

## Complete Issue 14(4)

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

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

### Recommended Citation

(1977). Complete issue 14(4). *Speaker & Gavel*, 14(4), 71-98.

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 1978 National Conference .....	71
Debate and a Liberal Arts Education: The Forensics Program at the University of Illinois—Kurt W. Ritter .....	72
A Speaker's Bureau That's Working—William H. Bos .....	85
British Union Debating: An Eclectic Approach— M. Lynn McCauley and Richard L. Stovell .....	89
New Initiates of DSR-TKA 1976-77 .....	95
Table of Parliamentary Motions .....	98

# 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:** THOMAS KANE, University of Pittsburgh  
**Vice President:** DAVID ZAREFSKY, Northwestern University  
**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:** JACK LYNCH, Saint Anselm's College

## REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

**Regional Governors:** WOODROW W. LEAKE, JR., University of Vermont; JAMES J. HALL, St. John's University; HALFORD RYAN, Washington and Lee College; KASSIAN KOVALCHECK, Vanderbilt 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:** GEORGE W. ZIEGELMUELLER (Past President) Wayne State University; JEAN CORNELL, Davidson College; WOODROW W. LEAKE, JR., University of Vermont.

**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:** DAVID ZAREFSKY, Northwestern University

**National Conference Committee:** CULLY CLARK, University of Alabama

**Research and Publications Committee:** WOODROW W. LEAKE, JR., University of Vermont

**Distinguished Alumni and Service Awards Committee:** RONALD MATON, University of Massachusetts.

**Speaker of the Year Committee:** WILLIAM BALTHROP, University of North Carolina

## STUDENT OFFICERS

**President:** LES SHERMAN, University of Southern California

**First Vice President:** FRED FOHRELL, University of Alabama

**Second Vice President:** CHARLES ILLSLEY, Brigham Young University

**Secretary:** CARMEN GUINN, Western Kentucky University

## 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; CHARLES ILLSLEY, Brigham Young University.

# Speaker and Gavel

---

Volume 14

Summer 1977

No. 4

---

## THE 1978 NATIONAL CONFERENCE

A major change in the scenery and some minor changes in schedule, activities and opportunities for extra-conference activities will mark the 1978 National DSR-TKA Conference being hosted by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, March 22-25, 1978.

Since we are centrally located, we hope that many schools will find it possible to enjoy spring in Champaign-Urbana. Champaign-Urbana is on two major interstates, one north-south and one east-west. We have direct airline service from Denver, Washington, New York, St. Louis, and Chicago and good connecting service anywhere in the nation. Airplane fares from many spots in the nation are the same to Champaign-Urbana as they are to Chicago, even though your flight will connect through Chicago. There are three trains a day to Chicago and one to New Orleans.

Many faculty sponsors will remember the large 1973 National Conference hosted at Champaign-Urbana. Several improvements over that conference will be made, including a two-tier housing arrangement in which people may stay quite economically in conference dormitories on the campus or make use of the comfortable facilities at the Ramada Inn at guaranteed rates approximating those of 5 years ago.

Our Illini Forensic Association, the Illinois Chapter of DSR-TKA, the Debate Staff, the Department and University are all looking forward to hosting the National Conference. We will be working with The National Tournament Planning Committee and its new chair, Cully Clark, of the University of Alabama, to host the best conference we can. To this end we will make some modest adjustments in the schedule to provide a less hectic pace for the events and we plan to schedule special seminars on topics of interest for those attending the conference. Since the conference dates this year include Good Friday, we will make arrangements for those who wish to participate in religious observances.

Materials on the conference will be sent in late December to all chapters. For additional information prior to that time or to suggest possible improvements and changes in your National Conference, please write either to Cully Clark at the University of Alabama or to me.

Kenneth E. Andersen  
University of Illinois  
1978 DSR-TKA Conference Director

## DEBATE AND A LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION:

### The Forensics Program at the University of Illinois

KURT W. RITTER

The University of Illinois, like many other institutions of higher education in the United States, has a long tradition in forensics which dates back to the campus literary societies of the last century. At Illinois enterprising students founded two literary societies—the Adelpic and the Philomathean—on March 7, 1868, just five days after the University opened. When women entered the school in 1871, President John Milton Gregory prohibited the “intermingling of the sexes” in the debating societies, and the women students promptly formed the Alethenai Society. Intercollegiate forensics competition began in 1874 when the University of Illinois competed in an interstate oratorical contest at Knox College. That affair led to the formation of the Illinois Intercollegiate Oratorical Association and soon the University was participating in annual interstate forensics competitions.<sup>1</sup>

The University has consistently fostered activities which have given its students opportunities to practice argumentative discourse. When the literary societies began to decline on our campus in 1920, the Illini Forensic Association was formed and it continues today as the undergraduate student debating society of the University. Over the decades, the *means* for teaching rhetorical skills have changed, but the *aim* of the Illinois forensics program has remained that of providing *practical and realistic training in public deliberation and public advocacy*. The forensics program is grounded in the belief that a liberally educated person ought to speak well and write well, and that in order to develop these abilities, a student must learn to argue well.

The purpose of this essay is not only to set forth the educational philosophy which guides the Illinois program, but also to describe the implementation of that philosophy and to give some concrete illustrations of the activities.

#### Problems with the Tournament Model for Forensics

During the 1950s and 1960s, the system of intercollegiate debate tournaments seemed the best means for achieving the aim of our forensics program. Public debating (both on and off campus) continued on a sporadic basis, but it was increasingly regarded as incidental to the debate tournament as a vehicle for education.<sup>2</sup> By 1970, however, the faculty of the Department of Speech Communication had become disenchanted with debate tournaments. The style of oral communication encouraged at these contests had deteriorated in direct proportion to their isolation from public view. These

---

Kurt W. Ritter (Ph.D. Indiana University) is an Assistant Professor of Speech Communication and Director of Debate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

<sup>1</sup> Winton U. Solberg, *The University of Illinois, 1867–1894: An Intellectual and Cultural History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968), pp. 193, 195.

<sup>2</sup> For example, during the 1950s Professor Halbert Gulley directed an annual series of parliamentary debates and the University radio station broadcast a weekly discussion forum presented by students in the forensics program. These forums, however, were ancillary activities in the debate program.

tournaments had become increasingly preoccupied with their own peculiar conventions—specialized formulae, bizarre interpretations of the debate topics, absurd rates of delivery, rigid rules of procedure, and so forth. For many engaged in this activity, “forensics” no longer meant a broad range of argumentative exercises; it meant only a debate tournament.<sup>3</sup>

As part of the National Developmental Conference in Forensics (NDCF), Kenneth E. Andersen noted with alarm that forensics programs had increasingly become isolated from the instructional goals and academic concerns of the speech communication discipline. Further, those teachers concerned with forensics have increasingly limited their interest to debate tournaments and “are doing less and less study of argumentation in the wide range of real-life settings in which it occurs.”<sup>4</sup> The NDCF reacted to this startling trend in forensics by promoting the concept of “forensics as communication.”

Happily, the National Developmental Conference in Forensics did lay the groundwork for developing a closer alignment of forensics and the instructional objectives of departments of speech communication. The Conference urged that forensics programs be broadened “by employing alternative forms of debate focusing on policy issues of varying context and impact, and reaching diverse audiences . . . Only an outlook on forensics that transcends the rules and norms of intercollegiate competition can extend the province of forensics beyond the tournament.”<sup>5</sup> Unhappily, however, there are few concrete models of forensics programs along these lines; hopefully the series of articles being published in *Speaker and Gavel* will help to fill this void. One of the purposes of the present essay is to set forth in some detail such an alternative model for forensics—not a model imagined for the future, but one which has been in effect at the University of Illinois for four years.

#### Public Debate as an Alternative Model for Forensics

In 1973 the University of Illinois set out to establish a debate program very much in line with the ideal soon to be enunciated by the NDCF. Illinois resolved to develop its work in forensics in a new direction—one which would emphasize debate as a part of a liberal education rather than as a specialized activity devoted to selecting a “national champion.” Ironically,

<sup>3</sup> See Joseph W. Wenzel, “Campus and Community Programs in Forensics: Needs and Opportunities,” *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 7 (Spring 1971), 253–259; Wayne Brockriede, “College Debate and the Reality Gap,” *Speaker and Gavel*, 7 (March 1970), 71–76; Franklyn S. Haiman, “A Critical Review of the Game of Forensics,” *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 1 (May 1964), 62–66; and Roger Nebergall, “Review of *Forensics as Communication*,” in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 12 (Spring 1976), 220. Numerous critiques and defenses of the “national championship” style of tournament debating have been published. For a brief (and accurate) denunciation from the British viewpoint, see Peter Haywood and Julian Priestly, “Come Home, Debaters,” *Spectra*, 9 (June 1973), 10–11. For an exchange of views between two American educators, see: Kurt W. Ritter, “Recapturing the Rhetoric Dimension: Debating in Campus Forums,” *Speaker and Gavel*, 12 (Fall 1974), 1–3; John F. Schunk, “Maintaining the Logical Dimension,” *Speaker and Gavel*, 13 (Spring 1976), 38–40; and Kurt W. Ritter, “Debate as an Instrument for Democracy,” *Speaker and Gavel*, 13 (Spring 1976), 41–43.

