State University attempts to accomplish three closely related goals. This program strives to provide maximum opportunity for participation in forensic activities for all interested students. Secondly, the program is dedicated to participation in competitive forensics without being dominated by competition and the pursuit of trophies. Finally, the program at CMSU endeavors to provide students with opportunities for personal achievement and recognition without sacrificing the educational benefits and purposes of forensics.

The first of these three goals represents a firm conviction that students with little or no high school experience in forensics should not be precluded or restricted from participation. We realize that a coach may enjoy a much greater chance for professional respect and prestige if highly talented and successful high school debaters and speakers are recruited heavily and then presented with large scholarships in exchange for their commitment and service to the coach and the institution. Nevertheless, we prefer to welcome all students and to allow them generally equal involvement and participation regardless of past experience or talent. Experienced debaters are indeed welcome, but totally inexperienced students are equally welcomed and equally exposed to tournament attendance. Essentially, we consider participation in college forensics as the right of any student who is willing to try.

This desire to serve all interested students is highly compatible with the second major goal of this program, that we not be dominated by the pressures of competition and the mad pursuit of trophies as an indication of the success of the program. Importantly, this is not in any way a rejection of competition. We do not agree with those who feel that forensics programs should avoid competition and restrict themselves to non-competitive audience debating and speaking activities. We view debate as an inherently competitive activity, and we believe that forensics can be more enjoyable when students are allowed to compete against students from other schools. Students here want to do well in competition and thoroughly enjoy winning trophies. In addition, there is no attempt to deny the desirability of representing the University successfully. Our goal, however, is not to allow the program to be *dominated* by competition. If the trophy case is not more crowded upon our return from a tournament, we see no reason to be discouraged or particularly unhappy. The mere absence of trophies should not constitute a negative evaluation of participation in a tournament. The fact that none of the teams has made the elimination rounds at a given tournament need not be equated with disaster. The students and coaches may still enjoy and profit from the experience of attending a tournament regardless of the outcome.

Another important aspect of this second goal is the necessity that our staff must be more concerned with helping students to learn from their failures. Much more important than worrying about not winning a trophy

---

James J. Floyd, Ph.D. Indiana University, 1972, is an Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg.

are the post tournament processes of reviewing ballots, of responding positively to criticism, and of striving to do additional analysis and research in preparation for future tournaments. It is also valuable, in our estimation, to review and to analyze the various approaches that other teams have taken toward the national propositions. Essentially, then, it is more important to learn from competition than to evaluate the activity in terms of numbers of trophies won.

Our third major goal flows directly from a determination not to be dominated by competition. As previously stated, we are pleased when students are able to realize success. Clearly it contributes significantly to a student's enjoyment of forensics participation. We are dedicated to the task of helping students to do as well as they possibly can, and we rejoice when their hard work pays off for them. However, the desire not to be dominated by competition plays a major role in our approach to the means of striving for success. It has a great deal to do, also, with overall coaching methods. We do not think that winning is important enough to justify the purchasing of evidence. We insist that students do their own research. Regardless of how much money we might have at our disposal we would not purchase evidence or hire graduate students to do the research. To do so, in our estimation, robs students of the valuable knowledge of using the library efficiently. Likewise, we do not believe that coaches should write cases or speeches for students. This merely serves to deny the student an opportunity to think his way through a debate resolution or to develop his thoughts effectively on a topic that he must present to an audience.

Another important aspect of this third goal is the obligation to help students to realize that the desire for achievement and recognition can never justify any kind of unethical behavior. We have not reached our goal if any student falsifies or distorts evidence. We have failed to serve our function as educators if we permit students to stretch the meaning of a resolution in order to catch the opponent unprepared. We cannot close our eyes and ears to semantic distortion and sophistry in order to win trophies. We have utterly failed as educators if students present plagiarized speeches or utilize prepared extemporaneous speeches. Quite simply, we cannot reach our goals when the desire for success and recognition win out over the obligation to honesty and personal integrity.

