

Volume 39, 2002 Speaker and Gavel

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



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

Recommended Citation

(2002). Volume 39, 2002 Speaker and Gavel. Speaker & Gavel, 39, 1-56.

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in Speaker & Gavel by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Volume 39, 2002 Speaker and Gavel

Cover Page Footnote

This digitized copy was created from a donated print copy made to the University Archives at Minnesota State University, Mankato by Dr. Kellie Roberts, University of Florida, Director of Forensics in January 2021.

Speaker and Gavel

The “Vichy Syndrome” and Legal Decision-Making in French Holocaust Trials

Marouf Hasian, Jr.

**Metaphysical Tales of Hate and *Differance*:
A Narrative Analysis of Gayman’s
“The Book of Adam”**

Scott R. Stroud

**Papers from the
2001 Tahoe Conference on Academic Debate**

**Former Forensics Directors Don’t Die
and They Just Shouldn’t Fade Away**

K. Jeanine Congalton & Clark D. Olson

**The Role of Debate in the Educational Systems
of Countries in Transition to Democracy:
A Case Study of Romania**

Florin A. Sava

Guest Editor’s Essay

**A Preliminary Indictment of the Current Slate of
Individual Events (and what to do about it)**

Thomas Kuster

Journal of
DELTA SIGMA RHO—TAU KAPPA ALPHA

Speaker and Gavel

Published by Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society

EDITORS

Daniel Cronn-Mills
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Mankato, MN 56001
507.389.2213
daniel.cronn-mills@mnsu.edu

Kirstin Cronn-Mills
1920 Lee Boulevard
South Central Technical College
North Mankato, MN 56003
507.389.9951
kirstin.cronn-mills@sctc.mnscu.edu

EDITORIAL BOARD

Susan J. Balther, DePauw University
Jon Bruschke, California State University, Fullerton
Ann Burnett, North Dakota State University
James Dittus, Highland Community College
Lisa Flores, Arizona State University
David Gaer, Minnesota State University, Moorhead
JanieM. Harden Fritz, Duquesne University
Karla Leeper, Baylor University
Allan Loudon, Wake Forest University
Mark Meister, North Dakota State University
Edward Panetta, University of Georgia
Lisa Perry, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Jeff Pierson, Bridgewater College
Kimberely Powell, Luther College
David Williams, Texas Tech University

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

S&G publishes refereed articles addressing all aspects of communication theory and practice. Authors should submit three copies of their manuscript prepared according to the latest edition of MLA or APA guidelines. Use minimal endnotes only for exposition or explanation, not as bibliographic citations. Include a cover letter identifying author(s) and affiliation(s). Remove all references in the manuscript to author and affiliation to facilitate blind review. for quicker processing of accepted manuscripts, enclose a computer disk with an accurate copy of your manuscript; clearly label the the disk with OS platform (e.g., macintosh, Windows 3.1) and word processing software.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 39 / 2002

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| The “Vichy Syndrome” and Legal Decision-Making in French Holocaust Trials Marouf Hasian, Jr. | 1 |
| Metaphysical Tales of Hate and Differ ^{ance} : A Narrative Analysis of Gayman’s “The Book of Adam” Scott R. Stroud | 23 |

Papers from the 2001 Tahoe Conference on Academic Debate

| | |
|--|----|
| Former Forensics Directors Don’t Die and They Just Shouldn’t Fade Away K. Jeanine Congalton & Clark D. Olson | 36 |
| The Role of Debate in the Educational Systems of Countries in Transition to Democracy: A Case Study of Romania Florin A. Sava | 42 |

Guest Editor’s Essay

| | |
|--|----|
| A Preliminary Indictment of the Current Slate of Individual Events (and what to do about it) Thomas Kuster | 50 |
|--|----|

Speaker and Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha National Honorary Forensic Society

NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: Vicki Karns, Suffolk University
Vice President: Joann Edwards, University of Mississippi
Secretary: Bruce Wickelgren, The Ohio University
Treasurer, Mike Edmonds, Colorado College
Historian: Robert Weiss, DePauw University

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editors Daniel Cronn-Mills, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Kirstin Cronn-Mills, South Central Technical College

Office Kathy Steiner

The “Vichy Syndrome” and Legal Decision-Making in French Holocaust Trials

Marouf Hasian, Jr.

Abstract

This essay unpacks some of the communicative dimensions of French Holocaust Trials. By looking at the controversial Barbie and Touvier legal proceedings, the author explores some complications that attend legal commentaries on the “Vichy Syndrome.” In the aftermath of World War II, many French legal authorities believed in the Gaullist myths of national French resistance, but the passage of time has brought renewed interest in the documentation of Vichy collaboration. A rhetorical analysis of these cases illustrates the problematic nature of Holocaust trials that attempt to instantiate partial visions of World War II histories and memories.

Introduction

These trials served an important function in re-examining long-buried events. . . . In the end, it was as if history was being rewritten by a fairer and more benevolent hand, because some form of reparation could be made.

Ted Morgan, May 22, 1994.¹

In the last several years, a growing number of communication scholars have taken an interest in exploring the role that “memory” places in various forms of public deliberation.² They have joined the interdisciplinary communities that have looked into the persuasive dimensions of a variety of objects, including museum artifacts, films, memorials, scrapbooks, calendar days, diaries, and historiographies.³ This renaissance of interest in the functions and structures of particular collective remembrances provides researchers with some unique opportunities, because both lay persons and scholars seem genuinely interesting in understanding some of the “consequences of memory.”⁴

In this particular essay, I would like to join in this scholarly conversation by looking at the role that legal decision-makers play in this modern memory work. Douglas has recently noted that an examination of “a specialized legal instrument, the criminal trial,” can be “used as a tool of collective pedagogy and as a salve of traumatic history.”⁵ This is a very strong claim, because Owen and Ehrenhaus have shown us some of the difficulties that one encounters when individuals and societies try to work through their “traumatic” memories.⁶ Zelizer has similarly remarked that all forms of “witnessing” and remembrance

Marouf Hasian, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Communication, 255 S. Central Campus Drive Room 240, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112.

Marouf.Hasian@m.cc.utah.edu

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 39 (2002), 1-22

involve the use of selective rhetorical frames, meaning that we always run the risk of forgetting other perspectives.⁷

Throughout this essay, I will argue that most Holocaust trials do not serve any unique communicative purposes, and that the costs of these trials outweigh their benefits. While there is little question that Holocaust remembrances do serve vital functions, we need to be aware of the fact that there are many extra-judicial forums that could be used to accomplish this task. As Roy Schwartzman has recently observed, we need to avoid having memory “degenerated to *memoria technica*,” where “long lists of information” are used to “impress audiences,” but “hardly serving any significant social functions.”⁸ As I argue below, staging Holocaust trials that reconstruct legal histories and memories of bygone years are popular with some political constituencies, but they raise a series of questions about procedural fairness and substantive due process rights. After the passage of more than half a century, memories fade, witnesses die, documents get buried, rules about statute of limitations get altered because of changing administrative leadership, and some parties have to sit in the docks because they have outlived their more culpable leaders. The importance of these issues means that communication scholars need to take up the challenge of exploring some of the rhetorical dimensions of these national and international Holocaust trials.

In order to unpack some of the communicative dimensions of this legal memory-work, I undertake a case study that investigates some of the rhetorical dimensions of what some have called the “Vichy Syndrome.” In the afterglow of V-E day in Europe, many French citizens joined in the celebrations that marked the victorious end of the Allied conquest of the Third Reich, but suspicious observers were sometimes pointing out that many French politicians were forgetting the amount of collaboration that took place under German occupation. The “Free French” forces might talk about how most of the population supposedly supported the resistance, and purges did take place, but how did these rhetors explain the discrimination, the segregation, or the Aryanization of various laws that were passed during the “Vichy” years?¹⁰ Charles DeGaulle tried to answer these critics by arguing that the France that had emerged from the war was an undivided nation, whose resistance fighters had maintained a four-year struggle against a few Nazi collaborationists.¹¹ From within this Gaullist narrative, France had liberated herself from Hitler’s minions. The Allied acceptance of such legal storytelling had pragmatic consequences, for it meant that France would not be occupied in the post-war era.

Yet as I argue below, the acceptance of such tales created a number of rhetorical problems for future decision-makers who might be interested in the prosecution of French war criminals.

The preservation or erosion of particular memories of French complicity is obviously a very volatile judicial issue, for both domestic and international observers. During the war, more than 75,000 Jews were deported out of France, and for almost half a century scholars have been intrigued by the question of how to deal with the French “Vichy syndrome.” Should scholars and lay persons simply accept the Gaullist myth and engage in collective acts of cultural amnesia? How have various French tribunals handled these legal memories, and has this helped

or hurt the working through of Holocaust memories? I argue that by comparing and contrasting the judicial memories that operated in the cases of Klaus Barbie (Gestapo chief), and Paul Touvier (Lyon milice),¹² we gain an appreciation of the incremental nature of the working through of French traumatic pasts. During these two trials, some audiences had to decide whether they were willing to engage in revisionist historicism, and there were vehement disagreements about the benefits that came from the opening up of some old political wounds. Moreover, these trials brought to the surface some generational differences in the ways that French citizens were willing to remember and forget Vichy France's dealings with the Nazis.

For communication scholars who are interested in the intimate relationship that exists between argument, history, and memory, this particular case study provides us with a heuristic lens that allows us to view how certain remembrances can shape the ways that national communities think about strengths and limitations of what once scholar has called "didactic legality."¹³ This concept invites critics to look into the question of whether courts are in the business of exercising "legal judgment" and the clarification of the "historical record."¹⁴ Are judicial forums equipped to provide closure for cases of legal justice and collective pedagogy?¹⁵

In order to help provide some tentative answers to such questions, this essay has been divided into four major segments. The first portion of the essay begins the analysis by exploring some of the cultural expectations that led to the judicial interrogation of Klaus Barbie, a notorious Nazi leader. This section illuminates many of the ideological barriers that stand in the way of the collective "working through" of certain memories. The second section builds on this analysis by showing how the trial of Paul Touvier provided some of these same communities with new opportunities for getting rid of their Vichy syndrome and how such sentiments eventually led to the trial of a Frenchman by the name of Paul Touvier. Both of these trials raised a number of issues that many members of the French community had hoped would be forgotten—the complicity of some French police with the Nazis, the colonial troubles in Algeria, and the popularity of Holocaust revisionism in France. While many interdisciplinary scholars hoped that some of these trials would help the French people with their Holocaust consciousness-raising, this proved to be a difficult and complicated task.

**Klaus Barbie, the Trials in Lyon,
and France's Experimentation with "Crimes Against Humanity"**

I fought the Resistance, which I respect, with hardness; but it was war and the war is over.¹⁶

Klaus Barbie, 1987
closing remarks at his trial

I would guess that if most international scholars and lay persons were asked to name history's worst war criminal they would probably mention the name of Adolf Eichmann, but I am convinced that they are thinking of the actions of someone like Klaus Barbie, the Nazi Gestapo captain who received medals for his counter-"terrorist" activities during World War II. Proceedings against Barbie would be-

gin in the 1980s, but there have always been observers who have complained that this belated justice provided an index of the unwillingness of many French to re-think the extent of the complicity and collaboration that might have taken place after the Nazi occupation.¹⁷ For decades, critics outside of France had complained that this was a nation occupied by a people who refused to accept Vichy's role in the occupation, and now Barbie's trial was viewed as France's answer to this criticism. Yet there were some who saw this as merely an example of an evil villain finally being brought to justice. As Brendan Murphy (who spend a great deal of time interviewing many of Barbie's victims, neighbors, and protectors) noted in 1983:

The trial of another prominent Nazi war criminal is now approaching, but no such lesson of *banality* can be drawn from the life of Klaus Barbie, the so called "Butcher of Lyon." If Eichmann was the detached bureaucrat expediting millions to gas chambers and crematoria in Eastern Europe, Barbie is the very opposite. He was closer in nature to the reality of the Nazi ethos: a brutal man of evil intent. . . . He was not only able to commit the crimes for which he was twice condemned to death by French military tribunals, but he was able to avoid punishment for almost forty years afterwards. . . . he became the prototype of unchastened criminality [emphasis in the original].¹⁸

During the immediate post-World War II period, French authorities searched for Barbie, but in the postwar intelligence years, it was said that he received the protection of the American Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC).¹⁹ Barbie was considered to be a person who could help the fledgling U.S. intelligence services establish spy networks that would counter communism, and in exchange for this aid he was given a new passport (under the name of "Klaus Altmann") and a Bolivian visa. Even though authorities in France and Germany were able to track him down again in the early 1960s, the lack of extradition treaties with Bolivia meant that he was temporarily living in safety. When surviving relatives of some of his alleged victims tried to bring him to trial in West Germany in 1971, a Munich prosecutor determined that it was then impossible to prove that Barbie knew that the Jews he had arrested for deportation were going to be gassed at Auschwitz, and the case was dropped.²⁰ Three years later, Bolivia rejected French demands for Barbie's extradition.²¹

Yet in spite of these national and international obstacles, by the late 1970s and early 1980s it was clear that a growing number of private individuals and public communities had not given up hope that Barbie would eventually be tried in some courtroom. Officials in both France and Israel expressed an interest in prosecuting Barbie.²² His wartime suppression of thousands of resistance fighters, communists, and Jews were acts that were still remembered by a number of victims, bystanders, and perpetrators. Barbie had been a key figure in the Nazi re-occupation of France in late 1942, and it was alleged that for the next several years he was personally involved in the deportation or killing of thousands of Europeans. Decades later, some the survivors supplied some of the most gruesome details of the

weeks that were spent in places like Lyon's Fort Montluc or the Ecole de Santé. A reporter for the *Los Angeles Times* would later report that the commencement of the Barbie proceedings would show the world how France was going to interpret the concept of "crimes against humanity."²³

When Barbie was brought to France in 1983, this was not the first time that he had been involved in these types of hearings. Military courts in Lyon had determined in 1952 and in 1954 that he had committed war crimes while he was fighting the French Resistance, but he had managed to make his escape.²⁴ In situations like this, the passage of time usually means that a defendant may be protected by the statute of limitations for war crimes, but during the 1980s many nations were beginning to treat crimes against humanity as "imprescriptable crimes," which meant that such acts would be free of any statute of limitations.²⁵ French audiences now read that Barbie was going to be tried for the following actions:

1. The arrest and assassination of a local police officer and 22 others, including women and children, in retaliation for an armed action against two German military policemen during the summer of 1943;
2. The arrest and torture of 19 persons in Lyon during the summer of 1943;
3. The liquidation of the Lyon Committee of the General Union of the Jews in France (U.G.I.F) in February of 1943;
4. The execution by firing squad of 42 persons; including 40 Jews, in Lyon and the surrounding area during 1943-1944;
5. A raid against a workshop in August of 1944. Several people were arrested, wounded, or killed; and
6. The August 11, 1944 deportation of some 650 people (half were Jews) to the Auschwitz and Ravensbruck concentration camps.²⁶

These formal charges were the only "remaining legal" types that "could be brought for his part in the Holocaust."²⁷ Unlike some of the other Holocaust trials that were taking place during the last quarter of the twentieth century, this was one trial that involved both documentary evidence and victims' testimonials. A battery of more than 40 prosecutorial lawyers called some 80 witnesses who spent four weeks providing testimony that detailed Barbie's activities between 1942-1945.²⁸

Press reporters who watched this trial realized the seriousness of the allegations and the potential consequences of having a trial that revisited many of the questions that might touch on Vichy collaboration and Nazi coercion. One journalist who sat in on some of the first weeks of the trial reported that the afternoon sessions seemed to be more like "performances than presentations of information" and that the newspaper accounts "read like reviews of a play."²⁹ The trial was held in Lyon's Palace of Justice, and pageantry was in the air. While the lawyers in the case wore black robes and white bibs, the judges and leading prosecutor wore red robes decorated with ermine collars.³⁰ No cameras, radios, or televisions were allowed into the French courtrooms, and the taping of the proceedings would be put away in the archives until the year 2007.³¹

For this former Nazi SS Captain, the entire trial was considered to be a sham, because this French Court was dredging up legal material on events that had taken

place some forty years ago. Much like the Nuremberg trials, this seemed to be a victor's trial, where relatively young prosecutors showed little respect for the German soldiers who did their best for the Fatherland. Flora Lewis, writing from Paris, remarked that:

He [Barbie] showed no sign of regret, contrition, even awareness of what the regime he served had meant. With stubborn, breathtaking composure, he relied on the ironic argument that he was being tried illegally because he had been brought from his refuge in Bolivia to stand trial in France by force, though with the agreement of the Bolivian Government of the time.³²

Barbie, like Eichmann before him, had many excuses. So did his defense counsel.³³

In many ways, the Barbie trial became much more than a judicial proceeding involving the potential guilt or innocence of a single individual—it was also an illustration of the difficulties that come with trying to “work through” particular Holocaust memories. The defense team, led by the controversial Jacques Vergès, made some of the usual procedural motions during the pre-trial proceedings, and many of the cross-examination questions were the types that one might expect. Vergès pointed out that Barbie was confronting witnesses who had faulty memories, and that some of the documents that were used against him were inauthentic or inaccurate. The defense attorneys also explained that Barbie was simply following orders when he signed some of the incriminating bureaucrat memos.

