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Stephanie Sue Sanford is a senior Speech Communication major at Wichita State University. She has been very active in the Wichita State forensics program for the past three years, and prior to this she competed for a year and a half for Coffeyville Community College.

Ms. Sanford has a diverse background in forensics. Specifically, she has been very active in debate and all ten of the individual events throughout her college career. She has won more than 100 awards in intercollegiate debate-forensics competition. Additionally, she has acted as the host (or co-host) for eight high school tournaments and Wichita State's college tournament for the past three years.

Finally, Ms. Sanford has excelled in both community service and academic endeavors. She has acted as judge/critic at numerous speech contests and has moderated several on-campus debates. She also has been an important force behind the Wichita State Student Speaker Bureau as a participant and administrator. In the midst of all these activities, she has maintained a 3.7 grade point average.
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Secretary

David Taylor, University of Mississippi
Sarah Carroll, Capital University
Robert Sommerfield, St. Anselm College
Eric Werner, Miami University

1984 DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

A Distinguished Service Award is presented by Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha to Professor Ronald Matlon of the University of Arizona.
A Distinguished Service Award is presented by Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha to Professor James F. Weaver of Iowa State University.
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No account of the life and career of Carl Edward Sagan can go far without centering upon his emergence as a consummate communicator. His success in bringing the expertise and imagination of the scientist to broad audiences has contributed to our national education. In him the age of science and the age of communication come together.

In creating and narrating the television series, "Cosmos," he brought the wonders and joys of exploring the universe to literally millions of fascinated viewers. And television is only one of the many media Sagan utilizes effectively. His books have included best sellers, and his articles are found in the most scholarly journals and the most popular of general circulation periodicals. He early became a master of the public lecture and has appeared
on many of our campuses as a visiting scholar. The most intriguing of his communication media have been the intergalactic voyagers, beaming universal symbols (such as “Hi, there”) to unknown extraterrestrial audiences. And even Sagan’s distinctive vocal articulation has gained him the heady compliment of ready caricature.

A distinguished scientist, Sagan proved to us that he could bring us not only scientific information, but also scientific curiosity, excitement, and concern. He is no stranger to advocacy and controversy. His influence has been substantial in the United States Space Program. His studies of the origins of life have pulled him inexorably into the “creationism” debates. And during 1983, the year of “The Day After,” his concern with the potential effects of nuclear warfare was expressed in teleconference activity with Soviet scientists on the subject as well as on American network television. His speech consistently meets DSR-TKA’s criteria of being intelligent, effective, and responsible.

Therefore, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, national honor society in forensics, is pleased to designate Carl Edward Sagan, professor of astronomy and space studies at Cornell University, as well as communicator par excellence to the populace of this planet and not impossibly of others, as recipient of its 1984 Speaker of the Year Award.
1984 DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARDS

Frank Angelo
Wayne State University

Frank Angelo's record as a journalist led the Wayne State University Chapter of DSR-TKA to nominate him for a Distinguished Alumni Award. Mr. Angelo is a former managing editor of the Detroit Free Press, a major national newspaper. He has been national president of Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalism honorary society, has served as president of the Michigan Associated Press Association, and is a member of the AP Managing Editors Association.

Gerald M. Phillips
Case Western Reserve University

The Pennsylvania State University Chapter of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is pleased to nominate Gerald M. Phillips for a Distinguished Alumni Award. Professor Phillips is one of the most active and productive members of the Speech Communication profession. He is the author of numerous books, monographs, and articles; he has been editor or associate editor of several communication journals; he has made many presentations to lay and professional groups outside the field of communication. His most important attribute is his leadership in the speech communication field in research and writing on shyness and reticent communication. Professor Phillips earned honors in Speech and Debate as an undergraduate and was a debate coach and director of forensics for eight years, first at North Dakota Agricultural College and later at Washington State University. He has been a faculty member at Pennsylvania State University since 1964.

Walter F. Probst
Wayne State University

Walter F. Probst is a leader in business. A lawyer by training, he graduated with honors from the University of Michigan Law School. He has served as executive vice president, president, and chairman of the board of the Essex Wire Corporation. When Essex Wire merged with United Technologies Corporation, he became a member of the executive committee of the merged corporation. He serves on the board of directors of two large banks, is a trustee of the Eisenhower Medical Center, and has served numerous other business and charitable organizations. Wayne State University Chapter of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is proud to nominate Mr. Probst.
1984 NATIONAL CONFERENCE RESULTS

Note: A fuller summary of individual and team achievements at the 1984 National Conference at the University of Nebraska will be published in the society's Newsletter. The following list constitutes only the major awards.

Team Sweepstakes

First University of Nebraska
Second Southern Methodist University
Third University of Mississippi
Fourth University of Utah
Fifth University of Kansas

NDT Debate Division

First University of Kansas (Rhaesa and Gaines)
Second Northern Iowa University (Fishbein and Wallace)
Semifinalists Butler University (Gatman and Perna)
Semifinalists University of Nebraska (Overing and Villhauer)

Top Five NDT Debaters
1. Gardner, University of Utah
2. Spicer, University of Utah
3. Wallace, University of Northern Iowa
4. Mastel, Macalester College
5. Davies, Macalester College

CEDA Debate Division

First University of Utah (Alberty and Tolbert)
Second Southwest Missouri State University (Groves and Green)
Semifinalists University of South Carolina (Osbaldiston and Johnson)
Semifinalists Weber State University (Cox and Degarias)

Top Five CEDA Debaters
1. Cox, Weber State College
2. Alberty, University of Utah
3. Firestone, University of Miami
4. Boyer, Weber State College
5. Poluton, University of Florida

Superior in Student Congress

Buroker, DePauw University
Danielson, Butler University
Koch, Southern Methodist University
Reynolds, Southern Methodist University
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Persuasive Speaking

