

✓  
**RECEIVED**

**AUG 29 1983**

**MTS LIBRARY**

**THE JOURNAL OF THE  
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION**

published by  
THE TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

**Fall 1983**

**Volume IX**

**Number II**

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION  
published by

The Tennessee Speech Communication Association

---

VOLUME IX

NUMBER II

---

CONTENTS	PAGE
VIEWPOINT	4
INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSICS IN THE 1980's: CURRENT FRAGMENTATION AND POTENTIAL REFORM Jim Brooks	6
HOW TO READ PLATO'S PARMENIDES John Gray Cox	22
THE NEWSPAPER COURSE--"PERSUASION": AN INSTRUCTIONAL AND PUBLIC RELATIONS PROJECT Valerie Schneider	40

---

SUPPORT THE CONVENTION OF THE TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION  
ASSOCIATION!

September 16-17, 1983  
Fall Creek Falls State Park

State Highway #30                      Pikeville, TN    615-881-3241

For further information, contact: Jim Holm  
Box 4446  
Austin Peay State University  
Clarksville, TN 37044  
615-648-7378

PATRON MEMBERSHIPS

AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

SOUTHERN COLLEGE

TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

TENNESSEE TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

TREVECCA NAZARENE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE - KNOXVILLE

THE TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

---

JIM HOLM President	Austin Peay State University
DAVID BRIODY President-Elect	University of Tennessee--Martin
JIM QUIGGINS Executive Secretary	Trevecca Nazarene College
RALPH HILLMAN Past President	Middle Tennessee State University
DAVID WALKER Journal Editor	Middle Tennessee State University

INTEREST GROUP CHAIRPERSONS

BETTYE KASH Theatre	Tennessee Technological University
JIM BROOKS Forensics	Middle Tennessee State University
STANLEY McDANIEL Curriculum	Johnson Bible College
JAMYE WILLIAMS Rhetoric & Public Address	Tennessee State University
REECE ELLIOTT Interpersonal	Austin Peay State University
RICHARD RANTA Broadcasting	Memphis State University
JOAN GARDNER Interpretation	Nashville
GERALD FULKERSON Religious Speech	Freed Hardeman College

## VIEWPOINT

During the past few years, people in education have fallen shockingly below the rest of the population in trying to keep up with the cost of living. During the past six years, from January 1977 through December 1982, the Consumer Price Index rose 59%. During that time, for instance, the salaries of faculty members in universities under the Tennessee State Board of Regents rose only 35%--a loss of 24% buying power over 6 years--a yearly average of 4%. Salaries in our community colleges rose 43%--a loss of 16%. Too many times we have been fed cliches such as "Be glad you have a job!" "Be more dedicated!" "The rest of the economy is just as bad off." People, these are facts. During that same six year period, salaries in wholesale and retail trade went up 48.3%--a loss of 10.7%. Salaries in construction were up 50%--a loss of 9%, or only 1.5% per year. Transportation and public utilities salaries went up 56.6%; salaries in finance, insurance, and real estate were at 57.9%; and salaries in manufacturing were up 58%. These areas virtually held their own with the Consumer Price Index. Salaries in mining, by the way, were up 68.3%--a gain of almost 10%.

We must desert our ivory towers and get our hands dirty through hard work to bring about reform. We must stop using our own cliches--such as "I don't want to do this," "I don't

think a teacher should have to do this." The truth is that we must do this, or be content forever to accept the crumbs that fall from the master's tables.

Active, concerned faculty members across the state are getting involved this fall to present our case more strongly to the public and to the legislature. Your faculty senate is probably spearheading the drive at your school. Get involved! Let's make our case known and emphatically so!

INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSICS IN THE  
1980s: CURRENT FRAGMENTATION  
AND POTENTIAL REFORM

by Jim Brooks

Wherever a few tired and declining debate coaches gather, there is the obligatory obituary on debate as it used to be and as it never will be again. This paper is an effort to carry on this fine forensics tradition. Thus, allow me to observe initially that debate has gone to hell in a hand-basket. I will, however, break with the tradition a bit toward the end of this short statement by suggesting some directions that forensics educators might go toward to reclaim debate as a healthy, popular, challenging, co-curricular, educational, and theory-based intellectual activity for fulltime, serious students and for coaches who must also be classroom instructors, researchers, and even family persons.

Before sharing some of my observations and concerns, I would like to issue several preemptions to the challenge of credibility, or as it might more likely be developed among my colleagues: "What the hell does Brooks know!" I do not present this statement as a scholarly research effort, but rather as a series of personal concerns and observations about a very valuable educational activity, and an activity I have been associated with for almost twenty years. My observations may be seriously flawed, but they are based on a good deal of experience at all levels of intercollegiate debate. I have coached two hundred and fifty debaters,

heard thousands of practice rounds, judged a thousand rounds of competition, directed thirty to forty inter-collegiate debate tournaments; and I have been a consistent coach -- fielding teams good enough to lose in every kind of way, in every kind of debate, and in practically every state in the Union; they have lost in levels of competition ranging from the octa-finals of the National Debate Tournament to a still bitter loss to West Georgia College in the final round of the Boll Weevil Invitational Debate Tournament in Enterprise, Alabama. At this point in my association with forensics, I have no ax to grind or angle to work; I don't care who votes for or against a team from my institution; I have no reason to be an advocate or apologist for CEDA debate, NDT debate, policy debate, value debate, or any other kind of debate. For all of these reasons, you might find my comments, hopefully, worthy of some consideration.

