THE JOURNAL OF THE
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

Fall 1977

Volume III   **Number II**

VOLUME III   NUMBER II

THE JOURNAL OF THE

TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

PATRONS

AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY

CARSON-NEWMAN COLLEGE

DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

MOTLOW STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

SOUTHERN MISSIONARY COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT KNOXVILLE

TENNESSEE TEMPLE COLLEGE

TREVECCA

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Tennessee Speech Communication Association is proud to announce that Nancy N. Pridemore of Dobyns Bennett High School in Kingsport, Tennessee, is the Speech Teacher of the Year for the state of Tennessee for 1977. Ms. Pridemore received her B. S. degree from Radford College and completed graduate studies at the University of Virginia, University of Tennessee, and Northwestern University School of Speech. She has been working thirty-two years with Speech and Drama tournaments and activities in the state of Tennessee. Other awards she has received include the Distinguished Teacher Award, Department of Classroom Teachers, from the Tennessee Education Association. She also received the Veterans of Foreign Wars Award, Department of Tennessee, for work in the "Voice of Democracy" Contest; she has had six state winners and one national winner.

SPEAKER OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Tennessee Speech Communication Association is also proud to announce that Ira North, minister of the Madison Church of Christ in Madison, Tennessee, is the winner of the Speaker of the Year award for the state of Tennessee for 1977. This year's winner is not only an outstanding speaker, but a Speech professional as well, having a Ph.D. in the discipline with graduate work completed at L.S.U. and the University of Illinois; he is a former professor of David Lipscomb College. Currently, Dr. North is minister for the largest Church of Christ in the world. Effective January 1, 1978, he will also become editor of the Gospel Advocate, the leading religious publication among the Churches of Christ.

TSCA AWARDS 1973-77

SPEAKER-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD

1973   Dr. Andy Holt, President Emeritus, University of
        Tennessee
1974   The Honorable Howard H. Baker, Jr., U. S. Senator,
        Tennessee
1975   James M. Neal, Chief Prosecutor Watergate Trials,
        Attorney-At-Law, Nashville, Tennessee
1976   The Honorable Jane Ann Wood, Commissioner of Revenue,
        State of Tennessee
1977   Dr. Ira North, Minister, Church of Christ, Madison,
        Tennessee,
        Editor, Gospel Advocate

TEACHER-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD

1973   John Hester, Memphis, Tennessee
1974   No Award
1975   Helen White, Motlow Community College, Tullahoma,
        Tennessee
1976   Jane Eldridge, Madison High School, Madison,
        Tennessee
1977   Nancy Pridemore, Dobyns-Bennett High School, Kingsport,
        Tennessee

HONORARY LIFE MEMBERSHIP AWARDS

1973   No Awards
1974   No Awards
1975   Lane Boutwell, Murfreesboro, Tennessee
        Hazel Gann, Erwin, Tennessee
        Freda Kenner, Bells, Tennessee
1976   Mr. and Mrs. Herman Pinkerton, Cookeville, Tennessee
        Ruby Krider, McKenzie, Tennessee
1977   No Awards

JULIAN BOND FOR PRESIDENT IN '76

Gordon French

Andrew Young is now the most influential black political leader in the history of the American republic. He wields that influence today because of the decision of another man seven years ago, a man who has yearned to be in Young's position.

Jimmy Carter is now the foremost leader of the Western world. He has attained that goal because the same man made a crucial decision two years ago clearing the path to the White House for Carter.

The source of Young's power was a daring political stroke committed in the spring of last year--the endorsement of long-shot candidate Jimmy Carter. Young's support, more than any other event, endorsement, shift or fluke, was responsible for the Presidential election of Jimmy Carter.

The on-going sagas of Carter and Young are now public lore. But there is another story here, interwoven with their's--the story of a man whose decisions dictated the success now en-joyed by Carter and Young. These men owe a debt of gratitude to another, to one who looks on from the outside at a newly burgeoning Southern power structure which he helped create, but the fruits of which will unlikely reach his lips.

This man is Julian Bond, erstwhile folk-hero of the 1968 Democratic convention, national lecturer and member of the Georgia State Senate. It has been over the carcass of his career that Andrew Young and Jimmy Carter have strode as they reached for the heights of power and prestige. This is not a story of political cannibalism, but one of political suicide.

The promising career of Julian Bond has fallen victim to self-inflicted wounds.

There was a time in the not-too-distant past when Julian Bond was the fastest rising black star on the political firmament. Opinion researchers reported that he was the choice among blacks to be America's first minority President. In the early seventies, he ranked with Ralph Nader and Dick Gregory as one of the three most sought-after speakers on the national lecture circuit. Whenever liberal politicians wanted to influence the black vote, Bond's phone began to ring.

At the apex of his political and financial success, Bond began making crucial misjudgments which presaged his current decline. In 1970 Andrew Young approached Bond with an offer to support him if he would run for Congress. Bond's refusal to enter the race opened the door to Young's political career. Most interested observers believe that Bond could have won the seat if he had manifested the necessary interest in it.

Later, in 1975, most observers expected Bond to run in the Presidential campaign in an effort to win delegates to broker at the nominating convention. In the earliest polls he showed remarkable strength. Bond's decision to stay out allowed fellow blacks such as Young and M. L. King, Sr. to support Carter, a support which most surely would have been withheld if Bond had run.

As a final irony, Bond chose to back the failing candidacy of Morris Udall. The man who so easily could have barred the

White House door to Jimmy Carter now became his most vocifer-
ous opponent.

For seven years Bond had been awaiting the time when he
would be old enough to pursue his fortunes as a national can-
didate. In March of 1975 he appeared in Chattanooga for a
lecture. He was pondering the future and searching for support
to make a run for the Presidency. Bond would have his own
Southern strategy designed to garner solid support from the
black community in an effort to build a block of delegate votes
for the convention. Tennessee would be an important start in
that plan, for only 15% of the popular vote would allow him to
take a portion of the state's delegates. Bond needed money
and volunteers, which were two of his reasons for coming to
Chattanooga.

Bond's speech in Chattanooga to the Southeastern Council
on Family Relations is the focal point of this paper. Before
one can fully appreciate the appeal of Julian Bond as a
politician, it is necessary to understand the man and how he
developed a national image.

Horace Julian Bond was born in Nashville (14 January 1940)
into a well-educated, middle-class family. His grandfather had
ministered in the Congregational church in Nashville and had
served on the faculty of Fisk University. As a member of
the Berea College Board of Trustees he was involved in a 1908
Supreme Court case which unsuccessfully attempted to end
segregated education in Kentucky.

Julian's father, Horace Mann Bond, was one of the leading black educators of the mid-twentieth century. He served as President of two black universities and was widely published. He helped write the brief that culminated in the landmark Supreme Court desegregation decision, Brown vs. Board of Education.

Julian's mother holds two masters degrees and has just recently retired from the library of Atlanta University.

Julian Bond modeled his own speaking after his father's academic style. Writer Howard Romaine traced many of Bond's qualities to his father: "The seeds of the younger Bond's incisive speech, his sardonic humor and gentlemanly demeanor can all be found here."[1]

The academic community provided an insulated environment which protected Julian from the harsh realities of being a black youth in the forties and fifties. He grew up in Pennsylvania, attending a private prep school during his high school years. Julian was the only black student in the school and it wasn't until his senior year that an incident involving a white girl made him realize what it meant to be black in America. "That," Bond recalls, "was really a blow to me; that was like somebody just stopping you and slapping you in the face."[2]

In 1957 the Bond family moved to Atlanta and Julian was overwhelmed with terror at the prospect of living in the South.

By 1960 Bond had been enticed into the germinating civil rights struggle and was a coorganizer of the first wave of sit-ins to hit Atlanta. In the spring of 1960 the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee was organized at the behest of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Bond became Director of Communications. While national attention focused on King and his causes, SNCC was doing the fundamental organizing throughout the South, building the foundations for later political victories. Bond travelled throughout Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and west Tennessee helping to organize and to make contacts with the press. His efforts to organize Southern black votes built a solid political base which remains with Bond to this day.

This early political orientation in SNCC led to Bond's decision to run for public office. He joined the first wave of blacks to be elected to the Georgia House of Representatives since Reconstruction.

Four days before the legislature convened, Bond's old cronies at SNCC released a strongly worded anti-war and civil rights statement which urged young blacks to stay home and fight the civil rights struggle instead of fighting on foreign soil. Bond expressed support for the sentiments expressed in the SNCC statement, pointing to his own pacifism and arguing that the American government was being hypocritical by fighting for Vietnamese liberties while not ensuring liberty for

black Americans. In 1966, most Georgians believed Julian Bond's position was tantamount to treason.

The House convened a trial and voted to exclude Bond from their midst. He became the target of wrathful legislators who were angry because the group of six blacks had been forced upon them by reapportionment. Bobby Pafford summed up the emotions of his colleagues: "...reapportionment ousted noble and distinguished statesmen from our midst, and has shoved in their stead, ...the infamous Mr. Bond. Jones Lane joined in the chorus of condemnation: "I'm scared of him. ... I'm scared of all those people."[3]

The United States Supreme Court later in the year ruled that the Georgia House had violated Bond's right to free speech.[4] As Bond was finally sworn-in, "Sloppy" Floyd walked out of the chamber, explaining, "This has nothing to do with race. We've got other nigger people in the House and seated them."[5]

Bond's expulsion from the Georgia House made him a minor hero among civil rights activists and liberals, but by 1968 he was living the role of an "asterisk in history," as he was characterized by Newsweek.[6]

The turning point of Bond's career was the 1968 Democratic convention. Bond led a challenge delegation to Chicago with hopes of unseating the hand-picked slate chosen by Georgia Governor Lester Maddox.