<sup>4</sup> Kenneth E. Andersen, “A Critical Review of the Behavioral Research in Argumentation and Forensics,” *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 10 (Winter 1974), 155.

<sup>5</sup> James H. McBath, ed., *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective* (Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1975), p. 164.

this view of forensics is not new at all; instead, it is a reaffirmation of the general goal "of broadening the intellect through the practice of rational discourse." This general goal of forensics education is as old as the study of rhetoric itself and "has over the centuries been implemented in a great many ways."<sup>6</sup> The real question raised at Illinois was: Could college forensics be re-established as a communication activity? Could it survive as a pedagogical instrument for the broad interests of the speech communication field? We concluded that forensics could be returned to its original purposes only by a straight-forward recognition that debate tournaments were merely one type of instrument for forensics education and that such contests should *not* be the heart of a forensics program. Although Illinois did not discontinue participating in tournaments, it discontinued using tournaments as its model for debate. Instead, the public debate forum was chosen as the best pedagogical model.

The public debate forum demands the fullest range of argumentation skills and provides a form of accountability for the forensics program: the substance and style of debates must stand up under the scrutiny of public view. In selecting public debate as the model for our forensics program, the Department also made four fundamental educational and administrative decisions about the program:

1. The debate program should serve the educational mission of the Department of Speech Communication. To this end, it should impart the full range of rhetorical skills needed in public deliberation and public advocacy. Moreover, these skills should be imparted to a large number of undergraduate students.
2. The debate program should make a contribution to the intellectual life of our student body and our larger community. Debate and discussion are fundamental to a liberal arts education and the debate program ought to provide a public forum for such deliberation.
3. The faculty member(s) and graduate students responsible for the debate program are *teachers* of debate. Like other teachers in the University, they are also expected to fulfill scholarly and professional roles. Hence, the time required by the debate program must not be so demanding as to prevent scholarly research, publication and related activities.
4. The cost of the debate program must be modest.

#### Nature of the Program

University of Illinois students engage in three types of debate: (1) intercollegiate debate competition; (2) campus debate forums; and (3) community forums before various public groups.<sup>7</sup> The opportunity to debate is open to many; each school year well over fifty students have participated

<sup>6</sup> Nebergall, p. 220.

<sup>7</sup> Individuals who would like more specific materials on the activities described in this section are invited to write to the author at the Department of Speech Communication, 244 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801. Available materials include: a set of rules and procedures for parliamentary debates, publicity posters, a brochure on the community forum program, rules and procedures for a "forensic progression," and rules and procedures for a "mock trial" debate event.

in debate. Many of our debaters participate in all three types of debate activity; however, students who have not debated before are encouraged first to gain experience by representing the University in tournaments at neighboring universities. We occasionally have students who are so talented or who had so much contest debating experience in high school that they are able to by-pass tournaments. But in general, our inexperienced debaters participate primarily in contests and only occasionally in public forums. After gaining experience through contest debating, they are strongly encouraged to advance to public debate forums held on campus and before community groups. As a consequence, our most experienced debaters are primarily involved in public debating and are only secondarily concerned with contests.

*Campus Debates:* Each year the members of the student debating society present a series of six major parliamentary debates in our student union. These monthly forums typically involve an Illinois debate team and a team from another university. Each parliamentary debate attracts an audience of between 300 and 600 people, depending upon the timeliness of the topic and the prestige of the opposing school. The annual aggregate audience for these forums is about 2,400 people. These debates are scheduled on weekday evenings and last about two hours. The parliamentary format includes:

1. introductory comments by the chairman;
2. a light-hearted secretary's report;
3. a formal presentation by each of the four principal debaters;
4. a period of "general debate" by the audience;
5. a single rebuttal speech from each side; and
6. an audience vote on the debate proposition.

The first principal debater from each side presents an 8 to 10 minute speech which sets forth the affirmative and negative positions. The second speakers are subject to questions *during* their stands on the floor. If a member of the House wishes to pose a query, he rises and asks: "Mr. Chairman, will the speaker yield to a question?" The speaker has the option to refuse to yield for a question; but unless his questioner has already taxed the patience of the audience, a debater can ill afford to refuse a question, for the audience will react loudly and negatively to the apparent evasiveness of the speaker. Because of the additional time required to answer questions, the second speaker from each side is allocated 14 minutes.<sup>8</sup>

The audience functions as the "members of the House," seating themselves according to their disposition on the debate resolution and changing their location during the debate if they are persuaded by the opposing side. Initially, our audiences were quite subdued and were enormously deferential to the debaters. That has changed! Our "rules of debate" invite the members of the house to respond to the debaters so long as it is in good taste. Specifically the audience is instructed that "heckling is encouraged, but its use will be under the chairman's strict supervision. Witty, intelligent, and clever heckling is permitted; dull, tactless, and boorish heckling simply will not occur." At times, the audiences at parliamentary debates prove to be something of a shock to debaters who are used to more passive auditors.

<sup>8</sup> For a more thorough listing of rules for public parliamentary debates, see Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede, *Decision By Debate* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1963), pp. 326-328.



A faculty member serves as the "faculty critic" at each parliamentary debate and presents a formal critique at the next weekly business meeting of the debating society.

Although the "members of the House" throw themselves into the parliamentary debates with great zest, a portion of each audience—usually about one-third—attend the debate as a class assignment. Students enrolled in our introductory speech communication course are asked to attend either a public debate or a public oral interpretation program sponsored by the Department. The fact that part of our audience is "captured" has not decreased the audience's enthusiasm. The doors are always open, so that anyone can leave during the debate. The debaters take the attitude that it is their responsibility to hold the interest of the audience. Typically, the new auditors are caught up in the excitement of the debate and only a few have voiced complaints about the assignment. In fact, just the reverse is true. On many critique sheets students have commented that they had never before attended a debate. They had feared that it would be a boring affair, instead they thoroughly enjoyed the event and planned to attend future debates. The popularity of campus forum is illustrated by our "crowd control" problems at a debate with the University of Notre Dame in February 1975. The forum, which was held four days after the conviction in Boston of Dr. Kenneth C. Edelin on manslaughter charges because he performed an abortion, concerned a proposal to amend the Constitution to prohibit all abortions. As an audience of well over 500 people poured into the "Ballroom" of our student union, the fire marshal ruled that we had to close the doors of the hall and prevent any more people from entering.

These public debates present a challenge to even our most experienced debaters; at the same time, the forums provide excellent models of debating for less experienced speakers and allow them to gain experience by speaking from the floor. Not surprisingly, these debates have emerged as the highlight of our debate program. In effect, the parliamentary forums have replaced exotic debate trips as the most desirable events for the debaters. The debates are routinely covered by the local newspapers and more rarely by television news. The principal speakers are selected through try-outs conducted by the officers of the debating society and open to any interested undergraduate student. Each year about 25 to 35 students participate in principal roles in campus debates.

The international debate arranged by the Speech Communication Association is the keystone of our parliamentary series each year. These debaters—especially those from the British Commonwealth and the United Kingdom—frequently remark that our audiences seem to be genuinely *part of the debate*, not merely *observers* of the debate.

Campus debating includes occasional forums presented during the noon-hour in a lounge of the student union. These debates are much less formal affairs with each debater merely presenting a short "position statement" as a stimulus to discussion. Less frequent debates before student groups, such as the College Republican Club and the Lutheran Students Association, serve a similar purpose of encouraging rational deliberation on public affairs. A number of neighboring institutions have invited us to their campuses for parliamentary debates, thus creating a type of "home and home" debate exchange. During recent years we have participated in public forums at the University of Chicago, DePauw University, Wabash College, and Western Kentucky University.

*Community Forums:* Through off-campus debates we seek both to stimulate public discussion on important issues and to provide students with

opportunities to debate in the "real world." These forums are presented to civic organizations, service clubs, high schools, and church groups throughout Illinois. The community forum program is similar to the "speakers bureaus" which function as part of many forensics programs except that all of our forums are debates or discussions which involve two, three, or four students. We do not provide individual speakers because the debate format both serves a larger number of students per program and demands more sophisticated rhetorical skills. Moreover, a debate is more likely to stimulate a lively discussion among the members of the audience: some community groups are reluctant to disagree with an individual student speaker, a guest of the group. When two or more students disagree among themselves, the same audience eagerly joins in the dispute.