Barbie's case took a bizarre twist when Jacques Vergès decided that part of the defense strategy would involve relativizing the actions of the Gestapo in France. Instead of just claiming that Barbie was relying on orders that had been dictated from above, this leftist lawyer determined that he was going to call witnesses who would testify to some similar atrocities that had been committed by French officials during the colonial years. Vergès reasoned that if Barbie was going to be put on trial for crimes against humanity, then the French nation needed to face the memories of the tortures that had been inflicted on colonial subjects in places like Algeria during 1958-1962.³⁴

The reporters who covered the trial were mesmerized by these defense strategies, because they touched on some previously taboo subjects in French collective memories. During some parts of the Barbie trial, Vergès hinted that part of his defense was going to be based on proof of French complicity in the Holocaust. This was also a defense attorney who was willing to do what many other lawyers refused to do—he questioned the veracity of some of the survivors who had lived through the horrors of World War II. The defense only called six witnesses to the stand, and on June 15, 1987, Vergès began the direct examination of Eddine Lakdar-Toumi. Toumi was put on the stand to try and show that French laws that dealt with wartime atrocities were inconsistently applied, and that this was a nation that did not rigorously apply any international standards in determining crimes against humanity. In commenting on Lakdar-Toumi's role, Vergès observed that this witness's father had been killed after being arrested by French Army officers, but that a suit that had been filed in 1986 had been dismissed because of an amnesty

that had been granted in the early 1960s for Algerian war crimes.³⁵ Two other witnesses, Paul Guiochon and Jacques Fastré, testified that the French crimes that had been committed in Algeria were on par with those that had been committed by the Nazis during the occupation.

These tactics infuriated the multiple prosecutorial teams, because they drew attention away from Klaus Barbie's wartime activities and toward a much more universal discussion of French nationalism and crimes against humanity. Vergès must have sensed that the topic of French colonialism was not scoring that many points with the judges, so he decided to shift gears and bring the case back to the Lyon of the 1940s. He called to the stand 63-year old Yves Damion, who had been a member of the S.S. during World War II. Damion testified that Barbie had been second-in-command of the German security forces in Lyon, and that he believed that Barbie was just following the orders of his superiors. Moreover, Damion remarked that his listeners needed to remember that in the Gestapo hierarchy, the person who signed a report about an operation was not necessarily the same person who carried out that operation.³⁶

The last witness who testified for the defense was Jacques Forment Delauney, a historian who took the position that the telex reporting on the arrest and deportation of the 44 children from Izieu did not contain Barbie's signature. Delauney had been doing some of his own research in the mid-1970s, and his photocopy of the telex was not the same as the one that had been presented by some of the prosecutorial teams.³⁷

Throughout the presentation of the defendant's case, many observers both inside and outside the courtroom were trying to decide just when Vergès would carry out his threats and show the extent of French collaboration with the Nazis.³⁸ To the relief of some of his compatriots, he never did. This would not have been too difficult a chore, because we now know that at least 860,000 Europeans outside of Germany chose to enlist in the Waffen-SS, and millions more volunteered to work in other capacities. In 1944, there were 171,000 Parisians who were working in Germany, and more than 400,000 were employed by the Germans during the occupation.³⁹ In spite of Gaullist myths, not all of these French men and women were members of the resistance.

In his summary of the prosecutor's case against Barbie, Pierre Truche pulled very few punches, and he did not avoid confronting the question of French complicity in Vichy affairs. He told his audiences that a verdict against the former Nazi captain should not be seen as a "salve to the conscience of France" because of Barbie's German origins. Truche remarked that more than 700 collaborators had been executed after the war, and Germany had been afflicted by a "Nazi cancer" for 12 years.⁴⁰ "We were affected by the same cancer," he observed, and "we took tranquilizers."⁴¹ The prosecutors admitted that some 208 people had been working in the Lyon Gestapo office, and that many of them were French collaborators or functionaries.⁴² These facts, however, did not excuse or mitigate Barbie's actions.

French trial procedures are usually complex affairs, and in Barbie's case both the jury and the judge had to answer some 341 questions regarding questions related to the defendant's guilt or innocence. All of the answers to these questions

pointed toward Barbie's guilt, and he was eventually sentenced to life imprisonment for crimes against humanity.⁴³ One supporter of these proceedings claimed that the "norms of French justice were applied with meticulous precision."⁴⁴

Yet Barbie had been a German officer, and some critics worried that if this was going to be France's last war crimes trial, the nation would never "work through" the Vichy traumas. Others, however, thought that the Barbie trial was as important for France as the Eichmann trial had been for Israel. Near the beginning of the proceedings, Jacques Chirac, the French Prime Minister, announced that the nation's high schools would be providing an hour's lesson on the anti-Jewish laws that had been passed during the Vichy years.⁴⁵ One Israeli reporter, Tamar Golan, remarked that what terrified her was the growing realization of the simplicity of the Nazi machinery, operating within a city that went on "living normally."⁴⁶

Other national and international commentators were not so confident. Even those who felt nothing but antipathy for Barbie were not always sure that French courts needed to be involved in these proceedings. In May of 1987, an indignant Ugo Iannucci, a representative of Lyon's Federation of Deported Resistants, asked the Court: "Who's the real defendant here? This should be Barbie's trial, but it's turning into the trial of the Resistance."⁴⁷ Paul Montgomery, an American journalist writing from Brussels, remarked in July of 1987 that:

There were some in France who believe that the country had lessons to learn from the Barbie trial, and there were many others—probably the majority—who believe that history is a matter of people acting in a certain way at a certain time, with no moral to be drawn from it. In the latter view, those who were not there, or who were not born [yet], have no right to judge . . . Barbie's could be the last trial of its kind in Western Europe. One of its lessons at least is a bitter one: Very few of us are heroes.⁴⁸

Montgomery was wrong, the Barbie trial would not be the last trial of its kind. Something was still missing from the French discussions of Vichy collaboration. Since the early post-war purges, very few French citizens had to contemplate the possibility that they themselves, or their relatives, might have to stand trial for war crimes or crimes against humanity. This changed in the 1990s, when Paul Touvier had his day in court.

The Trial of Paul Touvier and the Interrogation of Vichy Memories

I have never forgotten the victims of Rillieux. I think of them every day, every evening.

Paul Touvier, April, 1994.⁴⁹

In April of 1994, a frail defendant sat in a Versailles courtroom, anxiously waiting the judgment of one of France's appellate Courts. For more than forty years, this individual and his family had lived in hiding, sheltered by conservative clerics who must have believed that they were keeping both their vows of charity and their promises to the defendant. The man in the docks, Paul Touvier, was a Frenchman who had been sentenced twice before in post-war France for alleged war crimes. He had been saved by the fact that the statute of limitations had run out on those crimes in 1967. The intervention of some highly placed friends had even

helped him procure a pardon in the early 1970s, but somehow these decisions did not seem to matter much to the newer generations who saw him in a different light. To them, he was the second “Butcher of Lyon,” Barbie’s accomplice and the first Frenchman to be tried for “crimes against humanity.”

Touvier’s lawyer, Jacques Trémolet de Villers, would later call these proceedings a “show trial,”⁵⁰ but many of his compatriots saw this courtroom as just the next step in the logical progression of legal remembrance. Merchant, writing in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* in 1995, predicted that “the Touvier trial itself will stand out for future generations as the first example of the attempt to join history, law, and justice.”⁵¹ For many critics of the old Gaullist resistance myths, it was about time that observers around the world saw how the French were finally coping with Vichy complicity in the Holocaust. Didn’t the younger generations deserve to learn the “truth,” even if they were unpalatable for some? During World War II, some 75,721 Jews were sent from Vichy France to German concentration and death camps, and only a fraction survived the Judeocide.⁵²

The advent of the Touvier trial meant that now the French social agents were going to take center stage. If French politicians and judges were truly going to help their compatriots work through their Vichy memories, then there had to come a time when they were willing to confront the question of French complicity in Nazi affairs. The changing political scenes, differing generational expectations, and altered jurisprudential rules all converged and helped blur the line that purportedly existed between war crimes and crimes against humanity. Eventually, some French citizen would have to become a lightning rod for the expiation of collective guilt.

Paul Touvier seemed to be the unfortunate candidate who would become the potent signifier of Vichy complicity. Touvier was the chief of Milice intelligence in the Lyons area, and his status as a high ranking security officer meant that he sometimes worked closely with Klaus Barbie. The Milice had been a powerful governmental paramilitary force, and it was considered by many to have been the local enforcement agency for the Nazis. When the French resistance escalated their attacks on the invaders, Touvier’s job included catching these would-be “terrorists” and directing the reprisals.

When reporters delved into Touvier’s background, they found a host of explanations for why this French official could have become a Nazi collaborator. He had grown up in the small Alpine village of Chambéry. His father, François Touvier, was a tax collector in that town, but the family was reported to have been relatively poor. Most of the Touviers were anti-Republican and anti-Semitic.⁵³ There must have been times when he heard about the story of the malevolent power of the “International Jew,” who worked behind the scenes in many anti-Semitic narratives. Joining the Milice might mean that a person would be provided with the opportunity of fighting the communists.

These political and national tensions exacerbated an already volatile situation. By June of 1944, it was clear to even the most die-hard Nazi supporter that the war was not going well for the Germans. More than a million Allied troops had landed at Normandy, and the French Resistance declared open warfare with the Milice.⁵⁴ In order to help maintain order and boost morale, the Germans gave

Joseph Darnand even more ministerial power than before, and he now had at his disposal close to 30,000 auxiliary militia members. The Gestapo now used these personnel for hunting down the ‘enemies of the state’—the Resistance fighters and the Jews who stood in the way of the new French regime.⁵⁵ With the help of Philippe Henriot, the Information and Propaganda director, the Milice were trying to minimize pro-Gaullist sentiment throughout France. When the allies began to drop their bombs on French cities in April and June of 1944, thousands of civilians were killed, and the Milice were provided with even more justificatory arguments on the need to control the internal enemies of the state.⁵⁶

In late June, 1944, Henriot was assassinated by some members of the Resistance, and this infuriated both the Gestapo and the Malice. In towns like Clermont-Ferrand, Grenoble, Lyons, Macon and Toulouse, the local chiefs were expected to take retaliatory measures.⁵⁷ During this period, Touvier was the head of Deuxième Service, which was the Malice’s information branch. He was therefore in charge of an area covering some 10 departments (4 million people).⁵⁸

Scholars today are still debating just who gave the orders for the execution of Jews in retaliation for Henriot’s assassination, but there is a consensus of opinion that on the morning of June 29, 1944, seven individuals were shot beneath a cemetery wall in the northern part of Rillieux-la-Pape.⁵⁹ Touvier never denied giving the order for their execution, but as we shall see later, he pleaded that his actions were unavoidable.

At the end of the war, Touvier went into hiding, and in 1946 and 1947 he was tried by different French courts for treason and “assisting the enemy.” Thousands of other Milice members died during the post-war purges, but Touvier managed to survive. For the next 26 years he was able to stay in hiding, until he was pardoned by President Georges Pompidou. In an ironic twist of fate, it would be Pompidou’s act of clemency in 1971 that would eventually fuel renewed efforts to bring Touvier to justice.⁶⁰

The question of whether Touvier should ever have been brought to trial was a divisive issue in France. Representatives of several resistance groups now joined with members of Jewish organizations in calling for the retrial of Touvier. In June of 1972, a group of demonstrators led by Beate Klarsfeld went so far as to break down the gates of his home in Chambéry and his house was looted. Touvier and his family went into hiding once more, and for almost a decade he was able to evade French authorities. In 1981, an examining magistrate was finally about to indict Touvier and begin the modern day proceedings against the former Milice chief, but it took eight more years before the police were able to find his hiding place in Nice. Bruno Barrillot, a researcher for the Center for Documentation and Research on Peace and Conflicts in Lyons, hoped that his colleagues understood that Touvier was “the most wanted war criminal in France.”⁶¹

When the “Touvier Affair” reached a Paris appellate court in April of 1992, it looked as if these trials might once again be derailed. This particular body shocked observers when it dismissed the criminal and civil cases against Touvier, reasoning that 11 of the 12 criminal counts against him were not supported by either the law or the facts in the case. Using some very formalist and yet creative reasoning, the Parisian jurists reported that several legal precedents—including the Barbie de-

cision—had helped establish some key guidelines for analyzing cases involving war crimes and crimes against humanity. While the Nuremberg tribunals had talked about how acts like genocide, deportation, or enslavement could constitute crimes against humanity, it would be French jurists who had to decide just which state agencies could be held responsible for these violations. The Parisian court tried to claim that in the Barbie case the *Cour de Cassation* (the highest judicial authority in France) had reasoned in 1985 that only states engaged in practices based on “a policy of ideological hegemony” could be involved in crimes against humanity.⁶² Since this appellate court believed that Nazi Germany and *not* Vichy France had such organized ideologies, this meant that Touvier could only be held responsible for those specific crimes where he was assisting the Nazis.

The decision of the *Cour de Cassation* meant that the French lower courts had to re-examine the factual and legal frameworks that would be used in re-evaluating Holocaust documents and eye-eye-witness accounts. In Touvier’s case, the members of the Parisian Court believed that the only crime that might fall under these guidelines was the murder of the seven Jews at Rillieux, but that was a war crime that fell under the statute of limitations.

From a rhetorical vantage point, this legal maneuvering was intriguing, because it meant that the French appellate courts could now sidestep the question of direct French war guilt. The Germans would be remain the primary culprits in these tales involving crimes against humanity. The historical competition between various collaborationist, resistant, nationalistic, clerical, and Communistic groups meant that the appellate court could depict the Vichy years as turbulent times, when France simply had no “ideological hegemony.” Within this framework, the acts that were committed by the Milice were not automatically considered to be “crime against humanity.”⁶³ As an added bonus of such reasoning, if this definition held up to judicial scrutiny, it meant that the French officers who might have been involved in *colonial atrocities* could not have committed any crimes against humanity. The use of this type of narrative framing also meant that Touvier could now be treated as if he was a common thief, instead of an active accomplice in the “Final Solution.” The same legal maneuvers that had helped bring Barbie to trial (and convict him) were now being appropriated for the purposes of shielding Touvier.

The Parisian decision (April, 1992) was greeted with public ridicule and invective. Many felt that the members of this tribunal understood the letter, but not the spirit of the Nuremberg principles. What angered many observers was the recognition that these jurists refused to see the philosophical linkages between Vichy France and Nazi Germany, and this gave the impression that at least some French jurists were helping to preserve the Gaullist myths of a pristine France. After all, weren’t the members of the French Milice equivalent in both power and ideology to the Germans’ SS?⁶⁴ Such debates spilled over in the public domain, where lay persons carried on conversations about the culpability of the average French citizen.

During the fall of 1992 the *Cour de cassation* allowed for Touvier’s retrial on the theory that he may have been advancing Nazi interests, and the French legal

community was provided with yet another opportunity to work through the nation's Holocaust memories. Most of the most damning evidence in the case came from witnesses who portrayed Touvier as a French Hitlerite who brutalized his prisoners. Both the prosecutors and the representatives for the civil plaintiffs focused on the racial dimensions of the Rillieux murders.⁶⁵ The witnesses who testified in the Versailles courtroom painted a damning portrait of Touvier's character and his activities. One of the most effective witnesses who appeared for the prosecution was Louis Goudard, a former member of the Communist-led *Francs-Tireurs et Partisans (F.T.P.) Résistant Movement*. In June of 1944 Goudard had been a scared 24 year-old prisoner of the *Milice* in Lyon, and he was able to tell the court about his various conversations with some of Jews who were shot by Touvier's militia members.⁶⁶ Several of them were hopeful that the *Milice* were just after money and other property, but this was not the case. Even after they handed over their personal property or real estate, they were taken back to prison.

Several key prosecution witnesses helped establish the claim that Jews were singled out for execution on the basis of Touvier's orders. Goudard, who had barely escaped being killed himself, told the court that on June 29th, 1944 he found himself alone in his cell and he realized that "I had been spared because I was not Jewish."⁶⁷ Another witness, Gilberte Duc, had been Touvier's Secretary. She recalled that she had heard her boss say; "Henriot is avenged—we killed seven Jews." When Touvier rose up in the courtroom and claimed that he had never said that, Duc responded that she knew that Touvier had kept lists of Jews to be arrested in his files.⁶⁸ These cards would become another key part of the prosecution's case as they tried to show the "ideology" that linked the *Milice* with the Gestapo.

Touvier's aide-de-camp, Edmont Fayolle, corroborated Goudard's testimony. In 1946 Fayolle had been tried and sentenced to life imprisonment for his work in the *Milice*, but he ended up serving only 12 years of his sentence. Fayolle testified that he personally "saw Touvier give the orders" for the murder of some of the prisoners, and that he "heard him ask if the cards were ready."⁶⁹ To make sure that the local population would get the message, Touvier ordered that name tags be prepared for each of the seven individuals who was marked for death at Rillieux.

