

CORNERSTONE

 MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY MANKATO

Speaker & Gavel

Volume 13
Issue 2 *Winter 1976*

Article 1

Complete Issue 13(2)

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

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

Recommended Citation

(1976). Complete issue 13(2). *Speaker & Gavel*, 13(2), 22-32.

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

SPEAKER AND GAVEL

DSR-TKA National Conference—Norma Cook	21
Image Presentation in the 1972 Presidential Campaign— Thomas E. Harris	22
The Comparative Advantage Negative: An Integrated Approach—Joseph J. Hemmer, Jr.	27
Minutes of DSR-TKA National Council	31

SPEAKER and GAVEL

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS
By ALLEN PRESS, INC.

Second-class postage paid at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 66044
Issued quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

NATIONAL OFFICERS OF DSR-TKA

President: GEORGE W. ZIEGELMUELLER, Wayne State University
Vice President: NORMA C. COOK, University of Tennessee
Secretary: BERTRAM W. GROSS, University of Georgia
Treasurer: JACK H. HOWE, California State University-Long Beach
Trustee: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico
Historian: HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: RICHARD ROTH, University of Rhode Island; JAMES J. HALL, St. John's University; JOHN MORELLO, Madison College; JOSEPH C. WETHERBY, Duke University; ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University; VERNON R. McGUIRE, Texas Tech University; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; LARRY SCHNOOR, Mankato State College; WAYNE CALLAWAY, University of Wyoming; JOHN DEBROSS, University of Southern California.
Members at Large: NICHOLAS M. CRIFE (Past President), Butler University; BETTIE HUDGENS, Spring Hill College; RONALD J. MATLON, University of Massachusetts.
ACHS Representative: JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California.
Representative on SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: JOHN GREG, St. John's University.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Standards Committee: NORMA COOK, University of Tennessee
National Conference Committee: THOMAS KANE, University of Pittsburgh
Research and Publications Committee: ROBERT COX, University of North Carolina
Distinguished Alumni and Service Awards Committee: CULLY CLARK, University of Alabama.
Speaker of the Year Committee: KASSIAN KOVALCHECK, Vanderbilt University.

STUDENT OFFICERS

President: HOWARD STEINBERG, University of Massachusetts
First Vice President: PETER QUIST, University of Georgia
Second Vice President: CHRISTOPHER FARRELL, St. Anselm's College
Secretary: MARYANNE URTCZEK, Wayne State University

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: KENNETH E. ANDERSEN, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.
Associate Editors: BERNARD L. BROCK, Wayne State University; KURT RITTER, University of Illinois; CHRISTOPHER FARRELL, St. Anselm's College.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 13

Winter 1976

Number 2

DSR-TKA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

March 24-27, 1976

We look forward to welcoming you to our campus for this year's National Conference in March. We sincerely hope that your chapter is making plans to attend as it is your participation that will make the conference a successful and truly national event.

The conference will feature six major tournament activities. There will be eight rounds of two person debate with elimination rounds beginning with octafinals and eight rounds of Contemporary Issues Debate. We will continue the expanded schedule of individual events with several preliminary rounds and finals of extemporaneous speaking, persuasive speaking, and interpretation. Student congress will include party caucuses, committee meetings, and legislative sessions on the national discussion question. Members of the National Conference Committee will chair the tournament events.

As in the past, the conference will be more than a national tournament. Of special interest is the new symposium series being planned by the National Conference Committee. Students and faculty also will be participating in business meetings, model initiation of new members, social events, and the honoring of selected individuals with special awards.

We have arranged accommodations for housing and contests within close walking distance, and you will find a variety of types of restaurants nearby. Our area is serviced by McGhee Tyson Airport, and transportation will be provided for those who fly to the tournament.