I believe that intercollegiate forensics may be in the midst of a small crisis today. It is not a crisis of numbers. Indeed, it would appear that the participation in some form of competitive forensics is at an all time high. Individual events participation seems to be at the strongest level ever. Further, I have the impression that there has been an increase in the number of students participating in debate, and in the number of institutions fielding teams in tournament competition.



The crisis then concerns the current practices in inter-collegiate debate and their value as theory-based, educationally sound learning activities for our students. My own judgment and my conclusions from talking with a number of coaches in both NDT and CEDA debate is that the activity today is not what it should be. And I believe that we may be at a point where the decisions we make as educators will either perpetuate in some form the status quo with all of the problems I will outline in a moment, or we will turn the activity toward some new directions that will make it the kind of educational and intellectual experience it should be for our students.

Currently there are two major debate organizations or groups of debaters and coaches -- with some overlap. Commonly referred to as CEDA Debate and NDT Debate, each kind has its advocates and apologists. NDT Debate, it is claimed, centers on the intellectual concerns in an argumentative confrontation and thus focuses on issues, arguments, and evidence. CEDA Debate, others claim, maintains a commitment to traditional concerns for issues and arguments, but has less emphasis on evidence, and focuses more on the educational benefits of effective persuasive delivery appropriate for the general audience. In practice, however, neither kind of debate appears to be providing the best kind of training for effective oral

advocacy. NDT Debate is made up of an increasingly smaller group of debaters and judges significantly insecure about the future of the activity as they prefer it, yet very active and vocal in reinforcing a good many destructive, counter-productive, and seemingly non-educational practices. On the other hand, CEDA Debate, essentially a reactionary movement against some aspects of NDT Debate, has failed after ten years to provide a quality alternative. The majority of CEDA teams I have heard, many of whom enjoy some competitive success, are participating in a very mediocre version of what most of us believe is effective intercollegiate debating. Moreover, in their efforts to ward off the evils of NDT, many CEDA coaches appear to reinforce the mediocrity. In summary, there are indeed serious problems with NDT Debate, and, despite some very good contributions to our activity, the CEDA organization to date has failed to provide us with a very good alternative.

At this point, please allow me to be more specific if very brief in indicating to you the problems I find in the two competing debate groups. The first charge I will make against NDT debate is neither surprising nor new: despite some wonderfully ingenious arguments in its defense, the delivery style-- particularly the rate -- is unsuitable for effective oral advocacy. It has become incomprehensibly fast, too fast even

for an audience of one or more intelligent, expert judges. The results have been devastating to our activity. CEDA founders, in my judgment, reacted almost solely against the delivery style of NDT debate, and that remains the one thing that disturbs them the most. Since the founding of CEDA, the rate of delivery in NDT has significantly accelerated. The real impact of this presentation style has not, however, been among the original CEDA advocates. Rather, the important impact has been the much more recent effect on the traditional NDT folks. I am convinced that today there is an already small and ever-increasingly smaller pool of judges nationwide capable of flowing what debaters refer to as a "fast" NDT round, and even fewer who can while flowing comprehend all of the issues, follow all of the arguments, attend to all of the evidence, and ultimately render an intelligent decision based upon the arguments presented in the round. There are some, but very few who can do this. Even in strong NDT tournaments, the debaters themselves will label half of the judges in the pool as weak, or, worse, incompetent. With few exceptions, the debaters will prefer the first-year graduate student just out of NDT Debate as a judge instead of an author, for example, of one of our best textbooks in argumentation -- a real and repeated example! The rate of

delivery and the incomprehensibility of the speeches have led a lot of coaches -- people whom I believe to be very bright scholars -- to conclude that they simply are not capable of judging NDT Debate and thus they want nothing to do with it -- even though they do not always embrace the CEDA organization and its sometimes ill-informed criticisms of NDT.

For those judges who remain active in NDT Debate, their decision-making can take thirty minutes to an hour after the round so that they can read all of the evidence, wade back through their flows, and hopefully make some sense out of the clash. We have come to the point that the final round of the NDT may be decided partially by a judge considering a piece of evidence that was never actually read in the debate, but was given to him after the round was over as if it were read. The fact is that NDT judges have failed to demand that debaters speak at a rate that allows the arguments and evidence to be presented, understood, and considered within the format of the oral presentation.

Two other indictments of NDT Debate are perhaps less important but still worthy of mention. NDT debate educationally is a poor investment, in the same sense that spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to build a national championship basketball team is not a sound way to promote physical

education among a student body. In the quest for national competitive success, too much of our budgets is spent on too few students on a limited number of national-level tournaments involving expensive travel. Moreover, those students almost certainly have already benefited significantly from debate training in high school and will receive only limited additional benefit from the intercollegiate training. I have heard all of the arguments about providing opportunities for the very best students to meet the very best students from universities all across the nation. And while there may be something to those arguments, I think they too often are simply the rationalizations for coaches' ambitions. Whatever the case, I think the price is too great to pay when we could and should broaden our base and increase the educational impact of our programs by benefiting more students on our campuses.