The cumulative effect of all of this evidence helped to create a picture of a cold murderer who blamed Jews for Henriot's murder. The documentary record revealed that Touvier had been in charge of at least 25 prisoners, and the prosecution argued that if this retaliation was not ideological motivated, then all of them should have had an equal chance of being taken to Rillieux. The defendant's use of the cards with Jewish names tipped the scales.

This witness testimony was damaging in and of itself, but the prosecutors took no chances and turned their attention to Touvier's own admissions and his writings. The defendant never denied having ordered the execution of the seven victims at Rillieux—he simply argued that he had to act quickly because of orders, and that he had randomly selected the prisoners that had been shot. From the prosecution's vantage point, it looked as though Touvier was being evasive and unwilling to acknowledge any pity or remorse for anyone but himself.⁷⁰

During such proceedings, public statements that are made outside of the courtroom often have a way of creeping into judicial trials of defendants, and Touvier's

case was no exception. In the middle of April, 1994, President Mitterand mentioned in an interview that he personally believed that it was futile for the government to be involved in trying old men for crimes where there were few witnesses and “hardly any meaning any more.”⁷¹ An editorial writer for *The London Times* believed that this was a sentiment that was “widely shared among France’s war-time generation.”⁷²

Yet there were also many French observers who were still interested in having a Touvier trial. One of the most intriguing prosecutorial positions was taken by Arno Klarsfeld, the young attorney who was the son of two very famous Nazi hunters.⁷³ Klarsfeld, unlike many of the other state prosecutors and lawyers for the civil plaintiffs, refused to claim that Touvier acted under Nazi orders when he ordered the murder of his victims. This was one prosecutor who was unwilling to accept either the *Cour de Cassation*’s 1985 decision or the Versailles Court’s 1992 interpretation that narrowed the French interpretation of crimes against humanity. Instead, Klarsfeld tried to recontextualize the Touvier case so that the Court would return to the original definition of crimes against humanity that came from the Nuremberg Charter in the 1945 London Agreement. As this attorney explained in his book written about the decision:

The collusion between the Milice and the Gestapo in the concerted Final Solution plan of the Jewish Question is obvious. All Milice members pledged allegiance to Hitler, and in their hearts they wore the German uniform: that is, in fact, exactly how their fellow countrymen perceived them, seeming them as French Hitlerians totally aligned with the Nazi ideology. A France Hitlerian: that is what Paul Touvier was when he had seven Jews massacred at Rillieux-la-Pape.⁷⁴

Merchant contends that if one looks carefully at the “minds of the judges, jury, and public at large,” it was not Prosecutor General Touzalin’s closing address that garnered attention, but rather Arno Klarsfeld’s plea that “underlined the historical veracity behind the massacre of seven Jews at Rillieux-la-Pape on June 29, 1944.”⁷⁵ During his summation, Hubert de Touzalin had claimed that even if “the plan” for the Rillieux murders originated with the Nazis, the “complicity was French.”⁷⁶

Given Touvier’s admission that he had given the order that signaled the deaths of the seven Jews at Rillieux, the defense was hard-pressed to find some plausible defenses or mitigating circumstances that would explain the defendant’s actions. They hit on the strategy of trying to argue that their client had sacrificed the lives of 7 victims following Henriot’s assassination so that he could *save* the lives of perhaps 23 or maybe even 100 Jews. In the international press, this was called Touvier’s “Schindler’s Defense.” Within the defense scenario, it had been Touvier’s immediate superior, Victor de Bourmont of Lyons, who had panicked when he felt the pressure of German demands for reprisals. Touvier testified that Germans like Werner Knab wanted perhaps “a hundred Jews” to be selected, and that Touvier eventually convinced de Bourmont that this could be done in stages, beginning with only seven.⁷⁷

At this point in the trial, the leading judge in the case, Henri Boulard, began

peppering Touvier with questions:

Boulard: "There were other solutions. You could have called Vichy."

Touvier: "I didn't have time."

Boulard: "You could have been brave and told the Germans, shoot me instead of the hostages."

Touvier: "That didn't occur to me either."

Boulard: "Yes, you and your men went into the big room where you kept your prisoners and told them to open their flies . . . to see if any were circumcised."

Touvier: "I wasn't there."⁷⁸

During his summation, Jacques Trémolet de Villers demanded that Touvier be acquitted, because at most the Rillieux murders constituted a war crime, and not a crime against humanity. For four hours, de Villers told his listeners that Touvier had been pardoned in 1971, in large part because of the efforts of clergy who believed in the importance of charity and forgiveness. For many months he had had the monumental task of keeping this case focused exclusively on the defendant's actions, but both the press and some members of the court had made this impossible. De Villers argued that at least three French Presidents—de Gaulle, Pompidou, and Mitterrand—thought that France's wartime past should be buried, and he reminded his audience that Touvier was now "a tired, sick old man."⁷⁹

Touvier's chief defense attorney did his very best to try and make sure that his client did not become a metonymic symbol for all of the evils of Vichy France. At one point in his summation, de Villers told the Court:

[The trial was only of Mr. Touvier] not of a symbol, not of history, not of Vichy, not of France. . . . You are France, not the man in the dock. You are France, and you will give a historic verdict, but not a verdict on history. . . . You should not confuse pain and hate, memory and revenge, homage to the dead and vengeance against a man who was the involuntary instrument of their death. The dead do not demand an unjust condemnation.⁸⁰

The French tribunal that heard the case was not convinced. On April 19, 1994, the Versailles Court determined that Touvier had indeed committed crimes against humanity. In spite of the statute of limitations on other war crimes and Pompidou's pardon, the defendant was sentenced to life imprisonment. The verdict, which had been reached by 12 members of this French jury ("By a majority of eight votes or more")⁸¹ had taken some five and a half hours of deliberation.⁸² In spite of the herculean efforts of Jacques Trémolet de Villers, Touvier ultimately lost his case. Apparently the jury had not bought his rationalizations for the orders that he had given regarding the Rillieux victims. At the same time, it was held that his former status as an official of the French Milice had allowed him to be in a position where he was complicit in crimes against humanity.⁸³ The presiding judge remarked that these murders "fell into the framework of a concerted plan carried out by a state practicing a policy of ideological hegemony."⁸⁴ This meant that the

Rillieux murders had been committed by individuals who selected them for punishment because of their racial or religious attributes.

After the trial, de Villers filed a formal appeal, but there was little chance that the verdict would be overturned.⁸⁵ Once again, critics who defended such trials talked about their important pedagogical functions. French citizens and jurists were no longer going to avoid discussion of Vichy's anti-Semitic past. Alain Jacobowicz, for example, remarked that this "painful page in our history cannot be turned before it is written."⁸⁶ For many years Europeans had known about the tens of thousands who had died in the purges, but they were just beginning to realize the extent of French acquiescence in the rounding up, deportation, and death of many French and foreign Jews.

On July 17, 1996, Paul Touvier died in prison. Even this did not end speculations about the problematic nature of such trials. Many critics of the trial, both inside and outside France, considered Touvier to be a "small fish" who had nowhere near the power of a Bousquet or Papon. Perhaps the most scathing review of the trial came from Conan and Rouso, who claimed that these proceedings were of doubtful pedagogical or historical value.⁸⁷ As far as they were concerned, the prosecution had won their case, but at a very high price. Patrick Manham made this prognosis in February of 1994:

One could add that to put a man [sic] on trial in order to teach children a history lesson is a perversion of justice. In the Barbie case, loathing of the accused's beliefs and actions was considered an adequate justification for numerous breaches of the essential rules of a fair trial. The calm procedures of the courtroom were replaced by the frantic rituals of a national psycho-drama. The same process is now well under way in Touvier case.⁸⁸

Defenders of the Versailles court responded by talking about the importance of the case for French posterity. Merchant, for example, was convinced that the "Touvier trial must be considered one of the most constructive elements contributing to France's memory of the Vichy period."⁸⁹ The younger children who learned about the Vichy years during the trial were not the only potential beneficiaries of Touvier's trial. Hubert de Touzalin, one of the key advocate generals in the case, told the Court that he had learned a great deal about the Vichy regime, France's anti-Semitism, the passage of anti-Jewish laws, and the power of the militia during World War II.⁹⁰

Yet even the Touvier trial did not expiate all French guilt. Yes, more liberal interpretations of "crimes against humanity" were implicating a widening circle of perpetrators, but one wonders about the political pressures behind the trials, the use of legal formalism as a way of explaining sudden turnarounds in decisions or interpretations. Granted, Touvier was ultimately convicted of crimes against humanity, but the arguments and scenarios that had been used in the trial were crafted in such a way that they explained away Vichy complicity, so that the spotlight was once again placed on the Nazis and their minions.

Conclusion

One must admit that these trials became highly publicized events, that were interpreted by some as having taught valuable Holocaust “lessons.” Yet I would argue that in the vast majority of Holocaust trials, these judicial forums are not equipped to provide any type of closure for the preservation of Holocaust memories. Given the polysemic and political nature of Holocaust memories, the settlement of a single case may provide an end to the legal trial of a single individual or group, but these forums cannot freeze either our legal histories or our public memories.

Given the public and legal nature of these trials, it also is important that communication scholars take up the issue of how we want to remember particularly traumatic historical moments. Professor Blair, for example, has recently noted that rhetoric critics need to pay attention to the ways that particular memories are conveyed in public settings. In her short analysis of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), she explains that she is bothered by the ethical implications that come from displays that purposely create “physical discomfort.”⁹¹

I am similarly bothered by the growing popularity of international Holocaust trials, that are used for a variety of communicative purposes that go beyond the simple determination of the guilt or innocence of the individual who comes before the court in search of justice. There is a vast amount of difference between the establishment of a *prima facie* case against a witness, and the use of that trial as a forum for the expiation of national guilt, a project that shows a new administration’s willingness to remember when others forget, or the need for “compensating the slain.”⁹² As Manham noted, these larger societal goals end up overwhelming the primary task of determining individual guilt or innocence.

The growth of the Holocaust denial movement and the passage of years mandate that we never forget the Judeocide, but we need to be cognizant of the fact that there are many other extra-judicial forums that can be used for this type of memory-work. Moreover, a rhetorical analyses of the Barbie and Touvier trials shows us how some of these forums can sometimes be used to avoid grappling with the uniqueness of the Holocaust or the complicity of large communities. For example, the French rules of evidence allowed Jacques Verges to turn the Barbie trial into an interrogation of human rights violations during the French war with Algeria, a permutation of the normalization debates that were taking place all over Europe during the 1980s. Some of the judges and lawyers who participated in the Touvier trial could also avoid grappling with all of the implications of the Vichy syndrome, by using procedural rules to bracket out painful memories and politically uncomfortable findings.

It is very possible that these discussions that took place both inside and outside the halls of justice did provide some communicative benefits—they were considered by some to be therapeutic for some French individuals and communities. Yet these cases have also provided us with illustrations of the fine line that exists between “legal” and “moral” responsibility. Todorov and Anzalone, two critics who openly attacked some of the procedures and goals of a later trial, noted that here was little question that some of the Vichy politicians were “morally culpable” for not distancing themselves from the politics of the French state under Marshall

Pétain.⁹³ The key question for decision-makers involves the issue of whether courts should play a key role in the preservation of inherently selective Holocaust histories. These trials often end up telling us more about contemporary political alliances and modern needs, then they do about what happened during the World War II years.

Given the cultural milieu that surrounded the Barbie and Touvier trials, one can readily understand some of the reasons for the procedural and ideological maneuvering that took place both inside and outside of these courtrooms. This raises the question of the fairness of the proceedings when we understand the role that memory-work played in the mercurial changes that took place in the interpretations of Nuremberg principles or applications of statutes of limitations. For example, the Touvier cases, with the constant clash of opinion on the part of the Parisian and Versailles courts, show the fragile and contingent nature of both the prosecutorial and defense positions.

Couldn't these lessons have been taught outside of the courtroom? For example, the catalyzing Holocaust memory-work has already been accomplished, as evidenced by the fact that many academicians and politicians are now more than willing to help deconstruct the Gaullist myths of resistance. In 1995 French President Jacques Chirac publicly admitted that all of the nation was responsible for the deportation of more than 75,000 Jews to the Nazi death camps, and now listeners and readers were learning more about the Vélodrome d'Hiver stadium in Paris that had been used in 1942 as an embarkation point for Jews who would leave the country. At the same time, French writers and scholars have released a tide of works spanning every mode of memory retrieval: "historical, documentary, autobiographical, analytical, fictional."⁹⁴ If we need to find a cure for the Vichy syndrome, it can be found in the very process of arguing about, and researching the Holocaust.

Communication scholars should therefore view this rhetorical analysis of the Barbie and Touvier trials as a cautionary tale, that reminds us of the importance of open debate, and the contentious nature of memory-work. Professor Schwartzman has recently argued that when we attempt to review the communicative dimensions of Holocaust histories and memories, we need to remember that the "narrator" often "has a personal stake in recounting the past."⁹⁵ Given complexities and ideological nature of Holocaust memory-work, we need to acknowledge that there may be times when legal decision-makers have to confront the inherent limitations of their own forums. The goal of making final decisions and gaining closure does not work well in situations where we need open communication and the exchange of ideas. Legal involvement in the preservation of particular Holocaust memories may serve the needs of some constituencies, but they may end up being superfluous and counterproductive.

Notes

The author would like to thank all of the editors and reviewers of *Speaker and Gavel* who looked at this essay and who offered some very helpful and provocative comments. He would also like to thank Dean Robert Newman and the Tanner Humanities Center at the University of Utah for providing him with

much needed time so that he could make the revisions that were needed for the publication of this manuscript.

Endnotes

1. Ted Morgan, "The Hidden Henchman," *The New York Times Magazine*, May 22, 1994, sec. VI, pp. 31-32.
2. See, for example, the various perspectives on history, memory, and rhetoric that appear in Carole Blair, Marsha S. Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci, "Public Memorialization in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Memorial as Prototype," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 263-288; Stephen H. Browne, "Reading, Rhetoric, and the Texture of Public Memory," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1993): 237-250; J. Robert Cox, "Memory, Critical Theory, and the Argument From History," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 27 (1990): 1-13; Greg Dickinson, "Memories For Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 1-27; Marouf Hasian, Jr. and Robert E. Frank, "Rhetoric, History, and Collective Memory: Decoding the Goldhagen Debates," *Western Journal of Communication* 63 (1999): 95-114; Victoria J. Gallagher, "Remembering Together: Rhetorical Integration and the Case of Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial," *The Southern Communication Journal* 60 (1995): 109-119. Tamar Katriel, "Our Future is Where Our Past Is: Studying Heritage Museums as Ideological and Performative Arenas," *Communication Monographs*, 60 (1993): 69-75; Tamar Katriel, "Sites of Memory: Discourse of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 1-20; Kathleen J. Turner, ed., *Doing Rhetorical History: Cases and Concepts*, (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1998).
3. For an interesting discussion of some of the reasons for this scholarly interest in memory, see Michael S. Roth, *The Ironist's Cage: Memory, Trauma, and the Construction of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).
4. James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), ix.
5. Lawrence Douglas, *The Memory of Judgment: Making Law and History in the Trials of the Holocaust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 2.
6. A. Susan Owen and Peter Ehrenhaus, "Towards a Visual Rhetoric of Witness: Reflections on the Representation of Traumatic Memory," paper presented at the First Annual Visual Rhetoric Conference, 2000.
7. Barbie Zelizer, *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
8. Roy Schwartzman, "Review Essay: Recovering the Lost Canon: Public Memory and the Holocaust," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 544.
9. The "Vichy Syndrome" involves the idea that various French communities suffer from a traumatic malady (on both the right and the left parts of the political spectrum) that allows collectives to valorize the tales of French resistance, while at the same time repressing the possibility of extensive Vichy complicity with the Germans during World War II. See Henry Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France Since 1944*, trans. Arthur

- Goldhammer (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1996), 7-11.
10. Stanley Hoffmann, "Foreword," Michael R. Marrus and Robert O. Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995—originally published in 1981), ix-x.
 11. R. Scullion, "Unforgettable: History, Memory and the Vichy Syndrome," *Studies in Twentieth Century Literature* 23 (Winter, 1999): 14.
 12. The Milice were the powerful paramilitary arm of the Vichy regime, that had an incredible amount of power in both the police and legal systems of France during World War II. See Roussio, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 20-22.
 13. Lawrence Douglas, "History, Memory and Crimes Against Humanity: A Response to Todorov," *Salmagundi* 129 (2001): 320.
 14. Douglas, "History," 320.
 15. For an excellent commentary on the difficulties of reconciling the French judicial search for univocal meanings with scholars' interest in polyvocal histories, see Vivian G. Curran, "The Legalization of Racism in a Constitutional State: Democracy's Suicide in Vichy France," *Hastings Law Journal* 50 (November, 1998): 90.
 16. Klaus Barbie, quoted in Flora Lewis, "Foreign Affairs: A Model of French Justice," *The New York Times*, July 6, 1987, p. A-31.
 17. Note here, for example, the early work of Robert O. Paxton, *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1944* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972).
 18. Brendan Murphy, *The Butcher of Lyon: The Story of Infamous Nazi Klaus Barbie* (New York: Empire Books, 1983), 12. See Ted Morgan, "Voices From the Barbie Trial," *The New York Times*, August 2, 1987, Section VII, p. 24; Wolfgang Saxon, "Klaus Barbie, 77, Lyons Gestapo Chief," *The New York Times*, September 26, 1991, p. D-22.
 19. For the initial governmental report on the U.S. involvement with Barbie, see Allan A. Ryan, *Klaus Barbie and the United States Government: The Report, with Documentary Appendix, to the Attorney General of the United States* (Frederick, Md: University Publications of America, 1984). For some critical assessments of this involvement, see Christopher Anthony West, *Klaus Barbie and the United States Army Counterintelligence Corps, 1947-1951: A Violation of Denazification Agreements* (M.A thesis, James Madison University, 1993).
 20. Peter Hellman, "'Butcher' at Bay: The Dramatic Untold Story of How Infamous Gestapo Officer Klaus Barbie Was Finally Brought to Justice," *Life*, February, 1985, pp. 68-70.
 21. Tom Bower, "A Killer Goes to Ground," *The [London] Times*, September 20, 1983, p. 7.
 22. Guyora Binder, "Representing Nazism: Advocacy and identity at the Trial of Klaus Barbie," *The Yale Law Journal* 98 (1989):1342-1344.
 23. Paul L. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial: French Heart of Darkness," *The Los Angeles Times*, July 5, 1987, sec.V, p. 2.
 24. Barbie could not be tried again for the earlier war crimes convictions because French laws included a 20-year statute of limitations that had run on the previous charges. Lewis, "A Model," A-31.