The Democratic Party had been embarrassed in 1964 by the calls to conscience of the Mississippi challenge delegation led by Fannie Lou Hamer. The credentials committee was virtually committted to seating the Mississippi challengers in 1968, but no one expected that any of the other numerous challenges would be honored. But as the committee met during the week before the convention, the press began to publicize the confrontation between what became known as "the Bond delegation" and "the Maddox delegation." The contrast between the unabashedly racist Maddox and the calm, thoughtful Bond provided ideal fodder for the press and a testing ground for the party. A compromise solution was struck allowing both delegations to be seated in full with all members given one-half vote. Bond refused the compromise and asked for a convention vote on the issue.

The first "event" of the opening night of the convention was created by administrative bungling. The Georgia regulars had been allowed to fill the seats on the floor. Bond scrounged enough passes for his challengers to storm the delegation claiming their seats. Sympathetic delegates and spectators sent up cheers while police and reporters besieged the challenge delegates. In all the confusion there appeared Julian Bond on home television screens talking to reporters and charming the viewers.

When the Georgia question was finally broached by the assembly, Bond's effort to have only his delegates seated was defeated by the closest vote of the convention as party

regulars were asked to vote for the credentials committee compromise. As the vote total was announced to the delegates, a spontaneous roar of disapproval rose among the defeated forces. The opening session was gaveled to adjournment at 2:40 a.m. as the floor rang to the chant "Julian Bond, Julian Bond." The scene was rebroadcast the following evening in prime time on all three networks.

"An exciting moment at this Democratic convention, and perhaps a significant moment," intoned Walter Cronkhite.

"Julian Bond is knowingly or unwittingly a full-fledged Communist or Communist dupe," huffed Lester Maddox to the cameras.

Bond made such an impression on Eugene McCarthy that the candidate asked him to offer a seconding speech for his nomination. As Bond delivered his speech, police were attacking Yippie protesters in Grant Park--a stark, impression-making contrast for the television viewer.

The following evening Julian Bond became the first black offered for the Vice Presidential nomination of a major political party. The nomination was a ploy by anti-war forces to secure the microphone with the intent of protesting the conduct of the convention. Bond withdrew his name from consideration when it became clear that the effort had not been successful.

The Bond name contained magic throughout the convention. Even Norman Mailer was almost at a loss to describe it:

"Bond was extraordinarily--no other adjective--popular in this
convention, his name alone possessed an instant charisma--
people cheered hysterically whenever it was mentioned from the
podium, and the sound 'Julian Bond' became a chant."[7]

The image of Julian Bond created by the television cover-
age of the 1968 Democratic convention transformed him into a
national figure. By 1970-1971 he joined Dick Gregory and Ralph
Nader as the most demanded speakers on the national lecture
circuit. His views were sought by newsmen and his presence re-
quested by television talk shows. In short, he became a
celebrity.

Memory of Bond's performance at the convention as well as
his regular speaking stops around the country made Bond a con-
sideration during early speculation about the 1976 Presidential
campaign.

In 1970 a Maryland research organization reported that
Bond would be the choice among blacks if they could select a
black President.[8] In a November, 1974 Gallup Poll to determine
the choice among Democrats for the Presidential nomination, Bond
ranked sixth of thirty potential contenders suggested by Gallup.
All those ranking higher (George Wallace, Hubert Humphrey, Henry
Jackson, Edmund Muskie, and George McGovern) had developed
national reputations by previously running for President.[9]
Clearly, there existed some popular support for his candidacy.

A Bond candidacy would have had a clearly defined and
sizeable political base upon which to build. Blacks are

particularly important in the Democratic party, which attracted 94%
of the black vote in the 1968 election and 93% in the 1972
election. The result is that black influence in the Democratic
party far exceeds the 11% national population percentage. If
Bond could have added liberal support to the black vote which
would have naturally belonged to him, then he could have con-
ceivably taken a healthy block of delegates to broker at the
convention.

However, in July 1975, Bond determined that there were too
many obstacles facing his campaign and that it would require too
much effort to overcome them. The most pressing need was money--
too little of which found its way into his coffers. His youth
and race would have made it difficult for him to establsih the
seriousness of his candidacy. Further, he holds a low profile
public office that generates little national attention and that
provides him no major political base within his own state.
Finally, Bond's philosophy which is considerably to the left of
most Americans on most issues would have become a handicap.

And yet, within weeks of his withdrawal, he confided
regrets that he had not committed himself to a more serious
effort beginning earlier in the campaign.

When Bond appeared in Chattanooga in March of 1975, he was
still testing the potential of his candidacy. Whatever
potential that was, it was wholly the result of the image, or
ethos, which he had developed during the preceding ten years
of public life.

For Julian Bond the most important factor within the
political campaign setting is his ethos. More particularly,

that aspect of ethos which I choose to call image, defined as the preconception the audience holds of Bond. This image is responsible for Bond's lecturer career as well as the popularity he showed in those early Presidential polls.

Four factors have influenced the creation of Bond's image: (1) The Personal Dimension. Bond's attractiveness and personality have been constant factors throughout his career. He epitomizes the low-key, casual disposition that Marshall McLuhan calls "cool." His dress is conservative, his voice quiet, his demeanor reserved and gentlemanly. His face makes him appear younger than his years, thus accentuating the impression on young people and adding impact to his accomplishments. Articulateness, good education and family tradition have given him a reputation for intelligence.

(2) The Historical Dimension. In the late sixties Julian Bond was a symbol for the peace, youth and civil rights movements. There was perhaps no other person who personified those forces of change so totally as the young black from Georgia. His role as a symbol for the potential of black America continues to be the most important.

(3) The Relational Dimension. The people who have opposed Bond have added perspective to Bond's image. The battle over his seat in the Georgia House showed vividly the difference between the young black who represented the future in race relations, and the legislators who were clinging to a discredited past. Given that juxtaposition, most Americans chose to side with Bond.

At the Democratic convention, he found himself in a centrist position between Lester Maddox and Richard Daley on the right and the riotous peace demonstrators on the left. Subsequently, the rise of revolutionaries like Carmichael, Brown, and Cleaver on his extreme left caused Bond to appear moderate by contrast. In recent years, the political spectrum seems to have shrunken, leaving him once again on the far left, although that tilt appears to be less pronounced in the black community.

(4) The Affectional Dimension. Bond emerged from the 1968 Democratic convention as the lone hero for liberals. Subsequently, the media projected an idealized image of Bond which intensified the hero impression. In the vernacular of the day, he was believed to have charisma. Although this strong affection has mellowed with time, he is still greatly admired in the black community, particularly in the South.

Bond's image is a crucial element affecting his political stump speaking. It not only works as a selecting factor determining his audiences, but it also affects his strategies during the speech. He does not find it necessary to contribute overtly to his ethos with a great deal of ethical proof, and his delivery is purposely de-emphasized in an effort to focus attention on his message.

While Bond professes concern that his audience focus on the message rather than the person, his style is designed to

appeal more to the ear than to the intellect, as suggested in
this excerpt from his Chattanooga address:

> The reins of government have been seized by a
> national political movement whose acts are characteriz-
> ed by nothing less than the national nullification
> of the needs of the needy, the gratuitous gratification
> of the gross and greedy, a victory for the politics of
> penuriousness, prevarication, impropriety, pious
> platitudes and self-righteous swineishness.[10]

Bond is also fond of the metaphor. This vivid statement
appeared in his Chattanooga speech following a call for new
federal involvement in welfare and child care services:

> What is needed now is not the inception of old
> ideas, but the conception of new realities. We must
> halt the contraception of new ways of dealing with
> old problems and begin now to promote the birth of
> tomorrow's dreams. The incestuous relationship
> between government and America's affluent must
> cease, and we must halt the sterile relationship
> between the needy and their needs.[11]

Like every politician, Bond seeks to exploit the good will
and rapport that humor brings. In Arkadelphia, Arkansas he
was asked about the choice of a running mate should he become
the Presidential nominee.

> It must be a white woman from the Northwest.
> She needs to be Catholic and married to a Jewish
> oriental who speaks Spanish.[12]

Indeed, he is much more effective with extemporaneous humor
than he has been with prepared material (as in recent forays
onto NBC's "Saturday Night Live"). In introductory remarks he
specializes in self-deprecatory humor:

> I have just been sworn in to the Georgia Senate.
> As you know, I have moved from the House to the Senate,
> and they say it has improved both bodies. I'm just
> proud to know that I belong to the greatest delibera-
> tive body of men money can buy.[13]

While entertaining his audiences with humor and style, Bond advocates the causes of minorities and the disadvantaged. His solutions are liberal by today's standards, and leaning toward the left. In responding to a question concerning the changes in his personal philosophy, he recently told me: "I make much more or a Marxist analysis of these large economic forces which are controlling us all."