Thirdly, NDT Debate is unhealthy, physically and academically. Actually, this may be somewhat true of CEDA debate, but it seems more a problem of NDT debaters. The time demands on both debaters and coaches are severe. Research time, travel time, practice round time, and tournament time require too much of students. Tournaments are too long and exhausting. Students attend too many tournaments. The impact on students can be

more destructive than we would like to admit: they fail or drop out of courses; they drop out of school completely, although they sometimes keep debating; they don't graduate on time, or don't graduate at all. They get through rounds with sugar and caffeine highs from colas, coffee, and donuts. Between rounds, we rush them out for fast food made up primarily of fats, salt, and sugar. And, of course, there is a good deal of reliance on and recreational use of tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, and various forms of speed. Most of these things also characterize the life of their role-model - the coach. Debate coaches are not significantly involved in their academic departments or universities; they don't complete terminal degrees; they don't research or publish; they don't get promotions or tenure; they are notoriously out of shape with addictions to all sorts of bad habits; their marriages are on the rocks; and they soon burn out and quit coaching. If they do somehow survive, get tenure, and stay around awhile, they suffer the worst fate of all -- writing papers about how debate has gone to hell in a handbasket. In NDT debating, students and coaches pay a rather heavy personal price in maintaining the pace that the competition demands. And we should not underrate the impact of this factor on the success or failure of NDT debate. There are

increasingly fewer students and educators willing to pay this kind of personal price.

But what about the alternative to NDT, CEDA Debate. I have found this to be a very limited alternative. It lacks any philosophical and theoretical independence from NDT. After all, "talk slower and use humor" does not exactly form a new theoretical departure. After ten years and despite a few well-written articles, CEDA remains a reaction to NDT, and any justification I read for CEDA develops little that is new, positive, and unique; rather, CEDA Debate is invariably defined in terms of not being NDT Debate. I have no particular objection to CEDA being substantially no different from NDT Debate except in delivery style; however, apparently from the ballots my teams in CEDA receive, there are many judges who believe there is some significant and obviously unspoken philosophical and theoretical difference as if CEDA were some "new kind of argumentation." Thus, I have ballots that in fact read "that argument is an NDT argument and is not acceptable in CEDA Debate." This belief among some coaches that there is some vague, mysterious, intuitively-known difference is very frustrating to debaters who want to develop their skills, to coaches who want to teach those skills, and to both groups who want to know why particular rounds are won or lost.

Secondly, I do not find CEDA Debate to very innovative, as if innovation in CEDA were completely spent in its departure from NDT. Now seeming suspicious of innovation and ever on guard against that "ole debil" NDT and its gamesmanship strategies, many CEDA advocates in practice shun innovation and departure of any kind.

Thirdly, for whatever reason, CEDA Debate in practice lacks judge accountability. Ballots my teams receive at tournaments often say very little either specifically about presentation style or about the issues argued. And finally, CEDA Debate, for whatever reason, is poorer in substance, analysis, and evidence presentation -- despite some occasional exceptional teams. Maybe the reason here is that CEDA has more inexperienced debaters, or perhaps less intensified coaching, or a more relaxed attitude toward substance. But for whatever the reasons, the debating is not particularly good.

Despite all that I have said, NDT and CEDA debating both have important and unique assets. NDT Debate is theory based. A well-developed body of information and ideas on effective argumentation is available and growing, and NDT debaters learn that theory and develop their arguments on its basis. Judges have important expectations of debaters. Issues are expected



to be argued within some theoretical decision-making framework. All claims are supposed to be supported and documented. Judges have a mature attitude toward language as a set of symbols that is dynamic; things are things because we label them in that way, not because they are inherently that way. Thus, the meaning of a resolution is a question to be resolved in the debate. There is important judge accountability. Judges are expected to reveal in writing their attitudes toward decision-making, and they are expected to make their decisions on the basis of those attitudes -- even if they don't always succeed at that goal. And, importantly, there is the ongoing demand that judges write on their ballots clear reasons for decision based on what actually happened within the round. Though rigid in some ways, NDT debate also encourages innovation in decision-making theory and in practical argumentation strategies. Finally, NDT debate provides a challenge and an intellectual outlet for very bright students -- a challenge and outlet often not available otherwise at many of our mega-universities.

The CEDA departure has provided a number of practical, educationally sound improvements in intercollegiate debate. The two resolutions per year, the various kinds of resolutions, and the time of when they are announced are important developments. The burden of spending months researching the topic has

been lessened. Students can enter the activity in September without being already behind. Or they can enter after Christmas and begin with everyone else on a new resolution. If a resolution is really bad, the burden lasts only four months. Beginning debaters can be moved into the activity much easier. Since the activity is less demanding in terms of research time, tournament time, national travel, and pressure to win, students without high school and high school workshop experience, students who have parttime jobs, students who have other pressing responsibilities, and students who participate in other activities can more easily participate. CEDA has a continuing commitment to a delivery style which is effective for the expert debate judge and at least understandable to the general audience. The CEDA advocates are probably quite correct in arguing that CEDA Debate provides important kinds of training for public advocacy and public speaking. This activity, finally, seems to have people and coaches who have broader academic and personal interests, who are much healthier and happier. Clearly, empirically, it is a more popular form of debate. And we cannot have debate programs and debate coaches if we do not have debaters.

The future of intercollegiate debate depends upon whether we accept the current fragmentation of our activity which in the competition between the two factions appears to reinforce

the worst liabilities of each, or if we develop a synthesis of the two that combines the assets of both. I would hope we would do the latter. To go in that direction, I will simply list four possibilities that should be considered:

1. AFA should be the single, national governing and certifying organization for intercollegiate debate.
  - A. The NDT Committee and the CEDA organization should be abolished.
  - B. To deemphasize national titles, perhaps the NDT itself and the point system used by CEDA should also be abolished.
  - C. If a national tournament is retained, it should be an open tournament with randomly assigned, AFA-certified judges.
  - D. If any kind of point system is retained, it should promote attending strong regional tournaments with no more than six preliminary rounds, and should discourage "point hunting" by attending weak tournaments or putting strong debaters in junior divisions.
  - E. AFA should coordinate the selection of two national resolutions annually, with one announced in September and the other in January. AFA should see that there is some variety in the types of resolutions used.
  - F. AFA should sanction tournaments that adhere to the AFA Code of Ethics, that occur between October 1 and March 31, that have no more than six preliminary rounds (except for round robins), and randomly assign AFA-certified judges.
2. AFA should certify all judges who are fulltime instructors in higher education and meet these additional criteria:
  - A. Each judge must provide in writing for annual publication his/her ideas on decision-making

theory. This essay must be certain to address the questions of the pedagogical and argumentative importance of delivery style/rate in intercollegiate debate, the impact delivery has on decision-making in various advocacy situations, the judge's precise expectations in a debate round regarding delivery, and the actions the judge will take should his expectations not be met.