The community forums function as an intermediate level of competition for students who have learned the fundamentals of debate by attending tournaments, but are not yet skilled enough to win a position in a major campus forum. During the four school years since September 1973, we have presented over 200 community forums with an aggregate audience of nearly 20,000 citizens, and our annual number of such forums has varied between 40 and 60. Each year approximately 35 students debate before community groups. While some students participate in as many as a dozen forums, others may be in only two or three. When possible, we present intercollegiate community forums by coordinating the programs with our campus and contest debating. For example, when Western Kentucky University's debaters travelled to the University of Illinois for our annual Courtroom Debate Conference, we also arranged a public debate before a high school. Similarly, we scheduled two community forums with Princeton University when its debate team participated in one of our campus parliamentary debates.

Each year the debaters prepare for public discussions on about a half dozen topics; in most cases these topics are related to the subjects debated at campus forums and tournaments. As we phrase the exact debate propositions for these forums, we try to create resolutions that will encourage the debaters and the community groups to discuss concrete policies in light of a liberal arts education. Debates on foreign policy and capital punishment, for example, have focused on value choices which must be informed by an understanding of history, philosophical thought, and even religious studies.

The format of the community debates is adjusted to the needs of the host group; some forums last only 30 minutes, while others are two hours long. In general, the forums include:

- 1) a short debate of 20 to 40 minutes presented by two or four students;
- 2) a question and discussion period which involves both the audience members and the debaters and lasts between 20 and 40 minutes; and
- 3) a formal summary statement from each side and an audience vote on the debate proposition (5 to 10 minutes).

The audience is provided with shift-of-opinion ballots and is also asked to provide written comments to the debaters. Each forum is moderated by a person from the debate program—either a faculty advisor, a teaching assistant, or an officer of the debating society.

Our most valued audiences are groups composed of adults who have completed their formal education—the Kiwanis Club, the Business and Professional Women's Club, the Presbyterian Church's adult discussion group. Such audiences are usually composed of community leaders—the lawyers,

educators, doctors and business people who are influential in the local town and county. These audiences are in many ways the most critical and thoughtful judges that debaters can encounter. They are unimpressed with poorly presented or incompletely expressed arguments and they test each debater's claims against their own considerable experience. But, above all, they are genuinely interested in discussing the debate topic with the students. For them, a debate is not a game in which the advocates switch their position every two hours. Instead, they view the debate as a serious discussion of real issues—of problems that affect their communities and solutions that affect their taxes.

Unfortunately, it is not easy to reach adult, community audiences. The administration of the community forum program involves two basic tasks: 1) helping the debaters prepare for effective public advocacy; and 2) soliciting invitations from community groups. The first task, of course, is the very essence of a university debate program, but the second task requires skills in public relations. Each year we publish a brochure describing our community forum program and listing the debate topics. News releases and public service announcements on radio and television are also used to inform the public of our programs. By writing to chambers of commerce and public libraries, we attempt to develop a mailing list of every civic organization within sixty miles of the University of Illinois; we then mail these groups copies of our brochure. Unfortunately, the officers of such organizations change every year, so we must annually develop new lists. Typically, our mailing lists range between 500 and 1,000 addresses.

*Contest Debate:* Our forensics program provides modest amounts of contest debating for a large number of students. Each year, Illinois debaters attend about fifteen tournaments in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. Advocates of the "national championship" style of tournament debate who are aware of the philosophy of the Illinois debate program occasionally express surprise that we attend any debate tournaments. Such reactions reveal a fundamental misunderstanding of the "reform movement" in forensics. Those schools that have rejected the National Debate Tournament (as Illinois has) are not "against tournaments"—rather, they have rejected those types of tournaments which fail to teach the skills needed in public deliberation. In fact, we believe that the right kind of tournaments—those that truly function as laboratories for public advocacy—have much to recommend them. They are an efficient means of teaching students the fundamentals of debate.

Our program routinely provides between one and two years of tournament debate for our students. Usually about 45 students compete in debate contests each year, although in 1974-75 an exceptionally successful intramural competition boosted the total in contest debate to seventy. A few debaters participate in only one or two contests, but most attend four or five tournaments and some even compete in as many as eight tournaments a year. We have found that the debate staff simply cannot teach debating skills to a large number of students without the convenience of tournaments. We avoid tournaments that mimic the style of debate associated with the National Debate Tournament, and we remain concerned about the pitfalls of the uncommunicative practices often used in tournaments. Nevertheless, we have found that important skills such as careful and complete analysis of issues, rapid thinking in response to unexpected arguments, and the discipline of doing thorough research, are only occasionally learned well by students who have had no experience with tournament debating.

The trick, of course, is to attend the right kind of tournaments. When we

discovered that only a few such tournaments were available in our area, we created them. In order to take advantage of the efficiencies of tournaments, we have developed alternatives. Essentially, we have developed three "tracks" of tournaments. The *first sequence* of tournaments is for beginning debaters and includes six novice and "junior varsity" debate tournaments in Illinois and Indiana which use the national intercollegiate debate topic. Also included in the "novice" track are two intercollegiate student congresses. We have experienced some difficulty finding debate tournaments which challenge our new students without overwhelming them. Unfortunately, novice debate tournaments sometimes simply serve to teach students how to speak rapidly, use debate jargon, and spin-out absurd (but internally consistent) arguments. Therefore, once a student has learned the basics of debate he or she is literally forced on to the public platform and only returns to tournaments that offer unique educational benefits. The *second sequence* of tournaments provides challenging competition for our more experienced debaters. With the exception of Wayne State University's audience debate tournament, all of these competitions employ topics *other than* the national intercollegiate debate topic.

Because of the expense of taking large numbers of students to debate competitions at other schools as well as the paucity of tournaments that serve our educational goals, we have developed a *third sequence* of intramural and intercollegiate debate contests on our own campus which serve both novice and experienced debaters. In 1976 we reinstated the tradition of a midwest "forensic progression." Modeled upon the "Big Ten Debate Conferences" which were held in the 1950s and early 1960s, this intercollegiate conference is held early in the school year and focuses on various aspects of the national intercollegiate debate topic.<sup>9</sup> The "progression" of activities includes public speaking, discussion, and debate. In 1976, twenty Illinois debaters participated along with 70 students from 17 other universities.

Since 1974 the University of Illinois has also sponsored an annual intercollegiate "Courtroom Debate Conference" which provides college debaters with an opportunity to develop argumentative skills in a legal context. The conferences, which are held in the courtroom of our College of Law, have featured mock trials of cases involving the death penalty, abortion, and amnesty. In addition to these intercollegiate contests, we sponsor an intramural debate competition each semester. The topics for these intramural contests are *not* the national intercollegiate debate proposition; instead, we use topics which will be argued at campus parliamentary debates. Novice debaters participate in the intercollegiate and intramural competitions on our campus in order to learn the basics of debating, while their more experienced colleagues in the debating society use the same contests to help them prepare for public debates on similar topics. Because our program focuses on public deliberation and public advocacy, we encourage our debaters to compete occasionally in public speaking contests, especially those that involve original discourse such as extemporaneous speaking and persuasive speaking. Unfortunately, individual events are rarely offered at debate tournaments and our budget precludes a separate series of trips for such activities.

Our efforts to use debating contests as a means of teaching effective

<sup>9</sup> For more information on the format and procedures for this type of activity, see Kenneth E. Andersen and Jerome B. Polisky, "The Application of the Symposium-Forum to Contest Discussion," *Speech Teacher*, 9 (March 1960), 131-134.

public debating have met with varying degrees of success. Some of our debaters occasionally revert to the inartistic use of language and the truncated reasoning characteristic of "national championship" tournament debating. Our students are urged to debate in tournaments as if an audience were present, and most of our tournament debates could be presented to a public audience without embarrassment.

### Budget and Staff

With our shift from a debate tournament model of forensics to a public debating model, we effected a fundamental trade-off in expenses. The annual debate travel budget was significantly reduced from over \$5,000 to approximately \$3,000. While our new debate program required less money for travel, it attracted far more students than the old program. The old program had perhaps a dozen, while our new program serves approximately sixty students. Someone had to teach these debaters. Moreover, our new public programs required new administrative work. All of these factors dictated the assignment of an additional teaching assistant to debate. Fortunately, as we developed public debate programs, other offices on campus were willing to contribute some financial support.