First  
Wallace, University of Nebraska

Second  
Aden, University of Nebraska

Third  
Sanford, Wichita State University

Dramatic Interpretation

First  
Overmeyer, Kansas State University

Second  
Edwards, University of Mississippi

Third  
Guzalak, University of Florida

After-Dinner Speaking

First  
Bertrand, Wayne State University

Second  
Edwards, University of Mississippi

Third  
Edwards, Miami University

Extemporaneous Speaking

First  
Sanders, Kansas State University

Second  
Byrne, Miami University

Third  
Alberty, University of Utah

Prose Interpretation

First  
Rasmussen, Iowa State University

Second  
Brown, Murray State University

Third  
Hornbeck, University of Oklahoma

Impromptu Speaking

First  
Sherman, University of Mississippi

Second  
Andrus, Wayne State University

Third  
Aden, University of Nebraska

Expository Speaking

First  
Clark, Wichita State University

Second  
Aden, University of Nebraska

Third  
Sherman, University of Mississippi

Dramatic Duo Interpretation

First  
Hardin/Henry, Murray State University

Second  
Hurd/Baltzer, University of South Dakota

Third  
Edwards/Gillespie, University of Mississippi

Communication Analysis

First  
Rasmussen, Iowa State University

Second  
Sherman, University of Mississippi

Third  
Aden, University of Nebraska
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Poetry Interpretation

First: Hardin, Murray State University
Second: Wesley, University of Oklahoma
Third: Hornbeck, University of Oklahoma
ACTIONS OF THE DSR-TKA NATIONAL COUNCIL

Note: The full minutes of the semi-annual meetings of the National Council of DSR-TKA are published regularly in the Newsletter of the society. For the information of all members, summaries of the formal actions taken at these meetings will hereafter be printed in the Speaker and Gavel. The following section constitutes an account of motions passed at the three most recent meetings of the Council.

Actions of the DSR-TKA National Council Meeting
Cleveland, Ohio, March 9, 1983

Passed: That North Texas State University at Denton be approved for a chartered chapter.

Passed: That the National Council approve the invitation from the University of Nebraska to host the 1984 DSR-TKA National Conference (with dates to be determined later).

Passed: Because of careful planning and evident attention to detail, Be It Resolved that the National Council of Delta Sigma Rho Tau Kappa Alpha expresses appreciation to Dr. Austin J. Freeley, Reverend Thomas P. O'Malley, Lawrence L. Bachtel, James E. Traverse, Robert B. Carver, and members and friends of the John Carroll University Debating Teams and JCU DSR-TKA Chapter for their excellent hosting of the 1983 DSR-TKA National Conference.

Passed: That the lapel pin be included as an automatic benefit for student members, retroactive to January 1, 1983.

Passed: That future issues of the Speaker and Gavel be combined as follows—Volume 19, Nos. 1 & 2; Volume 19, Nos. 3 & 4; Volume 20, Nos. 1 & 2; Volume 20, Nos. 3 & 4; Volume 21, Nos. 1 & 2; Volume 21, Nos. 3 & 4.

Actions of the DSR-TKA National Council Meeting
Washington, D.C., November 10, 1983

Passed: That DSR-TKA accept the University of Kansas invitation for the National Conference to be held in a period between March 10–16, 1985.

Passed: That the Chairperson of the Standards Committee or the President write to the President (at Maryland, SUNY-Cortland, and other chapters) and advise that action to place these chapters on inactive status will be taken at the Council's next meeting.

Passed: That Marshall University in Huntington, West Virginia, be granted a chartered chapter of DSR-TKA.

Passed: That the University of Michigan-Flint, at Flint, Michigan, be granted a chartered chapter of DSR-TKA.

Passed: That numbers 1, 2, 3, & 4 of Volume 21 be combined into one issue and be mailed in May 1984.

Passed: That the DSR-TKA President and the Conference Director be
responsible for supplying the newsletter/journal editor with complete tournament results and memorabilia before leaving the tournament.

Passed: That all appointments be approved. Hagood as Trustee (3 year term), Rhodes as Conference Director (2 year term), Freeley as Chairperson of the Speaker of the Year Committee (2 year term), Flaningam as Chairperson of the Distinguished Alumni and Service Awards Committee (2 year term), Burkholder as Representative to the CIDD, McBath as Representative to the ACHS, and Jo Anne Miller as Advisor to the Student Council.

Passed: (1) That a one year waiting period be required, beginning from the date of notification (by certified mail) of an institution's intention to drop one honorary/honor society and join another honorary/honor society. (2) The intent of this motion is that applications cannot be approved until a school has been out of one group for at least one full year. The clock starts ticking from the time the school notifies one association (by certified mail) that it wishes to withdraw from the honorary or honor society. This certified letter must contain approval (signature) of the University President. (3) That DSR-TKA and Pi Kappa Delta should communicate on a more regular basis.

Actions of the DSR-TKA National Council Meeting
Lincoln, Nebraska, March 16, 1984

Passed: That $500 be presented to support the National Developmental Conference.

Passed: That the University of Maryland be placed on inactive status.

Passed: That the State University of New York be placed on inactive status.

Passed: That the dates for the 1985 National Conference be set for March 15, 16, and 17 (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday). This assumes registration and the National Council Meeting will occur on Thursday afternoon/evening, March 14.

Passed: A well deserved resolution of praise for the 1984 National Conference hosts.
THE SOUTH CAROLINA PRESIDENTIAL FORUM: AN INSIDER’S REPORT ON FORMAT

William M. Strickland

In February of 1980 the University of South Carolina and the newspapers of Columbia, South Carolina, proposed a public forum involving the Republican presidential candidates on the state’s ballot. The debate was scheduled to be held on the campus of the University of South Carolina on Thursday evening (9:00 p.m., E.S.T.), February 28—just eight days after the New Hampshire televised debate and only two days after the New Hampshire primary election. The South Carolina Educational Television Center, a local affiliate of the Public Broadcasting System (PBS), expressed interest in broadcasting the forum as a news event.

John Connally, Howard Baker, and George Bush were quick to accept the invitation to debate. Robert Dole did not accept the invitation until after the deadline for acceptance. He claimed that there had been a misunderstanding as to the requirement of a formal acceptance, and he was allowed to enter the debate. On the day before the debate, however, Dole withdrew because of his poor showing in the New Hampshire primary election. Other Republican candidates, John Anderson and Phillip Crane, not on the South Carolina ballot, were excluded from the debate.

