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INDIVIDUAL EVENTS SPEAKING:
TWO ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS

HALFORD RYAN

Jack Rhodes recently extended a call for various research studies in individual speaking events and, in his study of extemporaneous speaking, James Benson noted that most organizational patterns are trite and overused: "The most popular organizational patterns, regardless of the demands of the topic, are chronological and the "Three-Point" patterns." Similarly, persuasive speakers seem to overuse the problem-solution and the topical organizational patterns. The question, then, becomes: "Are there available to the individual events speaker other organizational patterns which are as effective as the traditional ones?" In this article, I shall examine two patterns rarely used in individual events speaking. I shall (1) explain why these patterns would help the speaker to organize his or her thoughts in order to become a better persuasive speaker and (2) provide examples of each pattern’s use.

The Classical Pattern

Corax, a Greek citizen in the colony of Syracuse, Sicily (c. 5th century B.C.), outlined the Classical organizational pattern in his "The Technique of Speaking." Corax divided the speech into five parts: Introduction, Narration, Arguments, Refutation, and Conclusion. The basic pattern evidently was used both in forensic and deliberative oratory, so its appropriateness to individual speaking events should be apparent. The Classical pattern predates the codification of the five canons of rhetoric, but it is actually a symbiotic blending of the canons of invention (inventio) and arrangement (dispositio). It dictates to the speaker the kinds of materials that should be researched and how the materials should be arranged for presentation.

Halford Ryan is Associate Professor of Public Speaking at Washington and Lee University.
5 For a discussion of the five classical canons of rhetoric, see Gary Cronkhite, Persuasion: Speech and Behavioral Change (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), pp. 22-23, and Kennedy, p. 266.
The Introduction should be self-explanatory.

The Narration adds persuasive appeal to the speech by suggesting that one should find and cast his or her materials into a story-like form. Gronbeck has noted the appeal of a narration: "A good narrative, then, sucks us into a story and gives us a particular way of viewing a series of events. And if it’s plausible and well motivated, it might even change some attitudes.”

Bryant and Wallace have observed that the narrative form "is very common in politics and in certain types of courtroom speaking." The Arguments section directs the speaker toward finding and arranging those materials which can be used to argue for the proposition.

The Refutation provides a neat counterpoise, or juxtaposition, to the Arguments by directing the speaker to refute them. In the Refutation, the speaker has at least two strategic options and could even combine them in some proportion for his or her particular ends. First, the speaker could find and arrange materials to refute the opponent’s case or analysis. Second, the Refutation could be used to argue against the audience’s doubts or reservations concerning the speaker’s proposition.

The Conclusion is self-explanatory.

The reader would benefit from a study of several significant speeches which utilize the Classical pattern: Edmund Burke’s “Conciliation with the Colonies,” Patrick Henry’s “Liberty or Death,” Senator Joseph McCarthy’s “The Red-Tinted Washington Crowd,” and Senator Richard Nixon’s “Checkers Speech.”

The Method of Residues

The method of residues, more recently termed the “elimination order,” presents an interesting strategy for the speaker to use when there is a range of options available for selection and persuasion. It is applicable in those persuasive situations in which the speaker and his or her audience already agree on the need for some action and need only to select a course to follow. The method of residues is actually an expanded form of the disjunctive syllogism. Copi has illustrated its pure form:

Either Fido ran away or Fido got hit by a car.

Fido did not run away.

Therefore Fido got hit by a car.

McBurney and Mills have noted that the speaker must partition the question into its exhaustive parts and then negate each part except that one which he or she advocates; hence, the residue. The primary responsibility of determining the exhaustiveness of the options lies with the speaker. To be persuasive, the speaker must eliminate all of the other options so that the audience can perceive the reasoning process and, to be logical, the speaker cannot affirm his or her residue until all of the options or disjuncts in the syllogism have been negated.

Hence we have a valid disjunctive syllogism only where the categorical premiss contradicts one disjunction premiss and the conclusion affirms the other disjunct of the disjunctive premis.

In its expanded rhetorical form, a sample employment of the method of residues might be outlined in the following example where the speaker and audience agree that the Navy should be strengthened:

Either we refurbish existing ships to strengthen the Navy
Or we recommission decommissioned ships to strengthen the Navy
Or we build new ships to strengthen the Navy.
Since refurbishment is too expensive,
Since decommissioned ships are outdated,
Therefore we should build new ships to strengthen the Navy.

Notice that the partition is apparently complete, that the “building” disjunct contradicts the “refurbishment” disjunct and the “recommission” disjunct, and the conclusion does affirm the residue disjunct by building new ships to strengthen the Navy.

The reader could study the method of residues in the following speeches: Patrick Henry’s “Liberty or Death,” President Nixon’s “Cambodia,” and Edmund Burke’s “Conciliation with the Colonies.” The application of the method’s theory is perhaps best illustrated in Burke’s speech. Burke himself can summarize best the partition of the options and how he negated the options and consequently was left with his residue:

If then the removal of the causes of this spirit of American liberty be, for the greater part, or rather entirely, impracticable; if the ideas of criminal process be inapplicable, or, if applicable, are in the highest degree inexpedient—what way yet remains? No way is open, but the third and last—to comply with the American spirit as necessary, or, if you please, to submit to it as a necessary evil.

Conclusion

In an attempt to add new organizational patterns to those already used or overused in individual speaking events, the Classical pattern and the method of residues were discussed.

The Classical pattern is useful because it suggests the kinds of materials the speaker should find and how he or she should arrange them in the discrete sections. The Narration affords a valuable opportunity for the

15 Copi, p. 201.
17 Burke, p. 95.
speaker to formulate a convincing story for his or her persuasive end. The Arguments-Refutation juxtaposition is particularly persuasive because the speaker bifurcates the presentation along defensive-offensive, pro-con, positive-negative lines. Although the pattern was originally used in ancient forensic and deliberative speaking, my identification of modern speeches which used the pattern suggests that it is useful and appropriate as a persuasive pattern in contemporary individual speaking events.

The method of residues is a rhetorical expansion of the disjunctive syllogism. To use it effectively, the speaker and the critic-judge should make certain that the partition of the question into its constituent options is exhaustive, or else the logical force of the residue will be faulty and, hence, its persuasibility questionable. Moreover, the speaker should provide, and the critic-judge should examine, the proof adduced against each of the disjuncts as well as for the residue. When speaker and audience agree on the need or problem, this method allows the speaker to demonstrate to the audience and the critic-judge the logical desirability of the residue, or solution, over that of the other negated options.

One hopes that these patterns will be incorporated into individual speaking events by enterprising and innovative speakers who wish to better persuade their audiences and critic-judges, and that the audiences and critic-judges will better understand the development and application of the patterns in persuasive speaking.
At a time when it is important to make intercollegiate debate as relevant as possible to real-world situations and the skills necessary to cope with them, it is disturbing that a misunderstanding persists in the debate community over what is probably the most confusing concept in policy proposition analysis—inheritency. In a previous article, the term “pseudo-inheritency” was introduced to describe this pervasive misanalysis of the nature of inheritency.1

The purpose of this article is to explore some further ramifications of pseudo-inheritency in two areas of plan attacks—circumvention and disadvantages—where questions which should be irrelevant to policy propositions often have been accepted as legitimate by both affirmatives and negatives alike. Let it be clear at the outset that this author does not fault negative teams only for raising these misguided plan attacks. Affirmative teams are also responsible for legitimizing such arguments when the affirmative case sets up the pseudo-inheritency positions.

However, before these two plan attack areas are examined, it is necessary to review the nature of the pseudo-inheritency misunderstanding. The legitimate stock issue of inheritency is best expressed by the following question: “Is any policy short of the one proposed inherently incapable of mitigating the alleged problems?”2 Pseudo-inheritency, on the other hand, entails a different question: “Can the alleged problems be solved (or disadvantages be attained) without making a structural change in the status quo?” While inheritency issues should concern whether there are nontopical ways to obtain the desired benefit, pseudo-inheritency erroneously asks whether the status quo has the ability to take the action outlined in the affirmative plan.

In order to understand the irrelevance of this latter question, it must be assumed that the topicality of a particular affirmative plan has been granted or established. (In fact, if the plan is not topical, there is no reason to resolve any of the other issues in a particular debate.) A negative team, then, fails to uphold its responsibility of negating the proposition when it argues the capability of the status quo to adopt the affirmative plan, for the topical action still must be taken in order to solve the alleged problems.