- B. Each judge should indicate his/her commitment to intercollegiate debate as an educational experience in oral advocacy, so that only evidence read and understood by the judge within the speeches and documented fully and qualified to the judge's satisfaction within the speeches would be considered. Other than to resolve questions of ethics, evidence should not be read after the round.
  - C. Each judge should indicate his/her commitment to provide in writing by the close of the tournament reasons for decisions based upon the judge's theory of decision-making and upon what occurred within the speeches themselves in the debate. Pre-round prejudices about issues or interpretations of resolutions and post-round evidence reading should not be factors in the decision-making.
  - D. AFA should publish each summer a yearly booklet containing decision-making statements of certified judges. Additional supplements may be published later in the academic year.
- 3. Students should be limited in their participation in intercollegiate debate to six semesters or nine quarters, to a maximum of ten tournaments a year, and to five tournaments on any one resolution.
  - 4. Tournament directors should experiment with formats that might encourage more in-depth consideration of issues, a more reasonable delivery rate, and fewer gamesmanship strategies. For example, a 10-3-4 format with a 6 minute first affirmative rebuttal might be one possibility.

I do not have time here to defend each of these charges in terms of advantages -- although I certainly am willing to do so.

But I will say here that if we do some of these things or at least move in some of these directions, I believe it would represent two important commitments: One, a commitment to theory-based debate training that would include judge accountability and concern for the education of students in methods of effective oral advocacy; and, two, a commitment to making the learning activities in debate enjoyable, healthy, stimulating, and exciting experiences for a wide range of students and rewarding experiences for communication educators who are also debate coaches.

## NOTES

The author is Chairperson of the Department of Speech and Theatre and Director of Debate at Middle Tennessee State University. This paper was originally given at the Southern Speech Communication Association convention of 1983 in Orlando, Florida.

## HOW TO READ PLATO'S PARMENIDES

John Gray Cox

Plato had a simple and straightforward defense of the doctrine of participation to offer in response to the "third man argument" of the Parmenides. Forms are self-sustaining and self-evident in character and so neither their existence nor our knowledge of them need to be explained by appeal to higher order forms. They are not, in any significant sense, self-predicting and no regress of forms can or need be generated. Plato's reasons for not defending the theory of forms in the Parmenides were pedagogical. The dialogue was designed to initiate the transition in students' knowledge from the mode of dianoia to that of episteme. The Republic's account of the education of philosophers can be used to specify the pedagogical intentions which motivate the Parmenides and determine its structure and content

Plato's Parmenides partakes of peculiarity. It is not an early dialogue, but it takes the form of elenctic Socratic dialogue so characteristic of the early period. What is more surprising is that the Socratic method is employed not by Socrates but on him. What is perhaps most surprising of all is that it contains an argument (the "Third Man Argument," or TMA) which purports to provide a devastating criticism of Plato's own theory of forms -- one that Socrates seems unable to adequately respond to.

It has been suggested by Gregory Vlastos and others that Plato's presentation of the TMA marks some kind of discontinuity in his thought, that it was a forthright and exceptionally honest expression of a growing perplexity he felt concerning the doctrine of participation and the theory of forms.

("The TMA in the Parmenides," Gregory Vlastos, to be found in Studies in Plato's Metaphysics, ed. R. E. Allen; Humanities Press, New York, 1969)

I shall argue that Plato was not perplexed by the TMA and that it does not mark any discontinuity in his thought. I shall do so by first analysing the TMA in order to show that it depends on what is generally known as the "Self Predication Assumption" (or "SPA"). I shall then argue that Plato did not believe forms were self-predicating. In further defense of this claim I shall argue that there are crucial flaws in



the textual arguments offered by Vlastos and others to show that he did. If Plato did not adopt the SPA, then he should not have been deeply troubled by the TMA and we may hold that it does not mark any discontinuity in his thought.

On any interpretation one is bound to be left wondering why Plato left his theory of forms undefended in the Parmenides. In Section IV I shall attempt to account for this via a discussion of the intended audience of the Parmenides and the aims Plato had in mind when writing the dialogue.

## I

There are two versions of the TMA and they have been reformulated in a variety of ways. However, regardless of how one formulates them, it is clear that they involve some version of what Gregory Vlastos has called the "SPA." That is, "Any form can be predicative of itself. Largeness is itself large, F-ness is itself F." (Vlastos 236) In the first version, this is introduced (at 132a) when Parmenides says: "now take largeness itself and other things which are large." In the second version it occurs (at 132e) when Parmenides, after arguing that a Form is like that which is made in the image of it, assumes that the Form which is like the thing must "share with the thing that is like it in one and the same thing (character). Without these SPA's, neither version of the TMA goes through for the argument's thrust is to show

that an indefinite number of forms are required since each must "self-predicate" by a higher order form by virtue of which it is what it is and is like phenomena it is like. In the next section I am going to argue that, in spite of the fact that the youthful Socrates provisionally accepts the SPA here, Plato himself did not. Thus, if the following argument is sound, then one may conclude that the TMA marks no hiatus in Plato's thought.