Do join us in March. We will be approaching the dogwood season in Knoxville, and we hope for good weather so that you can see some of the spectacular scenery of spring in East Tennessee. Those wanting to see more of our area will find Knoxville within easy driving distance of Oak Ridge, Gatlinburg, and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

NORMA COOK

1976 DSR-TKA Conference Host

DSR-TKA National Conference Committee:

TOM KANE, Chair
RAY BEATY
SKIP COULTER
JACK RHODES
HOWARD STEINBERG
ROBERT WEISS
DAVID ZAREFSKY

IMAGE PRESENTATION IN THE 1972 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

THOMAS E. HARRIS

Although images have probably always affected voter behavior, we have become increasingly aware in recent years of the power of image projection. The presidential candidates' images have become the overriding factors. As Marshall McLuhan argues: "The party system has folded like the organization chart. Politics and issues are useless for election purposes since they are too specialized and hot. The shaping of the candidate's integral image has taken the place of discussing conflicting points of view."¹ The skill or artistry of presentation of the political image appears to determine the eventual victor of a presidential election. "It is clear that personality and 'image' are the overriding factors today, not issues or policies."²

The various candidates present images much as actors present roles in a drama. The campaign functions as a staged event where the quality of performance and the ability not to be unmasked are crucial concerns.

This thesis is reinforced by an examination of the 1972 presidential campaign. The issues in the campaign were of little importance. No more than twenty-seven per cent of a national cross-section of voters agreed on any single issue as the most important one now facing the country.³ Alec Gallup, Vice President of the Gallup organization, concluded just before the 1972 election: "There is almost no difference between Nixon and McGovern voters; the issues appear to make very little difference."⁴ Even a quick review of recent elections emphasizes the increasing use of "spot" commercials rather than in-depth political discussion. The spot commercial emphasizes the voter's instantaneous impression of the candidate rather than the various issues of the campaign.

Image can be defined as the audience's intentional and unintentional perception of the *manner* in which the campaign communication is presented. This definition indicates that the image is *not only* the quality of argument or the opposing viewpoints taken on particular issues, but also the impression given by the presidential candidate to the voters. Image, then, is the perception of the quality of the performance by the candidates.

As the results of the 1972 election dramatically demonstrated, image made the difference between the two presidential candidates. If that difference had been based only on the political platforms, one would have expected a great deal more "coattailing" for the other Republican party candidates.

Thomas E. Harris is an Assistant Professor in the Speech Division of the English Department at Rutgers University.

¹ Quoted in: Joe McGinniss, *The Selling of the President 1968* (New York: Pocket Books, 1969), p. 22.

² Jules Ables, *The Degeneration of Our Presidential Election* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 28.

³ Jack Rosenthal, "Poll Finds Issues Not at Issue in '72," *New York Times*, Oct. 8, 1972, p. 55. He reviews polling results from Gallup, Harris and Yankelovich to establish the conclusion. See also: Max Frankel, "Nov. 7: It's a Clear Choice All Right, But What's the Difference?" *New York Times Magazine*, Oct. 15, 1972, pp. 34-6, ff.

⁴ Rosenthal.

Instead, the Democrats actually gained political ground almost everywhere but in the White House.

Even when a candidate appears to discuss the issues carefully, the effect on the voter involves the image. "The function of discussing issues is more latent than manifest. By quoting facts and details on a variety of issues, the candidate leaves the impression that he possesses the knowledge, sophistication and acumen to hold public office."⁵

Effects of Television

Image presentation has been affected by a tremendous increase in television viewing which has reinforced the effect of the candidate's image. "It is precisely in the area of building the public's imagery of political leaders and the political process that television's impact on American politics has been felt most strongly."⁶ Television shapes the viewers' image of candidates. The "widespread use [of image] denotes the fact that for many viewers—who are also voters—how a man looks and projects himself is more persuasive than the facts about his experience, competence, or depth of understanding. The image now rivals the substance as the ultimate political reality."⁷ In running for office, the candidate is concerned with the projected television image. The candidate or his staff often create events which are designed to increase the quality of the impression.⁸ In some cases the television image has for all practical purposes replaced the message. Joe McGinniss in *The Selling of the President* concludes: "The medium is the message and the masseur gets the votes."⁹

The Presentation of Image

The political campaign can usefully be viewed as a drama. Presidential candidates often approach politics from such a perspective. "Today the first question asked of a potential candidate for high office looks to his salability, his image, his charismatic character, his ability as an actor to project a cool image."¹⁰ Kenneth Boulding concludes: "The political image is essentially an image of roles."¹¹ The quality of the politician's performance will to a great degree determine the outcome of the election. Stated in different terms, "an image candidate is a leading character in the political drama presented by television before an election."¹² Presidential political success today is essentially the same as a successful theater performance. If we view campaigns as a show and television as the leading stage, then we can obtain a great deal of explanatory power. Television provides presi-

⁵ Dan Nimmo, *The Political Persuaders* (Englewood Cliffs; Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 120.