At this point, an application of the pseudo-inheritency concept to an example of attitudinal inheritency should be illuminating. Consider the 1979–
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intercollegiate topic, "Resolved that the federal government should significantly strengthen the regulation of mass media communication in the United States." A legitimate affirmative inherency position for a plan through which the federal government would impose limits on television violence might be stated in the following way. Attitudes in the broadcasting industry preclude a voluntary reduction of T.V. violence which is required to attain the affirmative advantages, and thus governmental restraint is required for solvency. The negative legitimately could defend inherency by defending such measures as self-regulation, the effectiveness of parent/teacher pressure groups on the broadcasting industry, the responsiveness of the NAB code, and so on—all of which would be without strengthened government regulation (without the topic). These are all legitimate negative inherency positions since only actions short of the resolution (which specifies the federal government as the agent of change) are argued as ways to achieve the same benefits as those alleged for the affirmative's resolitional action.

On the other hand, an example of attitudinal pseudo-inherency might sound like this: instead of asking why alleged problems cannot be solved without the proposition, the negative asks why the proposition has not yet been adopted. Apparently, federal policymakers have not been motivated sufficiently to adopt the affirmative plan, but the negative who argues that these attitudes against adoption are not inherent is guilty of the pseudo-inherency fallacy. When a negative argues that status quo policymakers in the federal government have no perverse motive in not requiring a reduction in T.V. violence, this merely means that the status quo can, and perhaps will, adopt the topic; this is not a reason why the topic should not be adopted (why the federal government should not significantly strengthen the regulation of mass media communication). The only inherency position relevant to negating the proposition (why the proposition should not be adopted) is the capability of the status quo to obtain the desired effect without taking a topical action.

Often, it is not the negative who is guilty of introducing pseudo-inherency into the debate. The affirmative may confuse true inherency with pseudo-inherency and may argue reasons why the affirmative plan has not been adopted (e.g., Congress has been reluctant to act because of First Amendment considerations of freedom of expression, or the FCC has been co-opted by the industry it is charged with regulating). Why a significant strengthening of the regulation of mass media by the federal government (legislative, executive, or judicial branch) has not taken place would be germane only to a proposition of fact—predicting that the federal government will or will not take such action—but not to a proposition of policy. There is no rationale for an affirmative arguing that a topical action will not be taken in order to demonstrate that the action should be taken.

With this review of the nature of pseudo-inherency in mind, the remainder of this article will examine two sets of plan attack issues which are grounded in the pseudo-inherency fallacy. The first of these consists of a set of solvency-circumvention arguments. The analysis typically runs something like this: if, as the affirmative case argues, policymakers do not currently want the affirmative policy, then they will find ways to see that the affirmative plan is not put into effect. As a result, affirmatives have

---

3 For a discussion of the reasons "federal government" is not restricted to the legislative branch, see Schunk, pp. 145-46.
responded with the magical power of fiat which mandates policy action to override these currently opposing attitudes.

Such an affirmative position distorts the concept of fiat, and unnecessarily so, since illegitimate inherency arguments are responsible for its inception. Affirmative fiat should be another way of saying that the affirmative team's obligation is not to prove that the plan will be adopted, but only that it should be adopted. It does not mean that the affirmative debaters are themselves adopting the plan, or that the judge adopts the plan when he or she votes affirmative. On the contrary, if this plan ever really were adopted, it could be done so only by those persons in the position of authority to do so: Congress, executive boards and agencies, and/or the federal courts.

Thus, an affirmative plan never would be passed as legislation unless and until a majority in Congress was persuaded to vote for it, even though a minority of attitudes in this branch of the federal government might remain opposed. The argument that Congressional opposition would result in repeal or some other way to circumvent (once the affirmative fiat the plan over current Congressional attitudes) is based on an erroneous notion of the meaning of “should.” By the same token, an executive agency would take action only after being convinced to do so (by statutory requirement or otherwise); opposing attitudes would have been sufficiently minimized so that they no longer prevented enactment of the affirmative plan. Clearly, nothing in the “real world” supports the distorted notion of fiat as a divine intervention which forces adoption of a policy that the majority (or those with the authority to adopt) do not want to adopt.

Another example from a recent intercollegiate topic may prove helpful here. Consider the affirmative plan in which the federal government mandates a nationwide mass media campaign to inform the public about the dangers of a particular product or behavior. Legitimate inherency issues center on ways to achieve the benefits alleged for this action without the federal government's strengthening the regulation of mass media communication to achieve those benefits. Pseudo-inherency raises questions about why the federal government has not taken this action in the past. Any of a number of motives for inaction by Congress or by executive departments and agencies (DOE, FCC) may be claimed by the affirmative and denied by the negative. When the affirmative claims such reasons, it paves the way for negatives to argue that the motives for non-adoption in the past will continue once the affirmative plan is adopted, and this will lead to circumvention.

Thus, negatives might argue any of a number of circumvention plan attacks: 1) Congress will repeal the affirmative plan after its adoption is mandated by the affirmative team; 2) Congress will refuse to fund the affirmative plan adequately; 3) DOE and FCC will refuse to enforce the affirmative plan effectively; 4) If the plan is appointed by the President, with Congressional approval, the affirmative plan’s independent board will be biased not to enforce the plan effectively because of the currently opposing attitudes in the legislative and executive branches; or 5) The Supreme Court will strike down the affirmative plan. (It is very strange that nearly everyone finds this latter argument illegitimate because Constitutionality is a waived issue in policy debate. The affirmative can merely say that all necessary actions should be taken, including Constitutional amendment if necessary; at the same time, many will not accept the same thing for the other two branches of the federal government.)

With a proper understanding of fiat, however, affirmatives can soundly
respond that 1) Congress should not repeal; 2) Congress should fund; 3) DOE and FCC should enforce; and 4) the President and Congress should not select board members opposed to carrying out the plan. Whether these actions, all of which are undertaken by the federal government (the agent of change specified in the proposition), will ever occur is irrelevant to whether they ought to occur. On the other hand, fiat realistically cannot mean that the affirmative team insures that the proposition will be enacted by claiming their plan incapable of repeal, by the affirmative team’s appointment of board members, or by the appointment of the affirmative team to the plan administration board. Yet these affirmative tactics, and others, have occurred because of theoretically unsound circumvention attacks.

This is not to say that there are not legitimate circumvention attacks when relevant inherency issues are identified. Media resistance to federal government mandates, for example, would be quite relevant, since the proposition wording only allows the affirmative to advocate what the federal government, and not the mass media, should do. If the negative demonstrates that federal government enforcement mechanisms will fail to induce mass media compliance, then opposing attitudes outside the federal government may indeed thwart plan solvency. However, opposing attitudes within the federal government no longer would be at issue since the wording of the proposition authorizes the affirmative to advocate desirable attitudes, regardless of whether the attitudes ever exist.

Neither is this to suggest that circumvention attacks grounded in pseudo-inherency cannot be relevant in determining the decision of a specific debate, particularly when both the affirmative and the negative accept the legitimacy of pseudo-inherency as an issue relevant to policy propositions. However, this article does argue that an increased awareness in the debate community can and should render such “non-real world” circumvention attacks and distortions of affirmative fiat to the same status of irrelevancy as the issue of Constitutionality.

The examples cited here deal only with propositions calling for action by the federal government. However, the clear majority of recent intercollegiate resolutions has specified the federal government as the agent of change. Moreover, when an agent of change is not specified, the topic is all the more vulnerable to pseudo-inherency positions, since the negative does not negate the resolution when it notes the capability of any agent to take the action specified in the resolution.

A second, more recent set of plan attacks rooted in the problem of pseudo-inherency appears to be increasingly in vogue. These arguments usually have been presented under the label of “process” disadvantage. They typically have been argued when the affirmative distorts the meaning of fiat in ways already suggested (e.g., claiming the plan as unrepealable, placing the affirmative team on the board, etc.) in order to deal with circumvention attacks apparently legitimized by pseudo-inherency. The negative, then, grants the affirmative distortion of the fiat power and argues various possible disadvantages of this new “process” of policy adoption and implementation.

Consider the following examples:

1) The negative argues that the affirmative plan is undemocratic because it is forced in over the majority opinions of the Congress and presumably the electorate which it represents. No affirmative who understands inherency, however, ought to place himself in the position of claiming that the affirmative team is mandating policy in order to overcome prevailing at-
titudes. A decision for the affirmative team does not mean that either the affirmative or the judge adopts the plan; it merely means that the judge has concurred with the affirmative that this plan should be adopted by the federal government. This would only occur, however, when the attitudes of the necessary decision-makers were similarly influenced.

2) The negative argues that the affirmative team lacks the expertise to dictate board members or to actually be members of the board. Of course, no affirmative should find it necessary to serve on the board or to identify receptive individuals to be appointed to the board in order to insure proper attitudes for plan administration and enforcement. The actions advocated by the affirmative are what should be done by whomever the personnel might be.