The forensics program at Central Missouri State is organized and conducted with these goals in mind. We have a staff of three: a director of forensics, one faculty assistant, and one graduate assistant. We have formal squad meetings on Monday and Wednesday for the purposes of planning for tournaments, discussing problems, planning non-tournament activities, listening to presentations from students in individual events, and conducting business relative to Pi Kappa Delta. Following the formal meetings (which usually last approximately thirty minutes), we meet with debaters for practice sessions, analysis and planning sessions, review of cases encountered at tournaments, and the discussion of any other problems relevant to the debate program. Students who participate in individual events meet with the three staff members on a regularly scheduled basis for planning and rehearsals.

With a travel budget of \$7300 we are able to involve twenty-five to thirty students in approximately sixteen tournaments. The majority of our travel is to tournaments in a seven state area, with a few more distant trips each year. The majority of the tournaments we attend are not classified as "major" or "power" tournaments. Generally we participate in tournaments

conducted by schools which appear to share our forensics philosophy. When we do attend a larger, "high-powered" tournament we do so for variety and for the purpose of exposing students to different styles and emphases in debate and forensics. Considerable pains are taken in helping students to minimize the tendency to conclude that such tournaments represent inherently superior programs and forensics philosophies.

We also participate in various non-tournament activities. Our students frequently present debates and speeches to civic, business, religious, and educational groups. In addition, we have sponsored a public speaking contest for students in basic speech classes, various campus forums relating to current political and social issues, and demonstration programs for high school students. We have also conducted a summer debate workshop for high school students, a one-day conference and workshop in individual events for high schools in the area, and various high school forensics tournaments. We are active in Pi Kappa Delta, attending province and national conventions and tournaments.

Other activities not directly related to forensics are important to us for the purpose of establishing group cohesion and student rapport. We field a team in the campus Quiz Bowl, a program similar to the television program, "College Bowl." We also have picnics and parties at various times throughout the school year. The forensics suite has work rooms and study areas as well as a student lounge where students and staff meet throughout the day for work, study and conversation. Basically, we attempt to do everything possible to create an enjoyable, relaxed atmosphere in which work and pleasure are combined. The students in the CMSU program are predominately intelligent, delightful people, and all of us take considerable pride in our friendship and group spirit. The students represent diverse socio-economic backgrounds and academic interests. We are not without differences in opinions, life styles, and interests. Nevertheless, our work and recreational activities appear to encourage acceptance and appreciation of these differences. It strikes us that a very real value of forensic participation can be seen in the development of healthy interpersonal relationships. Certainly the students in this program serve as a direct contradiction to the frequently expressed belief that debaters and competitive speakers are necessarily obnoxious, overbearing, and generally unlikeable people.

In spite of the obvious pitfalls involved in attempting to provide an objective assessment of one's own program, I am willing to assert that we have been able to meet our goals satisfactorily in most respects. In five years the program has grown from approximately twelve students to a present participation of approximately thirty students. As this growth has come about we have indeed permitted all students to participate as much as they desire. We have never restricted anyone on the basis of winning potential or talent. Our response to competitive experiences remains stable regardless of the amount of success or failure from year to year or tournament to tournament. Even during years when we have been inexperienced and unsuccessful, the overall attitude toward forensics and toward preparation and practice does not differ significantly from more prosperous times. This program continues to serve as proof that the enjoyment and advantages of forensic participation are not necessarily related to trophy collecting.

From time to time we have had problems with individual students who place excessive emphasis upon winning. They have tended to emulate high power debaters and have become upset by our insistence that evidence will not be purchased, less talented students will not be restricted from participa-

tion, and a continued refusal to move toward national-circuit, NDT debating. We have not asked them to agree with us, but we have insisted that they adhere to our program's policies and practices. It should be stressed, however, that these students represent a small minority of all students in the program. For the vast majority of our students competition does not dominate participation. When we do enjoy success in competition the students realize that their hard work paid off in earned recognition. They know that they did the research, that they prepared the arguments and the negative blocks, and they learned to speak and interpret because of their own work and dedication.

The students in Central Missouri State's forensic program are overwhelmingly good students. They have not been expected to sacrifice class work in order to engage in forensics. Their record of admission to graduate and professional schools is impressive. One former student is completing a medical degree at Johns Hopkins Medical School. Two recent graduates are in law school. Numerous graduates are successful teachers and forensics coaches. The Student Government Association is dominated by forensics students. Their record of personal accomplishment is undeniable.