25. Douglas, "History," 321. In order to catch more German perpetrators, France had changed her laws on imprescriptability and crimes against humanity as early as 1964. Curran, "The Legalization," 74.
26. Allan A. Ryan, Jr., "Klaus Barbie and the United States Government: A Reply to Mr. Justice Goldberg," *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 20 (1985): 71.
27. Lewis, "A Model," A-31.
28. Richard Bernstein, "Six Witnesses Take the Stand in Barbie's Defense," *The New York Times*, June 16, 1987, p. A-13.
29. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
30. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
31. Lewis, "A Model," A-31.
32. Lewis, "A Model," A-31.
33. Some of these excuses included that Barbie was simply following order when he shipped hundreds and Jews and resisters to the camps, that his signature was not on the deportation orders of the 44 Jewish children from Izieu, that members of the Vichy regime were no different from the ruling French parties during the Algerian troubles, and that nations should forgive and forget after wartime. See William Echikson, "Barbie Trial Draws to Close After Moments of Remembering and Drama," *The Christian Science Monitor*, July 3, 1987, p. 8.
34. For an excellent overview of the ideological divisions that existed in France and Algeria at this time, see Martin Evans, *The Memory of Resistance: French Opposition to the Algerian War (1954-1962)* (Oxford: Berg, 1997).
35. Bernstein, "Six Witnesses," A-13.
36. Bernstein, "Six Witnesses," A-13.
37. Bernstein, "Six Witnesses," A-13.
38. "During the months preceding the trial," noted Echikson, "Defense attorney Jacques Verges repeatedly promised to put France itself in the dock for collaborating with the Nazis and for human-rights violations during the country's war with Algerian rebels in the 1950s." Echikson, "Barbie Trial," 8. Echikson goes on to explain that in spite of this threat, "many thought his performance turned out to be anticlimactic" (8).
39. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
40. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
41. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
42. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
43. Lewis, "A Model," A-31.
44. Lewis, "A Model," A-31.
45. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
46. Tamar Golan, quoted in Lewis, "A Model," A-31.
47. William Echikson, "French As Who Is On Trial: Barbie or Resistance?" *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 28 1987, p. 9.
48. Montgomery, "Barbie Trial," V-2.
49. Paul Touvier, quoted in Alan Riding, "Frenchman Convicted of Crimes Against the Jews in '44." *The New York Times*, May 20, 1994, p. A-3.

50. Jacques Trémolet de Villers, quoted in Sarah Chayes, "Exorcising Vichy: The Trial of Paul Touvier for Crimes Against Humanity," *Massachusetts Review* 36 (1995): 425.
51. Jennifer Merchant, "History, Memory, and Justice: The Touvier Trial in France," *Journal of Criminal Justice* 23 (1995): 425.
52. See S. Klarsfeld, *Le Mémorial de la Déportation Des Juifs de France* (Paris: Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, 1978).
53. Patrick Marnham, "Henchman of the Gestapo," *The London Times*, February 23, 1994, p. 14.
54. Morgan, "The Hidden," 31.
55. Morgan, "The Hidden," 32.
56. Morgan, "The Hidden," 32.
57. Patrick Marnham, "Henchman of the Gestapo," *The London Times*, February 23, 1994, p. 14.
58. Morgan, "The Hidden," 32.
59. Marnham, "Henchman," 14.
60. Marnham, "Henchman," 14.
61. Bruno Barrillot and Mary D. Davis, "Winking at War Crimes: France's Touvier Affair Taints Church and State," *Washington Post*, July 2, 1989, p. C-1.
62. Tzvetan Todorov, "Letter from Paris: The Touvier Trial," *Salmagundi* 106/107 (Spring/Summer 1995): 3.
63. Todorov, T., & Anzalone, J. (1999, Winter/Spring). "Letter from Paris: The Papon Trial," *Salmagundi* 121/122 (Winter/Spring, 1999): 1-9. Todorov and Anzalone, "The Touvier," 3.
64. Todorov, "The Touvier Trial," 3.
65. If the seven victims who were shot at Rillieux had been selected by Touvier because they were resistance measures, then these atrocities might be labeled war crimes and were thus subject to the French statute of limitations
66. Morgan, "The Hidden," 32.
67. Morgan, "The Hidden," 35.
68. Morgan, "The Hidden," 35.
69. Morgan, "The Hidden," 34.
70. Todorov, "The Touvier Trial," 3.
71. "Justice Delayed," 17.
72. "Justice Delayed," 17.
73. For a valorization of Arno Klarsfeld's work as perhaps the best prosecutorial position in Touvier, see Merchant, "History, Memory," 426-432. Merchant argues that Klarsfeld's "judicial rhetoric" was somehow "bypassed," which assumes that there are some legal positions that can magically exist independent of rhetoric. I would of course argue that Klarsfeld was simply deploying a different rhetorical configuration.
74. Arno Klarsfeld, *Touvier, Une Crime Français* (Paris: Fayard. 1994), 103, 108-109. Jennifer Merchant's translation.
75. Merchant, "History, Memory," 426.
76. Hubert de Touzalin, quoted in Riding, "Frenchman," A-31.
77. Morgan, "The Hidden," 32. For a British account that seems to buy Touvier's

story of negotiating this number down to seven, see Marnham, "Henchman," 14. Amount the victims was a lawyer, a toymaker, a leather worker, and a house decorator.

78. Morgan, "The Hidden," 31.
79. Jacques Trémolet de Villers, quoted in Riding, "Frenchman Convicted," A-3.
80. Jacques Trémolet de Villers, quoted in Riding, "Frenchman Convicted," A-3.
81. Chayes, "Exorcising," 425. In the French legal system, regardless of the exact breakdown of individual decisions, the final decision is always read off as one that was reached "By a majority of eight votes or more . . ."
82. Riding, "Frenchman Convicted," A-3.
83. Merchant, "History, Memory," 425.
84. Chayes, "Exorcising," 425.
85. Riding, "Frenchman Convicted," A-3.
86. Alain Jacobowicz, quoted in Riding, "Frenchman," A-3.
87. Conan and Rouso, *Vichy*, 74-123.
88. Marnham, "Henchman," 14.
89. Merchant, "History, Memory," 426.
90. "Justice Delayed," 17.
91. Carole Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places," *Western Journal of Communication* 65 (2001): 287.
92. Lawrence Douglas, *The Memory*, 1.
93. Todorov and Anzalone, "Letter," 1.
94. C. Trueheart, "Letter from France," *The Washington Post*, November 2, 1997, p. X-15.
95. Schwartzman, "Recovering," 557.

Metaphysical Tales of Hate and *Differánce*: A Narrative Analysis of Gayman's "The Book of Adam"

Scott R. Stroud

Introduction

As America continues to grow in economic and social areas, individual pockets of citizens are left in a state of bewilderment and alienation at the rapid change and destabilization of their once certain world (Bennett, 1995). In the minds of such individuals, the world has been irrevocably changed by the advent of information technology, large-scale immigration, and international instability risked by global weapons and alliances. These individuals, frightened and alarmed at the precarious position they perceive themselves to be occupying, often turn to groups that use the passionate lure of hatred and exclusion to gain back value and stability in their lives. One of the more violent and influential segments of this end of the political spectrum is the "Christian Identity" movement, which claims over 50,000 members. This loosely organized national movement emphasizes what they claim is the biblically privileged position of the white (Aryan) race over the "scheming" Jews, minorities, and other non-Aryans (Schamber, 1996).

A key rhetor in this small, yet violent movement is a pastor by the name of Dan Gayman (*Danger*, 1996). Among Gayman's activities in this movement is the publication of small pamphlets that disseminate his racist views to the general public. Following the direction of Nothstine, Blair, and Copeland (1996), this paper will engage in community-centered act of criticism that illuminates potentially dangerous sources of rhetorical motivation within contemporary society. An important part of a critic's task is to highlight themes that pose a significant risk for the continued safety of a freely informed and discursive society. As such, this paper will analyze one of Gayman's pamphlets entitled *The Holy Bible: The Book of Adam's Race* (Gayman, 199-), focusing on his portrayal of the white race ("Adam's race"). Using the methodology of narrative criticism, this paper will argue that Gayman's use of narrative creates a potentially captivating story of the Aryan race's relationship to God, at the expense of other races. Through his use of settings and character descriptions, Gayman constructs the white race as divinely superior to non-white races, and as such, leads the way for potentially troublesome actional stances toward these races by members of this pamphlet's audience. In

Scott R. Stroud (M.A., University of the Pacific) is a graduate student in the Department of Philosophy, San José State University, San José, California, Scott_Stroud@hotmail.com. An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the 2000 National Communication Association Conference, Seattle, Washington. Dr. Jon F. Schamber, (University of the Pacific) and an anonymous referees are to be thanked for their helpful comments on this manuscript.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 39 (2002), 23-35

order to place this pamphlet in context, a brief overview of the Christian Identity movement, from its inception in Britain in the late 1700s to present day American advocates, such as Dan Gayman, shall be provided. The text will be described, followed by a description of the theoretical apparatus of narrative theory. Through this lens of narrative, Gayman's text will be argued to portray potentially dangerous characterizations of the white race, often at the expense of other racial groups. This paper does not purport to exhaust the meaning of the pamphlet in question; instead, it merely attempts to bring the light of critical reflection upon this largely unanalyzed text.

The Christian Identity Movement & Dan Gayman

While religion's influence in modern America is waning (Bennett, 1995), a virulent strain of racist ideology continues to exist at the fringe of right wing Christianity—the Christian Identity movement. This movement is a loosely organized constellation of groups with few commonalties outside of the biblically privileged status they confer on the white race and the hatred they share toward other races, especially the Jews (Carmichael, 1992).

The historical genesis of the modern American movement of Christian Identity occurred in Britain in the 1790s. Fear of the coming millennium and popular nationalism pushed many terrified British citizens toward the position espoused by Richard Brothers (1757-1824), who introduced the central tenet of "British Israelism;" the white Europeans (including the British) were the true "Jews" (Schamber, 1999). He presented the "idea of a direct link between Anglo-Saxons and Israelites" (Barkun, 1990, p. 122). At its inception, the British Israelite movement attempted to label the modern British as one of the "lost tribes" of Israel. Brothers was not the only founding member of this movement; John Wilson (1799-1870) and Frederick Robert Augustus Glover (1880-1881) were also involved in publishing books and spreading the British "claim" to Israelite status. This movement gained much sway in Britain, especially after the horrors of World War I. While the organization continued on into the 20th century, its strength declined significantly (Schamber, 1999).

In the late-1800s, British Israelism found its way to America under the guise of "pyramidology" (Schamber, 1999). The Reverend Joseph Williams (1826-1882) was one of the first British Israelite leaders in America; he published *The Trio* and the *Trumpet of Israel*, but was not able to keep them in print for very long (Schamber, 1999). Powerful and influential leaders that followed Williams in America were Reverend Joseph Wild, George Greenwood, and Reverend Matthew Mays Eshelm (Schamber, 1999). These individuals all preached that the "white seed" in America was the true tribe that is spoken of as supreme in the Bible; this message slowly evolved into one of exclusion and hatred toward all other races (including the Jews) in the 1920's (Simonelli, 1996).

Charles A. L. Totten (1851-1908) began this evolution into an exclusionary theology by courting premillennialists in America. He published several works on this topic which "blended the tenets of Anglo-Israelism with Anglo-Saxonism, a secular movement based on the notion that the Anglo-Saxon race was naturally superior and destined to rule the world" (Schamber, 1999, p. 6). In the 1920's,

Reverend John Harden Allen (1847-1930) held an influential position within the Identity movement, publishing books that furthered the evolution of this movement into its current form. Also playing a noticeable role was William J. Cameron, who was charged with using Henry Ford's newspaper, the *Dearborn Independent*, to disseminate radically anti-Semitic articles (Schamber, 1996).

After World War II, the Christian Identity movement turned more toward the racist and anti-Semitic end of the spectrum; leading this charge were Gerald L. K. Smith (1898-1975) and his disciple, Wesley A. Swift (1913-1970). Smith founded the Christian Nationalist Crusade and published *The Cross and the Flag* in order to air his white-supremacy views. Swift "is considered by many to be the father of the contemporary Identity movement" (Schamber, 1999, p. 11). He founded the Church of Jesus Christ, Christian in 1946. Swift was active in denouncing Catholics, minorities, and Jews in his quest for racial purity in America (Schwartz, 1983).

This movement toward racist hate theology was cemented into its modern form by the actions of Richard Girnt Butler. Butler founded the Aryan Nations Church, which was "openly tied to Klan and Nazi groups and describes itself as a white theopolitical movement whose goal is the re-establishment of white Aryan sovereignty" (Young, 1990, p. 153). This group is known for its violent tactics and vehemently hateful rhetoric. For around twenty years, Butler "has hosted the Aryan World Congress, an annual event which at its peak drew up to three hundred neo-Nazis, Ku Klux Klan members, and Identity believers" (Schamber, 1999, p. 13). Many of the current Christian Identity leaders draw their doctrine and preaching styles from Butler, since he operates an effective clearinghouse for racist documents (Schamber, 1996).

The Role of Pastor Dan Gayman

In 1972, Pastor Dan Gayman formed The Church of Israel, an Identity church that was to become the vehicle for the spread of his influential views (Young, 1990). Gayman is "regarded as one of the leading preachers of the contemporary Christian Identity movement" (Schamber & Ehrhardt, 1995, p. 19). He has spoke in front of many identity groups and has published various influential works, including *The Two Seeds of Genesis 3:15*. It is this book that best summarizes his ideology and place in the movement. Gayman indicates "the biblical account of the fall of Adam and Eve as recorded in Genesis not only provides a description of the original sin, but also explains the origin of the Jews as a Satanic Race" (Schamber & Ehrhardt, 1995, p. 19). Gayman argues that Eve's sin was in copulating with Satan (thereby producing Cain), and Adam's sin was in copulating with Eve after she had been defiled (Gayman, 1994). It is from the seed of Cain that the Jews are born; thus, they are literally the children of Satan. Adam's seed, on the other hand is Abel and Abraham; members of the white race is therefore the children of Adam, made in the image of God.

Gayman has translated his racist views into action; his church actively propagates and publishes his works, and he has been connected with some notorious individuals on the far right. He has spoken at Butler's Aryan World Congress and has been federally implicated as having ties to The Order, an extremely violent para-military group (Danger, 1996). Also, Gayman has admitted to supporting

David Duke in his Presidential candidacy; "I was convinced then and remain convinced that he [Duke] has a genuine interest in the preservation of the Caucasian race and for our country in general" (*Danger*, 1996, p. 54).

While Gayman is not afraid to air his racist and dangerous comments in public, his church has sought to attain a "quietist posture, as they seek primarily to withdraw to the greatest possible degree from a society seen as inherently contaminating" (Kaplan, 1993, p. 31). This trend might be changing; indications of renewed missionary activity have been observed. As indicated in a flyer from 1995, "the Church of Israel launched a new 'outreach ministry designed to bring the voice of the prophets and the faith of the apostles to the lost sheep of the House of Israel'.... Gayman [has] held meetings in various Western cities designed to introduce people to the Church of Israel and its philosophy" (*Danger*, 1996, p. 54). This could signal the beginning of a disturbing new trend of expansion for the Identity-affiliated Church of Israel.