As a matter of principle, no funds are expended on commercially prepared debate materials. Similarly, no money is spent to pay assistants for researching or developing debate briefs: the debaters do their own research. The debate society annually sponsors two intercollegiate debate conferences and one high school debate tournament and as a matter of policy makes no profit on these. And, we have a policy against awarding "debate scholarships." We believe that revenue sports and the purchasing of students with specialized talents, while perhaps appropriate for the athletic department, have no place in an academic program. Our debaters compete with other University students for academic scholarships which are awarded on the basis of financial need and scholastic promise.

*Contest Debate Expenses:* During the four academic years between 1973-74 and 1976-77, the Department budgeted an average of \$3,000 annually for debate travel expenses. The Department attempts to cover all of the reasonable expenses of students who represent the University at intercollegiate debate competitions, including transportation, lodging and meals. Our accommodations are spartan, but adequate. The meal allowances are modest: \$1.50 for breakfast, \$2.00 for lunch, and \$2.50 for dinner. Occasionally the debaters are house guests in the homes of members of the debating society when attending a tournament. We try to insure that a student's financial condition is not a determining factor in whether he or she participates in debate.

*Community Forum Expenses:* One of the delights of public debating is that it costs our department very little. Our School of Humanities annually allocates \$200 to pay for the publication and mailing of our community forums brochure. Following Jefferson's dictum that there ought to be "no tariff on public discussion," we never charge a fee for debate; however, the costs of transportation and meals are covered by the community groups which request the forums. On the rare occasions when a forum takes the debaters so far from campus that they require lodging, they stay overnight as guests in homes of the host group.

*Campus Forum Expenses:* Almost all of the direct expenses associated with campus debates are borne by offices other than the Department. The University's lecture committee provides approximately \$500 annually to pay

for the lodging and meal expenses of the visiting debaters in our parliamentary debate series. The student union provides \$380 for publicity for the parliamentary debates; this publicity takes the form of advertisements in the student newspaper and attractive posters. The undergraduate honors program annually contributes \$150 to pay part of the fee for our international debate. While we can never be sure of continued support from these particular offices, it seems clear that so long as the debate program performs services for the campus and community, it will receive some financial support from outside the Department.

*Staffing:* The faculty member responsible for the forensics program has the title of "Director of Debate" and is the faculty advisor to the student debating society. This faculty member is given a one-third reduction in teaching load. Additionally, three teaching assistants are assigned to help with debate. Normally, teaching assistants teach two courses. Those working with debate teach one course and assist in debate, thus approximately \$5,700 of our assistantship budget goes to debate each year. Each assistant is given an area of administrative responsibility as well as being responsible for the normal tutoring duties associated with debate "coaching." Thus, one teaching assistant is the "Director of Contest Debate," another is "Director of Community Forums," and the third is "Director of Campus Forums." This level of staffing is not fully adequate so we are pleased that faculty members, graduate students and law students volunteer to serve as debate judges and public forum moderators. In order to prevent the debate work from expanding beyond reasonable limits, all practice debates, planning sessions, and other debate coaching activities are accomplished at weekly Debate Workshops which are held on Monday evenings.

#### Program Evaluation

Certainly one important test of a forensic program is its interest and value to undergraduate students. By emphasizing a public debate model for our program, we have dramatically increased student participation and campus recognition. Typically, members of the debating society participate quite actively for one or two years before becoming "senior members," who serve as tutors to the younger members and occasionally participate in prestigious public debates. Although a few students debate throughout their four years of college, many enter the debate program during their sophomore or junior years. Hence, the debate society is dominated by upperclassmen rather than freshmen. The best debaters tend to be excellent students who often study abroad during their junior year. During the 1976-77 school year, for example, our debaters were attending the London School of Economics, the University of Vienna, the University of Manchester, and the University of North Wales. This fluidity in the debating society's active membership allows talented new members to rise rapidly to prominence and promotes a healthy spirit of competition. Most of the debaters are majoring in the social sciences and the humanities, although we have a sizeable contingent from the College of Commerce.

Because our debating activities take place in the "real world," our students seem to be inclined to pursue careers in which argumentation plays an important role. Relatively few aspire to become "debate coaches." While some of our students plan to teach at the university or secondary school level, by far the majority aspire to legal careers. Others are in a variety of doctoral programs or becoming established in business or service professions.

Many of our debaters have been singled out for national and international

honors. The president of our debating society during the 1976-77 school year was selected as a member of the U.S. International Debate Team which toured Japan in October 1976, and served as the Second Vice President of the National Student Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. One of our 1977 graduates has been designated as a John Henry Wigmore Scholar at the Northwestern University School of Law. Another former debater—now a third-year law student at the University of Illinois—has just been awarded an International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) Fellowship to study Soviet Law at Moscow State University. One debater has just received an Edward Hillman Fellowship from the University of Chicago to pursue a doctorate in political science. In April an Illinois debater was one of fifty-three college sophomores in the United States named as a “Truman Scholar,” a four-year award valued at \$20,000 designed to encourage outstanding students to pursue careers in government. Another former debater, after completing his term as student body president, served as the student member of the University of Illinois Board of Trustees. During the summers of 1975 and 1976 three debaters served as Congressional Interns in Washington. University of Illinois debaters were also semifinalists in the 1975 and 1976 Rhodes Scholar competitions.

The impact of our debate program, especially our public forums, has not gone unnoticed. In a recent report, the Dean of Campus Programs credited the debating society with an important role “in facilitating the change from the rabble-rousing confrontation rhetoric of the sixties to the logical (and at times humorous) discussion of the seventies.” He praised the debaters “not only with regard to their skills and verbal abilities, but for being such high quality representatives of the University of Illinois to other groups.” Similarly, the community forum program has been recognized as an important public service. We routinely receive highly complimentary letters from our audiences and certain groups invite the debaters back annually. A member of one such group took the time to write us about a community forum: commenting that the debaters not only gave his group a “timely and thought-provoking” program, but also gave them “a new insight and interest in the quality of students and staff at the University of Illinois. For this alone you are to be congratulated. We are proud of our University and this certainly was a remainder to me of its quality.” Our Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has also congratulated the Department of Speech Communication “for providing this excellent public service.” He remarked that “the University is sometimes misunderstood and occasionally maligned both locally and around the state. Programs such as yours do much to bolster our image and create an atmosphere of understanding.”

### Summary

After four full years of operation, our “re-directed” debate program has matured and stabilized, so that it now functions as an established part of the university. The program has a predictable sequence of annual events and is fairly visible on campus. The rationale behind our audience-oriented debating seems to be both understood and supported by the university’s faculty and teaching assistants as well as by the students who participate in debate. As the program has evolved, it has developed several distinctive features:

*First, the debate program is an integral part of the speech communication curriculum.* The debate program is conducted as a part of the department’s teaching mission; the staff is drawn from the speech communication depart-

ment; and decisions on student participation, type of debate activity, and so forth, are made upon a pedagogical basis. The debating activities serve as laboratory exercises for students enrolled in Speech Communication 123 (Public Discussion and Debate), and many students in our introductory courses attend a campus debate as a class assignment. The members of the debating society are viewed as students in a co-curricular activity.

*Second, the entire debate program has an intercollegiate emphasis.* Aside from one intramural competition each semester, all of our contest activities are intercollegiate. During our first year (1974-75) most of our campus forums and nearly all of our community forums were intramural affairs; this year nearly all of our campus debates and 60% of our community forums were intercollegiate clashes. Not only does the challenge of intercollegiate *public* debating seem to stimulate greater effort on the part of our students, but it often provides them with excellent models of debating by other schools.

*Third, the student debating society plays a central role in the debate program.* To a large extent, the breadth and scope of our debating activities is possible because of the enthusiastic and creative work of the members of the Illini Forensic Association. Within the pedagogical objectives of the program, the students have a wide latitude in selecting debate topics, initiating debating activities on campus, and so forth. The debating society normally acts through its executive board of seven officers, but specific projects are regularly discussed by the general membership at weekly business meetings. Students frequently assist in teaching inexperienced debaters, and debate tournaments held on our campus are typically run by the debating society. Matters involving the expenditure of university funds, however, are ultimately decided by the debate staff.

*Fourth, we have joined with like-minded debate directors at neighboring universities to create forensic activities that suit our needs.* In particular we have close working relationships with the debating societies at DePauw University, the University of Chicago, and Wabash College. To a lesser extent we cooperate with Indiana University, Western Kentucky University, and Illinois State University. These joint efforts include debate tournaments and related intercollegiate contests, "home and home" public debates, and some debates before community groups.