At the time that the invitation was issued, Ronald Reagan had not yet agreed to any campaign debates, maintaining that intra-party debates would cause divisiveness among Republicans. After losing the Iowa Republican caucuses, where he refused to debate, Reagan seemed to reconsider his position. While campaigning in Greenville, South Carolina, in February (prior to both the New Hampshire and South Carolina primary debates) Reagan held a brief meeting with his South Carolina campaign manager (Carroll Campbell) and his Southern strategist (Lee Atwater) in which both aides advised him of the advantages of participating in the South Carolina debate. Reagan then went to a press conference and announced his intention to participate in the South Carolina debate. This was the first debate he had agreed to join, and his spur-of-the-moment decision upset some of his national advisors—some of whom accused Atwater of unduly influencing Reagan and thereby forcing him into the New Hampshire debate as well as into other forums. Although Reagan’s decision to debate in South Carolina may have forced him into other debates, it was a decision made by Reagan himself and not by his regional advisors.

Of course, no debate could occur until an appropriate format could be developed. As a university faculty member in speech, the author of this essay was called upon to help devise a format for the 1980 South Carolina Presidential Forum. The proposed “debate” would be ninety minutes in

William M. Strickland is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of South Carolina.

length involving the major Republican candidates on the South Carolina primary ballot—Howard Baker, George Bush, John Connally, Robert Dole, and Ronald Reagan.

Upon accepting the responsibility for devising an appropriate format for a televised “debate” involving four candidates, I discovered that there were no clear guidelines or even models for such an affair. The purpose of this essay, in part, is to provide such a model, as well as to explain the rationale for the format and to present an evaluation of it. This essay serves the additional purpose of providing an accurate account of format decisions for one of the seven televised presidential debates of the 1980 campaign.

Criteria for Format Decisions

The first criteria used in the decision-making process were the Federal Communication Commission’s (F.C.C.) regulations and decisions. This consideration was placed first on the list, for violation of F.C.C. rulings would result in withdrawal of the television coverage by the South Carolina Educational Television Network and would limit the viewing of the debate to the 350 people in attendance rather than to a nationwide audience. The second criterion used was that of fairness to the candidates. Justice and fair play are values in and of themselves, but in an event so influential in the selection of a presidential candidate they take on an added dimension of importance. The danger of format bias was carefully considered in all decisions. The event was planned not only to be fair, but also to appear fair. The third criterion was audience interest. While no attempt was made to create a circus for audience ratings, a debate not viewed would be, in effect, a debate not held. The final criterion concerned the technical requirements of television broadcasting. Of particular importance in this area was time management of the debate.

Speaking Order

Considerable research has indicated the importance of speaking order; hence, much thought was devoted to selecting the most appropriate method of establishing the order of appearance of the candidates in the debate. Four different options were considered. First, speaker positions could be assigned on the basis of recent public opinion polls. The candidate with the lowest ranking in the polls would speak first (the next highest second, and so forth), based on the notion that the candidates with the highest rankings in the polls had the presumption in the debate somewhat on their side, while those with the lowest rankings in the polls had a greater “burden of proof.” Second, speaker positions could be assigned on the basis of alphabetical order. A third option was to assign speaking order by lot. The final option was to rotate speaker positions within structured divisions of the debate.

The first option (popularity polls) was rejected because of practical problems, such as what polling firm should be used, what poll date would be used, and whether the polls should be national or South Carolinian. Also considered was the fairness in penalizing a candidate for leading in the polls. Option two, alphabetical order, unquestionably was objective, but it was
simply too arbitrary and had no rational basis for speaker placement. The
notion of deciding speaking order by lots also treated candidates equally
without any particular rational basis for placement, but it did have the ad-
advantage of being consistent with the public's concept of how to start con-
tests (i.e., football games). The fourth option (rotation) had the advantage of
minimizing the importance of speaking positions. If the debate were struc-
tured in four divisions, the first, second, third, and fourth positions would
be assigned to each participant. This last option was combined with the lot
option to determine speaking order. This combination was considered fair
and consistent with audience attitudes, and it diminished the effect of
speaking order on the outcome of the debate.

The Panel

The panel of questioners posed another series of format options. It was
decided that having only one or two questioners would limit the variety of
questions and would unnecessarily limit participation in the forum. With
more than four panelists, however, the audience might easily fail to perceive
any continuity to the debate. Hence, a panel of four questioners was se-
lected in order to have two panelists with national outlooks and two with
South Carolina ties. The panelists were Jack W. Germond, a political col-
umnist for The Washington Star; William Raspberry, a columnist for The Wash-
ington Post; Lee Bandy, Washington correspondent for The State (Columbia,
S.C.); and Kent Krell, associate editor of The Columbia Record.

It was decided that the debate moderator needed to be a person with
both nationally recognized objectivity and highly developed television skills.
In line with these criteria, Jim Lehrer (co-anchor of the Public Broadcasting
Service's MacNeil/Lehrer Report) was asked to serve as moderator.

Format Options for Questions

Perhaps the most complex aspect of the South Carolina debate was set-
tling upon a system for posing questions to the four presidential candidates.
Five different possibilities soon emerged: 1) each candidate could be asked
a single question by each panel member with the candidates rotating; 2)
each candidate could be asked the same questions; 3) each candidate could
be asked a single question with both the questioners and candidates rotat-
ing; 4) each candidate could be given a set time period to be questioned
by the whole panel; and 5) candidates could ask each other questions.

The last option was immediately rejected because of the feeling that the
candidates would be unwilling to participate in a cross-examination debate.
Option four (time periods for each candidate) was rejected because if a
viewer saw only a portion of the debate he would miss some of the candi-
dates. Furthermore, focusing on one candidate at a time would slow the
action and would reduce the interaction and comparison of candidates. If
the time periods were set at fifteen minutes, for example, each candidate
would have a period of forty-five minutes in which he did not speak at all.

Option three (rotating panel and candidates) would make it difficult for
the audience to follow and understand the debate; it would also make it
difficult for the viewer to compare the four candidates' answers to a partic-
ular panelist’s questions. The panelists’ roles, would also be more diffused and their impact reduced.

Option two (using the same questions for each candidate) had the advantages of allowing for direct clash and giving more of an appearance of a debate. It had the disadvantages of repeating answers and limited flexibility in fitting questions to an individual candidate’s background or positions. For example, a question on the milk fund controversy would be appropriate for Governor Connally and not for the others. Option one (single question with candidates rotating) had the advantage of fitting questions directly to the candidates, but the disadvantage of reducing the direct clash over issues.