3) The negative argues that an unrepeatable affirmative plan is dangerously inflexible. This is, of course, true, but there is no reason for an affirmative to view its plan as unrepeatable in order to avoid circumvention arguments which misunderstand affirmative fiat.

4) The negative argues that the affirmative board is open to tyrannical abuses, for it is granted all-encompassing authority, powers to finance, self-perpetuating status, with inadequate checks upon it. Again, affirmatives who create omnipotent boards have done so unnecessarily. They have attempted to insure that the federal government will do something; the wording of a policy proposition merely requires that affirmatives advocate that something should be done.

For these and many other "process" disadvantages, a judge may find himself or herself in a position in which the negative arguments must be granted as relevant, since the affirmative has opened itself up to them by unnecessarily distorting the meaning of affirmative fiat. It would be far better, however, if we never heard such arguments at all. That will occur only with the realization that affirmatives are not required to "force in" changes which defy the prevailing attitudes of the change agent specified in the proposition. (Carried to its logical extreme, one can envision affirmatives magically fiatting peace, good will, and mutual understanding as the solution to all the world's ills.)

In short, that a proposition has not been adopted in the past is not relevant to inherency analysis; why non-topical actions have not and could not get the affirmative advantages or solve the affirmative harms is relevant. With that realization, unrealistic plan circumvention and "process" disadvantage arguments should become extinct. To the degree that competitive debate can weed out the theoretically irrelevant, the activity, and the climate for the activity, will become healthier.

Unfortunately, like all policy advocacy, this article is an illustration of its own thesis. What the awareness in the debate community should be has been recommended; whether it ever will be or not is quite another question, one over which the author of this paper has no magical power of fiat.
STATISTICAL VS. SUBSTANTIVE SIGNIFICANCE IN ACADEMIC DEBATE: A SIGNIFICANT ISSUE?

PAUL C. GASKE

One natural and obvious consequence of the increasing demand for quantifiable significance in academic debate is the increasing reliance on empirical studies as sources of such data. Another natural but perhaps not so obvious consequence is an increase in the misuse by debaters—in analysis, interpretation, and application—of data-based research efforts. Controversy over the "methodology" of studies (including design, procedures, subject sample, etc.) is becoming more and more a standard part of debate rounds. However, argumentation on the statistical procedures of studies, the nexus of the analysis and interpretation of the results, is noticeably lacking.

The following statement, copied during a round I judged at the 1979 National Debate Tournament, is typical and revealing of the need for discussion of statistical matters: "The hypothesis was found to be statistically significant. This means that there is a high level of probability that the findings are true and that the results are important." To one trained in statistical procedures, the fallacies in such a statement should be immediately apparent. To many of our debaters, critics, and even authors of journal articles, however, the above statement seems both reasonable and accurate.

To suggest that the substantive significance of research findings should be the focus of debate on quantitative subjects is hardly startling. Indeed, the stock issue of significance, which is frequently documented with empirical studies, is substantive, not statistical, in nature. It is not nearly as important to discover whether differences exist as it is to discover what those differences mean. What implications does the research have for theory development? For policy making?

When an author reports a "statistically significant" relationship between two variables, the researcher means that he or she is confident (beyond some specified probability level) that a relationship exists between the variables in the population (or universe) from which the data have come. Suggesting that "a relationship" exists between two variables, however, does not mean that the relationship is meaningful or important. As Gold indicates, "Statistical significance is only a necessary but not sufficient criterion of importance. An assessment of the magnitude of the association must still be made in some terms other than that of a statistical test of significance." "Substantive significance" refers to the magnitude of the

Dr. Gaske is an Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at the University of Oregon. A revised version of this paper was delivered at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho (April, 1980).


2 Gold, p. 44. Clearly, the statistical/substantive issue refers to research of an experimental or quasi-experimental nature to which tests of significance can be
strength-of-association between the measured variables and/or the observed group differences; it provides data necessary for resolving the question, "How much of a difference makes a difference?" In short, substantive significance is the importance of statistically significant findings.

A rational person cannot base policy solely on the existence of a statistically significant finding; he or she must be persuaded of the substantive significance of the data, that the differences detected do make a difference and do demand some sort of response. The problem comes about, of course, when statistical significance is taken as proof that substantive significance is present, a practice that researchers unanimously perceive as "a sin."

Does the sin occur? Is substantive significance inferred from the mere presence of statistically significant findings? Unfortunately, the answer is "yes." The claims of substantive significance in behavioral research are typically found in the discussion section of the reports, the quotes we often hear in debate rounds. Are the claims of meaningfulness supported by the hard data on the substantive significance of the results? Katzer and Sodt cast considerable doubt on the claims of many authors of quantitative studies when they observed that

In all of the non-correlational articles we only found one author who reported the OES (obtained effect size, a measure of substantive significance), and made use of it in the interpretation of his results. This would not be particularly worrisome if there were any evidence that researchers could intuitively compute and use it. However, we could not find any systematic difference in the tenor of conclusions between studies which accounted for less than 5% of the variance and those which accounted for more than 40%. (emphasis supplied)

In essence, the authors of many studies apparently claim far more substantive significance than they are entitled or, at least, the opinion quotes we hear in rounds are hardly correlated to the variance the studies explain.

Moreover, it is quite easy to conceive of cases in which trivial differences can be statistically significant. Why? As the ability of the statistical test to detect differences (statistical power) increases, the probability of committing a Type II error (failing to detect differences when they actually exist) obviously decreases. Statistical power is basically a function of three inputs—the alpha level set by the researcher (Type I error tolerance, the willingness of the researcher to falsely reject the null hypothesis), the sample size, and the effect size (the substantive significance dimension).

Since effect size is rarely specified on an a priori level, the most common options available to the researcher are to increase the probability of committing a Type I error (say from .05 to .15) or to increase the size of the sample. Convention has certainly restricted the use of a liberal alpha level (e.g., .15) by the researcher, so statistical power is typically a function of sample size.

The effect of raising sample size on the probability of detecting statistical significance can be great. David Bakan has demonstrated convincingly that

legitimately applied. While there are many matters of social importance which transcend these statistical issues (e.g., the principle of freedom of speech is more important than whether it is actually exercised), the issue is not directly relevant since a test of significance could not be legitimately applied to this comparison.

3 Gold, p. 44.

virtually any two variables will be correlated or groups differentiated at a statistically significant level if the sample size is large enough. And why not? Why should any two variables in nature be totally uncorrelated? Or why should two groups be exactly the same? Bakan’s point is telling—the null hypothesis of “no difference” is typically false in nature; the statistical test of significance affirms the obvious. The substantive importance of such a finding is virtually nil.

In my view, it is the burden of the team utilizing a study to demonstrate or to be able to demonstrate its substantive significance in quantitative terms; evidence of statistical significance or opinion evidence alone or in combination is, in light of the above indictments, insufficient. Demonstration of the quantified amount of variance accounted for in a study does not, of course, guarantee the acceptance of the study as being important or meaningful. However, it does provide all participants in the round with minimally sufficient information for debating the merits of the study in substantive terms.6

A major part of the statistical/substantive confusion is that many journal editors commit the same fallacy that our debaters do—they take statistical significance as proof of substantive significance, and thus do not require the reporting of the appropriate follow-up tests and variance-accounted-for information.7 To our discipline’s credit, most speech journals have moved recently to correct this oversight. Fortunately, as the Katzer and Sodt article demonstrates, the appropriate follow-up procedures can be conducted from the information presented in the results section of most studies, and substantive information can be obtained.8 These figures can and should be calculated by the teams using the studies; in the absence of such information, the importance of the studies can be called into question.

The implications of these comments, I believe, are clear. We have accepted as substantively significant that for which we have insufficient

---

6 Gold also provides general criteria “for evaluating the degree of relationship in order to attribute substantive significance” (p. 45). See, especially, pp. 45-46.
7 A different but related problem is the extent to which journals use statistical significance as a criterion for a manuscript’s acceptance. Rejecting manuscripts because they fail to find statistically significant results may dramatically increase the Type I error rate in published research (falsely rejecting the null hypothesis). Bakan argues that Type I error is more severe than Type II because “it has the effect of stopping investigation” (p. 427). That journals do in fact use statistical significance as an important acceptance criterion is empirically verified in Steven Kerr, James Tolliver, and Doretta Petree, “Manuscript Characteristics Which Influence Acceptance for Management and Social Science Journals,” Academy of Management Journal, 20 (March 1977), 132-41.
8 See, for example, W. L. Hays, Statistics for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1971), pp. 413-28 and 484-91, which provides many of the appropriate formulas. It should be noted, however, that these statistics must be appropriate to the experimental design of the particular study (e.g., fixed, random, mixed). Using inappropriate tests can greatly overestimate or underestimate the magnitude of experimental effects, thus confounding the substantive significance judgment. A discussion of these issues and appropriate strength-of-association measures for particular experimental designs is supplied by Joseph L. Fleiss, “Estimating the Magnitude of Experimental Effects,” Psychological Bulletin, 72 (1969), pp. 273-76.
proof. To assert that, by definition, a statistically significant finding is substantively significant is to commit a fallacy. To determine policy on the basis of a study’s or series of studies’ statistical significance alone is logically unsound.