*Fifth, the students are encouraged to advocate their own convictions in public debates.* Because we view forensics as training for real public deliberation, we cannot accept the "gamesmanship ethic" which sanctions the practice of students routinely advocating both sides of the same debate question. While such a practice may create glib speakers, it does not insure that they will be responsible public advocates.<sup>10</sup> We encourage our debaters to use their research, analysis, and debate briefing as bases for deciding which side of a particular topic they endorse. Once a debater has decided upon this rational basis—not on the basis of intuition or impulse—that she supports a particular position, the student is encouraged to advocate only that position in public forums. Hence, if debaters switch sides on a debate

---

<sup>10</sup> For further discussions of this ethical and pedagogical issue, see Richard Murphy, "The Ethics of Debating Both Sides," *Speech Teacher*, 6 (January 1957), 1-9; Nicholas M. Cripe, "Debating Both Sides in Tournaments is Ethical," *Speech Teacher*, 6 (September 1957), 209-212; Richard Murphy, "The Ethics of Debating Both Sides II," *Speech Teacher*, 12 (September 1963), 242-247; and Angela C. Crampton, "The Nature of Language: A Question of Ethics in Debating Both Sides," *Speaker and Gavel*, 4 (May 1967), 88-92.



topic, it is not because they are rhetorical transvestites, but because they have changed their convictions on the subject.

*Sixth, the public debate model for forensics is an economical means to educationally sound ends.* It serves more students at less cost than the "National Debate Tournament" model, and it allows our debate program to serve the educational goals of the Department of Speech Communication, especially as those goals are related to the liberal arts education.

It would be presumptuous to claim that our debate program was a necessary or sufficient cause for the successes of our students; however, these students almost universally describe their experience in forensics as one of the most important aspects of their undergraduate education.<sup>11</sup> An activity which attracts outstanding young men and women and engages them in serious discussions and debates serves an important function in the student life of a university. Bringing such students together to explore ideas and practice rational discourse has long been the primary function of good forensics programs. To the extent that we at Illinois are succeeding in fulfilling this function, our debate program is making an important contribution to the liberal arts education.

---

<sup>11</sup> Much empirical research has been conducted on the effects of participation in debate. See, for example, Kenneth E. Andersen, "Quantitative Research in Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 3 (September 1966), 112-115; Edward L. McGlone, "The Behavioral Effects of Forensics Participation," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 10 (Winter 1974), 140-146; and Andersen, "A Critical Review of the Behavioral Research in Argumentation and Forensics," pp. 147-155.

## A SPEAKER'S BUREAU THAT'S WORKING

WILLIAM H. BOS

In the past several years, enthusiasm for the usual program of inter-collegiate competition in debate, individual speaking, and oral interpretation has been diminishing. The cost of maintaining such a program has, as we all know, been getting almost out of hand. Furthermore, some of us at Stephen F. Austin State University have been less than satisfied with the educational benefits to our students: the competitive structure is relatively artificial, the winning of "hardware" and certificates soon loses its appeal, and the style of debating now in vogue seems to bear little relation to effective oral communication.

### *The Goals*

In an effort to provide a wider range of practical speech communication experience for our students, early in the 1972-73 school year Dr. Robert B. Capel and Dr. William H. Bos created a Student Speaker's Bureau to complement the standard debate and forensics program. Announced goals were:

1. To give interested students training and experience in practical public speaking in a variety of situations and formats,
2. To provide service to clubs and organizations in East Texas; and
3. To cultivate good will and support for the university and particularly for the Department of Communication.

These have continued to be our goals as the program has developed.

From the start the program had a wide acceptance from both students and the non-college community and it appears to be growing each year in popularity.

### *The Activity*

The activity begins with the training of students in public speaking. Promising students from the regular speech courses are invited to participate; students majoring in the public address area of communication are required to participate either in intercollegiate events or in the Speaker's Bureau for a minimum of two semesters; and other interested students are welcomed. Each semester, students from such widely divergent majors as business administration and forestry join the bureau because they hear about it and want the experience. Some stay for only a semester of one or two experiences, but most stay with it for at least two semesters. Several students have stayed active for as long as three years, and one now in his fourth year is as enthusiastic and interested as he was in his first year.

The bureau personnel meet weekly for a two-hour session. Each student presents a prepared ten-minute speech on a subject of his own choice that he feels will be of interest to prospective audience(s). The speech is evaluated collectively by fellow bureau members, the director, and the assistant director, and suggestions for improvement are made. This process is repeated until the director feels that the student is ready to "take to the

---

William H. Bos (Ph.D. University of Michigan) is Professor of Speech and Director of the Student Speaker's Bureau at Stephen F. Austin State University.

road" with the speech. Ideally, each student should have two speeches on different subjects ready for presentation. Some have only one, others have two each semester, or four speeches for the year. And some few do a variety of things: informative speeches, humorous speeches, story-telling or oral interpretation of literature.

If a group requests a particular topic, that request will be honored. Sometimes requests involve programs of oral readings of prose or poetry or programs for special occasions such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Lincoln's Day, and Valentine's Day. These programs have become increasingly popular in the past two years. For example, for November 11, 1976, the Smith County Veterans Association requested that a military veteran address the gathering in the city square of Tyler, Texas. In the spring of 1977, the National Secretaries' chapter of Bossier City, Louisiana, requested a program on parliamentary procedure.

The selection and development of topics is a continuing problem and point of learning for students. Students are encouraged to select and develop their own topics. These student-selected topics are announced as possibilities. Students tend to select topics they like, and then must be trained to adapt them in terms of the audience, so that the presentation will be appropriate for both speaker and audience.

Each program is designed to be twenty-five minutes long, unless otherwise requested, with two student speakers or readers with the director or his assistant as introducer/"master of ceremonies."

The students are selected on the basis of the suitability of their subject matter to the specific audience; the coordination of the two speeches for unity and coherence in the program; and their availability. Students do, of course, miss classes to present programs; but serious effort is made to use those who will not miss classes, and to keep the number of missed classes—especially in any one course—at a minimum.

At the program, the introducer explains briefly to the audience the nature of the program and introduces the speakers. He also tape-records the students' speeches. On the drive back to campus, the tape is played for analysis and evaluation with suggestions for improvement.

### *Securing Opportunities*

Program opportunities are secured primarily by announcement of the Speaker's Bureau service. A two-page announcement including an explanation of the activity, speech subjects currently available, and contact information is sent out around September 1 for the fall semester and another, with revised subjects, around January 1 for the spring semester. It is sent to all service organizations and social clubs, literary clubs, and other groups for which addresses can be secured within a radius of one hundred miles of the campus. Word-of-mouth contacts also generate requests for programs.

We rely upon the quality of our programs to generate repeat requests from year to year. Many organizations call on us repeatedly and some groups have made the Speaker's Bureau program an annual feature.

Normally, we prefer at least two weeks' notice for an engagement; but we also serve in a "last minute substitute" capacity whenever we are able to do so—and that does happen.

There is no charge for the Speaker's Bureau service, except that meals are to be provided whenever the program is to follow a meal. Transportation is the only regular expense, and this is covered by a modest budget. Groups are encouraged, on a voluntary basis, to contribute to the travel fund.

### *The Budget*

The activity was financed by a \$500 travel allocation in 1976-77, spent solely for travel expenses, at 16¢ per mile for one vehicle per engagement. Another \$500 was made available to be used as scholarships for worthy student participants, at the discretion of the director.

In former years, these amounts proved adequate; but in 1976-77 supplemental travel funds have been needed and a few voluntary contributions used. The total cost of the activity for 1976-77 has not exceeded \$1,100. This activity proves to be very economical, especially when compared to the allocation for intercollegiate debate and forensics. The 1976-77 budget allocation for the debate and forensics program was \$6,200 for travel and scholarships, with fewer students receiving fewer and less varied communication experiences in more artificial circumstances, before very few live audiences except for critic judges.

### *The Impact*

This program has been very well received since its inception. During the 1972-73 school year, which was a period of tentative activity and some program experimentation, perhaps six or eight programs were presented, involving about the same number of students. In 1973-74, we presented 24 programs involving 15 speakers who had 39 speaking experiences. In 1974-75, we presented 29 programs involving 14 students in 58 speaking experiences.

In 1975-76, we encountered problems of publicity, and announcements did not reach the public until about November 1. As a result, we presented only 18 programs, but still involved 14 students in 33 speaking experiences.

In all previous years, a single brochure was sent out in the fall. In 1976-77, one brochure was circulated after September 1 and another after January 1. During the fall semester, 21 programs were presented by 12 speakers in 48 speech experiences. As the year ends, we have used 17 speakers in 40 programs, with a total of 85 individual participations.