Follow-Up Questions

In planning the South Carolina Presidential Forum, we worked with the knowledge that the F.C.C. had indicated that each candidate must be asked the same number of questions—but not necessarily the same questions. If follow-up questions are used in multi-candidate televised forums, they have to be asked in an orderly pattern which would guarantee that each candidate would be asked the same number. Follow-up questions would have the advantage of requiring specific answers and exposing the candidates with weak answers to greater risks. They would also add an interesting dimension to the debate through the give-and-take of the interaction.

Timing

Standard debate time cards were rejected because of the factors of human error and difficulty of immediate recognition. An electronic system of green, yellow, and red lights was rented from the Des Moines Register and Tribune. This system had the advantage of candidate familiarity from the Iowa debate. The green light was turned on when the speaker started and stayed on until 30 seconds remained, then the yellow light was switched on and remained on until 10 seconds was left, and then the red light was switched on until time was up. When the speaker’s time was up, no lights were on.

Format Decisions

The rotation and placement by lot of candidates in speaking positions provided for variety of order, audience interest, and minimized the importance of speaker position on the debate outcome. The decision not to rotate the panelists’ positions was made in order to provide a greater sense of continuity. The first round, which constituted the bulk of the debate, consisted of the candidates’ answering the same questions with the first respondents having two minutes and the “rebuttalists” one minute each. Each panelist had 30 seconds to pose each question during Round I. It was hoped that Round I would allow the audience to judge more easily both the positions of each candidate and the relative effectiveness of each candidate in discussing important issues. Round I was specifically designed to allow for direct clash. The questions were to involve major campaign issues which applied to all candidates. The shorter time period for rebuttalists was
Table 1. South Carolina Presidential Debate. Format for Round I (44 minutes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist’s Questions: (30 seconds each)</th>
<th>Candidate Answers: (2 minutes each)</th>
<th>Candidate Rebuttals: (1 minute each)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Upon Completion of the Above Sequence, a Second Series of Questions Began:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist’s Questions:</th>
<th>Candidate Answers:</th>
<th>Candidate Rebuttals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2. South Carolina Presidential Debate. Format for Round II (20 minutes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist Questions (15 seconds each)</th>
<th>Candidate Responses (one minute each)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germond</td>
<td>Connally, Bush, Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandy</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raspberry</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krell</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reagan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3. South Carolina Presidential Debate. Format for Round III (10 minutes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator's Questions (Lehrer)</th>
<th>Candidate's Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15 seconds each)</td>
<td>(one minute for each question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Question</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Question</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Question</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Connally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Question</td>
<td>Connally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chosen in order to reduce repetitious answers, which we feared would dampen audience interest in the program. The four tables outline the actual format for each of the four rounds.

Round II of the debate was designed to allow each of the panelists to tailor his questions to the individual candidates. It was hoped that this round would elicit responses to questions which would be inappropriate in the earlier round of general questions. This was a "rapid-fire" round in which each panelist directed one question to each candidate. The panelist had 15 seconds to ask each question, and the candidate had one minute to answer each question.

The third round of the debate consisted of questions from the moderator to each candidate. This was also a "rapid-fire" round, as Lehrer had the freedom to select the most relevant topics for scrutiny. In Round III of the debate the moderator posed a question (15 seconds) to a candidate, who in turn had a maximum of one minute to respond, whereupon the moderator

Table 4. Forum Time Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.V. Opening</th>
<th>1:00 minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator's Opening</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round I (General Questions)</td>
<td>44:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round II (Individualized Questions)</td>
<td>20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round III (Questions Follow-Up)</td>
<td>10:00 (flexible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Statements</td>
<td>8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator's Closing</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V. Closing</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td>88:00 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
posed a follow-up question (also 15 seconds) to the same candidate. This allowed Lehrer to select an area of the debate in which an individual candidate had been weak or evasive and ask a question about it and a follow-up question. The nature of Round III with its questions and follow-up questions could easily be used to manage time. Depending upon the time consumed previously in the debate, the answering times in Round III could be uniformly modified to bring the debate back on schedule.

Finally, closing statements (two minutes each) were included in order to give the candidates opportunities to highlight their strengths and/or to point out the other candidates' weaknesses. Based upon lots, the speaking order for these statements was: Reagan, Baker, Connally, and Bush.

Format Evaluation

The varying structure of the first three rounds and the closing summary provided for audience interest. The debate picked up speed and developed some suspense in the last two rounds. Round I, with candidates being asked the same question, allowed for direct clash on major campaign issues applicable to all candidates. The eight questions for this round involved the topics of: hostages in Bogota, the black vote, people and programs that would suffer from a balanced budget, nuclear waste, the Nashua, New Hampshire Republican debate controversy, candidate's qualifications, the number of paid black staff members on each campaign, and changes in labor laws. Only the question on the New Hampshire debate was not applicable to all candidates; it did not apply to Connally who did not show up for inclusion in the Reagan/Bush debate. This round revealed that the differences in the candidates' positions were almost non-existent. Only the question of handling nuclear waste resulted in a direct clash of positions among the candidates. Howard Baker seemed to sum up this characteristic of the debate when he remarked: "You know Republican candidates are sometimes accused of all saying the same things, and I expect we all believe the same thing."

The problem of boring, repetitive answers was minimized by shortened rebuttal time, the ability of the candidates to say the same thing differently, and the three questions which called for personal campaign information. As far as judging the quality of answers, only a partisan of one of the candidates would have concluded that there was a winner. Round I, while not particularly newsworthy, achieved the goals for that part of the format.

Of the sixteen questions asked in Round II, only two were not tailored to the individual candidate as they should have been. Both of these were general questions asked to Reagan—one about the legalization of marijuana and the other on counting illegal aliens in the census. This was an exciting round with many provocative questions. Connally was asked whether, after spending ten million dollars and only gaining ten percent of the vote in Iowa and New Hampshire, he could ever gain public confidence. Bush was asked why he was known for no outstanding achievements after holding so many jobs. Reagan was asked to comment on the statement made by his former campaign director John Sears that Reagan was the best stand-up campaigner but often not adequately briefed. Baker was asked how he—
the great compromiser of the U.S. Senate—could provide the leadership America wants. This round certainly fulfilled the objectives for which it was designed.

Jim Lehrer in Round III did an excellent job of selecting answers from previous questions to explore. In addressing Bush, Reagan, and Connally, Lehrer pursued a single line of questioning with each candidate, but when questioning Baker he posed two queries on unrelated topics. Lehrer's questions fulfilled the rationale for Round III by forcing the candidates to go into more depth on some generalities they had presented in the debate.