Bond attempts to summarize his philosophy by closing with a quotation, as he did in Chattanooga, quoting from W.E.B. DuBois:

> I believe in God who made of one blood all the races that dwell on the earth. I believe that all men--black and white and brown--are brothers, varying through time and opportunity in form and gift and feature but differing in no essential particular, alike in soul and in the possibility of infinite development. I believe in the devil and his angels who wantonly work to narrow the opportunity of struggling human beings, especially if they are black; who spit in the faces of the fallen; who strike them that cannot strike again; who believe the worst and work to prove it, hating the image that their maker stamped on a brother's soul. Finally, I believe in liberty for all men, the space to stretch their arms and their souls, the right to breathe, the right to vote, the freedom to choose their friends, to enjoy the sunshine, to ride on the railroad uncursed by color, thinking, dreaming, working as they will in a kingdom of God and love.[14]

Where does Julian Bond go from here? Bond faces this question frequently, but really does not know the answer himself.

He continues to earn an above average income on the lecture circuit, although he has become bored with the routine. He has taken a fling into entertainment, acting in a movie called "Greased Lightning," as well as television appearances. Critics suggest he doesn't have much future there.

Bond had hoped to succeed Roy Wilkins at the NAACP, but was passed over in favor of the more moderate Benjamin Hooks.

A recent poll in Atlanta suggested that he could run well against incumbent Wyche Fowler (who won Andrew Young's seat) in the 1978 Congressional elections. But most observers feel he could not win and that he will not try.

Although his future is uncertain, one thing is abundantly clear--Julian Bond does not like Jimmy Carter. Perhaps if blacks continue to be disenchanted with the Carter administration, we may yet see Julian Bond make a symbolic race for President.

NOTES

Gordon French is an Advertising Account Executive for the Atlanta Journal-Constitution and is an adjunct instructor for the DeKalb Community College.

1
Howard Romaine, "Julian Bond Has Cut Off his Afro," Gentleman's Quarterly, XL (September 1970): 154.

2
John Neary, Julian Bond: Black Rebel (New York: Morrow, 1970), p. 44.

3
Marshall Frady, "The Infamous Mr. Bond," Saturday Evening Post, CCXL (May 6, 1967): 95-98.

4
Supreme Court 339, 1966, pp. 341-342.

5
New York Times, January 10, 1967.

6
"Bond's Word," Newsweek, LXXIX (December 19, 1966): 27.

7
Norman Mailer, "Miami Beach and Chicago," Harper's CCXXXVII (November 1968): 123.

8
Atlanta Journal, February 9, 1970.

9
New York Times, December 5, 1974.

10
Speech given to Southeastern Council on Human Relations, in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

11
Ibid.

12
"Words of the Week," Jet (May 1, 1975): p. 32.

13
Speech given to the Southeastern Council on Human Relations, in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

14
Ibid.

DEBATES: HOW THEY ARE JUDGED

A SYMPOSIUM

And so the judge, after carefully weighing all the issues involved, made his decision........

And so the judge, after listening to the speakers who impressed him the most, made his decision........

And so the judge, after remembering how many times the coach of the teams involved in the debate he was hearing had voted against his teams, made his decision........

And so the judge, after flipping a coin, made his decision....

How are debates judged? Are there significant differences, or is there a common agreement concerning decision-making? The Journal has solicited and received position papers from several debate coaches in the state of Tennessee answering the question: How do you arrive at your decision in a debate round as a judge? The following pages present their responses. We welcome any reaction papers any readers may have to these articles, including ones from debaters who may have wondered from time to time how they were judged.

Randy Fisher

With panels of three or five judges in the elimination rounds of most debate tournaments, "split" decisions are far from uncommon; this phenomenon does not necessarily represent differences in judging "philosophy." It may more likely

only suggest differences in what was heard, or how arguments were interpreted or weighted. In fact, since I know but one way to judge a debate, I assume everybody else judges the same way. (I offer that statement without any irony or satire intended.) Some judges frown more or less over the carless documentation of sources of evidence; some of us squirm more in response to shrill screams uttered in re-buttal at 235 words per minute; some of us rate debaters from 0 to 30 while others may have narrowed those margins; some judges (like myself) seldom ask to examine evidence after the debate is over because we believe debaters should clarify and apply data in the debate if it is to be given credence; and, there are even some judges (like myself) egocentric enough to believe we can keep an accurate record of all necessary and important bases for decision in a debate without a full stenographic account of every word uttered. These are differences and many other similar ones can be found but I honestly doubt that they are more than mechanistic differences between judges and do not provide for significant differences in how judgment is rendered.

As new jargon is found for argumentative techniques, new questions are asked about methods of judging, but, again, I doubt that important differences really exist. For example: Is debate a comparison of policy options or a test of hypotheses? (As I perceive it, it would not affect the basis for judgment.) Can a negative team win without any disadvantage offered or

standing? (Of course, if at the end of the debate it has shown no need exists for change or if it has demonstrated that the affirmative plan won't really lead to beneficial results as claimed.) Is falsifying evidence sufficient reason for either team to lose? (Of course.) Can the negative win if it demonstrates that the affirmative plan of implementing the proposition lies outside the framework of the resolution? (Of course. And I have never heard any judge of debate ever say otherwise.) Do you give weight to turnarounds? Or to upsidedowns? Or to Mickey Mouse? (Who cares--we judge the debate as a whole and sometimes these things add weight to affirmative or negative claims and some times they do not.)

In competitive debate the affirmative team advocates change. To win it must demonstrate a need (significant reason) for that change (the elimination of damage or severe threats of damage to important consensus values like freedom or justice or to more concrete matters like life, health, economic status); the affirmative must prove that the proposed change will work (it can be implemented, enforced, and will do what is claimed for it); and, finally, the affirmative must show that the benefits of change are not outweighed by offsetting ill effects greater than benefits gained. Judgment of debate proceeds through a series of paired comparisons in which the affirmative team argues that its evidence is valid and sufficient and applicable and in which the negative team contends that the evidence is inapplicable or invalid or insufficient or outweighed by other data. After

each initial line of argument has been explored and tested through a series of extensions, a decision is rendered. If satisfactory reason for change still exists, its workability claims have withstood attack and if disadvantages are out-weighed or have been refuted--the affirmative wins.

Judges may differ in opinions on which arguments withstood attack but I honestly doubt they have differences in judging "philosophy." Good judgment demands expertise, careful methods of receiving and assimilating, the ability to put aside pre-judgments _et_ _cetera_--but its basis really offers no mystery. I apologize if I'm ignorant or naive.

Richard Dean

True to its argumentative tradition, the forensics com-munity has been characterized by controversy since Protagoras of Abdera decided that every question has at least two sides. Modern "debates about debating" have been concerned with two major questions: who should judge debates and by what criteria should debates be judged? This brief article is concerned with the latter, but some of the major controversies arising from the "who of debate judging should be noted. Such disputes have centered around these questions: should the judge be a layman acting as a juror;[1] an expert in the subject of the debate;[2] an experienced debate coach or should students judge each other through peer evaluation?[4] Each school has its proponents, but the use of the professional debate coach

is the system presently most in vogue. As the venerable
American Forensic Association states, "Contests should be
judged only by persons competent in speech evaluation."[5]

Quintilian described the ideal speaker as "a good man
speaking well." Perhaps the ideal debate judge could be
described as "a wise man judging with something akin to
divine infallibility"--i.e., speaking ex cathedra with the
collective wisdom of Aristotle, St. Thomas, Perelman, Stephen
Toulmin, et al. Since such paragons of logical decision-
making are usually in short supply, the tournament director
must use what he can get. But judging from student feedback,
the use of debate coaches as critic/judges is reasonably
satisfactory--especially when said students have won!

And now to the second area of greatest controversy in
debate judging. Exactly how should a judge determine his
decision? Here again, polemics abound. One of the oldest
arguments on this subject, and one that still continues in
some quarters, concerns the "skills" vs. "issues" question.
Two early coaches, James M. O'Neill and Hugh N. Wells engaged
in a two year battle in the pages of the Quarterly Journal
of Speech[6] over this problem. O'Neill argued that the debaters
should be judged on the basis of the forensic skills they dis-
played, i.e., delivery, organization, refutation, etc. Wells
maintained that skills could not be separated from the arguments
themselves; he contended that it was debating skill that gave

force to argument. Today the "issues" approach is the preferr-
ed method of judging. However, it may be logically argued that
the "skills vs. issues" controversy is actually in the same
category with the "chicken vs. egg" argument, or the "immovable
object vs. the irresistible force" controversy. We cannot have
one without the other in meaningful discourse. Therefore, we
cannot consider one in an oral contest without considering the
other. The whole controversy is reminiscent of the "faith vs.
works" dispute in the early Christian church. The apostle
James wrote, "Faith without works is dead. . . I will show you
my faith by my works." Thus, to use a scriptural praphrase, the
debater shows us his skills by his arguments and lends force to
his arguments by his skills. And these skills are generally con-
sidered to be those listed on the Form "C" Ballot of the American
Forensic Association, namely: analysis, reasoning, evidence,
organization, refutation and delivery. Each should be carefully
evaluated by the judge in relationship to its use by the debaters
in presenting the issues of the debate.