Substantive significance should be the focus of debate on quantitative research. Statistical significance is not substantive significance. Recognizing the distinction between the two, and utilizing that knowledge in the debate round, should reduce the abuse of empirical studies in debate and promote a more responsible (and, probably, skeptical) attitude toward the practice of taking the substantive merit of behavioral research at its statistical value.
WHAT HAPPENED TO CAMELOT?
TED KENNEDY'S 1980 BID FOR THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION

JILL BIRNIE

Announcing his candidacy for President at Faneuil Hall in Boston, Massachusetts on November 7, 1979, Senator Edward M. Kennedy said:

For many months, we have been sinking into crisis. Yet, we hear no clear summons from the center of power. Aims are not set. The means of realizing them are neglected. Conflicts in direction confuse our purpose. Government falters. Fear spreads that our leaders have resigned themselves to retreat.

This country is not prepared to sound retreat. It is ready to advance. It is willing to make a stand. And so am I.

Therefore, I take the course compelled by events and by my commitment to public life. Today, I formally announce that I am a candidate for President of the United States.

According to the Gallup Polls, beginning in March, 1978, and reaching a peak in mid-October, 1979, Kennedy consistently led Carter by 60% to 30% as the preferred candidate of the Democratic Party. Yet, this same candidate lost 25 out of 35 primaries and reluctantly withdrew his name from nomination after losing a bitter fight for an open convention on August 12, 1980. What happened to Kennedy’s seemingly solid base of support in 1980? The problems were many. Some blame it on the advantages of an incumbent President; others, on the crises in Afghanistan and Iran; and still others, on the Anderson campaign. Although all of these reasons contributed to Kennedy’s failure, they were not the primary causes of it. Ted Kennedy’s campaign failure centered around three basic rhetorical flaws: (1) Kennedy’s search for campaign issues; (2) the public’s perception of Kennedy as an extravagant liberal, during an era in which the public had become disillusioned with the old “Great Society” programs; and (3) Kennedy’s ethos. I intend to examine these flaws in this essay.

According to the polls, Kennedy’s highest ratings were in the area of leadership; Carter rated lowest here. Thus, at the outset of the campaign, Kennedy faulted Carter on his lack of leadership, and proclaimed the need for a more active Presidency. However, due to the Iranian crisis, this issue lost its vitality. The American people traditionally rally to support a President during an international crisis, and the Iranian crisis proved to be no exception. In addition, Kennedy, quoted in Jack Newfield, “The Runner...
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4 “Announcement of his candidacy for President,” pp. 1–2.
Stumbles," made a serious faux pas when he remarked on December 2, 1979 that the Shah of Iran had run "one of the most violent regimes in the history of mankind," and that he had stolen "umpteen billion dollars" from the Iranian people."Kennedy continued, "Support for the hostages does not mean support for the Shah . . . The Iranians must know two things: first, that we will not be blackmailed—and second, that we are not blind to the abuses of the Shah." After the media condemned Kennedy for these statements, he became reluctant to criticize Carter at all. As Adam Clymer of the New York Times wrote:

...probably the single most damaging event of the campaign, it seems clear, was Mr. Kennedy's Dec. 2 attack on the ousted Shah of Iran. Sloppily done, it invited doubts about his judgment when tired and pressed. Even worse than the visible damage was the lasting case of shell shock inside the campaign, leaving it afraid to take any risk—even of ridiculing Mr. Carter when he confessed on television on Dec. 31 that he was shocked to learn that Russians lie and have imperialist ambitions—as Mr. Carter's Republican opponents were quick to say.

Therefore, Kennedy "experimented" with campaign styles and issues in Iowa, and lost the caucus to Carter by a 2-1 margin. After Kennedy's trouncing in Iowa, his aides decided that the themes and issues of the campaign had to be defined for the American public in a "reannouncement speech." So, on January 29, 1980, Kennedy spoke at Georgetown University and addressed the issues of the campaign.

In the Georgetown speech, a firmer Kennedy was revealed. Kennedy outlined his differences with Carter on both foreign and domestic issues. In foreign affairs, he advocated: (1) restoration of the SALT talks; (2) continuation of arms control; (3) opposition to the peacetime draft registration; (4) opposition to economic sanctions on Iran; and (5) support of the formation of a United Nations Commission which would investigate the Iranian government's grievances. Kennedy turned away from Carter's "non-policy" in foreign affairs, saying:

The real question is whether America can risk four more years of uncertain policy and certain crisis, of an Administration that tells us to rally around their failures, of an inconsistent nonpolicy that may confront us with a stark choice between retreat and war. These issues must be debated in this campaign.


12 Ibid., p. 2.
In the area of domestic policy, Kennedy flew his true liberal colors, arguing for: (1) a system of gas rationing; (2) his national health insurance bill; (3) federal assistance to urban areas; (4) equality in education and employment; (5) the ERA; and (6) the advancement of civil rights for all minorities. He argued against the proliferation of nuclear power plants. His solution to the problems of inflation was the installation of an immediate six-month freeze on wages and prices, followed by mandatory, across-the-board controls to combat Carter’s apparently ineffective measures of voluntary restraint.

Kennedy “took his gloves off” in the Georgetown speech to establish his campaign issues and to reaffirm his candidacy. In the speech, a confident campaigner was revealed, one who said:

... sometimes a party must sail against the wind. Now is such a time. We cannot wait for a full and fair wind or we will risk losing the voyage that is America. A New England poet once wrote: “Should the storm come, we shall keep the rudder true.”

Whatever comes in the voting of this year, or in the voyage of America through all the years ahead, let us resolve to keep the rudder true.

The effect of the Georgetown speech lasted only temporarily although it managed to bring in new money to his ailing campaign and seemed to “mute the suspicion that he had no reason for running beyond coveting Carter’s job.” However, “the cost for Kennedy was a retreat from a romantic to an ideological candidacy perched at what one staffer called ‘the outskirts of the Democratic Party’—and weakened within by a sense of encroaching doom.” The Georgetown speech was not enough to lead Kennedy to victory; he went on to lose both the Maine and New Hampshire primaries. Once more, Kennedy’s campaign was left without direction.

In order to find a new issue, Kennedy had a 12-hour meeting with his advisors. Since Kennedy now faced the Northeastern states, the hardest hit by the economic slump, the economy became Kennedy’s “one-note message.” Unfortunately, Kennedy’s reputation as an extravagant liberal did not help his credibility as he harangued Carter’s economic failures and simultaneously assured New Yorkers and other urban dwellers that social programs would not be cut in a Kennedy Administration.

In 1980, Americans were looking for a candidate who would be more frugal than Kennedy appeared to be. Many of the conservative economic ideals were being voiced from the members of the right instead of from New Deal liberals like Kennedy. Kennedy and his aides failed to realize that the public had grown weary of the old “New Frontier” and “Great Society” programs. The times had changed: America had to face energy shortages, productivity lags, and peace, very different prospects from those of the affluent and stormy era of the 1960s. Alexander Cockburn and James Ridgeway expressed Kennedy’s problem this way:

The real problem with Kennedy’s campaign is that political ideas in this country now are being most resonantly articulated on the right. Neither

15 Ibid.
Kennedy nor his advisors are confronting this reality ... The problem for Teddy Kennedy is that his perception of what the Democratic Party is and should be, continues to lie in the tradition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal ... this sort of presidency does not mesh with the times.18

An additional facet of this flaw is that all of Kennedy's predecessors were Roosevelt New Deal Democrats. The martyrdom of John and Robert Kennedy created a legend which Ted Kennedy felt impelled to continue. Of a poster hanging in Kennedy's National Headquarters which read "A Better Tomorrow," Frank Mankiewicz remarked, "The implication was: 'From the Folks Who Gave You a Better Yesterday.' The legend was that everything worked."19 The Kennedy legend lived with the Senator as he "call[ed] out the ghosts," and "probe[d] the memory." "Over and over, he tells his tale of the early '60s, a time of economic growth and price stability, a time when the brave young knight forced the steel companies to roll back prices, a time that can come again, if voters elect a 'real Democrat' and end '12 long years of Republican rule.' For every stop there is a personal reference."20 Ted Kennedy even claimed, "There's an enormous sense of expectation on people's parts about my candidacy. They established extremely high standards and clearly you're measured to those ... I'm always mindful that there's a sense of comparison."21 If Kennedy was aware of the comparisons, why did he not carve out his own identity for the electorate, rather than attempt to live up to the traditions, realities, and ghosts of the 1960s? Perhaps Kennedy needed the strength of his brothers' memories and records because he knew that he was the flawed brother. It was his problem, his ethos, which resulted in his failure.