The closing statements were very disappointing from the perspective of debate issues. Not one of the candidates mentioned a single issue discussed in the debate; rather, all used their time for persuasive/inspirational messages. Reagan used his now famous narrative about the "city on the hill" and the quality of the American people. Connally called for a return to decency and old values while unleashing American business to do what it does best. Baker told of his belief that the future was before America and not behind it and that the United States would stay strong and contribute good to the world. Bush spoke of peace and prosperity through his leadership and of his conviction that America would draw strength from its diversity. The candidates had requested closing statements which would provide important time for any one of them to clarify a debate position. In this debate, however, no such need for clarification existed. The candidates, therefore, made closing statements which added little to the debate.

South Carolina Primary Results

While there were no winners or losers in the South Carolina forum, there were winners and losers in the state's Republican primary. Certainly, there was no causal relationship between primary and debate results. Baker, who was excellent in the debate, received only one percent of the vote. Bush received sixteen percent, Connally twenty-nine, and Reagan an impressive fifty-four.

Conclusion

While the South Carolina Republican President Forum did not arouse extensive media interest, it did provide the people an opportunity to evaluate the major candidates. The format selected enhanced rather than inhibited the exchange of ideas. The debate was broadcast not only in South Carolina, but on the vast majority of the 265 Public Broadcasting System (PBS) television stations throughout the United States. In fact, three different language versions of the debate were made available to PBS stations—an English language version, a version with simultaneous translation (by an announcer) into Spanish, and a third version which included sign language as well as audio in the English language.

The variety in speaker rotation and the format of each round provided fairness for the candidates and interest for the audience. The candidates could be easily compared on the basis of their answers to broad questions asked to all, specific questions tailored to each, follow-up questions, and closing statements. While the debate lacked some excitement due to the
lack of diversity in the candidates' responses, the format offers a useful framework for future primary election campaign debates.

Some Final Reflections

If I were asked to develop a new format for a political debate, I would structure it around a number of salient propositions determined by public opinion polls and candidate positions. The use of a small number of propositions of known interest to the public would allow time for both constructive and rebuttal remarks on all the propositions. This approach would allow for a livelier debate and more specific answers than did the South Carolina Forum. I would also try to establish a system of direct questioning by the candidates and eliminate the media's role as questioners. Panel members in the past have frequently become the adversary of all the debaters, creating a situation which makes a direct comparison of the candidates more difficult. Press questioners occasionally ask two questions as one, a practice which does not lend itself to a clear answer. Too many of the questions in the debate of 1976 and 1980 took up valuable time and did not result in any argumentation or refutation. A more interesting and a better debate with speeches and rebuttals could be created by having the candidates ask each other questions.

Future presidential debates are now likely because of public demand. Reagan learned in Iowa, Bush in New Hampshire, and Carter in the general election that voters react negatively to a candidate’s opposition to free and open debate. Sponsoring organizations should recognize the pressure to debate and stop letting candidates dictate debate procedure by threatening not to debate. Sponsors must also realize the American people will listen to longer speeches if they involve clash over significant candidate differences. Americans watch bad debates; there is little reason to believe they will not watch good ones.
FIGHTING A BRITISH GENERAL ELECTION:
THE VALUE OF PLATFORM ORATORY

Martyn Sloman

This article has both a primary and subsidiary purpose. The primary purpose is to assess how important an ability to perform capably on a public platform is to anyone who seeks and achieves candidature in a British General Election. A subsidiary purpose is to offer some observations, based on personal experience, on how one candidate at least tried to prepare himself to perform effectively when fulfilling public and internal party speaking engagements.

More so than in most journal articles of this type the author's perspective, attitudes and approach must influence its content. Some biographical details would form a helpful part of the text at the outset, therefore. I have been a Parliamentary Candidate for the British Labour Party at four of the last five General Elections. Although always unsuccessful, I have come within 2,000 votes of winning on three of those four occasions. The continued decline in the Labour Party's vote over this period has taken place at a time when the Party has moved consistently away from a pragmatic, Fabian, and gradualist (or moderate) approach towards a fundamentalist, all-embracing and fiercely committed (or left-wing) approach. Whether the move to the left and the loss of popular support are causally connected, and whether the move is to be welcomed as return to traditional socialist roots or deplored as a step towards political extinction, are questions that lie outside this paper. However, it is hopeless for any practising politician to claim objectivity, and I must admit to an unequivocal support for the moderates' position and arguments. In fact I received what could be regarded as the ultimate accolade in moderate Labour Politics: Tony Benn, the former Cabinet Minister most closely identified with the Labour Party's shift to the left, moved unsuccessfully in 1982 at the Party's National Executive Meeting that I be not approved as a Labour Parliamentary Candidate. I hope that this brief excursion into personal biography will help the reader to form a more balanced view of my arguments and I will return to the central themes of the paper.

Two stereotyped and conflicting views of the place of platform oratory in British electoral politics can be identified. The first is the romantic view
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to be found in novels. Here a jovial, if often vociferous, populace assembles seemingly without prompting to the market place to hear the candidate flatter, cajole and persuade. Silver-tongued oratory captures the day irrespective of substance, argument and issues and the inevitable electoral triumph is secured. The second is the modern and cynical view: "Over the years public meetings have slowly declined in importance. When asked about the most useful campaign activities, a mere 14% of candidates mentioned public meetings, compared to 55% who mentioned canvassing and 43% who mentioned publicity. Only a few M.P.s are able to fill even medium sized halls. Organisers now place more emphasis on walkabouts in market places, shopping precincts or other crowd-gathering centres."

The argument advanced in this paper is that neither the romantic nor the cynical view give a true picture, certainly as far as recent Labour Party experience is concerned. Against the romantic view one can agree with the cynics that the days when public meetings are the prime or even a major determinant of electoral results are long passed if they ever existed—save in respect of the meeting as a media event (see the later discussion on this). However that does not mean that one should dismiss platform oratory altogether. A capability to meet effectively the demands of public speaking engagements is an essential part of a candidate's equipment. It can enhance his or her prestige, particularly in difficult situations, and it is hard to see how an aspiring candidate can succeed let alone prosper without a modicum of oratorical ability. To understand why this is so, it is helpful to identify the different types of public and internal party speaking engagements where the candidate will need to perform before polling day in a General Election.