When considering the issues of the debate, the judge must
include two types: stock issues that are common to every debate,
and the issues arising from the specific contest at hand.
Michael Sproule lists the former as follows:

> 1. Is there a need for a change? 2. Can the plan
> meet the need? 3. Are there disadvantages to the
> plan? 4. Is the need significant and inherent in
> the present system? 5. Is the plan practical and
> workable? 6. Do the case and plan implement the
> resolution or are they outside the sphere of the
> resolution?[7]

The second type of issues inheres in the debate itself. For example, if the affirmative contends that the plan advocated will be superior to the status quo as in providing medical care for all citizens, this contention becomes an issue in the debate. The negative will be judged on its attack of the issue and the affirmative on its defense. As Sproule states,

> The duty of the affirmative is to justify change via a prima facie case. This requires the affirmative to undertake a burden of proof to demonstrate that their case and plan are viable in terms of the stock issues. The negative's duty to uphold presumption and re- fute the affirmative requires them to be mindful of the stock and particular issues in the debate. . . the issues approach accords well with common sense. Why would anyone adopt a proposal that was unnecessary, failed to solve the problem or created worse problems than it solved.[8]

Finally, the critic/judge of a debate should be willing to state his reasons for the decision he renders, either orally or in a written critique. As Austin Freeley writes, "Judges of educational debates have two functions: One, they must discern which team did the better debating; two, they must report their decisions in an educationally useful manner."[9] Nicholas Cripe puts it this way,

> Because of the contest aspect of the debate, there is a tendency to place considerable emphasis on the decision. Actually who won should be of momentary importance to the teams and of even less importance to the judge. The truly important point is why one side won. The competent judge should clearly understand the reasons for his decision, and should be able to explain them with equal clarity. . . He should be constantly striving to make himself a better critic judge.[10]

Over half a century ago, Lew Sarett, poet, professor
and debate authority par excellence wrote, "Who of us has
not suffered, or imagined that he suffered from the dec-
isions of incompetent, in-expert judges?"[11] We have not
reached utopia today in the debate community, but if the
advice of the writers quoted in this article is heeded, we
will surely be on our way towards better decisions. We
may never arrive at instant omniscience, but we can at
least hope for reasonable verdicts.

Helen White

Judging a debate requires three things: objectivity,
knowledge of debating principles and the topic, and the
ability and willingness to follow the debate closely. These
are the standards I try to apply in my judging assignments.

First, I look at the case itself. Major issues must be
defined and pertinent to the topic. The type of case, whether
prima facie or comparative advantage, should be evident. The
contentions must be valid, clearly stated, and supported by
current and scholarly evidence, as opposed to a spattering of
quotes from Time and US News & World Report. The affirmative
debaters should be very familiar with the case and should not
be trying to deal with one that has been researched and pre-
pared by someone else. (I have judged rounds in which the
first affirmative speaker could not even pronounce fairly
simple words or names contained within his prepared speech.)

In regard to the negative team and its responsibilities pertaining to the case, I expect it to point out the weaknesses and to focus on the substantative issues, rather than trivial points. If the negative team cannot detect the flaws in the affirmative presentation, then I do not penalize the affirmative side for them.

Next, I pay close heed to the reasoning and logic evidenced by the teams. Premises and the conclusions drawn from them must be logical, pertinent, and adequate. One isolated incident does not "prove" a contention. Also, I determine if the analysis is being related to specific points; often, the debater is just rambling. "Canned shotgun" rebuttals are an abomination, as are labels such as "topicality" or "inherency" if the debater cannot relate specifics to this arguments.

Closely related to reasoning is the use of supporting evidence. Here I look for relevancy, objectivity, and substance. The practice of fabricating or removing from context "helpful" evidence is perhaps the darkest cloud in academic debate. A judge has a responsibility to ferret our this practice and to penalize by forfeit the offenders.

A well-organized presentation is one of my favorite things, for it makes following the debate so much easier. All my attention can be directed to what is being said. For the first affirmative speaker, organization is usually no problem; however, if the negative speakers can follow

the established organizational pattern, then their arguments
are more effective and more to the point. I dislike having
to keep a flow chart that resembles a temperature chart of
a patient severely afflicted with a case of the chills and
fever.

The delivery and style of the debaters do not weigh
nearly as heavily with me as the factors already discussed.
Nevertheless, I do have some pet peeves in this regard. I
dislike for debaters to tell me how to flow an argument
across or how to award the decision. Smart aleck debaters
with condescending attitudes toward weaker teams affect me
negatively. Rudeness, whether it be in the form of loud
"whispering," smirks, or affecting boredom, is something I
find difficult to tolerate and is a factor in my decision if
the debate is close. Those debaters who fight hard but fairly,
and who know and accept the fact that a judge may not always
choose as they would have liked are really fun to judge.

In the final analysis, however, my decision rests on the
content of the debate rather than the personalities of the
debaters. The majority of these students work too hard to
have their efforts nullified by biased, ignorant, irresponsible
judges. Moreover, the future of academic debate depends upon
competent, knowledgable, and objective coaches and judges.

Jim Holm

Traditionally, there have been two competing methods of
judging debates. The first method is to decide who won the

debate on the basis of who won the key issues; the second, to

decide on the basis of who did the better job of debating.   I

prefer the second method because I believe it produces more

equitable decisions.   In the next few paragraphs, I shall try

to illustrate this point with some examples from a recent

tournament I attended.

Early in the tournament, I observed a negative team

which used "spread tactics" to answer the affirmative argu-

ments.   Typical of spread tactics, the negative arguments

in this case were too numerous to be well developed and too

numerous to all be answered with an equal amount of attention. [13]

On the ballot, the judge awarded the decision to the negative

because "although the affirmative were obviously the better

debaters (8 points better in speaker points), the negative

raised so many plan attacks that the affirmative did not have

time to answer them all."

Later in the tournament, I judged an affirmative team

which raised two major contentions: "1) that organized crime

puts the squeeze on America; and 2) that (our team)will put

the squeeze on Organized Crime."   In my opinion, the wording

of these contentions was sufficiently vague enough to allow the

affirmative to shift its interpretation of the contentions

while answering negative attacks.   While I thought this an

extremely poor tactic on the part of the affirmative, most

judges evidently did not for my decision was the only loss that

case received in eight affirmative rounds of debate.

Finally, I sat in on a round in which two better-than-

average affirmative debaters competed against one good and

one very poor negative debater. Although the affirmative
team earned more speaker points than the negative, the good
negative debater according to the judge did manage to refute
the cause-effect relationship on which the affirmative based
its case and, thus, won the decision.

Each of these illustrations tends to confirm the trend
noted by J. Michael Sproule toward judging on the basis of
issues rather than on skills--a trend which I believe is going
in the wrong direction.[14] In my opinion decisions should not
be awarded on the basis of who talks the fastest or the trick-
iest, nor even on the basis of who legitimately wins one key
issue. Decisions should instead be awarded on the basis of
which team of debaters demonstrates the greatest clarity of
organization, precision in the choice of language, incisive-
ness in analysis of issues, coherence in the drawing of
conclusions from evidence, and articulateness in presentation.

There is little doubt that judging on issues is easier
than judging on skills, and usually more widely understood
and appreciated by debaters.[15] But judging on issues em-
phasizes the end results at the expense of the means or
methods of achieving such results. Hence judging on issues
obscures the process of decision-making. If debate, as an
intercollegiate activity, is substantively ever to be more
than a verbal trackmeet or a mental football game, then those
of us who coach and judge debate must refocus our critical
attention on the processes by which arguments are developed,

realizing that to the degree those processes are properly
adhered to the long-term results will be valid and
reliable.

Verna Ruth Abbott

As a debate judge, I am concerned with judging the
evidence, the reasoning, and the presentation. The affirmative
side carries the burden of proof and must convince the judge
with sufficient support for its argument. The negative side
must convince the judge with the refutation of the opponent's
argument. With this as a basis, I listen for logical, clear
reasoning, presented in a well-organized, persuasive manner.
I put great emphasis on delivery and how well the debater
communicates his thesis and supportive ideas.

It is my observation that many debaters become so in-
volved with their material and proof, trying to overwhelm
the judge with a mass of material, they neglect the communication
of their ideas and mar their presentation with sloppy delivery,
too rapid a pace, and poor articulation. No matter how in-
depth the research, or how sound the documentation of proof,
if the judge cannot understand what the debater is saying, the
debater cannot convince the judge of the validity and sound-
ness of his viewpoint. My final decision as judge is based on
the fundamental question: which side persuaded me to accept
their stand on the proposition?

Jim Brooks

Given my own fondness for inconsistency - even wild hair-
iness, I am suspicious of all formal decision-making policy
statements, including and especially mine. The more debates
that I hear, the fewer a priori positions I defend. As a
matter of fact, one of the things I enjoy most about current
academic debating practice is the dynamic nature of decision-
making theory. Nothing that follows then should be considered
a personal absolute; everything below to the contrary notwith-
standing, I will use any decision-making model (system?
position? eccentricity?) in a particular round that is per-
suasively forced upon me, or that is presented and defended by
one team, and unchallenged or agreed to by the other. In the
final analysis, I believe that debate decision-making theory
is debatable (as is everything else), and, alas, I will listen
to anything. For anyone who might still be interested in my
current thinking on debate decision-making, read on.