"The Holy Bible: The Book of Adam's Race"

Many of the Christian Identity groups publish inexpensive pamphlets that allow for wide dispersion among the public. These pamphlets are usually free, fairly short, and written in a simple manner. This study focuses on a pamphlet titled *The Holy Bible: The Book of Adam's Race* by Pastor Dan Gayman. This document attempts to convey to the reader the nature of the white race as being that of "Adam's seed." The Bible is conceived of as the white race's spiritual heritage, and must be protected against the pollution of non-Aryans. On the first page of text, Gayman (199-) indicates a fundamental claim for his arguments to come; he states "Adam man was the beginning of the White Race upon this earth" (p. 1). The rest of the text proceeds from this point, "proving" the special nature and essence of the white race. The reader is not only "dazzled" by Gayman's frequent use of biblical scripture and concordances, but is also commanded by the text on the cover to "Read it and Pass it on" (Gayman, 199-, Cover).

Narrative Theory

This text, due to its use of plot and characters to captivate modern audiences, shall be analyzed using the insights of narrative theory. Much research has focused on using this method of criticism (Carpenter, 1986; Burgchardt, 1985; Lewis, 1987). Narrative theory has its roots in the work of MacIntyre (1981), who indicated, "man is in his actions and practice, as well as in his fictions, essentially a story-telling animal" (p. 201). This line of theory concerning the fundamental nature of human communication was developed in earnest by Fisher (1984; 1987). Fisher (1984) argued that the dominant paradigm for human interaction, the "rational world paradigm," was defunct and did not address all the aspects of human communication. It is this reaction against modernity that Toulmin (1992) recounts in his history of modernity and its influences on communication and thought. Thus, in Fisher's (1987) seminal work, *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*, he proposes that human communication takes the form of a narrative or story that can be examined and criticized accordingly. Two key areas of focus are labeled by Fisher (1984); *narrative probability* is

“what constitutes a coherent story” and *narrative fidelity* concerns “whether the stories they [the audience] experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives”(p. 8). Rosteck (1992) further explicates these concepts by discussing “split-reference,” which in which a text refers to its own mimetic enactment and its applicability to the audience;

[a text] refer[s] both to the situation in the world and to itself. This split reference corresponds to the characteristics of narrative consistency and closure. As the rhetor constructs the connections between the narrative and the situation, the rhetor implicitly makes the case for the consistency of the narrative [*narrative probability*]. As the rhetor asks an audience to see the story as an example, the rhetor utilizes the narrative characteristic of closure [*narrative fidelity*]. (p. 30)

These overriding ideas should be within every narrative and should allow one to extract implications of power and value (McGee & Nelson, 1985).

Foss (1996) details some specific areas to describe and evaluate when examining a text’s narrative; one should examine the details and interactions inherent in the setting, the characters, and actions/causal events (among other areas). This criticism will proceed by examining Gayman’s (199-) pamphlet focusing on the settings and the various characters, and then analyzing the invited reaction the audience may entertain as a result of this narrative. Other areas of narrative analysis will be left for future research to address. Theoretically covering all of this are the ideas of *narrative probability* and *fidelity*; these are the ultimate adjudicators when considering audience acceptance or declination.

This inquiry argues that Gayman’s narrative portrays the white race to the assumed white (receptive) audience in a potentially worrisome manner. This narrative has significant implications for action and judgments on the part of white audiences that find it significant in terms of *narrative probability* and *fidelity*. By portraying the white race as special in terms of characterization and spatial location, motives for actions intent on rending community and racial solidarity can be seen. Accordingly, the following analysis will focus mainly on character description and causal events as related to the white race (as portrayed by Gayman), since this is the audience from which most of Gayman’s receptive audience shall be drawn.

Narrative Indicators of Racial Valuation

This narrative places the white race in a privileged position in the story. This section will describe some of the major ways that the white race is valued in this text, which will set the stage for criticism of the acceptance of this message by receptive audiences. Examination of the text revealed that the various settings were generally divisible into spatial and temporal locations. Additionally, the three main characters in this pamphlet, God, Adam’s race, and “other races,” are found to have differing traits and values attached to them.

Setting

Gayman (199-) relies heavily on a Christian underpinning of knowledge in the audience member who is examining this text. For instance, issues of spatial setting are not explicitly described at the start of the pamphlet; instead, through references to scripture, one realizes that Gayman is pulling our attention back to the Garden of Eden. The very first paragraph is a quotation from *Genesis* 5:1-2 detailing the creation of man by God. It is in this blessed setting of Eden that Adam's race "falls" from grace and is cast out of the Garden of Eden into painful existence on the earth.

The next spatial settings that impinge upon the reader of this tract are those of the afterlife and the Kingdom of God. Gayman (199-) talks of "bring[ing] forth into *this earth* the great and glorious *Kingdom of JESUS CHRIST*"(p. 19, italics mine). Here the shift from settings is evident; the earth is transformed into the newest setting, the Kingdom of Jesus Christ. All of these settings—the Garden of Eden, the earth, and the Kingdom of Jesus Christ—assume compliance with the traditional Christian ontological and metaphysical structure of reality; to a non-Christian, these settings might not be readily extractable from the text.

Wherever the descendants of Adam go, their surroundings (spatial settings) possess a special value. For instance, Gayman indicates that Adam man came from the Garden of Eden, an intrinsically beautiful place. Even after Adam and Eve were expelled from this state of Grace, they still had God's blessing and hope for a blessed future. Gayman (199-) talks of Adam's task as to "bring forth into this earth the great and glorious *Kingdom of JESUS CHRIST*"(p. 19). Here we see that even the "awful" and "painful" backdrop of earthly punishment is still imbued with a special value for Adam's race, as indicated by an important divine mandate. In addition to spatial settings, Gayman (199-) also utilizes as the temporal location of history (time) itself. Adam is uniquely situated in time; his beginning ("Creation") includes that of history itself, since "All history begins with White Adamic Man"(Gayman, 199-, p. 4). Not only does history start with Adam (p. 4), but also "all time is tied to Adam and His Genealogy"(p. 4). Here the idea is being developed that time and history, the totality of all possible relations, are being tied to the essence of Adam's race. The inclusive nature of this primary relationship is widened by Gayman to pull in the audience (Adam's Genealogy). This assertion of temporal "uniqueness" demonstrates a clear link between Adam's race (the white race) and the power inherent in the time-line of the created world. As is evident from the setting descriptions, the very concepts of time and history possess a special value in relation to Adam's race. According to Gayman's narrative, there exists some relationship between the white race and the special settings of their space and time.

Characterization

One of the main characters in this tract is God, or his incarnation Jesus Christ. God is described as being all-powerful, "almighty"(Gayman, 199-, p. 3), and as the one wielding the power of the "day of judgment"(p. 19). God is all-kind to his creation, the Adamic race, and accordingly sacrifices his son (Jesus) in order to give this race the salvation they deserve. God serves the typical role that this

divine figure has always played in Christian theology; an all-powerful, all-loving creator of all (Smith, 1986; Whitehead, 1960).

Gayman's (199-) narrative describes the main "character," Adam's race, in explicit terms. At the beginning of the book, Gayman leads the reader through a logical process of deducing "who" Adam's race is in today's world. He indicates "Adam means ruddy, to show blood in the face . . . The Hebrew meaning of the word Adam identifies him as a White Man"(Gayman, 199-, p. 1, emphasis in original). This "White race of Adam were [sic] made the custodians of the Sacred Scriptures"(p. 2). The emerging description is of Adam's race being a special creation of God; Gayman continues on and explains this relationship through the characteristics of Adam's essential nature.

Gayman (199-) describes Adam's race, the white race, as being the "children" (p. 7) of God; "Our race" is elected to "immortality" (p. 12) by God's grace. The "Spirit essence of Adam Man....was given by God (created) and it continues after time when the mortal flesh body dies in time"(Gayman, 199-, p. 12). The white race is being described as chosen by God, and thus as receiving the enormous benefits of His blessing. The very essence of this character, the white race, was created by God; "the Genetic template (pattern or mold) of the ADAM RACE was designed that this RACE should be divinely equipped to carry forth its DOMINION MANDATE over all the earth...as Vice Regents Under JESUS CHRIST"(p. 15). The mystical nature of Adam's race is alluded to when Gayman (199-) indicates "The qualities of Soul Essence, i.e. mentality, conscience, emotion, self-will, self-consciousness, were all genetically programmed to be much different in the Adam Man than in any of the other created being"(p. 16).

In seemingly direct opposition to the main character, Adam's race, is the character of the "other races"(Gayman, 199-, p. 3). Gayman wants his narrative to explain the differences between the other races and the white race; he does this by postulating the existence of races before Adam and then prohibits their intermingling with the biblical pronouncement of "Kind after His Kind"(p. 3). These races are described as having "left no written history . . . no culture, for they were sterile races, barren of all culture"(p. 3). Gayman concludes his short section on other races by indicating that "it is imperative to remember that the races occupying this earth before Adam had no history. All history begins with white Adamic Man"(p. 4). Given that all history begins with Adam's race, the role other races must play in this narrative are negative and derivative. Thus, while these races are not described in detail, their dominant characteristics of base nature and unimportance stand out in Gayman's narrative.

Problematic Portrayal & Narrative Warrants

This portrayal of the white race in Gayman's text is problematic because it portrays the white race in such a way that receptive audience members could use it as narrative council for how they are to behave to members of other races in their community. In order to unearth these messages, one finds that the ways that Gayman portrays the white race as special are integral ingredients in grounding such appeals. This special narrative description of the white race happens in four areas; the white race is portrayed as *progressing through time*, as *occupying sacred spa-*

tial locations, as essentially *chosen by God*, and as *separate from other races*. The narrative implication of Gayman's rhetoric is to blur the distinction between the stories in the Bible and the lives that audience members live today. This occurs through his portrayal of the white race as *progressing through time* toward the final destination of salvation and the Kingdom of God. Adam, having fallen, is able to start up the long road to salvation through the atonement and regeneration offered by Jesus. All the *spatial locations* along this temporal journey are aligned with the blessing of God; Gayman sees the earth, the Garden of Eden, and the Kingdom of God all in a different light when the members of Adam's race occupy them. The teleology implicit in his explication of the settings sets up a unique relation between this race and its spatial and temporal surroundings.

Other races have no history; wherever the white race goes, the surrounding time and space are seen to have special value. This perhaps can convey the causal relationship to readers that the presence of the white race *causes* the blessings and wonders inherent in the Garden of Eden, the earthly atonement, and the Kingdom of God. This race is perceived as so special, that God looks after it even after it has fallen into sin. Thus, the members of the white race (the ones receptive to this text) have new cause to be proud of their special role in this narrative drama that encompasses their own life. In turn, it provides them with narrative warrants for actions and beliefs that can continue to confirm this special value of their white race.

This opportunity for salvation and actual progress is not open to other races, as Adam is uniquely *chosen by God*. The White race is portrayed as the sole inheritors of the spiritual legacy of the Bible, and as such, "is charged with the Dominion Mandate" (Gayman, 199-, p. 19) over all things on this earth. The Bible itself is a "family history of one Race, i.e., the Race of Adam" (Gayman, 199-, p. 18). This is further augmented by the stunning metaphysical fact that the white race has characteristics that have been genetically optimized by the Lord Himself. The white race is portrayed as possessing the true knowledge of God (their family history) and of being created in the "likeness of the Triune God" (Gayman, 199-, p. 5).

Narratives can make arguments and claims with what they leave out of the story, just as well as what they include. Derrida makes this point in a powerful and unique way with his conception of the fundamental nature of difference and *differance* within the employment of language (Bizzell & Herzberg, 1990; Garver & Lee, 1994; Kamuf, 1991). It is this basic division at the heart of conceptualization that Derrida uses to assert the non-primacy of Western logocentrism (Olthuis, 1999); this line of theorizing can also be useful in our analysis of Gayman's seemingly innocuous treatment of other races. While he speaks positively of the white race in his tract, "other races" receive relatively little comment either negative or positive. While many see this as a tactic to preach a "soft line" on race issues, the ideas of Derrida could illustrate how it is just as argumentative as if he blatantly castigated the other races in his narrative.

The instantiations of linguistic concepts into texts often leads one to picture them as being mired in one identifiable context (Norris, 1997). Derrida argues that this idea is incorrect; in reality, "the word (also "text") is split; it both is and is not what it is" (Desilet, 1999, p. 350). This "law of repetition" specifies that lan-

guage use cannot occur “*in a way that eliminates the need for judgment* [by the receiver of the text]” (Desilet, 1999, p. 351). This interpretation by those exposed to the text must be affected by the fundamental *differance* at the heart of conceptual identity; Derrida’s theory leads one to the conclusion that “all identities . . . depend for their existence on something outside themselves, something which is absent and different from themselves” (Sweetman, 1997, p. 236). Gwozdz (1999) emphasizes a similar point in that “all identities involve their differences” (p. 305). The impact of the synthesis of required *differance* in linguistic usage and in necessitated judgment concerning contextualization lead Derrida to conclude, “our concepts always have far-reaching sociological and political implications” (Gwozdz, 1999, p. 308). Gayman’s narrative seems to possess ominous implications in regard to racial outlooks and relations, as it makes certain choices through its use of language that can convey valuation and devaluation through inclusion and exclusion.

By focusing mainly on the special nature of the white race, the audience is invited to judge this race (the white race) as the only “decent” or worthy race. The tract focuses almost entirely on the positive characteristics of the white race. Gayman (199-) demonstrates his “soft” exclusion through statements such as “Adam man[,] being the particular man (Race) of God’s Creation [stands] in contrast to the many (other races)” (p. 4). Adam was the chosen race of God; this is made clear by the narrative elements of his (race’s) ownership of the Bible, creation in the image of God, etc. If other races are excluded from relation to this character, Gayman’s narrative can coherently argue that these others races are inferior, dangerous, etc. According to Floyd Cochrane, a former leader of a Christian Identity group (“When,” 1993), this type of message can have dangerous implications on an audience’s future behavior. In a personal interview with Bates (1999), Cochrane indicated that “soft” line Christian Identity rhetoric is often easier for members and potential members to subsume into their underlying attitudes and beliefs, since it seems more “reasonable” and closer to what they already hold as true—for instance, a mild form of racial xenophobia could be cultivated into a metaphysical position positing the divine superiority of the white race, entailing harmful attitudes and actions toward other races in the community.

Desilet (1999) supports this empirical judgment by pointing out that “This selection [of context for the text] is also constructive by default in that the mix of what is included and what is left out or what is emphasized and what is obscured in various contextualizations is necessarily susceptible to being *differently* mixed” (p. 352). Thus, this tract can invite the audience to extract certain contextual messages from it in regard to the degenerate and derivative nature of other races through its selective portrayal of the white race. Gayman points out, “Can anyone assume that the third from Adam was a negro? That the forth was a mongol? Absolutely Not! Not by God’s Own Law of Kind after His Kind, A Law which does not lie” (p. 4)! His narrative separates the white race from the other races, by both labeling one as good (Adam’s race) and one as bad (other races having no history, culture, etc.), and by spending large amounts of narrative time focusing solely on the description of the white race. The denial of uniqueness and blessing in regard to the other races’ spatial and temporal surroundings, essential nature, and relation

to the white race all contribute to an exclusionary import within the text.

Fisher (1987) seems to argue that certain rhetorical artifacts that do not support the worth of all involved individuals should be labeled as a "bad story" (p. 76), and henceforth not narrational. However, the issues of context as broached previously come into play to allow a critic to judge the narrative probability and fidelity of this hateful, "bad story." Bates (1999) indicates that Fisher allows room for context, and that "If the audience believes a rhetor's story is acceptable (i.e., contains rationality and fidelity), then it is a good story for them. If it is, then the rhetor has been successful in constructing and presenting the story" (p. 111). Furthermore, Katriel and Shenhar (1990) and Bennett and Edelman (1985) all support the context-based situation of narratives; specific individuals in specific contexts either accept or reject specific narratives.

In regard to *narrative probability*, Gayman provides a consistent and coherent story that explains the role of the audience in relation to the "explanations" contained in the Christian Bible. The white race is consistently described as being special in regard to temporal and spatial location, relation to God, and in their superiority to other races. Not only does he include the audience in the narrative tale, he invites them to take part in concluding it. The biblical calls to Christian action and dominion, seen by outsiders as religious "myth," take on for the dedicated Christian Identity follower (or potential follower) the status of moral imperatives and deterministic explanation. Assuming the audience buys into this radical form of Christian narrative and is susceptible to Christian Identity messages, Gayman's intertwining of biblical narrative with the audience's personal, contextualized narrative could provide serious impetus toward Identity activity. The story is internally consistent and involves rich characterizations, especially of the race that includes its intending audience. Such a narrative is even more worrisome if it can capture high judgments from its audience of its *narrative fidelity*, or the extent to which it rings true with past experiences and thus provides warrants for action or belief.