The major problem that we have had to face is the tendency of a minority of students to enjoy the travel, the lack of pressure, and the social benefits without working up to their ability and capacity. It has been necessary, at times, to restrict participation until there is adequate demonstration of satisfactory preparation and practice. We have learned through experience that a relaxed, enjoyable forensics program must adhere to clearly defined standards of preparation and the willingness to work to the best of one's ability.

Essentially, however, the program at Central Missouri State is highly rewarding. It serves to accomplish what we consider the most desirable goals of forensics. Excellence is valued and hard work is expected. Effective communication is encouraged and nurtured without sacrificing enjoyment and desirable human relations. The students work hard and consistently demonstrate that a cocurricular activity can maximize both educational and personal accomplishment. It is a genuine honor to be associated with a program of this kind.

### ***Nominations for—***

## **Student Speaker of the Year Award**

For information or to make nominations write:

Sue Prokop  
Dept. of Interpersonal Communication  
Ohio University  
Athens, Ohio 45701

## FORENSICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

ROBERT L. KEMP

Some forensics programs are new; they developed quickly and have had great success. For example, many of us saw that happen at the University of Houston in the recent past. Other programs have existed at a school "almost forever" and just seem to keep going. While shifts have occurred at the University of Iowa as directors of forensics change, program direction has been aided by a long, strong tradition in forensics activities.

In 1871 the Zetagathians reported their members were involved in thirty-one debates and sixty-three orations. In 1876, Iowa debaters were probing such topics as Resolved: That justice demands, and policy recommends, that women should have the ballot, and "Are the fictitious works of the age injurious to morals?"<sup>1</sup> In 1891, the Zetagathian society was holding weekly meetings for work in debate and oratory. The society was a very powerful and popular organization.

Individual events also have been a part of the Iowa forensics tradition. On November 5, 1874, the University was the site of the state's initial oratorical contest with the oration "Two Roses in Ireland" declared the winner. And the university community responded well to the winners: when the 1902 orator returned victorious to Iowa City, he was met by a large, enthusiastic crowd which carried him on shoulders to the president's waiting carriage.

Perhaps the most important part of Iowa forensics history occurred in 1925 when a young Bates College teacher, who had the audacity to begin international debate years before many schools even thought of beginning a debate club, came to Iowa as a Professor of Speech. A. Craig Baird's influence on debate, oratory, and American public address is apparent half a century later. Professor Baird's standard's of excellence, his interest in audience debates, his love of good intercollegiate teams that represented themselves and the University of Iowa at an exemplary level, his feelings about good oratory and individual speaking all helped set the tone and direction of the current program.

Some twenty-three thousand students, about half graduate students, call the University of Iowa their school. The undergraduates mostly have Iowa roots and come from the cities, the small towns, and farms of the state. More than four hundred high schools claim some type of speech program with approximately fifty to sixty having debate teams. These programs are critical to the University's since more than ninety-five percent of our forensics students come from these schools.

Any interested student is urged to look at the Iowa program. But if a student has found the years of high school participation to be enough then we too are satisfied. Many who choose to debate or participate in individual events at Iowa compete all during their undergraduate years. The general rule is: if a student continues to learn, enjoy, or gain something—stay in the program; if not, do something else.

---

Robert L. Kemp is Director of Forensics at the University of Iowa. Many of his other responsibilities become clear in the essay.

<sup>1</sup>Clay Harshbarger, Professor Emeritus, will soon publish a history of the Department. His research has been of great value to this paper.

### *The Program*

The core of the program is the intercollegiate debate activity. Iowa debaters attend twenty-five to thirty state, regional, and national tournaments. They compete for and often gain entrance into the National Debate Tournament. An average season for a debater will be eight tournaments. Some students attend so-called national tournaments while others compete largely in a Midwestern circle.

These same students also give demonstration debates for high schools within a 110 mile radius, respond to service group speech requests, serve as the offerings for British debaters' feasting, and are part of a ten-year-old TV debate series that each spring "brings the viewing audience the best of Iowa high school and college debate teams."<sup>2</sup>

Experience has taught two important requisites of planning an active program of student-audience debates: 1) The core for the activity must come from a good strong program of intercollegiate debate, in which students are motivated and trained in analysis, use of evidence, and debate techniques. 2) The bulk of the preparation for off-campus debates, including sample cases and evidence, should be delegated to someone other than the debaters. A work-study person with debate background is used. While, ideally, all research and arguments should be left to the participants, the realities are far different. One concern is simply which students are available for a debate. We try to avoid having them miss classes, especially an exam. Thus teams are put together in an ad hoc fashion, sometimes with very little advance notice.