## II

To explain why Plato did not hold the forms were Self-Predicating, let me sketch his ontological views and make some remarks on his account of knowledge. The Timeaus gives the clearest account of his views. I shall focus largely on it, but would contend that these views are to be found intimated or implied in earlier dialogues.

To explain the phenomena of the world of becoming Plato introduced three kinds of cause. The first is the barely intelligible "receptacle" of "chaos" -- the "material cause" as it were. The forms provide the second sort of cause. They are simply given in organic relations to one another in the one "eternal living creature." In contrast, the relation of a form to a phenomena is that of original to copy or of exemplar to exemplification. The chaos is molded or made into

the image of the forms. This latter process is effected by a third kind of cause -- an efficient causality. In the Timaeus he calls it "the demiurge."

I have some reservations in labelling this mode of causality "efficient." The term is not Plato's, and what I mean by it is not quite what Aristotle had in mind, much less what the term means in modern parlance. What I have in mind is a notion of causality as a kind of power -- not an antecedent causal event, nor a causal law -- but a force or power. It is what Plato calls Eros in the Symposium, and calls the Good in the Republic. (I shall suggest that in the Parmenides he calls it the "One".)

In the Republic, for example, Socrates says "not only being known is present in the things known as a consequence of the good, but also existence and being are in them as a result of it." (509b) Here the Good is clearly functioning as an efficient cause that is proffered as a solution to Plato's version of the one over many problems. While he has earlier spoken of the Good as a Form or Idea (508c) he here goes on to explicitly distinguish it from Forms by saying, "the good isn't being but is beyond being, exceeding it in dignity and power." (509b)

He does not further specify its nature, for he holds in the context of the dialogue this would be impossible. One can only come to know the Good through a careful and prolonged

practice of dialectic. Indeed, it may be that Plato himself did not believe that the Good could be written of at all.

(See the Second Epistle 314c) I shall have more to say of this in Section IV.

In Plato's ontology, the operative metaphor is that of the craftsman. The demiurge is explicitly likened to a craftsman. (This metaphor can be found to run through the entire Platonic corpus. cf. Republic 595-598) A craftsman molds his material in the image of some model. He is an efficient cause which serves to force matter to exemplify the qualities of some original being. Similarly, in Plato's ontology, efficient causality makes the chaos (or material cause) in the image of forms -- which serve as exemplary causes.

The next four points need emphasis. First, note that the forms are not commutative universals or "formal causes" of the Aristotelian variety. They are exemplary beings. As a result, it is a category mistake to call them self-predicating. Strictly speaking they can not be self-predicating simply because they are not predicates at all. Only predicates can be genuinely self-predicating.

Second, the existence of the forms requires no explanation. Only that which is generated or destroyed need have its existence explained. But the forms exist eternally, unchangingly.

They are simply given and no explanation of their being is possible or required. In so far as the regress of the TMA is generated in order to account for the being of forms, it is superfluous.

Third, the forms are self-evidently what they are. To know Beauty I need only turn the gaze of my mind's eye toward it (As the Demiurge does in the Timaeus). Its character and nature is immediately evident. In so far as the regress of the TMA is generated in order to account for our knowing of the forms, it is a superfluous regress.

Fourth, let me deal with a further subtlety arising from Plato's epistemology. I only know what the predicate "is beautiful" means in so far as I am directly acquainted with the form of Beauty itself. There is a sense in which the form Beauty is beautiful. Indeed, it is perfectly beautiful -- were it not, it could not fulfill its key role in Plato's epistemology. And the process of recollecting it (described in the Symposium) would be impossible. However, since the meaning of the predicate "is beautiful" is wholly derivative from acquaintance with the form Beauty itself, to tell me that "Beauty is beautiful" is to tell me nothing at all. The sentence is not false (and it is not an identity claim as Allen has suggested). Rather, it is, strictly speaking, nonsense.

It can be a pedagogically useful piece of nonsense. Suppose someone is getting introduced to the theory of the forms (As in the Symposium). It will be helpful to tell them that Beauty is a certain marvelous beautiful nature. Indeed, if they were told that this claim is nonsense, they would be extremely puzzled. Such puzzlement would linger on until a rather technical account of Plato's epistemology had been given. More of this in Section III.

For now let me recapitulate this section. Plato's theory of forms is not susceptible to the TMA. No regress of forms is required to explain their being or make possible our cognizance of them because their being is self-explanatory and their nature is self-evident. Their likeness to phenomena is explained by efficient causality and not by formal causality, and so, again, no regress is required to explain that. Further, to speak of them as self-predicating is to either make a category mistake -- because they are not predicates -- or it is to utter superfluous nonsense -- because the predicate's meaning is wholly derivative from acquaintance with the forms themselves.

### III

Contrary to the foregoing argument, it has been held by Vlastos and others that Plato did adopt the SPA and that there are various texts in which he explicitly does so.

There are two sets of passages which have been held to commit Plato to the SPA. The first and largest consists of passages that all occur in dialogues from the early period. (Lysis, 217d; Hippias Major 289c; 291e, 292e, 294a-b). It is such a passage from the Protagorus (330c-d) that Vlastos has held is "the star instance" of Self-predication in Plato. "Here Socrates roundly declares that justice is just and holiness is holy. 'What other thing could be holy, if holiness isn't holy,' he asks, indignant at the idea that anyone could gainsay that holiness is holy." (Allen, 249)

The main difficulty with Vlastos' "star instance," and all of the others to be found in the early dialogues, is this. The theory of forms does not appear in any of these dialogues. In them, it is motive forces on states of soul which are being investigated, not metaphysical entities. Plato is not concerned with ontological questions about forms, but is asking substantial psychological questions about moral virtues. (cf. T. Penner, "The Unity of Virtue," Philosophical Review, 82 (1973), 35-68). Since Socrates is not talking about forms when he speaks of holiness and the like, he can not be thought to be claiming forms are self-predicating.