From the outset of the campaign, Kennedy had attempted to defuse the Chappaquiddick issue. He decided to confront the issue head-on in a nationally televised interview with CBS correspondent Roger Mudd on November 8, 1979. In the interview, Kennedy appeared uncomfortable and inarticulate. The interview, did not shed any new light on the events at Chappaquiddick. In fact, the interview may have harmed Kennedy more than it helped him. It seemed to rekindle old stories and provoke new doubts about the accuracy of Kennedy's account. It showed a man uneasy about his past, one very different from the confident Senator whom the public customarily had seen. Tom Wicker wrote that those who saw the interview saw a man who

... cannot or will not yet explain what happened at Chappaquiddick, or rectify the numerous inconsistencies in his 10-year-old account of the matter. Perhaps as important, viewers saw a man who, when questioned on this and on his alleged relations with other women other than his wife, seemed not only embarrassed and uncomfortable but inarticulate—and occasionally incoherent.

So might we all seem, under the same kind of questioning, but the rest of us are not running for President on a platform of leadership. What Mr. Kennedy demonstrated in his responses—rather, his lack of them—to Mr. Mudd was anything but leadership. He could not even define it.22

---

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
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The Chappaquiddick question did not go away; if anything, it intensified. Tom Wicker correctly predicted that Chappaquiddick... is lying there not so much like a time bomb as like a cancer on his [Kennedy's] candidacy. For if Mr. Kennedy can deal with it no more confidently and persuasively and candidly than he did under Roger Mudd's questioning, then the battering he is going to take on the matter, as the campaign proceeds, will steadily grow worse until perhaps it destroys him.23

Eventually, as the Chappaquiddick questions continued to emerge, Ted Kennedy became the issue. The January 28, 1980 issue of Time carried an article entitled "The Tide in Ted's Life: New Challenges to his Account of Chappaquiddick"; The Reader's Digest published "Chappaquiddick: The Still Unanswered Questions" in its February, 1980 issue. A New York Times poll in February, 1980 showed that, among Democrats, "distrust of Senator Kennedy's version of the accident at Chappaquiddick Island in 1969 continues to grow significantly to the point where only 16% believe him. 24% of the Democrats said that they would refuse to vote for him under any circumstances."24 The New York Times carried a 1½-page account on March 12, 1980, which was headlined, "Gaps Found in Chappaquiddick Phone Data." The March 24 edition of U.S. News & World Report reported, "Kennedy's Chappaquiddick automobile accident is a strong, undercurrent issue. His ratings in the polls keep going down as his candidacy prompts repeated stories of the 1969 drowning of Mary Jo Kopechne."25

Chappaquiddick was always there to undermine Kennedy's campaign, to loom larger than any issue with which he confronted Carter. Kennedy aides admitted that "until we can shake the moral issue, it is damn hard to make our substantive case."26 Kennedy himself said, "There hasn't been a political candidate and a political family that has been scrutinized as I've been, some fairly and some unfairly. It's a legitimate question whether I'm going to be the issue or my concern for the people is going to be the issue."27 Kennedy apparently was aware that his ethos would be questioned, but he seemed not to realize how important ethos is to a political candidate. As Aristotle noted:

Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible. We believe good men more fully and more readily than others; this is true generally whatever the question is, and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided.28

Kennedy aides later admitted that they had underestimated the destructive power of Chappaquiddick, particularly before the Iowa caucus. Therefore,

---
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before the New England primaries, Kennedy televised a half-hour "replay of the Georgetown speech" with "a bleak opening defense insisting that he had told the whole truth about the accident, conceding that some people 'will never believe me,' and begging judgment 'by the basic American standard of fairness—not ... gossip and speculation.'" This approach did not work either.

As I traveled with the campaign in Western Pennsylvania in April, 1980, there were hecklers at every stop. Some carried signs reading, "How can you save the country when you couldn't save Mary Jo?" Others shouted their distrust of him. Chappaquiddick caused the public to worry about Kennedy's reaction to crises, about his leadership abilities, and about his morality. After all, Kennedy was dealing with people who had experienced the lies of Vietnam and Watergate. They did not appear to want a President who, if he had lied about a personal matter, might also lie about a governmental one. Chappaquiddick was one issue that refused to go away.

One aide admitted, "Character is the only explanation for Kennedy's enormous negative ratings. The issues are coming around to us, but it's not helping."\(^{30}\) Another aide added that the most important thing "is to deal with our high negatives. We have to find the symbols of what a good man he really is."\(^{31}\) So, Kennedy tried speaking on the rights of women and the future of the family. Joan consistently campaigned with him, and the children of his two slain brothers campaigned for him, citing his merits as a family man. Yet Chappaquiddick continued to be his albatross.\(^{32}\)

No matter what Kennedy tried, Chappaquiddick haunted him. Jimmy Carter failed domestically and, in some respects, in foreign policy as well, but the fact remained that most Americans perceived Carter to be a good and decent man. In this country it seems that Aristotle is proven correct. "It is not true, as some writers assume in their treatises on rhetoric, that the personal goodness revealed by the speaker contributes nothing to his power of persuasion; on the contrary, his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses."\(^{33}\) Ted Kennedy might well agree.

Kennedy's 1980 bid for the Democratic nomination for President ended on August 12, 1980, having been plagued by three basic flaws: (1) his search for viable campaign issues; (2) the public's perception of him as an extravagant liberal; and (3) his ethos. Kennedy addressed his fellow Democrats that evening with these words:

May it be said of us, both in dark passages and in bright days, in the words of Tennyson that my brothers quoted and loved and that have special meaning to me now:

*I am a part of all that I have met . . .
Tho' much is taken, much abides . . .*

\(^{29}\) "Ted Tries, Tries Again," p. 31.
\(^{31}\) Ibid.
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... That which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts . . .
strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

For me, a few hours ago, this campaign came to an end. For all those whose cares have been our concern, the work goes on, the cause endures, the hope still lives and the dream shall never die.34

In 1980, Kennedy’s vision of himself as President slipped away. The candidacy that so many had looked forward to, and for so long, had come to an end.
Minutes of National Council Meeting
New York, NY November 13, 1980

Members present for all or part of the meeting: Schnoor, Rhodes, Cornell, Flaningam, Trapp, Roth, Lynch, Howe, Gross, Payne, Ziegelmueller.
Non-members present: Robert Smith, Alma College; Mike Pfau, Augustana College; Tom Goodnight, Northwestern University.

President Howe called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. The minutes of the previous meeting were distributed. Howe/Comell moved to correct the minutes by including the following motion: “Regional Governors are requested to contact annually each chapter in the region. The motion passed.” The motion to correct the minutes passed. Rhodes/Schnoor moved to correct the minutes by including the following motion: “All National Conference materials shall be mailed by mid-January. The motion passed.” The minutes were then approved as corrected.

Secretary Gross reported on membership. Initiates numbered 161 during 1979-80, which represented a 10% increase from the preceding year, but was well below the average for the previous five years.

Gross reported on the contract with Balfour for jewelry and certificates, noting cost increases of approximately 30% over the past two years. Rhodes/Cornell moved to increase the price of the key to $13 and the keypin to $14.25. The motion passed. Rhodes/Schnoor moved that the President appoint a committee to investigate alternatives to Balfour with the committee to report at the meeting at Mankato. The motion passed.

Howe reported that the current roster of Regional Governors is as follows: Region I—Richard Roth, Rhode Island; II—James Hall, St. John’s; III—W. R. Coulter, Roanoke; IV—Larry Caigoulet, Western Kentucky; V—George Ziegelmueller, Wayne St.; VI—Verm McGuire, Texas Tech; VII—Donn Parson, Kansas; VIII—Larry Schnoor, Mankato St.; IX—Al Johnson, Colorado College; X—Gregory Payne, Occidental.

The following reports were received from the regions:
I—Roth reported that he had just taken the position.
III—Coulter sent a report via letter, noting general health in the region. The major problem is the requirement of two years participation to establish eligibility for membership.
V—Ziegelmueller reported that regional activities will be conducted in conjunction with the debate tournament at Miami and the IE tournament at Wayne State.
VIII—Schnoor reported that UW at River Falls is the newest chapter. Macalester is reported to be interested in establishing a chapter.
IX—Rhodes reported for Johnson that DSR-TKA awards had been made at the Colorado College tournament.
X—Payne reported that DSR-TKA awards will be made at the California State at Long Beach and the Occidental tournaments.