While the national trend toward individual events programs is a clear one, at Iowa this emphasis has continued to be a secondary one to debate. Some fifteen Iowa students will participate in five to eight regional and, occasionally, a national individual events tournament. The money apportioned to this phase of the program varies from fifteen to thirty-five percent. In truth, the year's debate quality and the interest shown by the individual events people are both instrumental in the appropriation process. In years of strong debate teams that seem to benefit from national competition, more funds are expended on that activity. When the debate quality is less and the persuasive efforts of individual events people and their director greater, the funding approaches equality. While the correlation between small classes and greater learning may be difficult to establish, the relationship between the amount of funding and quality and success in forensics can better be determined. Individual events people are, by intercollegiate forensics criteria, more successful when they have the funds to travel. But when insufficient funds are divided equally only greater mediocrity is reached.

The debate and individual events students, occasionally the same people, are effective contributors to several on-campus programs. At the October high school symposium on the debate resolution, these students lead discussion groups on the topic and give demonstration debates; at the November Colloquy, they provide help in judging some ten individual events and student senate; at the December high school conference some will judge debates, others oratory or extemporaneous speaking while others will work in the tab room or run errands. At the Hawkeye Intercollegiate Tournament

<sup>2</sup> A set opening used by the WMT announcer, a CBS affiliate, as he introduces "Debate 77."

in February, some students will compete, others will be in the tab room, others hosting parties for the two- to three-hundred visitors. And in the Iowa Forensic League state finals our forensics students provide a pool of thirty to forty well-trained and respected critics.

The budget for squad expenses in forensics in the past decade has risen from \$2,000 to over \$9,000. The Speech Department and the central administration provide the greatest amount—\$7,600. A student group allotted \$1500 for 75–76. Another \$200–500 comes from income gained from the February tournament. But the last two sources of income cannot be counted on from one year to the next.

Mileage cost for a University vehicle has risen from six to fifteen cents a mile in these ten years. When the trip is over ten hours we fly. That cost is more than double that of a student fare only five years ago. Motel costs now average \$8.50 a person per night vs. \$5.00 only four years back. We now allot students \$6.50 a day for meals, up about forty percent from four years ago. We provide cards and dittos for debaters with a yearly expenditure of \$750.

A student at the University is eligible for membership in Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha during the junior or senior year. That person must have demonstrated high scholarship, active participation, and quality achievements. On the average, four people become members each year.

### Staff

The fact that both the Department of Speech and the Division of Continuing Education pay my salary makes an off-campus program a responsibility, not just an added burden. This, above all else, creates a *continuing* program. The University's commitment is essential for a strong, diverse program.

The University of Iowa has been blessed for several decades with a high level of graduate students in rhetorical studies. Many debaters with an undergraduate degree from Iowa move a short distance to the Law School or an even shorter step to the graduate program in speech. The combination of generally good graduate students and the number of Iowa debaters who choose the University's graduate school ensures quality debate teaching. The Department normally assigns two to three graduate students to work with the forensics program as well as to teach one or two undergraduate speech courses. I supervise and direct the program, work with debaters, and travel about six times a year, which is pretty much an average for staff travel. I also teach two classes and work approximately one-half time for Continuing Education. The latter appointment includes managing the state high school league. Fall is an intensely busy period but the total curricular and forensics program are so integrated that the semester becomes quite manageable.

Each staff member is directly responsible for a certain number of teams. These are "her or his" teams. Much of the teaching, case planning, and attitude adjustment is made in these small groups. The squad meets weekly and all staff members hear practice debates. The individual events instructor often asks other staff members to hear certain students. People and problems are often very close, and Iowa forensics has had both but maybe not its share. Our students are a fairly homogenous lot and do not require a lot of individual monitoring.