The second class of passages which are thought to commit Plato to the SPA are found in the middle dialogues. There are three: Two in the Phaedo and one in the Symposium. Contra

Vlastos, I believe a careful examination of Socrates' discourse in the Phaedo shows that he does not imply that the forms are self-predicating (I show this in detail in the appendix).

Under some readings one may hold that Diotima's speech (as recounted by Socrates) has passages which explicitly affirm that the Beauty is beautiful. Does such a statement by Diotima commit Plato to the SPA? I think not -- for three reasons:

First, the speech is not an espousal by Socrates but a report he makes of Diotima's speech. Second, it is not a well-concluded philosophical investigation that is reported but an oracular statement of a priestess, expressing inspired insight, not rigorous philosophical conclusions. These two considerations strongly suggest that one should not expect to find any rigorous technical points in the speech, and that this is why there is no explicit denial of Self-Predication. A third point provides further explanation. Since Socrates' audience (as well as Plato's) is just being introduced to the theory of forms, they would be astonished at a denial of Self-Predication as Socrates would have been himself in the early dialogues such as the Protagoras where Self-Predication could be legitimately employed since it involved no ontological claims. For Socrates to make a technical point of denying Self-Predication while reporting the climax of Diotima's sublime eulogy of Beauty would have been rhetorically



and pedagogically foolish. On the contrary, from a pedagogical point of view, the wisest thing is to tell the audience Beauty is "a certain marvelous beautiful nature," for this will help them orient their minds' eyes in the appropriate direction.

#### IV

I have argued that Plato had a simple and straightforward defense of the doctrine of participation to offer in response to the TMA which he could easily have presented in the Parmenides. Forms are not self-predicative and are what they are in and of themselves and not by virtue of higher order forms. Hence, no regress of forms can be or need be generated. Still, this leaves us wondering why he did not come out and offer this argument in the Parmenides instead of leaving his theory of forms so seemingly vulnerable. In this section, I am going to argue that his reasons were primarily pedagogical.

I believe the Parmenides was written for the purpose of educating students who had already been given some introduction to dialectic and who were familiar, in a general way, with the theory of forms. Its pedagogical purpose was to initiate them to the long and difficult process of dialectic by which they might come to know the "good" or "One." In terms of Plato's cave allegory, the function of the Parmenides was to "turn the

eyes" of students already outside in the daylight up towards the "sun." It's purpose was to stimulate active thought, so no solutions are given in it. In short, Plato wrote the Parmenides for an audience of young philosophers not unlike the Socrates that appears in the dialogues.

Socrates is depicted as being a young man who has studied philosophy for a time and is not unfamiliar with the basic method of dialectic. He has adopted a theory of forms, but as an hypothesis, in the manner of a geometer, with dianoia and not episteme. He is, for example, not yet sure what a form is. He suggests that it may be a psychic entity or perhaps an independent ontological one. (Compare 132b with 133d)

Parmenides critiques both sorts of accounts of the forms. But his aim is not to get Socrates to reject the theory and adopt some other. As Parmenides himself points out, if one denies the existence of the forms this will "destroy the significance of all discourse." (135c) Parmenides' aim is rather to make Socrates think more deeply about the Theory of Forms. The remark with which Parmenides concludes the second version of the TMA is an explicit encouragement to further investigation. "It follows that other things do not partake of forms by being like them, we must look for some

other means by which they partake." (133a) As I argued in Section II, the means by which they partake is the efficient causality which makes them in the image of the forms themselves. The task Parmenides is setting before Socrates is the investigation of this ultimate principle.

Socrates clearly needs to be motivated in this way to further investigation. He himself admits that he has not yet fully thought through the theory of forms. When asked, for instance, if he believes there are forms for trivial and undignified objects, he replies that he finds the view absurd, but has doubts about the issue. He says he retreats from investigating the matter and occupies his time thinking about the forms of more dignified things. (138d) Parmenides comments "That is because you are still young, Socrates, and philosophy has not yet taken hold of you so firmly as I believe it will some day." (130e) As the dialogue proceeds, it becomes clear that Parmenides is attempting to make philosophy take a firmer hold of Socrates. After giving Socrates the philosophical shock treatment that makes up the early part of the dialogue he pointedly tells Socrates that his difficulties in answering the questions put to him arise,

...because you are undertaking to define  
'beautiful,' 'just,' 'good,' and other particular  
forms, too soon, before you have had a preliminary

training... you must make an effort and submit yourself, while you are still young, to a severer training in what the world calls idle talk and considers as useless. Otherwise, the truth will escape you. (135b)

In other words, Socrates is being told that to deal with his difficulties he must carefully and strenuously exercise himself in dialectic. At Socrates' request, Parmenides then goes on to briefly explain the full nature of such an exercise and to provide him with a long and brilliant example of it.

It is significant that the example chosen concerns the nature of the One. I think Aristotle is to be believed when he tells us that Plato held that the One was identical with the Good. Both expressions are ones Plato used to refer to the ultimate principle. In the Republic Socrates tells us that the purpose of training in dialectic is to enable a philosopher to apprehend the Good, the first principle of all, "beginning of the whole" (Republic 511b) Clearly, this is the same principle as the One, for, "If there is no One, there is nothing at all." (Parmenides 166c)

By focusing on the one in his example of dialectic, Parmenides manages to not only generally motivate and guide Socrates' training by example, but to also begin turning his gaze towards the "sun."