In various debates, I have been persuaded to resolve the
issues by every known and unknown theoretical system - including,
in at least one instance, awarding the debate to the team most
willing to renounce totally the policy position it defended in
constructives. Still, there are two approaches to decision-
making that I am most comfortable with. The one theory that I
find less preferable but nonetheless useful might be called the
traditional stock issues model. This places heavy burdens on
the affirmative team. Negative debaters may argue practically

anything short of either inherency/plan attack contradictions
or evidential contradictions. Presumption and the unknown
risk in change weigh heavily for the negative. Negative argumenta-
tion may contain direct refutation, numerous inherency chal-
lenges, defenses of the solvency potential of many status quo
mechanisms, a liberal number of minor repairs, and the full
range of solvency and disadvantage arguments. To win the
debate, the negative team need only defeat one of three major
issues: the need or justification for change, the plan solvency,
the superiority of plan advantages over potential disadvantages.

My major objection to the stock issues approach to decision-
making is that this model does not necessarily force the nega-
tive to take a policy position stand -- other than perhaps a stand
against the resolution in general. I find this approach even
more objectionable when it is extended by the negative team to
the position that has become known as hypothesis testing. My
understanding of the hypothesis testing decision-making model is
that it is based on the idea that real-world decision-making
often involves the consideration of multiple alternative
approaches to solving a problem; that the negative team may not
only argue all the traditional stock issue positions but may
also introduce in theory at least an unlimited number of policy
alternatives (counter-plans); and that the only absolute position
that the negative team needs to take is one that denies the
resolution which is the hypothesis being tested. I suppose
hypothesis testing is theoretically sound and I am certain that
real-world decision-making profits from the consideration of

multiple alternatives to solving problems - especially since the real world has forever, instead of seventy-two minutes excluding preparation time. I am equally certain that the time constraints of the academic debate format do not permit intelligent consideration of limitless negative argumentation including numerous thirty-second counter-plans. However, I do believe that academic debate should reflect real-world decision-making with policy comparisons. But this must be done within the time constraints of the debate format if intelligent decisions are to be made by admittedly dull judges such as myself. More-over, the advocates in academic debate should have some consistent commitment throughout the debate to the policy alternative they defend. And that leads me to the second and more preferable decision-making model.

I prefer that debaters place me in the position of choos-ing between (not among) competing policy systems dealing with a single problem area. The negative policy system may be more implicit than explicit; still, I prefer the negative clearly outline and defend a specific, coordinated policy system through-out the debate. Each team may defend one policy system. I will vote for the better policy system, or the one that is shown on balance to be more advantageous. Presumption will lie with the system that has the greatest known factors; i. e., the present system. If the negative team wishes to propose a new policy system, they should expect to lose all claim to presumption and to accept the same degree of risk accepted by the affirma-tive. In other words, I do not like conditional counter-plans.

My biases toward counter-plan debating are based in tradi-
tional theory. I look for the policy that better solves the
problem first isolated by the affirmative. If the affirmative
plan requires enormous resources relative to available re-
sources, this should serve as the basis of several categories
of disadvantage arguments; this should not serve as grounds
for a competitiveness position to justify a counter-plan deal-
ing with a new problem area. If solving the problem with the
affirmative plan would require so much of available resources
so as to preclude normal governmental consideration for solv-
ing other pressing national problems, the negative should
contend that the problem does not merit the solution; i.e.,
that the plan is not cost beneficial. My preferred role as a
decision maker in academic debate then is one of a chooser
between policy systems, with each team restricted to defending
one policy system each dealing with the same problem area.

I would like to add brief comments on two other important
concepts that often have impact on my decisions. First, I
believe that topicality is an important issue in current
academic debate and one that, for obvious theoretical reasons,
can take precedence over all other issues in any particular
debate. However, I do not believe in the spirit of the re-
solution, nor do I believe that any affirmative team or
negative team or any judge or any group of judges has any
special revelation about the true meaning of any resolution.
The meaning of any resolution can most often be best sought

through the contextual history that deals with the problem area that the resolution appears to focus on. Still, in that language and thought and problems are all dynamic in nature, there can never be an absolute topicality determination and the issue of topicality is <u>always</u> debatable. Secondly, I would like to comment on disadvantage argumentation. Unproven, undocumented, but extraordinarily reasonable disadvantages may not win a ballot by themselves, but they do significantly increase the negative presumption when I am judging the debate. On the other hand, I am unconvinced by contrived, though heavily documented, disadvantages that wander through endless, tenuous casual links finally to arrive at a harm.

Those readers who are still with me at this point in this essay have an obvious, though inexplicable, interest in how I judge debates. It will be your burden to resolve finally the vicious rumors about my flipping a coin. But before you commit yourself to my defense, perhaps you should return to near the beginning of this statement and re-read sentence one in paragraph two.

Kenneth Schott

Debate is the most complex of all the forensic events and makes the greatest demands on the judge. Every debate judge needs a knowledge of the fundamentals of debating, a knowledge of the topic being debated, some personal experience in competitive debate, and a consistent set of criteria for evaluating debate.

The old A. F. A. Debate Ballot (Form C) lists six criteria for debate evaluation: analysis, reasoning, evidence, organization, refutation, and delivery. Each category was designed to receive equal weight in the judge's decision. Unfortunately, such objectivity is impossible even with such a highly structured instrument as the "Form C" Debate Ballot. Some judges give a disproportionate amount of weight to analysis; others make their decision primarily on delivery. The "Form E" Debate Ballot, currently used in most major tournaments, provides no criteria for evaluating a debate. The judge is free to apply his own criteria and priorities in making the decision. Consequently, an even greater disparity often exists among debate judges.

My first priority in arriving at my decision in judging a debate is analysis and refutation which I will combine into a single term, ISSUES. This is the ingredient that uniquely distinguishes debate from all other forensic events. Once the negative team outlines the major areas of clash between teams, I follow those arguments as they are extended and developed during the course of the debate. I believe that if the affirmative team drops any significant negative argument, they should lose the debate and my decision is relatively easy. For example, if the negative team raises serious doubt as to the efficacy of the affirmative plan and the affirmative team fails to dispel that doubt, my decision goes negative.

My second priority is EVIDENCE AND REASONING. Assuming that the affirmative team presents a _prima facie_ case, the negative team must substantiate their major arguments with evidence or I will decide for the affirmative.

My third consideration is organization and delivery which I
will combine under the category, SPEECH SKILLS. If both teams
appear equal in analysis of issues and evidence, I usually vote
for the team which is better organized and more persuasive
in presenting their case. A rapid fire delivery with slurred,
sloppy articulation often becomes unintelligible in a debate
round. The heavy use of debate lingo and cliches such as
"PMN's," "DA's," and "flow" also hampers effective communication.

Other subjective factors in a debate often affect my judg-
ment adversely. These factors tend to influence my decision
although I would not make them the sole rationale for win or
loss. One factor that turns me against a particular debater
is the use of profanity in a debate speech. I do not believe
profanity is appropriate in public address and I will rate that
speaker low on the ballot. Sarcasm and discourtesy also affect
me adversely.

Finally, I would like to propose a standard for debate
judges which I will call "The Golden Rule of Debate." It is
to treat other teams as you would like for your team to be
treated. I believe the application of this simple principle
by debate judges would result in the best possible decisions
in a tournament. It would cause judges to flow a debate con-
scientiously, to explain the reasons for their decisions carefully,
and include comments on the ballot which would help each team
to improve their debating skills.

Janet M. Vasilius

Ideally, my judging philosophy is very simple: I vote for the team which persuades me their position is true. However, as academic debate is rarely ideal, certain criteria aid in decision making. Frequently, the criteria must be decided in the individual round; the increasing discussion of argumentation theory by debate participants is an excellent demonstration of the dynamism of debate. The team that wishes to argue hypothesis testing, counterplans, conditional arguments or value validity should be allowed to argue for their strategy. Likewise, the team that chooses to isolate a single issue in the debate should have that discretion.

Unfortunately, many teams lack either the inclination or ability to discuss argumentation theory in competition. For these teams the "policy maker" judging criteria has several advantages. First, the teams must argue consistently. When two speakers on the same team contradict each other, there is no coherent policy presented. When this occurs the obvious conclusion is that the teams in contradiction are confused, refuse to listen to each other or are misrepresenting their research. This is, of course, not to deny that a team may take divergent approaches to an issue, merely that these approaches must not be in contradiction.

Second, the comparison of two policy options clarifies issues by placing them in contrast. Thus, the critic can evaluate the advanrages of the affirmative proposal by

examining the risks suggested by the disadvantages; the progressivity of the status quo must be measured against the speed and universality with which the affirmative may implement the proposal; the values inherent in the affirmative may be considered against the competing values of the negative.

Third, traditional components of argumentation such as burden of proof and presumption fit comfortably into the model. Rathern than compare two policies on an equally competitive basis, as may occur when a counterplan is advanced, the affirmative has the burden of overcoming the risk inherent in change. Plan objections become particularily important if the rationale for change can be supported by the affirmative. Most systems need change, the difficulty is in the implementation of that change. The burden of refutation is also clarified by policy comparison as each team is forced to view the totality of the opposition's position, rather than focusing on a few isolated issues. Coverage is very much a part of the burden of refutation.