Cornell reported that the Alumni and Service Awards Committee will be soliciting nominations shortly. Rhodes made a similar report for the Speaker of the Year Committee.

Flaningam reported for the National Conference Committee that the conference will be held March 26-29 at Mankato, MN. As requested by the National Council, the schedule has been revised so that all competition will be held over a three-day period. To facilitate judging assignments, it
is proposed that there be only one judge per round in IE and that a semi-
final round be held. Schnoor reported on local arrangements. Rooms have
been blocked at two Holiday Inns; classrooms have been reserved; the
banquet will be held at the Student Union. Rhodes/Trapp moved to sched-
ule two lunches as part of the conference fees. The motion passed.

A discussion of options for future National Conference sites and dates
was held. Occidental and Texas Tech have expressed interest in hosting
the conference. However, dates for future years may need to be adjusted
due to likely changes in the date of the National Debate Tournament.
Ziegelmueller/Trapp moved to hold the 1982 National Conference at Oc-
cidental if the dates can be worked out. Gross/Trapp moved to table the
motion until the meeting at Mankato. The motion to table passed.

Howe recommended that Annabel Hagood, University of Alabama, be
appointed Trustee. On the motion of Ziegelmueller/Roth, the council en-
dorsed the appointment. On the motion of Trapp/Payne the council en-
dorsed the reappointment of Jack Lynch as Historian.

Howe reported on the selection of a new editor for Speaker and Gavel.
Ziegelmueller/Payne moved to appoint J. Jeffrey Auer, Indiana University,
as Editor. The motion passed 5–2.

Cornell reported for the Nominating Committee. Nominees are as fol-
lows:

President—Jack Rhodes and Larry Schnoor
Vice-President—Sid Hill and Robert Weiss
Secretary—Jim Pratt and Jim Weaver
Treasurer—Elaine Bruggemeier and Gregory Payne
Council-At-Large—Paul Gaske, Keith Griffin, Thomas Ludlam and David
Waite.

Schnoor/Flaningam moved to nominate Mike Pfau for Council-At-Large.
The motion passed. Flaningam/Roth moved to close nominations. The
motion passed.

Goodnight reported on the activities of the topic selection committee to
which he is the DSR-TKA representative.

Cornell/Payne moved that the Secretary be asked to contact the Regional
Governors and ask them to submit an updated list of chapters and sponsors.
The motion passed.

Lynch/Ziegelmueller moved to adjourn. The motion passed, and the
meeting adjourned at 4:52 P.M.

Respectfully submitted.

Bert Gross
Secretary
ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW EDITOR

The term of the current editor expires with publication of the Summer, 1981 issue of Speaker and Gavel. All space for the remaining issues has been allocated except for papers submitted for the special issue on Undergraduate Papers in Forensics. All other manuscripts should be forwarded to the new editor, selected at the November, 1980 meeting of the Nation Council, Dr. J. Jeffery Auer. Dr. Auer’s address is as follows:

Dr. J. Jeffery Auer  
Editor, Speaker and Gavel  
Department of Speech Communication  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
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DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA
"SPEAKER OF THE YEAR" AWARD
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

The "Speaker of the Year" Award of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is given annually by this organization to a United States citizen who, in the opinion of the selection committee, has demonstrated the best qualities of public speaking: command of the English language, sincerity and nobility of purpose, dedication to his or her personal ideals, and the ability to influence public opinion. The award may be given for a single speech or for a career of speech-making. This year the award is given to the newly-elected President of the United States, Ronald W. Reagan, in recognition of his performances in the 1980 Presidential election, especially during the Presidential Debates.

President Reagan was born in Tampico, Illinois, on February 6, 1911. He gained valuable public speaking skills while a sports announcer for radio station WHO in Des Moines, Iowa, from 1932 to 1937 and continued to develop his talents with a thirty-year career in motion pictures and television. From 1967 to 1975 he served as the Governor of California. Among the many other honors which he holds, Mr. Reagan has a B.A. degree from Eureka College of Illinois (1932) and is the former President of the Screen Actors Guild and the Motion Picture Industry Council.

DSR-TKA is pleased to honor President Reagan for his excellent use of the debate format during the 1980 Debates against John Anderson and Jimmy Carter. Especially during the Carter-Reagan Debate, Mr. Reagan earned high marks among practitioners of public speaking for his poise, command of the language, and self-effacing manner. In countless other campaign appearances and in his public utterances since the Inauguration, President Reagan has demonstrated the qualities of good speech-making which DSR-TKA seeks to recognize and to encourage in public communication.

The White House has advised the selection committee that President Reagan, although unable to attend the National Conference in Mankato, has accepted the award with appreciation and has, since that time, forwarded a further memorandum that the plaque honoring President Reagan as 1980 "Speaker of the Year" has been received.

Jack Rhodes, Chair
"Speaker of the Year" Committee
DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA
DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

JACK HOWE
PROFESSOR, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY–LONG BEACH

Professor, coach, judge, statistician, historian, lawyer. Each of these can be used to describe Jack Howe, although he is best-known in the forensic community for his compilations of college and university forensic tournament results. Each year since 1960 he has collected, tabulated, edited and distributed minute statistical details concerning debate and individual events throughout the United States. The Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results publication has become a must for tournament directors as well as contestants. The editorial comments included provide a valuable record on the status and development of the activity.

In addition, Dr. Howe has assembled materials necessary to construct the tournament schedule which appears each summer in the AFA Newsletter. He was instrumental in founding the Cross Examination Debate Association which has grown in a few years to involve debaters from coast to coast. He currently serves as Executive Secretary for CEDA. His service to DSR-TKA has been exemplary, serving as both Treasurer and President of this organization. As a coach, his teams are consistently strong competitors and his judging is strict, evaluating public speaking skills as well as strategy and technique. As a person, Jack is punctual, appreciative and an able leader. He can make difficult situations bearable with humor and wit. For all of the hours, days and years spent in support of intercollegiate forensic activities, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is pleased to present to Jack Howe its Distinguished Service Award.

Nominated by Butler University.
A graduate of the University of Minnesota with concentrations in Speech, English and History on the route to his Ph.D., David W. Shepard has never been far from academic debate. From the time he first joined the Speech faculty at Ball State University in 1954 until the present, he has been an outstanding coach, an efficient tournament manager, and a successful teacher in many of the areas embraced by the discipline of Speech Communication.

When Professor Shepard stopped coaching and traveling to assume greater administrative responsibilities as Head of the Public Address Area in 1968, he continued to be a constant supporter of forensics at Ball State. He still manages debate tournaments sponsored by the department; he was instrumental in expanding the coaching staff and increasing funding for speech activities; he donates time to judge; and he has contributed from his personal funds for department forensic activities.

Dr. Shepard is also active in other professional associations, serving as editor of the Indiana Speech Journal since 1970. Two books on debate and parliamentary procedure are supplemented by numerous journal articles and papers presented at state, regional and national conventions.

Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is pleased to honor Dr. David W. Shepard with its Distinguished Service Award as an expression of appreciation for inspirational leadership and selfless service in intercollegiate forensics.

Nominated by Ball State University.
David Thomas has contributed immensely to the understanding of debate practice and theory. Secondary school programs benefited for years from Professor Thomas' editorship and publishing of Issues, a newsletter dealing with affairs of interest in debate theory and current debate topics. Further, all levels of forensic activity have benefited from two editions of Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice and Teaching. He has also contributed many journal articles in his own right and is currently editor of The Journal of the American Forensic Association.

David's contributions have not been limited to editorships and authorships, however, as he also served on the National Council of the American Forensic Association and numerous committees of the Speech Communication Association. He was active in the organization and administration of the Bicentennial Youth Debates for the southeastern area of the United States.

Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha expresses its indebtedness to Dr. Thomas for his many and varied contributions to forensic activities by awarding to him its Distinguished Service Award.

Nominated by Creighton University.
Waldo W. Braden, Boyd Professor Emeritus, Louisiana State University, has distinguished himself as a teacher, forensic coach, administrator, professional leader, editor and scholar. Throughout an immensely productive tenure at LSU, he consistently maintained the highest standards of the speech communication profession inspiring students, undergraduates and graduates, to pursue careers of intense scholarly and professional involvement. Countless Braden alumni also serve with distinction in the professional world and as community leaders.

As a high school, then college debate coach, he achieved an outstanding reputation for excellence. As his lengthy publication list shows, he also contributed significantly to the literature of forensics. He has directed at least seventy Master's Theses and forty Doctoral Dissertations, many after his so-called “retirement” in 1976. Their subjects range from politics to history to rhetoric and beyond.