Each student is encouraged to remain with the program and is rewarded



in several ways: 1) a good teaching staff, 2) fairly broad participation opportunities, 3) half-tuition scholarships. These are awarded each fall by the forensics staff to approximately fifteen people. The only criteria are past performance, either in high school or college and continued interest in University forensics. The staff normally waits until late October to notify the recipients which allows for normal additions and attritions. The financial aid of \$375 a year tries to say that the student and his work are important to the University but the money is hopefully not sufficient to keep a person in the activity. We do not endorse the "I can't quit forensics and lose the scholarship" approach. Usually the scholarships are divided with eighty percent to debate and twenty percent to individual events students.

Doing well, doing the best possible, being carefully prepared, debating hard, picking up as many ballots as possible, trying to know why losses occur, taking pride in representing the University are phrases that are likely to be used by a staff teacher to an Iowa forensics student. The philosophy of Iowa forensics is hopefully educational and pragmatic. Few students on campus have the opportunity to have the first class tutorial teaching the forensics students have. This is an expensive program which should produce unique and significant learning. Students are expected to give a good deal of their time and talent. For that effort each should have his knowledge of speech communication increased and his skills developed as a result of participating in the Iowa program. Each should enjoy the experience, but more important, each should be better prepared to enter law school or do graduate work in speech or teach in a secondary school. (Every debater in the past ten years has done one or more of these.) The staff and students have a joint responsibility to carry out this educational purpose.

### *Publicity*

It is easier to garner publicity for high school forensics programs than for the University's. For high schools in Iowa I began a statewide weekly poll of debate teams that has been widely used by newspapers. We have state individual events champions selected by the state forensic directors and we have promoted statewide TV debates. Our University news service will send out forensics news to local papers. Our campus and local papers are less likely to print a forensics story. Probably our own students are the best source of campus and statewide publicity. But Madison Avenue could probably be a help to our program.

### *The Program's Future*

I am not sure where the University of Iowa forensics program will be a decade or ten decades from now. No program works in isolation. The increasing emphasis on individual speaking may have some influence. The expected decline in undergraduate enrollment may have an impact. A dramatic shift in emphasis in speech activities in Iowa or Midwestern high schools could alter this program. More probably the central administration and department executives' beliefs about the worth of forensics ultimately play a greater role.

My position is a fairly unique one but, I believe, quite possibly an ideal one. It allows me to teach in and direct summer institutes for high school students and teachers. Speech methods and directing speech activities

classes keep me in contact with future teachers. My roles as chairman of the Iowa Forensic League (a high school speech organization), director of forensics at the University, teacher, consultant, and program co-ordinator for high schools courtesy of the Division of Continuing Education all help keep me in close contact with many facets of forensics in the state. This appointment allows me an early and continual opportunity to sense student, teacher, and school needs and to do something about many situations.

If continued support is given, future Iowa students can be expected to have the opportunity for training in both public and intercollegiate forensics, to be both a product of and catalyst for change in forensics, and to participate in a program shaped by both idealism and pragmatism.

## SUGGESTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *Speaker and Gavel* is anxious to receive quality manuscripts related to its area of interests. At the moment there is a minimal backlog of articles for publication so submissions will receive prompt evaluation and response from the Editorial Board.

The Editorial Board is particularly interested in receiving articles which deal with current criticism, descriptions of innovative forensics procedures, descriptions of ongoing forensics programs, and essays by student members. For a more detailed description of editorial policy, see pages 3-5 of the Fall 1975 *Speaker and Gavel*, Volume 13, Number 1.

Materials submitted for publication should conform to *The MLA Style Sheet*, 2nd ed. A ribbon copy and a second copy should be submitted. All copy should be typed double-spaced including footnotes which should be typed separately from the body of the essay.

### PLAN AHEAD

### DSK-TKA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

University of Utah

Salt Lake City, Utah

March 23-26, 1977

For advance information, contact Jack Rhodes, Department of Communication, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.

## MINUTES OF THE DSR-TKA NATIONAL COUNCIL

San Francisco, California December 27, 1976

Present for all or part of the meeting: Ziegelmueller, Cook, Howe, Lynch, Andersen, Kane, Hudgens, Weiss, Greg, Calloway, Roth, Moorhouse, Schnoor, Matlon, Rhodes.