Fourth, policy decisions allow a comprehensive discussion of the issues within the limited time allowed. The prime difficulty in hypothesis testing is the confusion that results when an inexpert team attempts to explore maximum possibilities in a minimal amount of time. On the other end of the spectrum, teams who limit their discussion to a few issues produce argumentative redundancy, rather than argumentative depth.

The topic, and the affirmative case restrict argumentation; there is no need for further curtailment. Policy making is the most practicable approach to judging.

The counterplan has been prominent in recent years; the conditional or hypothetical counterplan has also surfaced. Counterplans serve to expand the scope of argumentation by allowing the negative team to develope the best arguments, rather than merely the traditional arguments, concerning the resolution. With a counterplan, the negative team may deviate from defense of the status quo, or may expose a faulty affirmative proposal by presenting an alternative to that solution. A counterplan imposes the burdens of non-topicality, competitiveness and an additional advantage which the negative must secure to counteract the shift of pre-sumption. The conditional counterplan provides a solution to the dilemma faced by the negative speaker who perceives a need for change, but cannot suggest a minor change without adopting the resolutional change suggested by the affirmative.

With the inclusion of parameters with the debate re-solution, topicality can be perplexing for the critic. Some cases may be topical but not fit the parameters; a few cases may be parametrical without being topical. As the Develop-mental Conference which suggested the parameters also specified that the parameters not be binding on the team's inter-pretation of the resolution, it would be inappropriate for an individual critic to restrict the competitiors. My view of

topicality has tended to be fairly liberal in practice, not because I ignore topicality arguments, but because few topicality arguments have persuaded me that the affirmative case lie outside the bounds of the resolution. Extratopicality, as a device to reduce solvency or the significance of an affirmative case, seems to be a more practicable argument.

Attitudinal inherency is as legitimate as structural inherency. Actually, as structural inherency is ultimately based on attitudes, attitudinal inherency is both cause and effect of structural inherency and should be considered at least as viable. Teams arguing attitudinal inherency, however, may encounter difficulties in claiming solvency.

The turnaround of a disadvantage to an advantage is an old technique with a recent label. The best defense is still a good offense; by turning a disadvanrage to the favor of the affirmative team, the defeat of the attack is absolute. However, the additive advantage gained by the affirmative demands external support before it should be added to the benefits of the affirmative case.

Cross examination plays an important part in decision making. All cross examination periods are flowed and referred to as the debate progresses. A position taken in the cross examination period is binding; a question left unanswered is as damaging as a dropped argument; a question that is not raised before rebuttals may not be asked at that time. Cross examination effectiveness is a characteristic of a competent team, whether the team is questioning or responding.

Ethics cannot be overemphasized. The quantity of evidence used, the closed nature of most debate rounds and the mobility of individual teams provide ample opportunity for abuse. On a very basic ethical level is a "fairness doctrine." This dictates that new arguments cannot be raised in rebuttal, that arguments dropped by one speaker cannot be revived by his partner and that the second affirmative rebuttal is an inappropriate time to clarify the affirmative case. Refusal to allow the opposition to examine evidence or case, refusal to clarify or answer questions and use of incomplete source citations hinder the ability of the opposition to debate. These, and other practices, can contribute to the loss of a ballot. On questions of varying interpretation of evidence each team has the opportunity to convince the critic that their view is justified; ultimately the critic may examine the evidence herself. The falsification, adulteration or gross deletion from context of a piece of documentation is grounds for an immediate loss.

Personal quirks also play a large part in forming a judging philosophy. A fast speaking rate is usually indicative of argumentative sophistication unfortunately restricted by time allotment; however, many teams mistake speed as the cause, rather than as the symptom, of excellence. Courtesy to critic, partner and opposition is essential. Disadvantages that do not apply specifically to a given plan have no place in the debate round, no matter how extensively they are developed;

arguments unsupported by evidence are totally acceptable if the analysis is sound. No argument should be issued that cannot suggest an impact. No speaker should repeat an argument when she can extend an argument. Adequate preparation, skill in argumentation, inventiveness and consideration should make debate a satisfying experience for all involved.

Kass Kovalcheck

In recent years the issue of the philosophy of judging intercollegiate debates has gained increasing importance among those interested in both the practice and theory of debate. This concern is an extension of the controversy in the late 1950's and early 1960's between those people who called themselves "issue judges" and those people who voted on "who did the better debating." The question, then, in judging was that a debate topic might be so one sided that a team could not win the issues of the debate but could be so superior in the techniques of debate that even while losing the issues, they should be awarded a victory. For years the American Forensics Association Debate Ballots asked judges to award the decision "to the team that did the better debating." In the past few years this concept has been extended to include such argumentative devices as conditional counterplans, additive advantages, "turnarounds," and propositional arguments. All these are part of the same package, and a

judge's statement of philosophy usually indicates what the judge will emphasize in the decision rather than a statement that departs from normal argumentation theory.

Most of us who judge debates accept these precepts: (1) the affirmative must advocate a change from the present system; (2) that change must be supported by "good reasons," either advantages over the present system or some need inherent in the present system; (3) the change has to solve the problem; and (4) there cannot be overriding disadvantages to making that change. While most judges tend to accept these standards, individual differences do exist. For example, some judges, when faced with an affirmative case with a real problem but a strong indication that the plan will not solve the problem will still vote for the affirmative unless the negative can provide a disadvantage. Others (and I believe myself to be part of the others) will not vote for the affirmative, even if no disadvantages exist, unless there is clear indication that the plan will solve the problem.

Another instance of judging variation is present in the question of counter plans. Some judges believe that a counterplan must solve the same problem the affirmative outlines. Others, in a period when affirmative cases are so narrowly drawn, argue that as long as the counterplan is non-propositional and that the negative can demonstrate the proposals are mutually exclusive, then the plans are compared on relative benefit, even if the negative solves a different problem.

All differences, however, only reflect a commonality of opinion on argumentation theory. Judges vote on the issues and the resolution of those issues is determined by the team that "did the better debating." For those of us judging a significant number of debates each year, we inevitably find ourselves emphasizing different parts of debate theory in every round, but decisions are made as I make them--based on the need for a change, the workability of that change and the disadvantages that change creates. For all the differences of judging philosophy that individuals might espouse, those have been the standards of judgment since Richard Whately became re-incarnated in the ideal first affirmative speech.

NOTES

Randy Fisher is professor of Speech at Vanderbilt University, and is the author of several debate publications.

Richard Dean is Director of Forensics at East Tennessee State University.

Helen White is Director of Forensics at Motlow Community College.

Jim Holm is Director of Forensics at Austin Peay State University.

Verna Ruth Abbott is an Instructor at Dobyns-Bennett High School in Kingsport, Tennessee.

Jim Brooks is Director of Forensics at Middle Tennessee State University.

Kenneth Schott is Director of Forensics at David Lipscomb College.

Janet M. Vasilius is Assistant Director of Forensics at Middle Tennessee State University.

Kas Kovalcheck is Director of Forensics at Vanderbilt University.

1
  Hugh N. Wells, "Judging Debates," Quarterly Journal of Speech, III (October, 1917): 341.
  Donald Graham, "Private Debate vs. Public Speaking," Forensic, XLV (October, 1959): 8-12.

2
  Joseph Wigley, "The Art of Persuading Whom?" Gavel, XLIII (May, 1961): 67.

3
  Anita Taylor, "Is it Persuasion or Argumentation?" Gavel, XLIV (November, 1961): 6.

4
  Joseph Baccus, "Debaters Judge Each Other," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (February, 1937): 74-80.

5
  Donald W. Klopf and Carroll P. Lahman, Coaching and Directing Forensics, (Skokie National Textbook Corp., 1973): 242.

6
  James M. O'Neill, "The Juryman's Vote in Debate," Quarterly Journal of Speech, III (April, 1917): 346.
  Wells, P. 340.

7
J. Michael Sproule, "Debating and Judging: the Inter-
action of Variables," in Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory,
Practice, and Teaching, David A. Thomas, ed. (Skokie: National
Textbook Corp., 1975), pp. 311-312.

8
Ibid., p. 312.

9
Austin J. Freeley, Argumentation and Debate (Belmont,
Calif.:Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1976), p. 312.

10
Nicholas M. Cripe, "Evaluating the Debate," Argumentation
and Debate: Principles and Practices, (New York: Holt, Rine-
hart, and Winston, Inc.), 1963), p. 362.

11
Lew Sarett, "The Expert Judge of Debate," Quarterly Journal
of Speech, III (April 1917): 135.

12
See, for example: James Noble Holm, How to Judge Speech
Contests (Portland: Platform Publishing Co., 1938), pp. 52-66;
O'Neill, "The Juryman's Vote in Debate;" and Wells, "Judging
Debates."

13
Dennis Lefebvre and Donald P. Cushman, "Constructing the
Affirmative Case: an Update," in Advanced Debate: Readings
in Theory, Practice, and Teaching, pp. 118-124.

14
Sproule, pp. 310-315.

15
Roy V. Wood, Strategic Debate, (Skokie: National Textbook
Company, 1968), pp. 163-167.

OUTLOOK: THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION MAJOR

Michael Osborn

In brief, the answer is "good." The Speech Communication major should be increasingly valued in our high-gear, rapidly changing society precisely because it teaches flexibility, adaptability, and self-reliance. In such a complex social system as ours, communication across masses of people and specialized interests will become more and more difficult and a more valued commodity. The Speech Communication major will rise correspondingly in value.