I think we should assume Plato's pedagogical intentions in writing this dialogue were not unlike those of the Parmenides

who speaks in it. Plato must have had a number of students at the Academy (and perhaps elsewhere) who had reached a development parallel to that of the young Socrates interrogated in the dialogue. The theory of education presented in the Republic gives us good grounds for believing that Plato thought such students needed to have their eyes turned toward the sun just as Socrates' eyes are turned by Parmenides.

To conclude my essay, let me reaffirm my central claims. The TMA did not mark any hiatus in Plato's thought. His theory of forms is not vulnerable to it because it does not involve a "self-predication" of any form by a higher order form in virtue of which that lower order form is what it is. Plato's reasons for not defending the Theory of Forms in the Parmenides were pedagogical. The TMA was not a source of any discontinuity in Plato's thought. Rather it is best understood in its functioning to initiate students to the process of dialectic. The only discontinuity marked by the TMA is that between the periods of dianoia and episteme in the educational careers of the young "Socrates" who were Plato's disciples and whom Plato sought to make in the image of the original.

## APPENDIX

There are two passages in the Phaedo sometimes thought to commit Plato to the SPA. A close examination of these texts shows that they do not commit Plato to the SPA. One of these passages in the Phaedo is at 100c. Vlastos suggests that Socrates there presumes "Self-Predication" when he indulges in the expression, 'if anything else is beautiful, besides Beauty itself.'" (Allen 249-250) I submit that this expression is merely a convenient one Socrates makes use of to explain to Cebes the doctrine of causality provided by the theory of forms. One should think of it as a "pre-theoretical" or "introductory" expression, so to speak. The full text (in Tredennick's translation) is:

Then consider the next step, and see whether you share my opinion. It seems to me that whatever else is beautiful apart from absolute beauty is beautiful because it partakes of that absolute beauty, and for no other reason. Do you accept this kind of causality? (100c)

Here Socrates is not implying that absolute beauty is beautiful. Strictly speaking, he is simply referring to that which is apart from absolute beauty (in the world of sense) and is beautiful.

The reason Socrates does not make a point of saying that, strictly speaking, we cannot say absolute beauty is beautiful and uses a locution that might be construed to the contrary is that the speech context is not one in which strict speaking is

yet possible. The audience is just being introduced to the theory of forms. Both Socrates' imaginary audience and Plato's actual audience were familiar with the psychic notions of the early dialogues in which "Self-Predication" was legitimately employed and would have been needlessly troubled by an introduction of a more technical point concerning the Self-Predication of forms.

The same general analysis can be applied with equal force to the other case of alleged Self-Predication in the Phaedo noted by Allen. In speaking of sticks, Socrates asks, "Do they seem to us to be equal in the sense of absolute equality, or do they fall short of it in so far as they only approximate to equality?" (74d)

Moreover, this passage is preceded by one in which Socrates is meticulous in not predicating equality of itself. He asks, "have you ever thought that things that were absolutely equal were unequal, or that equality was inequality?" If Socrates was comfortable with the assumption of Self-Predication then he would not have hesitated to ask if equality was ever unequal. That he is careful in not phrasing his question in this way counts as good evidence that he did not assume Self-Predication -- much better than any counter-evidence that the loose pre-theoretic locutions alluded to by Vlastos and Allen supply.

John Gray Cox is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy  
at Middle Tennessee State University.



THE NEWSPAPER COURSE--'PERSUASION':

AN INSTRUCTIONAL AND PUBLIC RELATIONS PROJECT

Valerie Schneider

The author wrote and directed a newspaper course entitled, PERSUASION: THE ART OF INFLUENCING OTHERS, in cooperation with the University Relations Office at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City. It was primarily instructional but contained secondary value for the public relations function of East Tennessee State University.

THE NEWSPAPER COURSE IN 'PERSUASION': BASIC DETAILS

The persuasion course consisted of two parts. I wrote eight newspaper articles and also a thirty-page course packet. The packet contained a handout and an exercise to supplement each article. A course bibliography, basic instructions and a class evaluation form were also included. This newspaper course is the only locally-produced one ever to be done at East Tennessee State University. In fact, it is the only locally-produced newspaper course ever done in the state of Tennessee or in the tri-state region, including Western North Carolina and Southwestern Virginia, in which ETSU is located.

The newspaper articles ran during eight Thursdays from October 4--November 22, 1979 in the JOHNSON CITY PRESS-CHRONICLE. When I approached the managing editor, he agreed to run the

series free of charge, provided that I would not run it in the other tri-cities newspapers. (Kingsport, Tennessee and Bristol, Tennessee and Virginia are the other tri-cities.) In addition, I could retain copyright. (I wrote all course materials during the summer when I was not on the university payroll.) The PRESS-CHRONICLE also agreed to run one major advertisement for the course, which I also wrote, and brief reminders regarding enrollment procedures along with the first two articles. The course was also described in THE BULLETIN OF CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES AT EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY (Fall, 1979) which came out about three weeks before the course began and was sent to persons on a direct mail list.

"PERSUASION" was designed as a non-credit course to be taken for one C.E.U. It had a registration fee of \$10. One Continuing Education Unit equals ten hours of in-class effort. The readings and exercises were designed to take the average person 10-12 hours. The format was primarily independent study with one class meeting at the end of the term to turn in the exercise assignments, ask questions, and discuss materials. Students could arrange to send the exercises to me through the mail, if they preferred. Students were encouraged to phone or write me while working on the materials, if they had questions or problems. Total expenses for the course (xeroxing and mailing) were about \$30. I was paid the remaining \$200 generated in fees for publicizing and supervising the course.