Report of the Treasurer, Jack Howe. Howe indicated that 124 of 182 chapters owe dues totaling \$7,900.

Report of the National Conference Committee, Thomas Kane. The National Conference will be held at the University of Utah, March 23-26. The following will chair events: James Weaver, Off-topic debate; John De Bross, Two-man debate; Al Johnson, Individual events; Ken Andersen, Student Congress. Kane announced that there were some modifications of the rules governing events which will be printed in the winter issue of *Speaker and Gavel*. Howe moved that winners in all events receive plaques. Motion passed. Howe moved that winning teams teamed with other schools in Off-topic debate received awards. Awards will still be presented to schools with the best unit records.

Report of the Standards Committee, Norma Cook. During 1976, letters and application forms were sent to six schools which indicated interest in DSR-TKA chapters: Alderson-Broadus College, IUPUI, Morehead State, St. Louis University, University of South Florida, and Virginia Military Institute. Correspondence is beginning with three schools: California State at Fullerton, Illinois State, and Northern Virginia Community College. Completed application forms from Newberry College (South Carolina) and the University of Northern Alabama were considered by the National Council after review by the Regional Governor and the Standards Committee. The Committee voted to accept the application of Northern Alabama but not that of Newberry College.

Report of the Editor: Kenneth Andersen. There is a shortage of good manuscripts; potential contributors should take note. Andersen suggested possible economies in the publication of *Speaker and Gavel*. Greg moved that Andersen investigate feasibility of publishing three instead of four issues a year and the use of black and white instead of color on the cover page. The motion passed. Matlon moved that the philosophy of *Speaker and Gavel* remain unchanged. The publication will continue to publish articles, in-house materials, and the report on the National Conference.

Reports of the Regional Governors followed.

Region 1, Richard Roth: The Region has fourteen chapters, eight (Bates, Dartmouth, Emerson, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, St. Anselm's and Vermont) participate predominately in on-topic debate while four (Brown, Connecticut, Wesleyan, and Yale) compete exclusively in off-topic debate. The remaining chapters (Bridgeport and Hartford) do not participate at all.

Region 4. The National Council expressed its regret at the death of Joseph B. Wetherby, Governor of Region 4 and noted that Kassian Kovalcheck, Regional Vice-Governor will succeed as Regional Governor.

Region 5. Robert Weiss reported on the maintenance of active chapters.

Region 7. Moorhouse indicated that John Schunk is now debate coach at Wichita State University.

Region 8. Schnoor commented on the possible realignment of Region 8 with another region.

Region 9. Calloway noted the innovation at the Colorado College tournament of a special sweepstakes trophy for DSR-TKA schools in attendance. Twenty-three DSR-TKA schools competed and the award was presented to the University of Wyoming.

*National Debate Topic.* Greg reported on the application of parameters on the national inter-collegiate debate topic and a request for more input on suggestions for potential debate topics.

*Nominating Committee.* Weiss reported that the committee nominates: President, Thomas Kane and Norma Cook; Vice-President, Cully Clark and David Zarefsky; Secretary, James Benson and Bert Gross; Treasurer, Jack Howe; at-large, Jean Cornell, Woodrow Leake, and Kurt Ritter.

*Student Speaker of the Year.* Howe moved that a framed certificate be awarded to the student speaker. The motion passed.

*At-large Membership.* Howard Dooley, Director of Forensics at Western Michigan, was approved as an at-large member.

*International Debate Program.* Matlon moved that DSR-TKA contribute \$250 to support the International Debate program for one year only and that no additional funds be contributed beyond this year (1977-78 budget). The motion passed.

*Suspend Chapter Charters.* Charters for following chapters have been withdrawn: Memphis State, University of Washington at Seattle, Knox College, St. Cloud State, Cornell College (Iowa), Rollins College, University of Idaho, University of Montana, State University of New York at Binghamton, University of Washington (St. Louis) and Case-Western Reserve.

*Outstanding Chapter Award.* Greg moved that a committee be appointed to suggest ways of implementing an outstanding chapter award. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jack Lynch

### 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 request 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 \$15.00. The official key (size shown is cut on this page) is \$10.50, or the official key-pin is \$11.75. A lapel button is available

for \$7.00. **Prices include Federal Tax.** The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the Fall 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.



**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.