There are, I believe, some cautions. I am concerned that too many of our academic programs for undergraduates may be out of balance. For a time this problem concerned the exclusively performance-oriented program which did not offer enough good, substantial nourishment for the minds of our students. Now the problem extends to programs which have reacted to the performance program by setting speech up as a purely academic study which sneers at the performance classroom. We need to avoid such extremes, and offer students curricula which balance study and practice, which nurture the mind along with ability in speech communication. We do need to stress more, I believe, the development of critical ability in our undergraduates so that they can separate the spurious from the genuine in the vast outpourings of communication to which they are subjected each day in the normal life of our society.

Another caution we need to be sensitive to is the tendency to let speech communication become isolated as a study, away from the mainstream of actual communication practice in our time. If we allow this to happen, we shall surely wither as a discipline. I look for the Speech Communication major to be oriented more and more to the great communication technologies of our time, television, radio, and the newspaper. Rhetoric and communication need to be taught as they converge, not as separate and distinct fields of study. Our own new College of Communication and Fine Arts at Memphis State University will give new impetus to the study of such convergence. This union of interests should give more depth to the study of mass communication, and more vigor and application to those academic studies traditionally associated with Speech Communication.

Finally, we need more than ever in our courses to be sensitive to unethical communication behaviors of our time. In a recent publication I identify a number of behaviors which are abusive to those engaged in communication.[1] In the face of such dehumanizing and belittling behaviors, we need to encourage a new kind of ethical communication that treats tenderly the humanity of those whom it addresses. If we assume this ethical task in the classroom, we ourselves shall grow in stature and the importance of the Speech Communication major will grow along with us.

G. Allan Yeomans

About one year ago, Kathleen M. Jamieson and Andrew D.
Wolvin, both Professors of Speech Communication at the
University of Maryland, contributed an article entitled,
"Non-teaching Careers in Communication Implications for the
Speech Communication Curriculum" to the November 1976 issue
of Volume 25 of The Communication Education journal. Based
on the premise that "higher education must change to survive
the changing professional marketplace," the Jamieson/Wolvin
article does a thorough job of assessing tomorrow's job
market for Speech Communication majors. It also proposes
some steps Speech Communication Departments must take to
prepare people for the changing market, and relates this
problem to the larger one projected by the United States
Department of Labor Statistics which predicts that the supply
of college-educated workers may very probably exceed job re-
quirements by 10% or more within the next three to five years.
More explicitly the Bureau of Labor Statistics is estimating
that within three years, only about 20% of all jobs available
in the United States will require college education. Moreover,
estimates indicate that by that same time there will probably
be a surplus of about 140,000 college graduates who will have
no jobs! How many of these will be Speech Communication majors
graduating from Tennessee colleges and universities?

This writer sincerely believes that the answer to the above question may be determined by the extent to which we are able to reconsider our traditional liberal arts curriculum and how clearly we recognize and accept our responsibilities to provide our students with marketable skills. We humanists must not let our lust for the concept of 'education for life' blind us to the hard fact that much of life involves earning a living.

In view of the changing marketplace for college graduates, our tenacious hold to elitist concepts of the "total liberal arts" education, along with the traditional view that a speech major inevitably prepares one to teach speech, is it any wonder that our career-minded students are querying with every-increasing skepticism, "What can I do with a major in speech?"

How many of our national SCA conventions can you recall having attended within the past ten years when a non-teaching career was represented at the interviewing tables in our ment service facility? How many non-teaching vacancies do you recall seeing listed in placement bulletins of either the SCA or ATA within the past five years? When was the last time your department invited campus representatives of major industries or businesses to come to your campus to interview your graduating speech majors? When was the last time your department revised its curriculum with express purpose of accommodating any discernible market other than the teacher market? The point is, our lack of focus on non-teaching jobs has been characterized

by our department curriculum designs, the courses we offer, the
placement services our professional associations maintain, and
even the voluntary counseling we extend to our students.

Imagine our surprise on the Knoxville UT campus a couple
of years ago when we commenced to survey randomly what was
happening to our Speech graduates, only to learn that FIVE OF
THE FIRST SEVEN GRADUATES WE LOCATED WERE IN NON-TEACHING
POSITIONS! "Those devious little nonconformists had defied
our course offerings, curriculum design, counseling, placement
service efforts, and letters of reference and by some ingenious,
devious, circuitous pandering, located an assortment of non-
teaching jobs and had somehow become gainfully employed!" We
argued, "How could that be? There were no non-teaching careers
available for speech communication majors! Or were there?"

What _had_ happened to our wayward ones? One was holding down
an administrative position in a regional office of the Headstart
Program. Another was selling air time for a major broadcasting
corporation in East Tennessee. A third was in a public relations
post with a major corporate industry in the St. Louis metro-
politan area. A fourth had found her way into a local major
advertising agency. Another venturesome soul had organized his
own advertising agency, and with a staff of five subordinates
(four of who are speech majors graduated from other schools),
generates a healthy advertising business with a number of sub-
stantial accounts. Still another is in a junior executive
position with a state training agency. Another recent speech

major has accepted a position in the public relations department of a major utilities company. A recent MA graduate has an administrative post with the Louisiana Department of Public Education. Two of our graduates have recently worked with political staffs in statewide campaigns - no doubt aspiring to permanent positions as professional speech writers, or media managers for state or national legislators. A number of our majors have gone into direct sales, sales counseling, and/or sales training. Others are in the broadcast media.

What are the implications of all of this? Despite our own retarded or reluctant efforts to design our curriculm, tailor our course offerings, or shape our professional services to prepare our students for the changing marketplace, they have taken their teacher-oriented degrees and, with indredible diligence and some ingenuity parlayed them into job placement in non-teaching careers. Surely they would go better equipped and the placement would come easier had we ourselves prepared them more appropriately.

These recent experiences should persuade all of us involved in Tennessee speech communication departments that our responsibilities are at least two-fold; (1) we must comprehend and meet the demands of the current job market; and (2) we must actively wage a statewide campaign to persuade Tennessee employers that a degree in speech communication is insurance that these potential employees will be knowledgable, educated, in a broad humanistic sense, but at the same time will bring to

employers useful, marketable skills which will enhance the growth and productivity of businesses, institutions, corporations and general economy throughout the state. At the same time, of course, we must continue our efforts to persuade school administrators of the intrinsic values of training in communication skills.

What we must <u>not</u> do is to "conceptualize new thrusts" in the preparation of more teachers for more vacancies that simply are not out there! As Edwin S. Newman once warned: "Beware the conceptualized thrust!" He added, "I saw one that had gone berserk one time, and it took four men to hold it down!"

Larry V. Lowe

The future of Speech Communication as a discipline and, in turn, as an academic major in our institutions of higher learning depends on the ability of those teaching the discipline to convince students, faculty in other disciplines, and administrators of the relevancy of the discipline. As teachers in the discipline, we are quick to point out to our students that a subject being dealt with must be relevant to the needs of the audience if the interest and involvement of that audience is to be sustained. However, we are not so quick in actively pointing out the relevancy of the discipline in meeting the needs of students nor in relating the speech Communication discipline to other disciplines and thus stimulating interest among faculty members in those disciplines nor

working ourselves into a position of justifying the con-
tinuation of the discipline to administrators.

There is no doubt in my mind that the relevancy can be
established in a meaningful way on all three of these vital
levels, but it will require, among other things, a sincere
dedication on the part of the Speech Communication faculty.
This dedication must, in turn, produce a great deal of hard
work in evaluating the existing programs and instituting
changes, where needed, to create relevancy. In undertaking
this venture, it should be noted that such evaluation has
to be of a continuous nature if the relevancy established
is to remain current. I think perhaps our greatest need
to-date is to dedicate ourselves to this task and be willing
to exert maximum efforts in the establishment of relevancy on
all three levels.

In an effort to establish relevancy of the discipline in
the mind of the student, it is essential that the discipline
be examined and, in turn, molded in a way to allow students to
gain instruction which will prepare them for a wide variety of
vocational possibilities. This will in some instances mean
massive curriculum changes and a general up-dating of the
discipline. It most certainly should mean involvement of the
student by way of the faculty actively seeking input from the
student. It may also mean designing of interdisciplinary pro-
grams in cooperation with departments of business, journalism,
and mass communication, as well as other potential interdisciplin-
ary ventures. In fact, the last of these possibilities may

very well hold the key to the future of Speech Communication as a discipline.

The interdisciplinary potential serves to introduce the importance of establishing relevancy for the Speech Communication discipline in the mind of faculty members in other disciplines. In fact, it is more than merely important, it is imperative, that faculty in other disciplines be exposed to and come to understand the potential for students in their discipline of receiving instruction in oral communication in and through the Speech Communication discipline. It would seem, on the surface, that such an understaning would be readily apparent but not necessarily so. At best, it requires a concerted selling effort and in doing so never forget that you are very much involved in the act of persuasion. In working toward achieving this second level of relevancy, one must remember that the Speech Communication discipline is not a single discipline but rather a discipline within and of other disciplines. When so viewed, the instructional potential for students in other disciplines becomes more relevant.