Most of our programs are presented to service clubs in the area, but we also reach other types of audiences: this year we presented programs to 6 Rotary Clubs, 5 Lions Clubs, 6 Optimist Clubs, 4 Kiwanis Clubs, 5 Womans groups (such as a Symphony Club, Literary Clubs, and Pilot Clubs), 5 aged peoples' organizations, 2 high school assemblies, 2 Unitarian groups, a Catholic monastery, and an all-city Veterans Day observance. Last year, a number of speakers presented book reviews to classes in a nearby elementary school in observance of National Book Week. Our audiences have varied in size from 8 to 200 persons.

Now in our fifth year of operation, we believe that our original objectives have proven to be valid ones, and that we have attained them, at least to a modest degree. The numerous and varied speech opportunities provide valuable experience on the public platform for all participants.

We see much value in the program. First, we have been able to provide participating students with invaluable experience that would be available to them in no other practical way. They have been able to experience speech, not in a classroom setting with a grade as the primary objective, but in a public situation with practical self-improvement as a strong element, but an artificial "grade" forgotten. And with repeated experiences involving different audiences, situations, partners, and settings forcing awareness of the importance of audience analysis and adaptation as a practical necessity, participants have sometimes made outstanding progress—and enjoyed every minute of it.

From a monetary point of view, all of this has been accomplished with a minimal financial outlay, a real educational “bargain.”

It has also been an invaluable means of building public good will, not only for the Communication Department but also for the university as a whole. Many letters of thanks are received following presentations of program. A few sample sentences are:

On behalf of the ----- Noon Kiwanis Club, I want to thank you for providing the excellent Veterans Day program. It was very appropriate and well received.

A hundred-plus Rotarians certainly did appreciate the fine program you brought us on Monday . . . . It was one of the best programs of the year.

It was certainly a pleasure to have your students present our program on Parliamentary Procedure. It was most helpful. The work and planning put into this program was most effective and definitely advantageous to all of us.

Your Speaker's Bureau is indeed an asset to the University, and it is of much benefit to those of us that have the good fortune of coming in contact with you . . . . We look forward to another visit, soon.

Some student reactions to their experiences follow:

Practice makes perfect, and the only way to practice speech is to speak to many different audiences, learning to adapt to varying people and situations. Only experience can teach these things.

The most important thing I have learned from this activity is adaptation to a variety of audiences and situations; this has made me a more flexible speaker.

Unlike other activities, the Speaker's Bureau gives me a chance to develop my own thoughts into a speech. Then I can share with others the feedback I get from an audience.

For a public relations career I need experience in relating to the public, and Speaker's Bureau provides that experience. I can experiment with entertainment and persuasion with a variety of audiences, and this is of immeasurable value.

The work is unending, the hassle is great, and the benefit is immeasurable.

In brief, this has proven to be the most beneficial speech activity our department has ever sponsored; it is an enjoyable activity; and it seems to be growing each year.

## BRITISH UNION DEBATING:

### An Eclectic Approach

M. LYNN McCAULEY AND RICHARD L. STOVALL

Debate coaches develop philosophies of forensics in part as a result of their personal experiences in debate competition and their training in argumentation and debate. Unfortunately, a coach's philosophical justification for a forensics program may often be inadequately and imprecisely developed in his own mind. Rather than directing forensics activities in a manner congruent with his debating philosophy, a coach may consider his own philosophical convictions only in rare instances, e.g., in a job interview when a prospective employer raises the issue. However, in the 1970's, American universities have encountered extreme pressure to become accountable for their educational programs. As a consequence of these pressures a department's forensics philosophy is no longer a private concern.<sup>1</sup> We are no exception at the University of South Carolina. This essay describes the situation that led to the creation of our forensics program, the goals established for that program, the program's operation, and the results which we believe may be achieved to some degree at any institution of higher education.

In the summer of 1974, the University of South Carolina created a Department of Theatre and Speech. Formerly, theatre was simply a division of the English Department; speech, as an academic major and discipline, did not exist. Forensics, since the retirement of Dr. Merrill G. Christophersen some years earlier, had fallen on hard times. Consequently, debate was operated as a student-funded club that from time to time made feeble attempts to compete in intercollegiate tournaments. Regrettably, the club's inability to accomplish sound educational objectives or to expend its meager financial resources within established guidelines resulted in nothing but "bad press."

Consequently, shortly after the formation of the department, a series of discussions ensued to determine the nature and scope of the program in speech communication. We concluded that forensics would serve an integral function within overall departmental objectives. However, specific forensics goals were not set forth, with one exception. We wanted our new forensics endeavors to be of higher quality and to produce immediately discernible educational benefits.

Given the experience of those of us who were members of the department's speech communication division, it was without difficulty we agreed a forensics tournament experience produces numerous benefits. We steadfastly held to the concept that tournament debating teaches analytical and

---

Mr. McCauley (Ph.D., 1974, Louisiana State University) is Assistant Professor and Coordinator for Speech and Mr. Stovall (Ph.D., 1975, The Ohio State University) is Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at the University of South Carolina, Columbia.

<sup>1</sup> The National Developmental Conference on Forensics undertook as one of its major objectives the establishment of a rationale for charting the future direction of forensics education.

organizational skills as well as skills in problem solving.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, we had certain reservations regarding current forensics trends. First, we were concerned that tournament debating is no longer an educationally justifiable means of instruction in delivery skills. Second, forensics competition neglects even a smattering of training in persuasion. And, finally, we believe that intercollegiate debate does not provide students with experience in handling audience situations.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time we were formulating the goals for the forensics program, we were evaluating the nature and scope of our basic course in public communication. After extensive discussions, we agreed that assigned classroom speeches are too limited; a need existed to provide our students with speaking experiences before large audiences. Thus, our public communication course and our forensics program faced a common problem: application of the persuasive, audience-centered encounter. British union or parliamentary debating, a tradition borrowed from British universities and based on the format used in the House of Commons,<sup>4</sup> seemed to be a viable means of fulfilling and facilitating this educational objective.

The procedures used to implement British union debating are relatively simple and inexpensive.<sup>5</sup> Among the most important of these is the selection of debate topics. We chose to poll students in the multiple sections of our public communication course. Providing students with a list of potential topics, we ask them to select three propositions in which they are interested

<sup>2</sup> Numerous studies have attested to the values of academic debate, e.g., Henry L. Ewbank, "What's Right with Debate," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 37 (April 1951), 197-202; John R. Stewart and Jerrold J. Merchant, "Perceived Differences Between Debaters and Non-Debaters," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 6 (Spring 1969), 67-72; Richard Huseman, Glenn Ware, and Charles Gruner, "Critical Thinking, Reflective Thinking, and the Ability to Organize Ideas: A Multi-Variate Approach," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 9 (Summer 1972), 261-265; Russell Taylor Church, "The Educational Value of Oral Communication Courses and Intercollegiate Forensics: An Opinion Survey of College Prelegal Advisors and Law School Deans," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 12 (Summer 1975), 49-55. See also Thomas Kane, "British Union Debating: Exercise in Utility or Futility," SCA Convention, San Francisco, California, December, 1976.

<sup>3</sup> Scott Nobels, "The Issues of Forensics," in *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*, ed. James H. McBath (Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1975), pp. 52-58. See also James L. Golden, "Debate: Rhetoric and Relevancy," SCA Convention, San Francisco, California, December, 1976.

<sup>4</sup> See Christopher Hollis, *The Oxford Union* (London: Evans Brothers Limited, [1965]) for an extensive history of the Union at Oxford and a brief account of a similar society at Cambridge. Additionally, it should be noted that the authors had previous experiences with parliamentary debating. The current program is, in part, modeled after the long-standing and successful parliamentary forum at Louisiana State University.

<sup>5</sup> The normal cost for such an event is approximately \$100.00 for advertising, facility, and sound equipment. Receptions if used in conjunction with the debate vary in cost depending on the number of guests and type of food and beverages provided. Our time is not an indirect cost of the program, since this work is considered a regular part of our duties. It is possible to host four parliamentary debates each year for a cost of approximately travel to and participation in one regional intercollegiate debate tournament. The University of South Carolina forensics program encompasses ten to twelve debate trips, about twelve to fifteen students, and a budget of \$8,000.00 to \$10,000.00 per year. Additionally, one intercollegiate and two high school tournaments are sponsored annually.

and to indicate their support or opposition to each. The final selection is made on the basis of the topics that receive the highest number of votes tempered by the proposition with the most widely divided student opinion.

A second consideration faced was arranging a suitable facility in which to house the event. While we want to provide seating for most of our audience, we think a feeling of urgency and excitement comes if a significant number of persons are forced to stand. Thus, we use a limited number of chairs—evenly divided in number—arranged to face a central aisle, much like the layout of the British House of Commons.