The first of these is the selection speech. In an attempt to secure a Parliamentary Candidature a candidate will appear in company with his rivals in front of anything from one to a dozen meetings of nominating bodies in the geographical area that forms a Parliamentary Constituency. In the Labour Party each of these bodies will have the right to put one name forward for consideration at a short-listing stage. The process culminates in the selection conference where typically five or six candidates speak for a quarter of an hour each, answer questions for another quarter of an hour, and a vote is taken to choose between them by the hundred or so delegates present.

Although in many cases the result of that vote can be determined in advance with a fair degree of accuracy, such are the political forces at play, it is difficult to see how, except under the most unusual circumstances, any
candidate could hope to succeed without some sophistication in the spoken word.

The second category of speaking engagement takes place after the candidate has been selected but before the election has been announced—this period can be anything up to two or three years. All sorts of occasions fall into this category but as a generalisation most of these will have taken place at the initiative of the candidate and gatherings with an audience of more than thirty will be rare. It is important, for example, that the candidate speaks to each of the Branch parties and to the local trade unions. In Nottingham special meetings on the welfare of the elderly and immigration law were held—reflecting my special interests. The 'nightmare' invitation is often expressed thus: "We are organising a meeting at our trade union branch on Tuesday and we would like you to speak to us on the effects of the two Employment Acts." This invitation delivered at four days' notice to the author requested an address on two of the most complex pieces of legislation to enter the British statute book. Bear in mind that the typical British Parliamentary Candidate has a full-time job outside politics, no research or secretarial facilities provided for him, and is lucky if any sponsoring body will meet even a proportion of his expenses.

Once an election is announced local constituency parties hold a formal adoption meeting at which their candidate, who was chosen at the selection meeting and has been plugging away at the interim public and party meetings, is endorsed as their standard bearer for the General Election. The candidate is proposed and seconded by leading local Party Members who say what an excellent person the candidate is and urge all Party Members to give him or her their fullest support. The candidate then gives the third category of address identified in this review—the adoption speech. This address which can be anything up to an hour in length is designed to set the tone of the campaign and to inspire the troops; it is also used as a test-bed in that successful passages of an adoption speech will reappear time and again in a different guise throughout the campaign. The fourth and final category of speaking engagement is those that occur between the adoption meeting and polling day: these are the whole variety of public election meetings that figure prominently in the romantic view of political oratory. These third and fourth categories will be discussed shortly in the context of experiences in Nottingham in the last General Election.

Before doing so, a second major strand in the argument should be introduced. These four categories of speaking engagements become far more important, and require far more preparation, forethought and skill, in a situation like the one experienced in the Labour Party in the last five years. They then become an essential part of the candidate's armory.

It is difficult to exaggerate the extent of the divisions that occurred within the Labour Party during the period of the 1979–83 Thatcher Government. Bitter, continuing and acrimonious internal rows were the order of the

---

7 See any of the General Elections' studies by David Butler including (4) above or D. A. Kavanagh, Constituency Electioneering in Britain (London: Longmans, 1970).
day—perhaps the nearest American equivalent would be the splits in the Democratic Coalition in the late 1960's. Whereas the survival and integrity of the Labour Party has in the past depended (and some would argue will continue to depend if it is to survive) on defeated factions accepting the verdict of the majority, in the four years in question matters were seldom if ever settled and sores were kept open. It was impossible for candidates to avoid taking sides and arguably moral cowardice for them to try to do so. In this situation, one could repeat the words of the post war Labour Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan: "We know what happens to people who stay in the middle of the road. They get run over." The content of a public or internal party speech therefore became a careful balance between making one's position clear to the internal party supporters and the electorate while offering some accommodation to those who were less ready to be enthused.

If we turn again to personal experience, my selection speech at Nottingham East in November 1982 can be used to illustrate some of these points. It began with a reference to my previous candidatures including my first in a very safe Conservative-held seat; this section was intended to demonstrate the depth of a long-standing commitment. There followed an extended section on the problem of unemployment in the City of Nottingham and a piece on the relevance and importance of traditional socialist measures in their solution. This argument could have been presented in a similar way by anyone in the Party. Then I nailed my colours irretrievably to the mast and revealed myself as a supporter of the moderate faction: "I must make my position clear. I am an orthodox, traditional member of the Party and a supporter of the Labour Party Solidarity Campaign. I will do everything in my power, whether as a Parliamentary Candidate or a member of the rank and file, to keep alive the spirit of mutual respect, tolerance and brotherhood that is characteristic of the Party at its best." I closed with a section pledging energy and determination.

The importance of trying to achieve some sort of balance continued thereafter and into the election campaign. It may now be helpful to provide some detail on the meetings that took place in the Labour Party's Nottingham East General Election Campaign in May/June 1983. The opening meeting, of course, was the internal Party adoption meeting, which was the point at which those members of the Party who would have preferred a left-wing candidate were invited to come to terms with the situation. I made a deliberate effort to conciliate ("I know that there are those amongst you who would have wished to see a more left-wing candidate. Let me say this. One of the most heartening experiences over the last few days has been to receive telephone calls from people who hold this view and have said now you are the candidate we will do everything we can to support and assist"). The meeting passed off without problems and no hands were raised against endorsement. Public or open meetings were held regularly throughout the campaign. In the three weeks between adoption and polling day ten such meetings took place generally in public halls in different parts of the constituency. Mostly the audiences fell somewhere between twenty and fifty in size and a local Party Member chaired the meeting. The constituency had decided
that supporting speakers should, if possible, include a high proportion of women, young socialists and members of ethnic minorities. Typically, after the Chairman's introduction, the supporting speaker would orate for ten minutes and I would then speak for half an hour. A question session lasting up to an hour would follow. On one occasion I was supported on the platform by a neighbouring Member of Parliament and on another by the President of the Nottinghamshire Miners, a nationally known trade union figure.