The *narrative fidelity* of this text is epitomized by the concluding statements to the audience to "help others of your Race bring forth this earth the great and glorious Kingdom of JESUS CHRIST" (Gayman, 199-, p. 19). Gayman's strength in this text is in using the characterization and spatial placement of "Adam's race" to captivate white, Christian Identity audience members. The power and election of the chosen white race confers an "awesome responsibility under which you [the audience] walk" (Gayman, 199-, p. 19). The audience, whom we can assume are white and familiar with Christian doctrine (this is not to say, of course, that a majority of Christians accept this type of position), is very likely to be sympathetic to this ego-bolstering maneuver on the part of Gayman's narrative. He includes the audience, not only through genealogical relations in the past, but also through mystical future activity that leads to the ultimate salvation of the white race. Gayman culminates his narrative by giving closure to this story through this involvement of the audience. Couple these factors with the "soft" approach to denigrating other races, and Gayman's narrative has the potential of affecting even "reasonable" audience members. Individuals who may feel displaced or uncertain in this age of rising globalization, seemingly increasing "sin," etc. have the potential to see in

this narrative a way to find value and certain in their life through this biased and unequal reading of Christian texts. Gayman's text, through its "soft" approach of mainly discussing the white race, helps the sympathetic member of his audience not only define themselves, but also gain ways of defining and denigrating other races by seeing them as excluded from the special nature of the white race qua character in this narrative.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to focus scholarly attention on the pamphlet entitled *The Holy Bible: The Book of Adam's Race*, by Pastor Dan Gayman. This text is a typical instance of Christian Identity propaganda, disseminating their views through biblically tainted argumentative narratives. Critics have an imperative to examine such texts in the communities our scholarship inhabits and informs; as Desilet (1999) indicates, critical inquiry "must always be open to and cognizant of the thread of judgments and values in its [the text's] fabric"(p. 356). The structure and the implications of this text have been extracted by using narrative criticism, as detailed by Fisher (1987) and Foss (1996). It has been argued that this pamphlet, through the special characterization and location of the white race, helps construct potentially harmful narrative warrants for belief and action on the part of sympathetic audience members. While this research does not exhaust possible lines of inquiry into the machinations of this text, it does begin to provide an answer to how Gayman portrays the white race through narrative. The Christian Identity movement has been connected to violence since its inception in America the late-1800s (Schamber, 1999). Through analyzing the story lines that members believe themselves to be a part of, progress can be made toward interrupting the violent actions and conclusions of these Identity narratives that so many of these individuals long to complete.

Works Cited

- Barkun, M. (1990). Racist apocalypse: Millennialism on the far right. *American Studies*, 31, 121-140.
- Bates, M. C. (1999). *A narrative criticism of Christian Identity's "Who Killed Christ" tracts*. Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of the Pacific.
- Bates, M. C. (1999). Personal Interview with Floyd Cochrane conducted on October 14, 1999.
- Bennett, D. H. (1995). *The party of fear: The American far right from nativism to the militia movement*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bennett, W. L., & Edelman, M. (1985). Toward a new political narrative. *Journal of Communication*, 35, 156-171.
- Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (1990). *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present*. Boston, MA: Bedford Books.
- Burghardt, C. R. (1985). Discovering rhetorical imprints: La Follette, "Iago," and the melodramatic scenario. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 71, 441-456.
- Carmichael, J. (1992). *The Satanizing of the Jews: Origin and development of mystical anti-Semitism*. New York: Fromm International Publishing Corporation.

- Carpenter, R. H. (1986). Admiral Mahan, "narrative fidelity," and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 290-305.
- Danger extremism: The major vehicles and voices on America's far-right fringe.* (1996). New York: Anti-Defamation League.
- Desilet, G. (1999). Physics and language—science and rhetoric: Reviewing the parallel evolution of theory on motion and meaning in the aftermath of the Sokal hoax. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 85, 339-360.
- Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 1-22.
- Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Foss, S. K. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration & practice.* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Garver, N., & Lee, S. C. (1994). *Derrida & Wittgenstein.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gayman, D. (199-). *The Holy Bible: The book of Adam's race.* Schell City, Missouri: Church of Israel.
- Gwozdz, T. (1999). Derrida, Maritain, and deconstruction. *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 39, 305-316.
- Kamuf, P. (1991). *A Derrida reader: Between the blinds.* New York: Colombia University Press.
- Kaplan, J. (1993). The context of American millenarian revolutionary theology: The case of the 'identity Christian' Church of Israel. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 5, 30-82.
- Katriel, T., & Shenhar, A. (1990). Tower and stockade: Dialogic narration in Israeli settlement ethos. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 359-380.
- Lewis, W. F. (1987). Telling America's story: Narrative form and the Reagan presidency. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 280-302.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- McGee, M. C., & Nelson, J. S. (1985). *Homo narrans: Narrative reason in public argument.* *Journal of Communication*, 35, 139-155.
- Norris, C. (1997). *Derrida.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nothstine, W. L., Blair, C., & Copeland, G. A. (1996). *Critical questions: Invention, creativity, and the criticism of discourse and media.* New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Olthuis, J. H. (1999). Feature review article: On *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida* by John D. Caputo, and on *Deconstruction in a Nutshell*, ed. John D. Caputo. *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 39, 347-353.
- Rosteck, T. (1992). Narrative in Martin Luther King's *I've been to the Mountaintop.* *Southern Communication Journal*, 58, 22-32.
- Schamber, J. F. (1996). *The Jews as the antichrist: A cluster analysis of the rhetoric of the Christian identity movement.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, November 1996, San Diego, California.

- Schamber, J. F. (1999). *A brief two hundred year history of the Christian identity movement*. Unpublished manuscript, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California.
- Schamber, J. F., & Ehrhardt, D. A. (1995). *The revitalization of the curse of Cain and the curse of Ham in the theology of the Christian identity movement*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, November 1995, San Antonio, Texas.
- Schwartz, A. (1983). The 'Identity churches': A theology of hate. *ADL Facts*, 28, 5-16.
- Simonelli, F. J. (1996). Preaching hate with the voice of God: American neo-nazis and Christian identity. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 30, 43-54.
- Smith, H. (1986). *The religions of man*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Sweetman, B. (1997). The deconstruction of western metaphysics: Derrida and Maritain on identity." In R. T. Ciapalo (Ed.) *Postmodernism and Christian Philosophy*. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press.
- Toulmin, S. (1992). *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- When they leave: Floyd Cochrane quits Aryan Nations. (1993). *The Monitor: A Publication of the Center for Democratic Renewal*, 27, 8.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1960). *Religion in the making*. New York: Living Age Books.
- Young, T. J. (1990). Cult violence and the identity movement. *Cultic Studies Journal*, 7, 150-159.

Former Forensics Directors Don't Die and They Just Shouldn't Fade Away

K. Jeanine Congalton & Clark D. Olson

Introduction

Throughout forensics history, a necessary foundation of the activity has been the directors who teach, coach, administer tournaments, and train graduate students to do both. A successful director implements a variety of skills, many of which are learned on the job. Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes (1976) articulate these skills when they conclude, "[a] director must be often simultaneously, coach, administrator, counselor, scholar, and teacher" (p. 69). Bartanen (1994) refined the role of director of forensics by classifying it as a part of an organizational system. He identified three domains which a director must manage: (1) the interpersonal domain, which recruits students and manages interpersonal relationships on the team; (2) the organizational domain, which administers and manages the team including program justification, financing, and public relations; and (3) the educational domain, which is concerned with teaching, coaching and judging (p. 50).

Yet how important are these same skills once a director retires from the activity. What happens to these directors once they leave the official ranks and become former directors? The activity and individual programs often track the accomplishments of various alumni after their competitive careers have been completed. To date, however, little attention has been focused on the "afterlife" of the director of forensics. Although we know much about the active role of directors of forensics, we know practically nothing about the lives these individuals lead once they leave coaching. Indeed, Gill (1990) has hypothesized that the average tenure of a director of forensics may be as short as six years. Given the high level of academic training most of these individuals have attained, it seems likely that many of these individuals will choose to stay in academic settings. Yet, little is known about what impact their forensics experience has on their current endeavors and if/how forensics is still a part of their lives. Matlon and Keele (1984) surveyed past participants of the National Debate Tournament to determine their profile post forensics participation, but no attempt has been made to do the same for past directors of forensics. Literature pertaining to past directors is, for example, limited to Murphy's (1988) essay on transitioning from a former to a new director. Yet Murphy's essay provides few clues as to the impact former directors may have on

K. Jeanine Congalton, Department of Speech Communication, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92834-6868; Clark D. Olson, Hugh Downs Schools of Human Communication, Arizona State University

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 39 (2002), 36-41

the activity.

Given a host of personal experience, the current study seeks to systematize our experiences by surveying former directors to learn what skills are most valuable to former directors in their "new" lives. Furthermore, we were curious as to whether former directors continue involvement in the activity at their local institutions. Thus we chose to investigate whether directing a forensics program has benefits in the "afterlife" and to what degree former directors are interested in maintaining any ties with the activity.

Method

In the spirit of past research on forensic alumni, an eight item, open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix) was mailed to thirty former directors of forensics listed in the American Forensic Association's and regional forensics directories. Seventeen surveys were returned for a response rate of 57%. Demographic data from these participants found that they came from five different AFA districts. Their time span as directors ranged from 3-42 years, with an average of 16.4 years. We acknowledge this may well be higher than the average. Their last year of formal participation in the activity ranged from 1-15 years ago, with the average director having last coached eight years ago. The responses to each question were sorted and coded for frequency.

Results

The first question sought to determine the most valuable skill learned as a director of forensics. There was greatest agreement in response to this question. Interestingly, half the respondents commented on the importance of various administrative skills. The term "multi-tasking" became a theme for these responses. Respondents focused on the ability to "manage a diverse and challenging workload" as well the ability to implement a strategy to meet "competing demands and priorities." References to specific skills such as "budgeting," "scheduling," "planning," and of course "balancing multiple tasks" were predominant.

One-half of the responses also reflected skills related to conflict management. References to the importance of managing "diverse and sometimes difficult personalities" became a secondary theme in response to this question. Respondents noted the importance of "learning how to cope, teach, inspire "diverse" personalities" as well as the ability to "separate issues from interpersonal conflict." In these instances, the ability to be patient, to tolerate different points of view, and to manage difficult people were paramount.

The next question asked how the skills learned as directors were transferable to their current positions. Eight skills were mentioned more than once with the most frequent skills being planning and organizing (8), using the debate model in decision-making (6), and administrative budgeting and evaluating (3). Other useful skills were leadership abilities, evaluating and performing as a speaker, and the ability to see the big picture.

When asked how their experiences as directors impacted their current performances, fourteen respondents credited forensics with enhancing their current job skills, be they administrative or in the classroom. Four of these respondents again

made reference to managing diverse personalities and acknowledged experience in conflict management helped in their current position.

The greatest variety was found in former directors' current levels of involvement in forensics. Many respondents gave multiple answers, with the most frequent being judging at tournaments (7), running tournaments (5), alumni relations and fund raising (3), involvement in national organizations (4), supervising the current director as his/her chair (5), and moving involvement to the high school level (3). In addition, 3 former directors admitted minimal current involvement. This fact is interesting in the face of the results of the question, "[T]o what extent does the current director of forensics at your school seek your advice?" Here, one-half the respondents said they had minimal involvement in the current program, while another four said they had more involvement immediately after their departures, but that involvement tapered off after a year or so. Only five respondents claimed they had frequent contact with the current director and felt their input was actively sought.

However, when asked their degree of willingness to still be actively involved, the results were fairly evenly split. Seven former directors said they would be willing to be more actively involved, especially in coaching. At least one former director indicated that s/he was willing, but had "not been asked." Seven were not willing to increase participation or be involved. The reasoning here ranged from diminished time availability because of current administrative duties, other career interests, or decreased interest due to "find[ing] fewer and fewer colleagues of [his/her] own age and interests to socialize with" or because of "getting older." Three respondents were satisfied with their current level of involvement.

As to involvement in forensics, two distinct and opposing opinions proved intriguing. One former director was very clear in noting that s/he had paid his/her dues and was no longer interested in maintaining any involvement with the activity. This respondent indicated that s/he had "been there, done that, and accomplished all that I wanted to accomplish" and that "my mentality is probably all or nothing when it comes to forensics." On the other hand, one director noted that former directors have an obligation to the activity. This respondent remarked that, "I do believe that a key to the future vitality and viability of college forensics is related to whether former DOF's and coaches continue to provide support, guidance, etc. when they leave the formal ranks of forensics."

Discussion

Not surprisingly, the results of this survey reflected that multi-tasking was one of the most important skills for former directors of forensics. Given that multiple tasks have been articulated as necessary for the director, the respondents in this survey indicated that the ability to juggle many activities as well as the ability to juggle many interpersonal situations was very important. The initial information reveals that former directors of forensics find that the administrative skills used in directing forensics programs are important in their current positions. Given that many of the former directors who responded indicated that they are working in some administrative capacity, then it would be logical that administrative forensics skills would be helpful. Whether a department chair, an assistant dean, or

chairing a university/college committee, respondents found that the ability to plan, organize, and budget their time has proven beneficial for them in their current professional lives.

Additionally, these same former directors have found the ability to multi-task or to perform many roles beneficial. Of special interest here is that some respondents noted that multi-tasking included more than on the job, task related behaviors. One respondent noted that multi-tasking “seems to go beyond the simple terms ‘time-management’ or ‘organization.’ It also involved prioritization of tasks and measurement of interpersonal as well as task needs.” Another respondent noted that s/he could engage in “multi-tasking at an even higher order than I could have accomplished in another area.” This same respondent suggested that s/he learned how to “balance research, teaching, social, home, family, and church” activities. In both instances, the respondents found that their ability to balance their lives and play multiple roles transferred from directing forensics to social situations. As a result, we found that multi-tasking included the ability to manage both “task” and “interpersonal” dimensions in the lives of these former directors.

Generally, then, the management skills were not limited to task oriented activities, but included interpersonal dimensions as well. Without exception, those former directors who indicated that they were either chairing departments/divisions or working as assistant/associate deans noted that being able to manage diverse personalities and resolve conflict were skills they found to be invaluable. These same respondents found that prior experience in managing a diverse group of personalities also helped them to manage conflict when a clash of personalities resulted in interpersonal conflict.

As to involvement in forensics, the results of this study demonstrate that old forensics directors don't have to fade away unless those currently involved in the activity allow them to do so. The results indicate that if requests are made, former directors of forensics are likely to provide some assistance or advice to new directors. We posit that because of a lack of communication or because of mutual misperceptions, some new directors are likely to bypass asking former directors for help while some former directors may avoid offering help to new directors so as not to be perceived as being “pushy.”

Why might current directors not seek the advice of previous directors? First, undoubtedly new directors to programs need to make the forensics programs “their” programs. The forensic activity is personality-driven and it is important that directors are rendered “ownership” of a program. To ensure a smooth transfer of program “ownership,” new directors typically need to assert themselves as being in control. So that their visions can be realized, new directors typically want to put their unique stamp on a program's administration and development. As a result, it would be reasonable to assume that new directors would first focus on establishing themselves as directors before seeking out the skills and opinions of previous directors.

Conversely, though unsurveyed, new directors may recognize the need to give former directors some “space.” Having been associated with forensics for any number of years, as a director formally leaves the activity, new directors may realize that the former director needs time to develop her/his own new career direc-

tion. New directors may choose to respect the newfound privacy of the previous director, and not choose to involve them in time-consuming activities, even when perhaps a small piece of advice could save the new director countless time and confusion. However, former directors were careful to indicate that they did not want to be perceived as interfering in the program.

For those former directors who choose to maintain involvement in forensics, the results reveal numerous means to remain involved. Without the time-consuming pressure of day-to-day coaching, several former directors choose to serve in national forensic organizations, so as to benefit not only their host institution, but the entire activity, with their expertise. Keeping in touch with former students was valuable for many former directors, and this benefited programs through alumni contact and fundraising. Several former directors moved their focus to the high school level. And most commonly, the expertise of former directors was used occasionally to help judge or administer tournaments.

Future Research

Obviously one limitation of the current survey is the self-selection of former directors who hold at least in terms of membership, some level of professional connection to forensics. As a result, we are missing the insights of particular former directors of forensics who willingly have terminated their connections with the activity and/or discipline. If such is the case, then it would be interesting to understand why individuals have chosen to completely remove themselves from the activity. Additionally, efforts should be made to seek out those former directors who have moved from the academy to the private sector. Research could then determine whether serving as a forensics administrator has any impact (either positive or negative) in this arena.

Given the results of this survey, we now know that some directors maintain involvement with their institution's respective forensics programs. The next step is to survey a greater number of former directors to ascertain which particular forensics administrative skills have proven most helpful to them. Additionally, future attempts to survey more former directors in order to determine what occupations they are in, what additional skills they find useful, and whether there are a greater or lesser number of former directors who are interested in assisting with forensics programs in any way could add to this investigation. Moreover, an expanded demographic analysis, such as the type done by Matlon and Keele (1984), would help determine a more specific profile of the former director.