Third, rules were established to govern the parliamentary debating. Procedurally, a chairperson opens our debates by announcing the proposition, explaining the rules, introducing the speakers, and keeping order as the debate progresses. Specifically, our rules allow for two brief opening speeches, one in support and one in opposition to the resolution. Following these presentations by members of the debate squad, the floor is open for comments by audience members. The chair alternates recognition between the pro and con members. Audience participants are allowed to address the initial speaker or their opponents across the aisle. Much like the House of Commons, heckling is tolerated; individuals may even choose to switch sides. At the end of the debate, the house is divided to determine the outcome.

We decided that the activity was important enough to merit the interest of other campus and community groups. Thus, we set ourselves to the task of advertising the event. Using a slide of Churchill's statue in the Members' Lobby of Westminster Palace in London, a student artist created a symbol to represent the event on posters distributed on campus. News releases are prepared for the campus and the local press. In a day when campuses are saturated with announcements of important events, our publicity has resulted in modest but nevertheless discernible increases in audience size.

On the other hand, the educational benefits that resulted were not immediately obvious. The first few debates were particularly difficult for the debaters who found that actual audiences do not respond to attacks of inherency, attitudinal motivation, and extra-topicality. Only after continuing negative feedback from the audiences did our debaters begin to modify their debating techniques. At the same time, students in our beginning public communication course find that ill-reasoned, excessively emotional, and poorly delivered remarks, although often used in public debate, are frequently not an effective means of persuasion. Nevertheless, our British union debates have come to have an aura and fervor reminiscent of camp meetings and public debates of past generations.

The educational worth of British union debating may best be assessed from three distinct perspectives: the learning experience for intercollegiate debaters, the learning experience for fundamentals students, and the overall effect as a contribution to the life of the university. At Carolina, our debaters' initial reaction to the audience debates was less than enthusiastic. They saw little reason to expend their efforts in an endeavor that awarded no trophies. Their low motivational profile was accentuated by their initial failure to persuade or arouse audiences. As a consequence of faculty suggestions and the satisfaction they received from publicity and audience feedback, our debaters began to significantly improve their parliamentary debating skills. Concurrently, they now make asides about having achieved a bilingual status. They are able to successfully utilize the technical jargon of intercollegiate debate on the one hand, while, on the other, they have become successful public communicators.



Our students of public communication tell us that they too look forward to these encounters. Surprisingly, a significant number feel compelled to express their views on such questions as abortion, the presidential election, and American intervention in the Middle East.<sup>6</sup> Nearly all sharpen their skills as discriminating listeners. Poorly delivered, excessively emotional, undocumented, or ill-reasoned arguments by either the debaters or speakers from the floor are quickly labeled as such. In short, students see the pitfalls of which their instructors have cautioned them. Additionally, they have the opportunity to hear issues discussed and aired that would otherwise perhaps remain undiscussed.<sup>7</sup>

From a departmental perspective—particularly departmental visibility—British union debate has been quite effective. Although we were aware from our observation of other universities' parliamentary debating programs that union debating possessed a potential for enhancing a department's public relations, we were not fully aware of all the possibilities. Because our program has established and/or enhanced contacts with other departments and faculty members, attracted a modest interest with the local news media, gained favorable administrative attention, and provided a means for participation in the international debater's tour, we believe a detailed discussion of these beneficial effects on the campus and community is warranted.

As Owen Peterson suggests, British union debating allows for the use of an almost unlimited variety of topics.<sup>8</sup> We soon discovered that a director of forensics, beyond meeting the interests of a wide cross-section of undergraduates, has an immediate drawing card with colleagues in other disciplines. They, in turn, are in positions to channel their departmental majors into classes in argumentation, public communication, and persuasion. Additionally, our department has hosted a number of receptions for students, administrators, and faculty members who have an interest in a particular topic. We believe such student-faculty interaction is healthy for all those concerned. Two years ago, for instance, we had a large delegation of students and a faculty sponsor in the ROTC program attend a debate on American intervention in the Middle East. On another occasion, a large group of Catholic students and their sponsor attended a debate on abortion. In selecting a variety of appealing propositions and in hosting these receptions, our department enhances the prestige of speech communication as a discipline, gains debaters for the debate squad, and recruits students for our upper-level courses.

Additionally, these efforts—coupled with campus newspapers, radio, and yearbook coverage—have brought the department praise from our university's central administration. In fact, the vice president for academic affairs recently told our departmental head that British union debating is a more beneficial co-curricular activity than intercollegiate debating. He noted that despite the fact that Carolina's debaters have brought home the hardware, those students actively involved are few in number. For him, the attractiveness of British union debating comes because it involves several hundred students.

---

<sup>6</sup> In addition to the topic areas mentioned, debates have centered on the death penalty, university support of intercollegiate athletics, gun control, powers of the United States Presidency, amnesty, the world food crisis, and busing.

<sup>7</sup> Currently, attendance averages 400–500 per debate.

<sup>8</sup> Owen Peterson, "Forum Debating," *Speech Teacher*, 14 (November 1965), 286–287.

Once the campus newspaper and local print media regularly covered our debates, South Carolina ETV began to take an interest in the event. Through contacts with a director who is employed by the state's ETV, we produced two thirty-minute broadcasts of the debates. For the first, a mobile unit with a crew of five to ten technicians spent an entire day setting up and filming one of our on-campus debates. On another occasion, we modified the format and took our debaters to the local studio. These two telecasts covered the state.

With our added visibility and administrative support, we availed ourselves of the exchange program operated by the Speech Communication Association's Committee on International Debate and Discussion.<sup>9</sup> Last year, we hosted two gentlemen from Oxford. Following an amusing clash over the American Revolution, we honored them with a reception at Lace House, an antebellum home across from the governor's mansion used by the state government for important social functions. A member of our university's governing board, the provost, a vice president, a large number of our university colleagues, and two to three dozen members of the local chapter of the English-Speaking Union were among the guests. This spring, the English-Speaking Union has agreed to co-host and co-fund a similar affair when two debaters from the University of Edinburgh come to our campus. Next year, we hope to secure the support of the departments of history, international studies, foreign languages, and journalism in sponsoring a Russian team or some other unusual debating pair.

Since hosting international debaters has enhanced our campus, community, and state visibility, we are now considering the possibility of hosting prominent political, economic, and social leaders as guest speakers.<sup>10</sup> Christopher Hollis, in his history of the Oxford Union, observes that numerous British Leaders—Lord Randolph Churchill, David Lloyd-George, G. K. Chesterton, Neville Chamberlain, Winston Churchill, and Anthony Eden—have appeared as guest speakers of the Oxford society.

American politicians, journalists, writers, and leaders should be equally interested in a college platform. Perhaps the best-known recent example of using well-known individuals in such a setting was the appearance of Lowell Weicker and William F. Buckley for the Yale Union during the Watergate crisis. Large or prestigious universities may have both the funds and the appeal to secure the services of individuals of the note of Weicker and Buckley. On the other hand, local and state politicians, particularly in election years, are potential guests for the British union format. Or, faculty members in other disciplines may be willing to debate one another in this sort of setting. The possibilities of variations on the format are numerous.

Whether or not a director of forensics chooses to include non-student speakers, the department that sponsors British union debating contributes, in some modest way, to the intellectual life of a campus. By creating a forum in which students may hear and debate the critical issues of the day, members of our discipline surely enrich the intellectual atmosphere of a college or university.

Additionally, parliamentary debating serves as a means to an end, both for

---

<sup>9</sup> This program began with A. Craig Baird's debaters from Bates College traveling to Britain in 1921. Currently, the association sponsors several foreign teams in the States and American teams overseas.

<sup>10</sup> Bruce Markgraf, "The Parliamentary Debate in Action," *Speech Teacher*, 12 (September 1963), 219-222, tells of using such speakers at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

forensics and fundamentals programs. It broadens the perspective of debaters to include educational objectives and to place debating on another level beyond the competitive one. British union debating offers students in fundamentals of communication an opportunity to sharpen their skills as communicators and as discerning listeners in situations that are not as remote or artificial as the classroom. By placing educational value upon research and analysis as well as audience adaptation and good speaking skills, we believe directors of forensics come a step closer to combining the techniques of *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos* into an effective program that not only directly benefits students enrolled in work under the supervision of a department of speech communication but also the university community at large.