One public meeting attracted a capacity audience of well over a thousand: this marked the visit of Michael Foot, the Party Leader, to the City. Each of the three Labour Candidates in the City participated in this large gathering. The one sitting Member of Parliament who was defending his seat chaired the meeting; then I, Michael Foot, and the third candidate spoke in turn. No questions were taken in what was essentially a rally of the faithful, the highspot of the campaign and, above all, a media event. Extracts from Michael Foot's speech appeared on the national evening television news. The meeting was therefore designed as a platform for the Party Leader to address a mass audience much wider than those who were physically present. The meeting as a media event marks the culmination of the trend that has been observable since Victorian times: the purpose of an election meeting for the national Party Leadership has been uprated from an attempt to secure a result in a given constituency, through mass gatherings in a national campaign, to a forum for media attention.

The content of my speeches on all these occasions varied little. I dwelt on three main themes: economic policy and unemployment (concentrating especially on the problems of the young where I had some experience from my working environment to refer to); the future of the welfare state; and nuclear defence (where the Party's internal divisions were at their worst).

I doubt if many votes were actually won or lost by the quality of my performance—the numbers attending were tiny compared with the electorate. If votes were won or lost through meetings this process occurred through the agency of the 'national media' meeting described above. These local platform excursions did however serve two purposes. They managed to persuade some of the doubters within the Party that, even if I would have not been their choice at the selection conference, I was capable of doing a competent job for the Party. Second, a significant section of the overall audience consisted of traditional Labour voters who wanted to be reassured that the Party had not changed as much as they feared. I believe therefore that these meetings were worthwhile.

This section on the public meetings held during the election should not conclude without mentioning two other forms of gathering: the meetings when the candidates from the different parties debated together and the special meetings held for various interest groups.

During the 1983 General Election the four Nottingham East candidates (Conservative, Labour and Co-operative\(^9\) (1), Social Democratic and a maverick independent) appeared together on the same platform twice: once to debate the deployment of cruise missiles under the auspices of the local

\(^9\) See note 1.
campaign for nuclear disarmament; once to appear on an hour's programme for the local commercial radio network transmitted live from the City's Market Square. The first occasion required the candidates to make a ten-minute statement of position; the second was a question and answer session. They were probably the most taxing activities of the whole campaign. The fact that only two joint platforms were arranged may seem surprising to a foreign observer of British politics; to a domestic observer the surprise is that any such occasions were held. It marked a switch in approach by the Conservative Party who had previously shown a reluctance to appear on joint platforms.

The major special interest group meetings held during the 1983 General Election in Nottingham were those organised by and for the minority ethnic groups—especially the Asian voters who originated from the Punjab. The purpose of these meetings was mainly to assure the members of the community that the candidate was aware of and would support the Party's new policies on immigration and nationality; the vast majority of Asian voters supported the Labour Party for this reason.

The courtesy of the hosts made these meetings perhaps the most enjoyable part of the campaign and provided one fond and amusing memory. The pattern for these meetings was that a Chairman from the community would introduce the candidate and then, before I addressed the meeting, would call on another community member to speak in my support. This supporting speaker would start by speaking in English, but after a few sentences invariably say "With the greatest respect to the candidate I can best make my political points in my own native language" and continue in Punjabi. At one of these meetings quite inadvertently a non-Asian native Nottingham elector had heard in advance that the candidate was appearing at the local hall and, not realising that it was designed for a special group, had come along to listen. Far from being embarrassed he seemed to enjoy the experience and I noticed that he proceeded to join in the applause that greeted every important political point made in Punjabi and shared in the jokes.

Before this article concludes some final points should be made about the preparation required if a candidate is to perform effectively throughout a General Election. Two relevant comments have already been made: first, the fact that the candidates have no research facilities provided for them (secretarial facilities are provided during the campaign); second, the fact that the adoption meeting speech is used as a pilot run for the other public meetings.

In practice I found that development of the three major themes (employment, the welfare state and nuclear defence) was sufficient for almost all occasions except the meetings held for the Asian voters where, obviously, concentration on race relations, immigration and nationality was required. Over the eighteen months between the selection conference and polling day I built up detailed files of cuttings on these subjects which proved, if anything, too voluminous. Two useful supplements emerged during the campaign. First, the Labour Party nationally mailed to all candidates each morning a three or four page news sheet which contained facts and comments on the vital immediate issues. Second, early indications suggest-
ed to me that the record of the Labour controlled authority on rents and repairs of the municipal housing stock would be under attack; I therefore asked a close political colleague, a former local authority housing spokesman, to visit Nottingham and prepared a position paper. Beyond that, it came down to what I could remember from my files as summarised on four or five prompt cards kept in my inside pocket.

It is impossible to produce a paper like this without relying heavily on personal experiences and the risk of it becoming anecdotal. It is hoped that these excursions into personal recollections have not detracted from the main argument advanced: effective platform performance is, and is likely to remain, an essential part of the armoury and equipment of every aspiring candidate; its purpose is to reassure those, from inside and outside the Party, who seek such reassurance rather than to convert vast numbers of the electorate. It therefore becomes far more important on occasions like that faced in the British Labour Party recently where divisions and factionalism necessitated a careful and cautious approach.
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<td>Theodore F. Sheckels, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Richmond, VA 23173</td>
<td>Alan Cirlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke, Salem, VA 24153</td>
<td>William R. Coulter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402</td>
<td>Phillip Warken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22901</td>
<td>Dan Sutherland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, VA 24450</td>
<td>Gayla McGlamery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA 24061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington and Lee, Lexington, VA 24450</td>
<td>Halford Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia, Morgantown, WV 25606</td>
<td>Dennis Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Wesleyan, Buckhannon, WV 26201</td>
<td>Gary Eckles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185</td>
<td>Patrick Micken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region IV**