Conclusions

Former directors of forensics have both the experience and the ability to provide a wide array of skills necessary to keep the forensics activity vital. At their current institution, once firmly established in a new capacity, and/or when a new director perceives that she/he has put a unique stamp on a forensics program, the advice and counsel of the former director would be advised. Even if a request is denied, former directors can prove to be powerful allies for new directors. Whether teaching new directors how to cut through the bureaucracy of an institution or helping to raise funds for the forensics squad or even serving as a sounding board,

former directors of forensics still have something to offer, should they be so willing. This study demonstrated that former directors can and are often willing to serve in various capacities including judging at tournaments, helping with tournament administration, or occasionally helping to coach individuals. Most seem willing to help, but either have not been asked or do not want to appear to be meddling in current programs. Hence, it appears that the discipline of communication could help build bridges between current and past directors of forensics to insure successful and nonthreatening involvement it would have great benefits for all involved.

Appendix: Survey Instrument **Contributions of Former Directors of Forensics**

1. What is the most valuable skill that you learned from serving as a director of forensics? Briefly explain why that skill is important to you?
2. Specifically, what forensics related skills are most important for your present position?
3. How have the skills listed in question #2 had an impact on how you perform your current job?
4. What level and types of involvement in forensics do you continue to maintain?
5. To what extent has the current Director of Forensics at your college/university sought your advice on topics related to forensics?
6. Are you willing to increase your involvement in forensics at your college/university? Why or why not?
7. How many years did you serve as a director of forensics? _____
8. What was the last year that you served as a director of forensics? _____

References

- Bartanen, M. D. (1994). *Teaching & Directing Forensics*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Faules, D. F., Rieke, R. D., & Rhodes, J. (1976). *Directing forensics: Contest & debate speaking*. 2nd edition. Denver: Morton.
- Gill, M. (1990). Why forensic coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 179-88.
- Matlon, R. J., & Keele, L. M. (1984). A survey of participants in the national debate tournament, 1947-1980. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 20, 194-205.
- Murphy, T. L. (1988). Coaching in a continuing trend. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, New Orleans, LA.

The Role of Debate in the Educational Systems of Countries in Transition to Democracy: A Case Study of Romania

Florin A. Sava

Abstract

The present paper discusses the role and the limits of debate in the development of a democratic culture through the process of education. The idea of this article is to emphasize that debate represents the bridge between the passive style of understanding democracy and the active, community approach, which characterizes a strong civic society. Debate *per se* does not directly lead to democratic behaviors and attitudes. Instead, it sets the conditions for students to democratically express themselves. The article concludes with several policy measures designed to improve debate in the Romanian educational system, as a necessary step to obtain major gains in students' civic training.

Introduction

When facing civilization drifts from an authoritarian value structure to a socialized and democratic value structure people tend to adopt one of the following two possibilities; either they learn to live with diversity and slide into a democratic institutional functioning or they revert to traditional authoritarianism and institutional rigidity. The education is the main tool that a society has at its disposal for instructing people on the benefits of the first choice. In order to achieve the positive aspects of democracy, the educational system should use those tools that are most effective in teaching people to be open to others' opinions. Open-mindedness becomes the essential pillar of being involved in civic society.

The present paper thesis regards the role of academic debate movement in educational process as an efficient tool of developing a democratic civic culture. In this article, the focus will be both on advantages and limits of using debate for civic and human rights education. The context of discussions is represented by social and political conditions of new democracies from Central and Eastern Europe and more particularly, the case of Romania.

This article seeks to explain to the readers the benefits of construing debate as a democratic and educational tool. Although debate is important in promoting civic education it does not necessarily induce democratic thinking and behavior in a person. However, due to its characteristics, detailed later in course of the article,

Florin A. Sava, University of the West in Timisoara, Romania, Center for Psychological Studies and Research, fsava75@yahoo.com

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 39 (2002), 42-49

academic debate can be considered a better solution when compared with traditional style of education.

In order to achieve the above-mentioned aims, reference will be made to the connection between democracy and debate after discussing the role of education in consolidating principles of democracy. The main idea is that debate represents the bridge between a passive style of understanding democracy and the active, community approach, that characterizes a strong civic society.

The role of education in consolidating democratic principles

The Nobel Prize winner in economy, Becker (1997), stated that education, along with professional development, constitute the most important investments in human capital. This is indeed true since the role of education in the development of society is also supported by sociological and psychological results. Thus, from a sociological point of view, education plays an essential role, facilitating the society changes and helping overcome the difficulties of adapting to new structures and mentalities (Giddens, 2000). Citizenship training and freedom of inquiry continue to be educational topics, demonstrating a permanent need to address educational questions in terms of cultural and social dynamics. The socio-political norms that stemmed from the Revolution of 1989 found the Romanian society mainly unprepared for these profound and radical changes. Disagreements regarding the rhythm and direction of change occurred shortly after the Romanian anticommunist revolution took place. All citizens wanted a new way of life but only a part managed to change their behaviors and mentalities (Neculau, 1996). A parallel situation can be found in a school setting where, when faced with difficulties some people tend to react in an affective manner, developing a defensive attitude, rigidity, and lack of respect for others' opinions as well as resistance to change. These individuals seem to lack some of the following dimensions: identification of the viewpoint, recognition of the assumptions underlying opinions and especially ability to analyze supported arguments. Accepting others assumptions, opens the way for a receptive dialogue and has direct implication for problem solving activities. Unfortunately, the old style of teaching, still very common in the Romanian educational system, is not suited to incorporate the above-mentioned aspects. According to Tibbits (1994) in Romania, as with most Eastern and Central European countries, teaching has been primarily content-driven and traditional in format, which supposed reading of text by teachers and the use of questioning in order to ensure that students memorized the proper answer. This style falls far short of the expectations of the Council of Europe's Recommendation of teaching human rights aspects through methods which ensure the learning of skills, knowledge and feelings related to this topic (Osler and Starkey, 1994). In order to achieve these goals, a good civic education method should involve three dimensions of learning (Tibbits, 1994). These refer to the information dimension that involves student's knowledge, the inquiry dimension that focuses on developing critical thinking abilities in students, and the participation dimension that prepares students to implement basic tasks associated with human rights and civic education.

Positive outcomes of using debate in the educational process

In new democracies, the ultimate goal of the educational reforms should be to turn out thoughtful citizens, persons able to think well so that new demagogues and authoritarian personalities should any longer be able to manage to persuade people for their own benefit. However, achieving these skills requires proper training programs. Psychologists have demonstrated the necessity of thinking programs elsewhere (De Bono, 1991; Sternberg, 1997). In fact, in the mid 80's, the USA National Commission on Excellence in Education expressed its concern that "many 17-year olds do not possess the higher order intellectual skills we should expect from them. Nearly 40% cannot draw inferences from written material and only one-fifth can write a persuasive essay" (McTighe, 1987). Debate activities can be seen as tools for developing thinking, personality traits and research activity. A previous follow-up pilot study conducted for one and a half years on Romanian high school pupils, revealed promising results. Children who were involved in one-year debate activities showed significantly greater social responsibility and self-acceptance compared to control group children. It should be noticed that these differences might be considered to be gains from debate activities since at the beginning of the study there were no differences between pupils. However, the results also showed, since the beginning, a greater empathy and tolerance towards others' opinion by pupils who choose to be involved in the debate program compared to pupils who were not interested in following these activities (Sava, 2000).

These general sociological and psychological reasons for using debate in the educational process show the benefits of using debate when compared only to traditional style of education. However, there are other methods that may be also used for the same purpose. Why then use debate for learning and consolidating democratic principles? One of the reason is that debate does more than just stimulate a passive traditional school environment; it is a tool to exercise democracy. The following table summarizes the main reasons that support these assumptions. They are conclusions of a policy report that conducted a one-year national program on debate tournaments with resolutions on only human rights issue (Sava, 2001b).

Table 1

Aspects of Debate that Help Students Consolidating Democratic Principles

- Debate implies the use of skills that develop the inquiry dimension of learning
Debate activities enhance critical thinking skills of students. Additionally, due to the documentation period, visits to non-profit foundations that support human rights and civic issue are encouraged. This constitutes an active way of learning human rights aspects.
- Different formats of debate set conditions for expressing democratic behaviors
The rules of different styles of debate permit equal access to the discourse. Debaters use dialog as a form of communication. The resolutions involve debating on conflicting values, which facilitate the comprehension of value clashes. This

also helps in setting limits and differentiating between rights and responsibilities of citizens.

- Debate makes use of rationality instead of arbitrary rules or violent behavior *Defending the validity of one's claims implies the presence of several conditions that argumentative rationality encompasses. They are the abilities to empathize, to see things through the eyes of the opponent, to recognize the other as an equal, to consider all points of view worthy of being considered as premises of talking (tolerance).*
- Debate helps differentiating among promises, lies, and solid policy proposals *Debate activities stimulate the social responsibility of students, enhancing their interest for community and political life. Due to experience in debate students manage to identify demagogic speeches or insufficiently prepared policy proposals.*
- Debate represents the easiest content-free method of exercising democracy *Aspects such as inclusion of minority teachers, development of school newspapers, lack of discrimination among students, a multicultural perspective within the curriculum, all depend on official policy decision. These activities require more resources, and probably will be mechanically applied. Instead, debate can be implemented more easily through the existing national debate network. Debate also addresses more directly to teachers and students, as primary receivers.*

School does not only teach content material, but also impose values and norms, which can be taught directly or indirectly. The first alternative consists of subjects such as civic education. The second one, entitled community approach, involves pupils in the practical process of incorporating these abstract values in their usual living. Debate represents a bridge between these two alternatives. On one hand, due to its characteristic community approach it is an informal tool that can not be implemented in a formal education system. On the other hand, the core curriculum of social studies that encompasses democratic principles and inspires civic virtue in students does not automatically lead to the development of a good moral character. Therefore, debate represents the best way of consolidating democracy in a formal school setting. By debating, both high school and university students become more aware and responsible to the importance of consolidating democratic values, attitudes, and behaviors. Debate activities should not eliminate civic education classes, but should be present in schools to emphasize the active and practical manner of reflecting upon the acquired values and knowledge.

This aspect is especially important for emerging democracies from Central and Eastern Europe. In the new democracies there is a strong need for debate since its citizens face two main problems: lack of democratic stability due to cultural and value changes (resistance to change), and lack of proper thinking and personality tools to solve such issues. Debate activities address both aspects trying to develop an open-minded attitude, critical thinking, tolerance for other's views, and social responsibility. If designed successfully, it will consolidate both democratic values and people's civic attitudes, attributes that are needed for constructing a

healthy society. This is particularly important, since previous experiences demonstrated a tendency for countries that became independent rather recently to face totalitarianism (fascism and/or communism). One of the causes why this happened was the success of nationalism in these countries, especially due to their lack of historical achievements and their long periods of oppressions (Hermet, 1989).

Another argument in favor of introducing debate to consolidate democratic behaviors and attitudes is based on the idea that people tend to see democracy from the eyes of common sense. Thus, Martin Lipset (cited in Hermet, 1989), introduced the concept of "democracy preconditions". These imply mainly that poor nations are not capable of living in democracy, since they can not enjoy the benefits of freedom. Instead, they are attracted more by egalitarian and xenophobic speeches. This fact was confirmed at least for Romanian context, where due to economical problems caused by social and economical transition, more than half of the respondents to a national pool said, "it was better during the communist times using as a criteria the degree of freedom perceived"! (Sava, 2001a). Debate limits the power of such speeches in favor of more responsible speeches based on good policy proposals. In spite of the above-described benefits, debate does have limits that sometime may interfere with the development of a solid democratic culture.

Limits of debate programs as educational tools for democracy

This constitutes the main concern in the artificial character of many debating issues. This allows students to use debate more like an operating system than as a tool of democracy awareness. Especially during the tournaments, participants concentrate more on winning a debate and defeating an opponent than on finding a plausible solution to a community problem or on understanding in a deeper way the philosophic clash beneath the resolution. A more cooperative direction may perhaps be found in the solution proposed by Gates (2000). It involves and encourages the win-win approach, which will be more conclusive for the purpose of shaping an open-minded person, who is oriented towards community issues.

This alternative seems to be more practical when shifting the stress from the concept of democracy as an establishment of certain relations between government and its citizens to a civic-comunitarian approach (Malpas & Wickham, 1998). This emphasizes the notion of democracy based on communities with active citizens.

Thus, a healthy society will be developed, providing a greater interest toward increased citizen participation and civic democracy. This measure will make people sense that they have some degree of control over their own lives, teaching them to trust one another by working together.

In conclusion, debate represents a bridge between *theoretical school subjects*, such as civic education that lack the active involvement of students, and the *community approach* that require an active approach in order to modify miscellaneous aspects of life in a particular community. It has also been observed that debate *per se* does not necessary lead directly to democratic behaviors and attitudes. Instead, it sets democratic conditions as described in table 1, that make students experience democratic behaviors and attitudes, as a prerequisite for future community inter-

ventions.

Up to this point, the importance and limits of debate activities in the educational system as a modality of developing a civic awareness to students was presented. However, analyzing the present ways of putting to practice these theoretical gains should be taken into consideration. In the forthcoming part, the focus will be on Romanian experience in the field, as well as on the related measures requested to implement the debate program in the educational system. All examples come from exploring the educational history of including debate in the national curriculum with a special emphasis on the main barriers that Romanian Association of Debate, Oratory and Rhetoric encountered while implementing debate as a high school subject.

Concrete steps of teaching debate in schools

The educational reform was required in Romania as in any other former communist country. It does not represent just a political compromise, but a necessary measure in order to get a real transformation oriented towards open society values. The former Ministry of Education, Andrei Marga (1996-2000), realized that the reform process requires "the new method of argumentation and public debate that helps implementing good decisions" (Marga, 1998).

The debate program was introduced in Romania by Open Society Foundation in 1994, as a modality of providing tools for developing critical thinking and open society values in students. In 1998, the program was taken over by the new-formed Romanian Association of Debate, Oratory and Rhetoric (ARDOR) as a measure of institutionalizing the Open Society Foundation debate program. The main aim of the new organization was to help the development of communication abilities, as a support for problem solving, concerning social issues emerged during the reform process.

Within this context, two major steps were requested to implement debate in schools. They refer to the institutionalization of the debate program and to teachers' motivational aspects in order to overcome barriers set by resistance to change.

One of the main successes of ARDOR was the signed agreement with the former minister of Education, Andrei Marga on 6th of January 1999. This act officially recognized the importance and the necessity of a debate program. This also meant the inclusion of debate in the Romanian Official Curriculum, as a high school optional subject for "Logic and Argumentation" within the curricular area "Individual and Society". This legal measure assured the debate development at high school level.

This decision was supported by several policy measures that facilitates the development of the program in schools. The responsibilities of the state in schools is to provide opportunities that stimulate independent thinking, develop free and supported opinions and enhance positive social attitude by the use of critical thinking, communicational abilities and argumentation competencies (Dagmara Georgescu, Secretary of State, Order no.10319 from 20.04.1999).

The institutionalization of debate activities in schools led to the explosion of the number of participants in debate activities. Additionally, this measure helped debate activists to find satisfactory resources when preparing debate activities.

Both consequences will lead to wider democratic exercises among pupils and students. Despite the achievements, a series of problems occur in the implementation process.

Barriers in implementing academic debate

Mainly, as in any process of change, there is a resistance to adapt to new aspects (Bogathy, 1999). In the educational system, this category refers especially to local school boards and school principals that are not fully aware of the program benefits, such as the promotion of open society values and the development of critical thinking. They are still trapped by the debate “façade” evaluating the entire program as a “show” or “just talking”. Due to this undesirable situation, several teachers, who were trained to teach this subject, still do not have this opportunity. However, it seems that time will solve the problem since after one year of institutionalized debate the majority of high schools in big cities provides students with this opportunity. Moreover, teachers become aware of the useful way of using debate as a free content method that can be applied to specific subjects such as Romanian language, literature, history, science and others.

Another impediment refers to the relative low figures of university departments that agreed to introduce such activities to their curriculum. At the moment, this negative situation is compensated due to students’ great interest in debating social aspects in the ARDOR framework.

Unfortunately, the most important barrier consists in the problem of human resources within ARDOR. Since the debate program was at first an Open Society Program, the financial support was significantly higher than the majority of non-profit organizations. Each year the financial support decreased, determining many persons that were trained by ARDOR to leave the organization. This fact comes to emphasize once more the limits of debate program in changing mentalities since there were persons that refused to be involved in voluntary activities. Yet, this phenomenon can not be generalized since there were many people that continued the activity and started searching successfully for alternative sources of financial support.

In conclusion, in spite of some limits, debate activities manages to promote civic values, as well as thinking tools in order to guide the social and public life of the program’s participants. This helps them develop a civic awareness that defines the core rights and responsibilities of a democratic citizenship. These values are incorporated in our constitutional democracy and may be also derived from debate programs. In order to be successful, debate should be institutionalized and included in the educational curriculum. The Romanian experience of ARDOR, the national non-profit organization that promotes debate activities, shows that the usual barriers can be overcome in the near future so that the perspective of debate in the educational system is bright, especially for high school level.

References

- Becker, G.S. (1997). *Capitalul uman. A analiza teoretica si empirica cu referire speciala la educatie*. [Human capital. A theoretical and empirical analysis with special focus on education, 3rd edition]. Bucharest: All.