Dr. Braden's administrative abilities were evident at Louisiana State University where he served as professor and Department Chair from 1958 to 1976. He served as Executive Secretary of the Speech Communication Association and later as President. He has served as editor of The Speech Teacher. LSU honored him with the highest academic rank which the
University can bestow, the rank of Boyd Professor given in recognition of national prominence in the recipient's academic field.

Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha recognizes Dr. Braden with its Distinguished Alumni Award, not only for his tireless work in promoting scholarship and high standards in Speech Communication, but also for his enthusiasm, energy and continuing sense of humor.

Nominated by Louisiana State University.
DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA
DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARD

HERMAN COHEN
PROFESSOR, PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Herman Cohen was initiated into Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha at the University of Iowa where he learned the art of communication from one of its masters, A. Craig Baird. As a debater he was one of the first to debate the British National Team when they came to the United States. From Iowa, to Oregon, to Edinburgh, Scotland, to Massachusetts, and, finally, to Pennsylvania State University, his contributions to the discipline of Speech Communication have been significant. The author of text books, book reviews and articles by the dozen, Dr. Cohen has been a lifelong student of such widely diversified interests as radio, forensics, speech education and rhetorical criticism. He is widely known for his extensive research and writing on Scottish rhetoric and Hugh Blair in particular.

Dr. Cohen’s quiet manner underlines his understanding and compassionate way with students while friends and co-workers describe him as a sensitive communicator. Verbal communication is not his only strength, however, as he is an artist of unusual talent.

As proof of his leadership abilities, Dr. Cohen has served on professional committees of state and national organizations, acting as editor of Western Speech and assistant editor of The Quarterly Journal of Speech. In 1975 he became President of the Speech Communication Association.

It is with pride in his achievements and representation of the ideals of this organization that Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha presents its Distinguished Alumni Award to Dr. Herman Cohen.

Nominated by Pennsylvania State University.
As an undergraduate at Wayne State University, Bonnie Perry was involved in many activities and known for her enthusiasm and sense of fun. She won awards in speech events and in intercollegiate debate, being named Michigan State Champion in Women’s Extemporaneous Speaking in 1966.

With an English major and B.A. in hand, Ms. Perry entered Michigan State University where she earned her Master’s and Ph.D. degrees, concentrating in Communication and Social Psychology. She served as an Instructor for undergraduate and graduate courses in Communication, Persuasion and Research Methods. During this time, she continued her interest in forensics and was assistant debate coach for the Michigan State University Forensic League as well as an administrator for the Communication Arts Institute for high school students, held each summer.

In 1971, Ms. Perry started work in industry with Booz, Allen, and Hamilton in their Philadelphia Division as Senior Consultant and Social Psychologist to major U.S. industries and government on marketing and consumer issues. In 1978 she joined the Sun Company in Radnor, Pennsylvania. As Director of the Sun Institute, an educational center for the development of Sun employees, she directs the communication and management training curriculum for a population of 30,000 employees.
She, along with her staff, is responsible for a budget in excess of $1.25 million.

Bonita Perry is a splendid example of an individual who has achieved great success in the business world by emphasizing the importance of communication. It is for these reasons that Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is pleased to present its Distinguished Alumni Award to Ms. Bonita Perry.

Nominated by Wayne State University.
Senator Larry Pressler, a farmer from South Dakota and a United States Senator, grew up on a family farm which his parents still operate. He received both national and international recognition for his work in 4-H. At the University of South Dakota, he was president of the student body and initiated into Phi Beta Kappa. He was an active intercollegiate debater and a member of the University of South Dakota’s Debate Control Board as well as a member of DSR-TKA.

After graduating from college, Senator Pressler attended Oxford University as a Rhodes scholar, receiving a degree in 1966. Two years with the United States Army, part served in Vietnam, was followed by study at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and by a Juris Doctorate degree from Harvard Law School in 1971. Since then, he has served with distinction for two terms in the United States House of Representatives and was elected to the United States Senate in 1978, receiving a record sixty-eight percent of the vote.

Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is pleased to present its Distinguished Alumni Award to Senator Pressler in recognition of his work and example of leadership and service in public life.

Nominated by The University of Utah.
The 1981 Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha National Conference was hosted by Mankato State University, Mankato, Minnesota on March 26–29. Twenty-nine member schools participated.

**CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE**
(Cumulative Placing)

First: DePauw University (Donovan and Boehm)
Second: University of Illinois (McShane and Read)
Third: University of Illinois (Studzinsky and Hunsaker)

**NATIONAL TOPIC DEBATE**

Team Placings:
First: University of Kansas (Wright and Grant)
Second: Wayne State University (Harris and Debold)
Third: University of Kansas (Gidley and Payne)
Texas Tech University (Eady and Alley)

Speaker Awards:
First: Harris, Wayne State University
Second: Debold, Wayne State University
Third: Gidley, University of Kansas
Fourth: Leader, University of Kansas
Fifth: Grant, University of Kansas
Sixth: Eberts, Loyola University–Chicago
Seventh: Faust, University of Iowa
Eighth: Dash, Loyola University

**STUDENT CONGRESS**

Superior Ratings:
Roseann Mandziuk, Wayne State University (First Place)
John Heinemann, University of Nebraska
Barbara McHugh, DePauw University
Lisa Tate, DePauw University

Excellent Ratings:
Will Aubrey, Murray State University
Diane K. Davis, Indiana State University
Laura Haug, University of Nebraska
Richard Sturgis, Clemson University
INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

After Dinner Speaking
- First: Lamb, University of Mississippi
- Second: Nassar, Wayne State University
- Third: Andrew, Ball State University
- Fourth: Richardson, Ball State University
- Fifth: Mize, University of Alabama
- Sixth: Howe, Emerson College

Communication Analysis
- First: Friedman, Murray State University
- Second: Mandziuk, Wayne State University
- Third: Miley, University of Mississippi
- Fourth: Rowe, Emerson College
- Fifth: Andrew, Ball State University
- Sixth: Sinquefield, University of Mississippi

Dramatic Duo Interpretation
- First: Sinquefield and Miley, University of Mississippi
- Second: Nassar and Mandziuk, Wayne State University
- Third: Winters and Clancy, Western Kentucky University
- Fourth: Rowe and Tucker, Emerson College
- Fifth: Mize and Hubbard, University of Alabama
- Sixth: Johnson and Button, Clemson University

Dramatic Interpretation
- First: Nassar, Wayne State University
- Second: Hubbard, University of Alabama
- Third: Mize, University of Alabama
- Fourth: Harrington, University of Mississippi
- Fifth: Hughes, Murray State University
- Sixth: Davis, Indiana State University

Extemporaneous Speaking
- First: Harrington, University of Mississippi
- Second: Brown, Murray State University
- Third: Joeckel, University of Nebraska
- Fourth: Miley, University of Mississippi
- Fifth: Hunsauder, University of Illinois
- Sixth: Aubrey, Murray State University

Impromptu Speaking
- First: Lamb, University of Mississippi
- Second: Beck, Ball State University
- Third: Harrington, University of Mississippi
- Fourth: Miley, University of Mississippi
- Fifth: Joeckel, University of Nebraska
- Sixth: Winters, Western Kentucky University
Informative Speaking
First: Harrington, University of Mississippi
Second: Bascom, Mankato State University
Third: Mandziuk, Wayne State University
Fourth: Ellis, Western Kentucky University
Fifth: Sinquefield, University of Mississippi
Sixth: Milev', University of Mississippi
Seventh: Vaughn, Murray State University

Persuasive Speaking
First: Sinquefield, University of Mississippi
Second: Ellis, Western Kentucky University
Third: Miller, University of Minnesota
Fourth: Harrington, University of Mississippi
Fifth: Lamb, University of Mississippi
Sixth: Joeckel, University of Nebraska

Poetry Interpretation
First: Nassar, Wayne State University
Second: Cutrone, University of Wisconsin-River Falls
Third: Clancy, Western Kentucky University
Fourth: Bascom, Mankato State University
Fifth: Myers, University of Alabama-Birmingham
Sixth: Ellis, Western Kentucky University

Prose Interpretation
First: Friedman, Murray State University
Second: Mandziuk, Wayne State University
Third: Miley, University of Mississippi
Fourth: Rowe, Emerson College
Fifth: Andrew, Ball State University
Sixth: Sinquefield, University of Mississippi
The Student Congress at the 1981 National Conference of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha deliberated on the general topic of “The Melting Pot.” Twenty delegates from nine colleges participated in these deliberations. The Speaker of the Assembly was Richard Sturgis, Clemson University, and the Clerk was Barbara McHugh, DePauw University.