**Acting Governor:** Skip Coulter, Samford University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama, University, AL 35486</td>
<td>Frank Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, Auburn, AL 36830</td>
<td>Ken Himes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea, Berea, KY 40403</td>
<td>George B. Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson, Clemson, SC 29631</td>
<td>Bernard Duffy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, Davidson, NC 28036</td>
<td>Jean Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke, Durham, NC 27706</td>
<td>William Griffith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee, Johnson City, TN 37601</td>
<td>Paul A. Walwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky, Richmond, KY 40475</td>
<td>Max B. Huss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory, Atlanta, GA 30327</td>
<td>Melissa Wade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611</td>
<td>Donald E. Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State, Tallahassee, FL 32306</td>
<td>Gregg Phifer (Sp.)</td>
<td>Marilyn Young (Dir.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, Athens, GA 30602</td>
<td>Patricia Linder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506</td>
<td>J. W. Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Macon, GA 31207</td>
<td>Bill Slagle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33126</td>
<td>Mike Gotcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi, University, MS 38677</td>
<td>Jo Anne Miller Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State, Mississippi State, MS 39762</td>
<td>Sidney R. Hill, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State, Murray, KY 42071</td>
<td>Robert A. Valentine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Alabama, Florence, AL 35630</td>
<td>Eugene Balof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Stephen C. Koch, Miami University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lt. Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Jennings, Illinois State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albion, Albion, MI 49224</td>
<td>Bruce Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma, Alma, MI 48801</td>
<td>Cathy Ling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State, Muncie, IN 47306</td>
<td>Judie Mosier Thorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Indianapolis, IN 46208</td>
<td>Martha Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital, Columbus, OH 43209</td>
<td>Thomas S. Ludlum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637</td>
<td>Charles D. O’Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221</td>
<td>Lucille M. Pederson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison, Granville, OH 43023</td>
<td>William A. Dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw, Greencastle, IN 46135</td>
<td>Robert O. Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover, Hanover, IN 47243</td>
<td>Barbara Garvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram, Hiram, OH 44234</td>
<td>Linda Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801</td>
<td>Kenneth E. Anderson (Sp.) Jimi G. Cantrill (Dir.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State, Normal, IL 61761</td>
<td>Craig Cutbirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana, Bloomington, IN 47405</td>
<td>J. Jeffery Auer (Sp.) Karen King Lee (Dir.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana-Purdue, Ft. Wayne, IN 46805</td>
<td>Robert Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State, Terre Haute, IN 47809</td>
<td>Marjorie Hesler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll, Cleveland, OH 44118</td>
<td>Austin J. Freeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola, Chicago, IL 60611</td>
<td>Elaine Bruggemeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester, N. Manchester, IN 46962</td>
<td>Ronald Aungst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Oxford, OH 45056</td>
<td>Stephen C. Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48104</td>
<td>James R. Springton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan-Flint, Flint, MI 48503</td>
<td>Michigan State, East Lansing, MI 48823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum, New Concord, OH 43762</td>
<td>Jerry L. Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern, Evanston, IL 60201</td>
<td>Thomas Goodnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556</td>
<td>Bro. John Doran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin, Oberlin, OH 44074</td>
<td>David A. Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio, Athens, OH 45701</td>
<td>Richard Dempsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State, Columbus, OH 43210</td>
<td>David Radanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, OH 43015</td>
<td>Edward Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-Hulman, Terre Haute, IN 47803</td>
<td>Donald Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, Toledo, OH 43612</td>
<td>Norbert H. Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash, Crawfordsville, IN 47933</td>
<td>Lee McGaan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wayne State, Detroit, MI 48202 ........................................ George Ziegelmueller
Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 ........................... Archie Watson
Wittenberg, Springfield, OH 45501 .................................... Ernest Dayka
Wooster, Wooster, OH 44691 ......................................... Barbara Hampton
Xavier, Cincinnati, OH 45207 ........................................ Willlan A. Jones

Region VI
Governor: Vernon McGuire, Texas Tech University
Baylor, Waco, TX 76703 ............................................. Robert Rowland
Houston Baptist, Houston, TX 77074 ................................. Rex R. Fleming
Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, LA 70803 ............................ Harold Mixon
North Texas State, Denton, TX 76203 ................................ John Gossett
Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019 ....................................... Craig Dudczak
Southern Methodist, Dallas, TX 75175 ............................. John McMurphy
Texas, Austin, TX 78712 ............................................. Richard Cherwitz
Texas Tech, Lubbock, TX 79409 ....................................... Vernon R. McGuire
Tulane, New Orleans, LA 70118 ...................................... Edwin Anderson

Region VII
Governor: Donn Parson, University of Kansas
Creighton, Omaha, NE 68183 ....................................... Fr. Marion Sitzmann
Grinnell, Grinnell, IA 50112 .......................................... Robert L. Kemp
Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242 ........................................... James F. Weaver (Sp.) John R. E. Bliese (Dir.)
Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045 ......................................... Donn Parson
Kansas State, Manhattan, KS 66502 ................................. Harold J. Nichols (Sp.) Duane Hemphill (Dir.)
Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211 ..................................... James Gibson
Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588 ......................................... Jack Kay
Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA 50613 ............................... Bill Henderson
Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, MO 65738 ................... Richard Stovall
Wichita State, Wichita, KS 67208 .................................... Robert Vartabedian

Region VIII
Governor: Larry Schnoor, Mankato State University
Augustana, Sioux Falls, SD 57102 .................................... Michael Pfau
Mankato State, Mankato, MN 56001 ................................. Larry Schnoor
Marquette, Milwaukee, WI 53233 ..................................... Stephen J. Spear
Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455 ................................... Clark Olsen
North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND 58201 ............................... David Clinton
South Dakota, Vermillion, SD 57069 ............................... Carl Flaningam
Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706 ........................................ James W. Pratt
Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201
Wisconsin-River Falls, River Falls, WI 54022
Region IX
Governor: James A. Johnson, Colorado College

Brigham Young, Provo, UT 84601
Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309
Colorado College, Colorado Springs, CO 80903
Denver, Denver, CO 80210
New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87701
New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, NM 87701
Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112
Utah State, Logan, UT 84322
Weber State, Ogden, UT 84408
Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82070

Nancy Rooker
William Fischer
James A. Johnson
Charles Brody
Tom Jewell
Dorothy Beimer
Jack Rhodes
Harold J. Kinzer
David Berube
B. Wayne Callaway

Region X
Acting Governor: Jack H. Howe, California State University–Long Beach

California State–Fullerton, Fullerton, CA 92634
California State–Long Beach, Long Beach, CA 90801
Nevada, Reno, NV 89557
Occidental, Los Angeles, CA 90041
Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403
Oregon State, Corvallis, OR 97331
Pacific, Forest Grove, OR 97116
San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94117
San Francisco State, San Francisco, CA 94132
Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90007
Stanford, Stanford, CA 94305
Washington State, Pullman, WA 99163
Whittier, Whittier, CA 90608
Willamette, Salem, OR 97301

Lucy B. Keele
Jack H. Howe
David Hoffman
Steve Combs
David Frank
Ron Manuto
Melan Jaick
Lawrence D. Medcalf
Thomas Hollihan
David Strother
Gregg Walker
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