Relevancy of the discipline at the third level, that of the administrator, is becoming increasingly difficult to establish and sustain. This is understandable in view of the ever increasing emphasis on accountability. There is only one way to sustain relevancy at this level and that is to maintain your academic program at a level which will justify continuation of the program. In other words, have enough

students enrolled in your courses which, in turn, produces enough student credit hours which, in turn, justifies the expenditures necessary to offer the courses and programs in the first place -- at best, it is a vicious circle but a necessary one.

Thus relevancy at these three critical levels is most necessary if one expects to have a healthy program in Speech Communication. You ask -- how do you accomplish all this. Well, you work at it personally, you have a faculty who is dedicated and willing to work at it, and most importantly, you sell the relevancy of the discipline -- you sell it to your students in the classroom, you sell it to your fellow faculty members in other disciplines, and you sell it to your administrators.

Relevancy can be marketed -- to put it in business terms. In my opinion, it should be approached as a product to be marketed, and it is up to those in the discipline to explore every possible buyer and to establish relevancy in the mind of those buyers. One final thought -- remember that as in

any business venture, you must present the product in the most favorable way possible. In our case, the Speech Communication discipline depends on our effectiveness in doing so.

Joe Filippo

In the past decade, universities across the nation have witnessed a proliferation of programs in many areas of

of education. Not surprisingly, a corresponding proliferation
in Speech Communication has resulted in educttional opportuni-
ties heretofore unseen in this field. The traditional areas
of Public Address, Theatre and Drama, and Speech Science and
Therapy have experienced the addition and development of
programs that are becoming increasingly important due to their
size and their relevance to the present student. Interpersonal
Communication and Mass Communication serve as striking examples
of mushrooming disciplines.

Primarily due to the growth of new programs, the Speech
Communication major is still in demand. Many students see the
opportunity to apply themselves in the relatively new area of
communication theory that will involve them in behavioral studies.
Others, with one eye on the market-place, prefer to become in-
volved in studies, i.e., radio and television, that equip them
for a seemingly more specific future. Contrary to national
trends in enrollment, Austin Peay State University has ex-
perienced significant growth in recent years, and the Depart-
ment of Speech and Theatre has kept pace and contributed to
the increase in student population--one example of the continu-
ed demand for Speech Communication in the state of Tennessee.[2]

While the demand for Speech Communication majors continues,
the job market appears to have become restricted in certain
areas. Mass Communication, almost always a tight market, weighs
heavily in favor of "the buyer," although future efforts in
cable television may serve to modify the trend. In contrast,

teaching positions in Speech Communication, while by no means as available as they were in the sixties, continue to demonstrate some measure of promise for opportunity in the near future, perhaps especially at the local level.

One of the Speech Communication major's most optimistic notes pertaining to job opportunities is the fact that business seems more willing than ever to cast Speech Communication graduates in nontraditional roles. For example, a number of public relations firms as well as other areas of employment that require interpersonal or public contact seek the Speech Communication graduate. In other words, business appears to be increasingly aware that Speech Communication attempts promote the ability to reason, to provide the ability to communicate more effectively, and to produce a strong, enduring impression among those it serves. Furthermore, this change in attitude on the part of business in general is due in large part to the increased realization that their primary contact with the public is essentially persuasive in nature, and that the Speech Communication major is among the best equipped to accomplish the business objective in a persuasive situation. An even greater change in the climate of public opinion and business should increase the necessity for a Speech Communication degree.

Should Departments of Speech Communication, then, continue to solicit students for the major? Essentially, the answer is "yes." It is my firm belief that, so long as there is a reasonable demand for the major among students as well as

among prospective employers, and so long as the Speech Com-
munication major continues to justify itself on social and
economic grounds, not only should we solicit the major, but
we should consider any other course of action utterly improper.
The passing of time could alter judgments on the status of the
Speech Communication major, but the near future dictates with
firm hand that we sustain the major.

Jim Quiggins

The study of human communication has had a long, but
at times uneven history. It has been studied with diversity
of method and under such names as rhetoric, elocution, speech,
and perhaps now most commonly, speech communication. The
"discipline"(?) of speech communication, and as a result our
majors, continue to suffer an identity crisis of sorts. Un-
like many identification problems, however, ours is a healthy
condition. Because our interests are often pursued across
disciplinary boundaries, we are in essence "multi-disciplinary";
not non-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary as some may have
contended, but rather inextricably involved in any and all
disciplines that increase our understanding of "man as com-
municator." While it is my contention that the inconsistencies
this situation sometimes arouses is a healthy thing, it does
require us and our majors to learn to live creatively with
our condition.

In spite of our multi-disciplinary nature, we still can

claim autonomy and uniqueness as a major field of study. In fact it is this very nature that makes our field and our majors the distinctive and relevant entities they are today. There is a great demand in many contexts for individuals with the training our majors acquire. An increasing proliferation of workshops and seminars in group process, effective communication skills, assertiveness training, self-awareness, presentational speaking, listening, improving relationships, etc., being offered in all kinds of organizational settings is an indication of the heightened awareness and need for trained communicators. This should be an encourgement to our profession. However, although the demand for what we have to offer is great, it unfortunately seems that the demand for "Speech Communication majors" is not so great. What I am saying is that our label is not necessarily identified with what we do by those outside academia, and often not even by our colleagues or prospective students. Al Golberg of the University of Denver in a recent issue of "Spectra" (August, 1977) dealing with the survival of our profession stated it this way:

> Although I have not been an advocate of a name change, the phrase speech communication does not help us. It conveys little positive information and since it "carries" so little meaning, it makes us appear peripheral on the face of it.

This is not so much a problem for the purer divisions of our field (e.g. theatre, broadcasting, speech pathology), but a growing number of our programs are producing majors whose interests and training are not this focused.

Perhaps our undergraduate programs need some rather drastic revision so that our students are prepared for a variety of

jobs and post-graduate experiences in a more direct and precise
way. I'm not suggesting that we become vocational-oriented
departments as such, because our strength lies in the liberal
and generalized knowledge and awareness that our majors possess.
We do need, however, to place greater emphasis on application
as well as the comprehension of new information and knowledge.
We must be willing to "let go" of our students and encourage
them to choose second majors if necessary which are more
marketable and readily identified by the work-world. A
better alternative, but less feasible perhaps because of our
professional myopia, would be to utilize and combine learning
experiences available through other departments or disciplines,
as well as learning opportunities beyond our institutional
walls. Some of our programs might be temporary and highly
individualized and combine courses and field experiences from
a number of areas. The kind of programs I envision would
attract students because they would address themselves to
contemporary problems and needs and to the existing job market.
This approach calls for a flexibility and willingness to ex-
perience frequent change or structural upheaval. This can be
especially threatening to a discipline or professional who may
feel somewhat insecure and uncertain of his identity in the
midst of so many long-standing disciplines and college depart-
ments. This idea of a temporary system or program somehow runs
against our grain and our image of what colleges or higher

education should be. Furthermore, the concept of multi-disciplinary, temporary programs has great potential for causing anxiety and stress in our own personal and professional worlds. But it is in this arena that our discipline has historically thrived. If we could but allay our fears we may find a new and stronger identity which we could impart to our majors and the increasingly more versatile student who will come our way in the future.

NOTES

Michael Osborn is professor of Speech and Director of Graduate
    Studies in the Department of Speech and Drama, Memphis
    State University.

G. Allan Yeomans is professor of Speech at the University of
    Tennessee, Knoxville, and serves as Executive Secretary
    of SSCA.

Larry V. Lowe is professor and chairman of the Department of
    Speech and Theatre, Middle Tennessee State University.

Joe Filippo is chairman of the Department of Speech and
    Theatre, Austin Peay State University.

Jim Quiggins is chairman of the Department of Communication
    and Speech, Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville.

    1
    Orientations to Rhetorical Style (Palo Alto: SRA, 1976).

    2
    With the exception of one year during the current decade,
Austin Peay State University has shown an increase in student
enrollment. Since 1970 the number of Speech Communication
majors has nearly doubled.

PUBLICATION INFORMATION

The purpose of the publication is to expand professional
interest and activity in all areas of the field of
speech communication in Tennessee. Articles from
all areas of speech study will be welcomed, with
special consideration given to articles treating
pedagogical concepts, techniques, and experiments.

All papers should be sent to the editor. Authors
should submit two copies of their mansucripts, each
under a separate title page also to include the author's
name and address. Manuscripts without the identifying
title pages will be forwarded by the editor to a panel
of reader-referees who will represent the varied in-
terests within the discipline.

All papers should be double-spaced, typed in standard
type with a dark ribbon, and on standard typing paper.
Margins should be standard and uniform. Notes need to
be typed single-spaced on separate sheets following the
last page of the manuscript proper. The first footnote
should be unnumbered and should contain essential infor-
mation about the author. This footnote will be eliminated
by the editor from the manuscripts sent to the panel of
readers. Any professional style guide, consistently
used, is acceptable. Accuracy, originality, and proper
citing of source materials are the responsibilities of
the contributors. Articles from ten to twenty pages will
fit best into the Journal.

Institutions and individuals wishing to be patrons of
the Journal may do so with a contribution of $25.00
yearly.