The following record comprises the legislation approved by the 1981 Student Congress.

**CONGRESS BILL #1**

By Gary D. Button, Clemson University

AN ACT to recommend a supplemental summit meeting of world powers.

Whereas, the world refugee problem is at crisis proportions, representing an archipelago of human despair, and

Whereas, simply ignoring and refusing to discuss this problem in a rational manner offers no viable solution, and

Whereas, only through concourse and discussion can a feasible solution be found, and

Whereas, precedence concerning this situation can be found in the world summit meeting in 1938 at Evian and again in 1979 at Geneva,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That a written recommendation be sent to Washington urging a supplemental summit meeting of world powers be held to discuss viable alternatives and resolutions to this current refugee crisis.

**CONGRESS BILL #2**

By Richard Sturgis, Clemson University

AN ACT to revise existing bilingual education programs.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. Abolish the Bilingual Education Act of 1968.

Section 2. The Department of Education shall institute special English courses for minorities/ethnics during regular school hours. (a) The emphasis of these courses will be to mainstream foreign students and/or children of immigrant parents into the regular English curriculum. (b) The course shall not deny the students’ family heritages, but shall use that heritage as a base from which to further the students’ abilities to function in a predominantly English-speaking American society.

Section 3. This program shall be administered by the Department of Education.
Section 4. This program shall be financed out of the general revenues of the Department of Education with appropriations not exceeding $200 million dollars.

CONGRESS BILL #3

By the Immigration and Citizenship Committee

AN ACT to update and restructure the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Whereas, the effectiveness of the INS is damaged by internal administrative problems, and
Whereas, ineffectiveness is also due to internal corruption and abusive behavior of INS employees, and
Whereas, Congressional funding for changes in the INS is withheld for fear that such internal confusion would lead to waste of these funds, therefore,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That a Federal commission be appointed to oversee the restructuring of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and its administrative procedures.
Section 2. This commission be Congressionally appointed and have the authority to direct the use of currently withheld funds.
Section 3. This commission will consist of seven members.
Section 4. A system of fines and/or dismissal be instituted to provide punishment to INS employees found responsible for abuse or violation of INS policies and procedures.

CONGRESS BILL #4

By Gary D. Button, Clemson University

AN ACT to resolve the current refugee crisis in Southeast Asia.

Whereas, the growing refugee problems of Southeast Asia represents first and foremost a human tragedy of appalling proportions, and
Whereas, the presence of large refugee populations is a source of domestic concern, regional instability, economic problems, and religious and ethnic tensions to first-asylum countries and worldwide, and
Whereas, this situation represents a threat to peace in these regions and to the stability of United States allies, and
Whereas, the United States is a nation dedicated to the ideals of leadership, humanitarianism, and the eradication of oppression, and
Whereas, it is therefore to be considered a duty of the United States to attempt a solution to this problem,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That additional qualified Peace Corps and Red Cross volunteers be assigned to work in refugee camps.
Section 2. A network of new transit centers be created to alleviate existing pressures on present refugee camps.
Section 3. Funds be allocated for the purpose of resettling refugees to nations who are willing to accept said refugees but which do not have the
resources to do so, by the creation of an International Refugee Settlement Fund.

CONGRESS BILL #5
By Doug James and Paul Ingram, Murray State University
AN ACT to establish a national cultural exchange.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. Establish a national cultural exchange for the exhibition of articles, ideas, and activities representative of ethnic groups.

Section 2. These exhibitions shall be non-permanent displays of ethnic cultures and shall be made available to other American museums.

Section 3. The Smithsonian Museum shall coordinate the collection and loan of articles from the national museums of the country of origin and the acquisition of articles from American ethnic communities.

Section 4. Appropriations for the establishment of the museum and its exhibitions shall be $20 million for the first year of operation and $10 million for succeeding years.

Section 5. Zero-based review of these appropriations be made at least every five years by the Department of the Interior and the Congressional Oversight Committee for the Department of the Interior.

CONGRESS BILL #6
By the Immigration and Citizenship Committee
AN ACT to control the use of private immigration bills in Congress.

Whereas, these bills are used by foreign individuals to circumvent regular immigration laws, and

Whereas, such circumventions and attempted circumventions waste Congressional floor time, and

Whereas, the Abscam cases illustrate the existence of abuses of these bills,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That the use of private immigration bills be hereby limited to cases involving adoption of foreign children by American families.

CONGRESS BILL #7
By Laura Haug, University of Nebraska and Doug James, Murray State University
AN ACT to instate multi-cultural education for primary and secondary students.

Whereas, it is important for students to be aware of the rich cultural variety within the United States,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That the federal government shall encourage state governments to promote cultural education for primary and secondary students.
Section 2. School districts shall use social science textbooks which include the cultures of Black Americans, Indians, Chicanos, Jews, Slavs, Europeans, Orientals, and Muslims.

Section 3. School districts shall begin to use these textbooks no later than September 1, 1991.

Section 4. Any school district which does not comply will lose fifteen percent of any federal funds which they receive.

CONGRESS BILL #8

By the Immigration and Citizenship Committee

AN ACT to update the restrictions on entrance of immigrants to be consistent with changes in our laws.

Whereas, many of the administrative problems of the INS are caused by archaic and unenforceable laws, and

Whereas, the nature of our country grants individuals rights and beliefs,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That any prior conviction on the charge of possession of marijuana in this or any country of less than one ounce of marijuana is no longer considered a criminal charge for determining eligibility for entrance into this country under immigration laws.

Section 2. Anarchists and homosexuals will no longer be barred from immigration to this country.

CONGRESS BILL #9

By the Committee on Refugees

AN ACT to admit refugees to the United States.

Whereas, recent increases in the total number of refugees admitted have created immense problems in caring for and controlling refugees, and

Whereas, the indefinable criteria for quota exemptions denies to the American people control over the total number of people entering this country,

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That the refugee quota be redefined at fifty thousand refugees per annum without restriction to national origin.

Section 2. That the parole authority of the attorney general of the United States to grant exemptions to the refugee quotas be withdrawn.

Section 3. That refugees shall be redefined as those who are forced to leave their home country by a political body.

Section 4. That any sections of existing legislation in conflict with Section 1 or Section 2 of this bill are hereby repealed.

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #1

By Tricia Johnson, Clemson University and John Heinemann, Nebraska University

A resolution to guarantee compensation to American Indians.
Whereas, the 1790 Non-Intercourse Act provided that no land treaties be made between American Indians and private United States citizens, without approval of Congress, and
Whereas, such treaties were made without Congressional approval, and
Whereas, the land is still legally owned by those American Indians, and
Whereas, those citizens who presently occupy the land are not responsible for those treaties,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. That we support the idea of fair compensation to the Indian who illegally lost land under the above mentioned treaties wherever feasible.

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #2

By the Resolutions Committee

A resolution to show our appreciation of the people who helped to make this conference possible and successful.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1. We warmly thank Prof. Larry Schnoor—Conference Host, Dr. James Pratt—I.E. Director, Dr. Rita Flaningam—2-person Debate Director, Dr. Bill Henderson—Contemporary Issues Director, and Dr. Carl Flaningam—Conference Director.
Section 2. Especially related to the Congress, we show our appreciation to Kerry Greisbach, Jayne Dressen and Donald Parker.
Section 3. We also wish to thank Kathy Steiner—Speech Department Secretary, Guest Judges—Jan Jenson, Michael Nicoloi, Lucy Christen, James Weaver, Briani Halloon and Rick Lamers.
Section 4. We, the participants of Student Congress, extend a very special thank-you to Dr. Weiss for his work with Student Congress.
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EDITOR'S COMMENT

This issue marks the end of my term as editor of Speaker and Gavel. I wish to extend my personal thanks to the members of the Editorial Board for their support and diligent efforts over the past three years, to the two presidents of DSR-TKA who gave advice and encouragement during my tenure, to those who submitted manuscripts voluntarily and to those who submitted them when asked, and, most importantly, to those readers of this journal who have been patient in their waiting and kind in their comments.

It is my perception that Speaker and Gavel can play an increasingly vital role in the forensic community, and it is my hope that progress in fulfilling that position has been made in recent years. The diversity in audience for this journal is both problematic and invigorating. That diversity requires that many interests be reflected in these pages—contemporary critical efforts, pragmatic and theoretical concerns in debate and in individual events, issues and techniques of pedagogy—with the result that each of us becomes more aware of the other aspects of argumentation. Such awareness and concern is essential, I believe, for the continued prospects of forensics in the years to come. I look forward to watching Speaker and Gavel prosper under the editorship of Professor Auer.
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