## **ATTENTION!!! 1974-75 DSR-TKA INITIATES**

**Your complimentary subscription  
probably ENDS with this issue!**

**To continue receiving  
Speaker and Gavel  
you must subscribe—**

Order by sending \$5 to:

*Speaker and Gavel*  
Allen Press  
P.O. Box 368  
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

## NEW INITIATES OF DSR-TKA 1976-77

### UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Deborah Jane Blackstone  
Boyett Judson Hennington  
Edna Irene Keiser  
John Frederick Mandt

### AUBURN UNIVERSITY

Mark Allen Collins

### BUTLER UNIVERSITY

Thomas D. Hamm  
E. Claire Jerry  
Gregory A. Mark  
Brent D. Taylor

### BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Barbara N. Anderson  
Steven L. Asay  
Alan D. Groesbeck  
Clifford D. Henke  
Thomas E. Jewel  
Einar W. Johnson  
Kaelyn Johnson  
Dennis W. King  
Beverly Newman  
John E. Shosky

### BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Aprele G. Elliott  
Eric A. Goodman

### CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

Lawrence J. Stuker

### CAPITAL UNIVERSITY

Jeffrey L. Ebright  
Terry V. Hummel  
Sherrie J. Passmore

### UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

James E. Burd  
Susan Y. Davis  
Jane E. Dietrich  
Roger B. Fransecky  
Ron Light  
Joyce A. Miller  
Michael S. Porte

### CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

J. Michael Baxley  
F. Stone Workman  
Steven L. Wright

### CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Mark P. Petracca

### DAVIDSON COLLEGE

Ellen E. Oglivie  
Maria M. Patterson  
Randy N. Sherrill

### UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Lewis D. Kendall

### EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

Stephen O. Bryant  
Doris Klein Campbell  
Carolyn S. Eakin  
Larry E. Eakin

### EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Thomas Murphy  
Johnny Samples  
William Wigglesworth

### ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE

Myla L. Easter  
Robert A. Peters  
Donald E. Rife  
Elizabeth A. Stueck  
Jane E. Valas

### EMORY UNIVERSITY

Brian Dumas  
Jenny Lynn Willis

### FAIRMONT STATE COLLEGE

Lewis Hall  
Kimberly Kay Helmick  
James Bradley Peluso  
Roger L. Williams

### FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Edwin R. Hudson  
Robin T. Lumb

### UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Mark A. Brown  
Rodger E. Herndon  
Robert E. Speers

### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Lawrence E. Rosenthal  
Mary P. Tobin  
Richard C. Williams

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Brian P. Lee

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY**

Thomas William Porter

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

John O. Burtis  
David Lee Cooper  
David E. Proctor

**MANKATO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Bruce G. Jones  
Richard A. Lamers  
Jon M. Larsen  
Diane M. McBride  
Donald E. Parker  
Frederick H. Seitz  
Bruce Sheppard  
Nancy J. Sutlief

**MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY**

Susan A. Heicher  
Peter A. Wilke

**UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Robert A. DeFrusco  
Mary O'Malley  
Bruce J. Pederson  
Alan G. Rosenbloom

**MIAMI UNIVERSITY**

Michael J. Fortner  
Charles O. Meier

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

Nelson P. Hickman  
Katherine MacEachern  
Dan Western

**MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY**

John M. Futrell  
Kenneth G. Graves  
Eddie Hester  
Bill Huddleston  
Charles H. Tardy  
Randall L. Trammell

**UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA**

Christy R. Bauer  
Justin L. Eldridge  
Ligeia Hall  
Leslie E. McGrew  
Laurel L. Traynowicz

**UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO**

Jason W. Kent

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA**

Patricia Anne Chambers  
Frank L. Eastland  
Sandra L. Hall  
David L. Hope  
Charlotte D. Murks  
Arnold Stewart O'Bannon  
Barbara Denise Plonka  
Kathy A. Slusher  
Richard L. Wassner

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, GREENSBORO**

Lori A. Cecil

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA**

Michael J. Ginder  
David R. Oeth

**PACE UNIVERSITY**

Carleen Boate

**PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Dane Keller Rutledge

**UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH**

Irene T. Anichini  
David Cicola  
Earl Creps  
Gary Harris  
David Schiller

**UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND**

James F. Duffy  
Michael P. Duffy

**ST. ANSELM'S COLLEGE**

James D. Canarie  
Paul M. Dello-Iacano  
Diane K. Moran  
Ricardo Torres, Jr.

**ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY**

Jessica A. Indig  
Jeanne E. Martin  
Barbara H. Thompson

**SLIPPERY ROCK STATE COLLEGE**

Deborah Lynn Wilmot

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA**

David C. Buckley  
Barre C. Dumas  
Walter S. Lowry  
Mark A. Nelson  
Alex W. Zoghby

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Richard A. Barlow  
Donald A. Drennon  
Elizabeth A. Ferrell

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

Mike Bartanen  
Steve Combs  
Bill deKay  
Brady Lee Garrison  
John S. Gossett  
Jim Ham  
Richard Kirkham  
Kim Maerowitz  
Marlene Pontrelli  
Les Sherman

**SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY**

Susan DiFrancesco

**UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE**

Nancy D. Carter  
Tillman L. Lay  
Nancy-Ann E. Min  
Kathy A. Montgomery  
Howard D. Shaver

**TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY**

Solomon E. Fields  
Ronald E. Hill  
William L. Slagle  
John L. Watkins

**UNIVERSITY OF UTAH**

Linda S. Beath  
Rachelle Leigh Fisher  
Edward A. Hinck  
Martin G. Jenkins  
Rene Lastreto  
Michael Nash  
John P. Osburn  
James W. Paulsen  
Reid Tateoka

**VALDOSTA STATE COLLEGE**

Michael K. Parker

**VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY**

Bert Haas  
Steve Kratsch

**WABASH COLLEGE**

Gus J. Buktenica  
Gregory C. Fuchs  
Briane House  
Samuel D. Krutz  
Alan L. McLaughlin  
Jay W. Ponder

**WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE**

Thomas M. Fallert  
Christine A. Ward  
Jeffrey P. Ward

**WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY**

James Nathan Falk  
Walter D. Kelley, Jr.  
John David Rosen

**WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

Mary Aiken  
Douglas Merrill Nancarrow  
Mark Rogstad

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Linda Marie Calo  
Gerald M. Cox  
Keith Godfrey  
Joan M. Harrigan  
Kent J. Martini  
Denise L. Mitcham  
Audrey J. Montgomery  
Susan M. Orbain  
Christopher S. Varjabedian  
Colette T. Vogel

**WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY**

Terry Wayne Barnes  
Larry Martin Caillouet  
Kenneth Brian Cooke  
Carmen Miranda Guinn  
Teresa Lee Jenkins  
Phillip Wayne Smith  
James Russell Thomas

**WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

Howard John Dooley

**WESTMINSTER COLLEGE**

Thomas A. Tupitza

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Elizabeth Harlenske  
Jennifer Jackson  
Jeffrey P. Macauley

TABLE OF PARLIAMENTARY MOTIONS

MOTION	PURPOSE	May Interrupt	Mover Must Be Recognized	Second Required	Debatable	Vote Required	Amendable
<b>PRIVILEGED MOTIONS</b>							
To take a recess	To dismiss for a given time	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	Y
Question of privilege	To make request during debate	Y	N	N	N	Maj	Y
Call for orders of day	Force consideration of a postponed motion or mandated business	Y	N	N	N	Chr	N
<b>INCIDENTAL MOTIONS</b>							
Appeal decision of chair	Obtain vote reversing chair	Y	Y	Y	*N	Maj	N
Call for division of house	Ascertain the correct vote	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Raise a point of order	Correct a parliamentary error	Y	N	N	N	Chr	N
To divide a motion	Consider in separate parts	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	Y
To withdraw a motion	To remove from floor	N	Y	N	N	Maj	N
To suspend rules	To permit action contrary to standing rules	N	Y	Y	N	2/3	N
To rise for parliamentary inquiry	To ascertain proper procedure or status of business	Y	N	N	N	No	N
<b>SUBSIDIARY MOTIONS</b>							
To table	To defer action	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	N
The previous question	To close debate-force vote	N	Y	Y	N	2/3	N
To limit or extend limits of debate	To control length of time for discussion	N	Y	Y	N	2/3	Y
To postpone to a certain time	Defer action (maj) or to create special order (2/3)	N	Y	Y	*Y	*2/3	Y
To refer to a committee (May include members)	To allow consideration by a special group	N	Y	Y	*Y	Maj	Y
To amend (an amendment)	To clarify an amendment	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	N
To amend or substitute	To modify a motion	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	Y
To postpone indefinitely	To suppress action (kill)	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	N
<b>MAIN MOTIONS</b>							
The bill of resolution (to adjourn)	To introduce business (to adjourn the Assembly, <i>sine die</i> )	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	Y
<b>RENEWAL MOTIONS</b>							
To reconsider	To reopen debate & consider	*N	*Y	Y	Y	Maj	N
Take from table	Return to consideration motion previously deferred	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	N

\* Modified by circumstances as to nature of time, question, effect, etc.

## 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.

## 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 Sep-

tember 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.