- Bogathy, Z. (1999). *Negocierea in organizatii* [Negotiation in organizations]. Timisoara: Editura Eurostampa.
- De Bono, E. (1991). *Teach your child how to think*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gates, C.T. (2000). Toward a healthy democracy. *National Civic Review*, 89 (2), 161-168.
- Georgescu, D. (1999). Ministry of Education. Secretary of State Order no.10319 from 20.04.1999
- Giddens, A. (2000). *Sociologie* [Sociology]. Bucharest: Editura All.
- Hermet, G. (1998). Poporul contra democratiei. [*People against democracy*]. Iasi: Institutul European.
- Malpas, J., & Wickham, G. (1998). Democracy and instrumentalism. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 33 (3), 345-353.
- Marga, A. (1998). Reforma invatamantului acum! [*Educational reform now!*]. Bucharest: Scoala Romaneasca.
- McTighe, J. (1987). Teaching for thinking, of thinking and, about thinking (in Noll, J.W. (editor) *Taking sides. Clashing views on controversial educational issues* (4th edition). Guilford, Co: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.
- Neculau, A. (1996). O perspectiva psihologica asupra schimbarii. [A psychological view on the process of change]. In Neculau, A. (ed.) *Psihologie Sociala*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (1994). Fundamental issues in teacher education for human rights: an European perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 23(3), 349-360.
- Sava, F. (2000). *The psychological effects of debating. A longitudinal study on high school pupils*. Paper presented at ARDOR National Curriculum Meeting, Tusnad.
- Sava, F. (2001a). Conditia libertatii in tranzitie. [Conditions of liberty in transition period]. *Revista de Psihologie Aplicata*, 1 (3), 75 – 84.
- Sava, F. (2001b). *Debating on human rights issue – educational outcomes*. Unpublished manuscript. Final Report: The Delegation of European Commission.
- Sternberg, R.J. (ed.) (1994). *Thinking and problem solving*. San Diego, Ca: Academic Press, Inc.
- Tibbits, F. (1994). Human rights education in schools in the post-communist context. *European Journal of Education*, 29(4), 363-377.

Guest Editor's Essay*

A Preliminary Indictment of the Current Slate of Individual Events (and what to do about it)

Thomas Kuster

Let nobody underestimate the importance of this subject. Our forensics programs face difficult times. We need more than tradition, certainly more than trophy count, to perpetuate them in times of staff and budget cutting. We need to be able to demonstrate the core educational value of what we spend all this time and money on. That is, we must be able always to connect our practice to sound and current rhetorical, performance, and pedagogical theory. This, I submit, we currently find difficult to do. I know of no body of research that grounds the traditional slate of eleven individual events in theory. In fact, a significant range of our current practice either ignores or contradicts the best contemporary theory.

If what follows is an indictment, it is limited, to be sure. It draws on impressions of the author and others, more than on hard evidence. It calls (and provides opportunity) for research as much as for change. But change is its goal. Change there must be.

Though it may seem otherwise to some, our eleven standard events have not been around forever. A peek into archives, or a talk with "old timers" such as I have perhaps become, reveals changes over the years, and suggests that a periodic re-evaluation can be beneficial, for at least these two reasons:

1. Theory advances, and leaves practice behind.
2. Practice evolves in directions that depart from theory.

When it disconnects from theory, practice ossifies into conventional techniques, rather than prompting a deeper continuing reexamination of performance theory and practice itself. Our practice becomes "stand like this" and "don't move like that" — and why? Not because "that captures meaning" or "that moves audiences," but because "that's what judges like" and "that's what wins." The often deplored but powerful "unwritten rules" are all unexamined requirements of technique.

I am arguing here that only a "fruit basket upset" of events can prompt the kind of examination, understanding, and practice of performance arts that will justify the continuing existence of our activity.

Thomas Kuster, Ph.D. Professor, Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, MN.
tkuster@blc.edu

• An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2002 CTAM Conference, Stillwater, MN.

* Dr. Kuster is the editor of the journal *SpeakerPoints*. He was invited by the editor of *Speaker and Gavel* to prepare this article.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol. 39 (2002), 50-57

Problems with the Current Interpretation Event Slate

These problems have long been apparent with the interpretation events.

- There is virtually no 3rd person prose being performed.
- There is virtually no multi-character drama being performed
- As a result, there are three events that sound alike to the listener. At a tournament, you could sit in a PRO round, a DI round, and (increasingly) a POE round and, without the schedule and the sign-in formula on the chalk board, you wouldn't be able to tell which event you were witnessing. All three, as currently practiced, draw on the same narrow set of analysis and performance skills – prose (virtually always first person), drama (virtually always monologue), and poetry (more and more first person).
- There is virtually no literature more than ten years old being performed, hence a massive amount of world-class, challenging literature is of no interest to us.

All this means that a broad range of potential analysis and performance skills are not being taught, practiced, or valued. Consider all the excellent narrative and third person prose that is out there. Consider the challenge of bringing multiple characters of a drama alive in a listener's imagination. Consider all the great poetry in which the persona of the narrator differs from the chief character in the poem, or perhaps where there is no chief character in the poem at all. A vast variety of great literature is out there, untouched by our students, unappealing simply because under the current paradigm, an interpreter is unlikely to win with such a piece. The unique specialized approaches needed to understand all that literature are of no interest to us. The important and challenging performance skills required to bring that literature to life in an audience's imagination lie unexplored simply because, with our current slate of events, they are not "commercial."

Some respond that all this is just a temporary trend. Let a few good readers win with a third person prose, they say, or with a multiple character drama cutting, and the pendulum will swing back again. But I don't think so, and here is why. In the hands even of the best performers, certain kinds of performances have inherent advantages over others in competition. In interpretation, this benefit is formalized in the widespread fundamental judging criterion called "internalizing," which skews all evaluations in favor of first person material. Since judges are more powerfully drawn emotionally to "there's the poor suffering soul standing before me," this performance will always win over "that's a good description of some other suffering soul." Just as in informative speaking, the "I have this disease myself" conclusion creates an emotional edge, the portrayal always wins over the mere description. It follows that, if we are to provide our students with a full breadth of opportunities to develop their analytic and performance talents, we must create categories that value exclusively those literary genres and performance skills that are "driven out" by current practices.

Problems with the Current Public Speech Event Slate

All of the "platform events" have become increasingly formulaic and predictable. Persuasive speaking has become limited to problem-solution formats, with a "call to action" required. The reason for this is similar to what keeps us

mired in the rut of first person interpretation pieces. When a problem/solution speech is placed side by side with a “mere” speech to convince – designed to shape attitudes rather than urge a course of action – the speech to convince will always be at a competitive disadvantage by seeming somehow less thorough, less complete. As a result, students have no motivation to explore the particular persuasive approaches involved in convincing, not to mention other quite different persuasive strategies which have a strong basis in current theory, such as audience changes prompted by narrative.

It is particularly disheartening to observe what has happened to After Dinner Speaking and Communication Analysis, events which by their very nature should embody experimentation, imagination, even risk-taking. Haven’t these events become more and more “standard” and predictable? Are there alternative approaches to humor left untouched by our practice of ADS? Perhaps, in Communication Analysis, it is the ten-minute time limit that leaves little room for the imaginative experimentation with critical approaches that rhetorical criticism, in real scholarly practice, seems to invite if not require.

Problems with the Current Limited Preparation Event Slate

I like these so much that they might be the only events I would leave alone – although some of the stultifying “unwritten rules” about such things as numbers of sources in Extemporaneous Speaking, and organizational patterns in Impromptu Speaking, could be loosened up by injecting some variety into the rules from year to year.

Possible Changes in the Slate of Events

What then are the possibilities for revision? I see the following choices.

Changing events by specific prescriptions

We might adjust the current event descriptions so as to require practices otherwise neglected. For example, we might change the rules so that PRO must include a “substantial portion” of third person narrative, or that DI must include “substantial” involvement of multiple characters.

Adding events

It is at least conceptually possible to add an event or two to the current slate of eleven. This is a conservative approach in the sense that it preserves the status quo in the eleven for those who wish to continue those as they are, while it extends the range of possibilities for the venturesome. The problem of course is logistic. There may be nothing sacred about the number 11, but scheduling more events into a typical tournament might be difficult. Still, it is done from time to time with “experimental events.” Scheduling experts, please comment. What would a 15-event tournament schedule be like?

Substituting events

We could excise, from the standard eleven, one or two events considered particularly troubling, or combine some, and insert a new event instead, leaving

the magic number at eleven. For example, current practice in PRO and DI could without loss be combined into a single "MONOLOGUE" event, and the gap filled with a "NARRATIVE" interpretation event.

Rotating events annually

This is my favorite. It would be both exciting and intensely stimulating to our activity.

Just as policy debate leaders gather each year, collecting suggestions from their constituency and then finally, with due process, choosing a debate topic for the year, IE leaders could annually decide on a slate of events for the coming year. In one year students could focus their analysis and performance skills on Shakespeare, in another on 19th century literature, the next on classical poetry in translation, to mention only three areas of outstanding literature of virtually no interest in the current scheme.

Similar changes could direct platform events into previously neglected areas – speeches to inspire, eulogies, ceremonial speaking, and the like. How could current practice in ADS and CA be opened up and redirected in imaginative ways, in touch with contemporary rhetorical theory?

Consider the delectable variety of possibilities: interactive impromptu, no-source extemp, cultural comment, criticism of literature, biography, original literature, lyric description, group diagnosis, and the like (all these are suggestions by Cronn-Mills, Smith, and Wightman, 1999).

We might even escape the blandness of "safe" topics with an event called "controversial persuasion."

Systematic rotation of events would make our activity intensely educational, compelling students and coaches alike to delve deeply not only into new literary areas, but into those aspects of performance theory by which the best results might be achieved for that particular genre. It would virtually eliminate the development of the sets of "unwritten rules" that ossify our practice. Some might resist. Coaches would have to work harder, unable to depend on the formulas and techniques that have spelled competitive success in the past. Judging would become much more unpredictable. Judges would need to develop new sets of evaluation criteria each year. But I would argue that these "problems" are really benefits. Students and coaches alike, instead of believing they have mastered an event because they know the technique of it, should continually be asking and wondering, "How do I approach this event?" The effect could be this: not only would forensics clearly reflect contemporary rhetorical and performance theory, it could in fact contribute importantly to the continuing development of that theory.

And that is as it should be.

A Strategy for Change

If a change in the standard slate of individual events is warranted, how can it be brought about? I expect it won't be easy. Consider these principles.

Ideally, real change should be system-wide. Our goal is a system of events, adopted nationally, probably under the aegis of AFA, and almost certainly incor-

porated into its system of national qualification (legs).

A single tournament cannot instigate change alone. A few years ago, the Vocal Viking at my school tried to “make a statement” by restricting prose entries to third person pieces only. The result: what is usually one of the largest events in a tournament became the smallest (and we incidentally lost hundreds of dollars in entry fees). Virtually everybody was doing first person prose that year, and still is. Nobody will prepare a special piece for a single tournament.

“Experimental events” won’t lead to needed change. They are novelties, fun for some people to do at certain tournaments, but usually with low entry numbers and not taken seriously. The reason, of course, is that they don’t earn legs, so they are a luxury indulged in if doing so doesn’t interfere with what is more important, the traditional events.

I see only one very slim glimmer of possibility with “experimental events” – a “wild card” leg. NIET could reformulate its legs policy to enable experimental events to count somehow toward qualification. Perhaps under carefully described conditions, a student’s success in an experimental event could provide her a needed third leg to qualify a related standard event. I don’t foresee this happening, but if it did, it would certainly encourage experimentation in offering different events at many tournaments.

Real change must arise from the grass roots. The leaders of the various forensics organizations, some of whom have discussed this matter, seem to be waiting for some indication from their memberships about their direction. The impetus for change isn’t likely to come from the top. It should more properly emerge from us down here at the bottom.

A Radical Proposal

None of this is new. Ideas about restructuring and reforming the traditional events in ways such as these were presented at the Developmental Conference on Individual Events at Rice University in 1997, and those presenters made reference to the previous conference in 1990. Conference papers for years have said the same. A number of such articles, easily available online, are referenced at the end of this paper.

I don’t have enough coaching years left to be patient with incremental change – three, four, or five years of trying out an experimental event to gather data on it, and so on, and so on, doesn’t interest me at all. I am calling for a revolution – not against leadership (I believe they are only waiting for direction) but against a stultifying tradition which endangers the future of the activity I love.

I propose that a significant corps of coaches form a coalition for change, and commit themselves and their programs to the following three-year plan.

Decision Point One (sometime during this year): a group of coaches in one or more geographical areas commits to the following plan.

Stage One (current season): Generate an alternate slate of events.

The proposed events, of whatever number, should be firmly grounded in current rhetorical, performance, and pedagogical theory. The year should be devoted to research for that purpose – by coaches, graduate students, and competitors in our schools. On this basis we will be able to justify the choice of our new slate over

the status quo, and we will be able to demonstrate to anyone (such as our school administrations) that our activity (using the new events) is of value to our students and schools.

During this year, the coalition will invite any other schools, and the leadership of the various forensics organizations, to join us in our work to justify a new slate of events. If they do, Stage Two may not be necessary. We will decide this at...

Decision Point Two (spring-summer after first year): the coalition of coaches decides whether the national forensics scene is open to change. If so, we lead the movement. If not, we move to

Stage Two (the following season): For this season, all schools involved in the coalition pledge to offer only the new slate of events at all tournaments they host. This should offer students at coalition schools plenty of opportunities to compete (and learn) in the new events. In effect, these schools would be withdrawing from the traditional national tournament qualifying systems, including AFA-NIET legs, and planning from the beginning of the year not to participate in the traditional national tournaments.

I concede that this proposal is indeed radical – if not dire. But I don't see change occurring any other way. "Legs" have driven choices, decisions, and practice in forensics far too powerfully in directions perhaps good for competition, but bad for education and for the future of our activity. They must be challenged and, if unyielding, discarded.

Is the problem serious enough to warrant such action? I believe it is. Is the future viability of our activity at stake? I believe it certainly is. Most important, does our proposed answer to this problem provide the very best educational benefits for our students? Of that I have no doubt.

References

- Aspdal, Christopher S. "Challenging The Conventions Of Oral Interpretation." *Third Developmental Conference*, 1997, <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/devconf/aspdal.html>> <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/devconf/aspdal.html>.
- Cronn-Mills, Daniel, and Al Golden. "The Unwritten Rules in Oral Interpretation," *SpeakerPoints*, 4.2 (spring 1997), <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/cont42.html>>.
- Cronn-Mills, Dan, and Seth Michael Smith. "Reinventing Forensics for the 21st Century: A New Set of Individual Events," *SpeakerPoints*, 6.2 (spring 1999), <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts6.2/contents.html>> <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts6.2/contents.html>.
- Hindman, M'Liss S. "New Directions For Public Speaking: The Perfect Pendulum Swings." *Third Developmental Conference*, 1997, <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/devconf/hindman.html>> <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/devconf/hindman.html>.
- The Resolutions from the Third National Developmental Conference on Individual Events* held at Rice University, August 13-16, 1997 <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/devconf/res.html>>.
- Rice, Jonah, and Jack Mummert. "Perceptions of Event Lines: Do They Exist?"

SpeakerPoints, 8.1 (fall 2001), <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts8.1/contents.html>>.

Thomson, Diana H et al. "A Proposed New Event," *SpeakerPoints*, 2.1 (fall 1995), <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts2.1/thomson.html>>.

VerLinden, Jay. "The Unwritten Rules in Public Address," *SpeakerPoints*, 4.2 (spring 1997), <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/cont42.html>>.

Whitney, Shawnalee A. "If It's Problem-Cause-Solution This Must Be Persuasive Speaking: Are We Short-Changing The Art Of Persuasion?" *Third Developmental Conference*, 1997, <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/devconf/whitney.html>>.

Wightman, Carol. "Coloring Outside The Lines: Reinventing Forensics," *SpeakerPoints*, 6.2 (spring 1999), <<http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts6.2/contents.html>>.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha National Council has established a standard subscription rate of \$10.00 per year for *Speaker and Gavel*.

Present policy provides that new members, upon election, are provided with two years of *Speaker and Gavel* free of charge. Life members, furthermore, who have paid a life patron alumni membership fee of \$100, likewise regularly receive *Speaker and Gavel*. Current chapter sponsors and the libraries of institutions holding a charter in the organization receive each issue.

Other individuals and libraries are welcome to subscribe to *Speaker and Gavel*. Subscription orders should be sent to:

Daniel Cronn-Mills
Department of Speech Communication
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Mankato, MN 56001

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them payable to: "The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha."

The membership fee is \$15.00. The official key is \$15.00; the official key-pin is \$17.00. **Prices include Federal Tax.** According to present regulations of the society, new members receive *Speaker and Gavel* for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive *Speaker and Gavel* may subscribe at the standard rate of \$10.00 per year.

SPEAKER AND GAVEL

Daniel Cronn-Mills
Kirstin Cronn-Mills
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University
Mankato, MN 56001

**Forwarding and Return Postage
Guaranteed**