There were the topics of the eight newspaper articles:

- (1) "Persuasion: Safeguard of a Democratic Society;
- (2) "Habits: You Can Persuade Yourself," (self-directed behavior modification);
- (3) "What You Call Yourself Makes A Difference" (self-fulfilling prophecies);
- (4) "Overcoming Attention and Perception Barriers";
- (5) "How Do You Get Others To Do What You Want?" (building sufficient reward-value for the persuadee(s);
- (6) "The Golden Mean and Persuasive Success";
- (7) "Persuasive Campaigns: Opinion Leaders are a Necessary Ingredient"; and
- (8) "Persuasive Speaking: Stage Fright and Its Remedy."

#### COURSE RESULTS AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

The National Endowment of the Humanities funded 10 newspaper courses between 1972-1982. The national series was entitled, COURSES BY NEWSPAPER. NEH spent about \$250,000 per course for development, advertising and for distribution to several hundred newspapers. These national courses were based upon 15 articles per course. A different nationally-known expert was selected for the writing of each article. Later all course articles were edited by a professional journalist. Data on the Spring, 1979 Courses By Newspaper offering, DEATH AND DYING, became available shortly before the PERSUASION course was run. This CBN study was utilized as a comparative base in evaluating the locally-produced course.<sup>1</sup>

In addition, I supervised a telephone survey of 278 persons during a five-day period immediately after the last newspaper article on PERSUASION was run. I designed a short questionnaire and marked every tenth name in the Johnson City phone directory. If an individual was not at home, didn't read the PRESS-CHRONICLE or refused to participate in an interview, the next person on the page was phoned. Three student assistants did the phoning and recording of data. Also, students enrolled in the class filled out a questionnaire evaluating the course, selecting their favorite and least favorite articles, and giving demographic data.

The PERSUASION course enrolled 23 students. DEATH AND DYING had averaged 20 students per circulation area. Four percent of PRESS-CHRONICLE readers, 1100 people, studied the course at the level of reading all the articles in the paper. DEATH AND DYING averaged 3 percent reading all articles, but had 33 percent studying at least one of their 15 articles, while the PERSUASION course resulted in only 23 percent of PRESS-CHRONICLE readers looking at at least one of the eight articles.

After the PERSUASION course had been done, two departments at ETSU decided to utilize Courses By Newspaper materials. The Sociology department sponsored a course on MARRIAGE for non-credit program and enrolled four students. The Institute for Appalachian Affairs sponsored a credit course on ENERGY. Even though ENERGY was run in both the Johnson City and Kingsport newspapers, it had a total enrollment of only ten students.

I felt a major reason for such low enrollments was that advertising and instructions for registration were practically nonexistent in the newspaper itself: instead they were carried out through other channels of the university.

Twenty-one of the twenty-three enrolled students in PERSUASION actually completed the course. This compares nationally with a completion rate of only about one-third enrolled in a correspondence-type course. Those enrolled could rate the course from 1 to 5 with 5 being the best score. The composite rating for the course was 4.2. Both enrolled students and those studying by reading all the newspaper articles gave virtually the same ranking to popularity of the articles. Both groups liked the stagefright article best, followed by a tie between the articles on self-persuasion of habits and self-fulfilling prophecies. Next was the article on "How Do You Get Others To Do What You Want?". The article on "The Golden Mean" was the last choice of both groups.

Regarding demographic data, about an equal number of men and women enrolled. Only two students were under thirty. Almost half were college graduates, and two had some graduate training. Most were involved in some type of sales, promotional, publicity or management-type work and two were teachers. One student took a credit course from me the next term, and another took a speech course for credit from

another professor. Two others said they planned to take a credit course in another department at ETSU. Overall, the men rated the course slightly higher than the women.

#### SECONDARY PUBLIC RELATIONS IMPLICATIONS

Any message, even when it is primarily instructional, which mentions the name of an organization in a favorable manner, advances the public relations-image building effort of that organization. In a study of the Courses By Newspaper series George A. Colburn says, "Most colleges and universities see great benefit in affiliating formally with their local newspaper through CBN. Many administrators view the newspaper's involvement--and promotion of CBN as worth thousands of dollars in publicity for their institutions."<sup>2</sup> In addition, the advertising for PERSUASION stressed that it was a locally-produced effort, never before done in the institution or in the whole region, to better serve the convenience of non-traditional students.

## NOTES

Valerie Schneider is a Professor of Speech Communication in the Department of Communication at East Tennessee State University. This project was reported on at the 1983 convention of the Southern Speech Communication Association.

<sup>1</sup>Research Report on Courses By Newspaper-"DEATH AND DYING," September, 1979, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>George A. Colburn, "Courses By Newspaper: No Longer An Experiment," in Chamberlain, Martin N., ed., CONTINUING EDUCATION BY MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY, (New Directions for Continuing Education, #5) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980, p. 45.

## PUBLICATION INFORMATION

THE JOURNAL OF THE TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION is published twice yearly in the Fall and Spring. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to David Walker, Box 111, MTSU, Murfreesboro, TN 37132. Regular subscription price for non-members is \$4.00 yearly, or \$2.00 per issue. The TSCA JOURNAL is printed by the MTSU Print Shop, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN 37132. Special fourth class postage is paid at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN.

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 manuscripts, 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 interests 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 information 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.

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