⁶ Harold Mendelson and Irving Crespi, *Polls, Television and the New Politics* (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Co., 1970), p. 265.

⁷ *New York Times*, Oct. 6, 1966, p. 38.

⁸ The concept of pseudo-event performances for television is forwarded in: Daniel J. Boorstein, *The Image or What Happened to the American Dream* (New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1962).

⁹ McGinniss, p. 23.

¹⁰ F. D. Wilhelmson and Jane Bret, "The Legacy of TV: Has the Tube Taken Over?" *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Oct. 22, 1972, p. 3H.

¹¹ Kenneth E. Boulding, *The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society* (Ann Arbor: The Univ. of Michigan Press, 1956), p. 103.

¹² Gene Wycoff, *The Image Candidates: American Politics in the Age of Television* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 216.

dential candidates the audience (viewers) for the events that combine to produce the impressions of the candidates developed by the viewer. Because of the great difficulties in trying to reach all voters in person, television is used as the national platform for presentation of self or image.

The candidate attempts to provide an image that will obtain voter support. The secret to being an effective political candidate is to act carefully, for "all roles require a certain degree of skill in the performance of the role as well as an image of the role itself."¹³ In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Erving Goffman further explains: "A performer who is disciplined, dramaturgically speaking, is someone who remembers his part and does not commit unmeant gestures or *faux pas* in performing it. He is someone with discretion; he does not give away the show by involuntarily disclosing its secrets."¹⁴

In the 1972 election, Richard Nixon realized that his best campaign tactic was simply to play the non-politically involved President. As the Chief Executive, rather than as candidate, Nixon stayed above the political arena restricting his activities to presidential duties. James Reston concluded during the campaign, "The Nixon strategy of dominating the news by bold foreign policy moves is working as planned."¹⁵ Nixon acted the part of President with the necessary amount of skill and was perceived by the public as the superior candidate. More important, the President did not allow any indiscretions (such as an old style Agnew speech) to discredit the act.

George McGovern did not have the same effect. In the beginning of the summer, McGovern chose a high-minded and idealistic campaign that appeared to be unswayed by politicians. As such, he was viewed by the voters as a "white knight." With the Democratic presidential nomination, McGovern no longer had the option of being non-political. Whereas Nixon had the option of being a candidate or playing President, McGovern was forced to make decisions concerning the campaign. As the main political candidate in the Democratic campaign, or leading character in the play, he became subjected to national scrutiny. Increased coverage requires increased skill in order to avoid unmeant gestures or *faux pas*. McGovern apparently lacked the necessary skill to present the proper image. Consequently, instances such as the Eagleton issue, the denial and later acceptance of the story about Shriver in Paris, reversals on his welfare program, and Larry O'Brien's dissatisfaction with the McGovern campaign allowed the audience (public) to see behind the scene, discover flaws in the act, and discredit the performance.¹⁶ "If the role is occupied by individuals who do not requisite skills, the image of the role is profoundly modified in all those with whom they come in contact."¹⁷ McGovern's previous image as the idealistic candidate was changed to an image of indecision, confusion, and extremism. The issue in the campaign became the McGovern image. Each crisis further discredited McGovern's performance. "The [Eagleton] affair was all the more damaging to McGovern and his party for being played out day by day in

¹³ Boulding, p. 105.

¹⁴ Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1959), p. 216.

¹⁵ James Reston, "Nixon's Campaign Strategy," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Aug. 18, 1972, p. 31.

¹⁶ These are meant only as representative examples and are not intended as an exhaustive list.

¹⁷ Boulding, p. 105.

full public view."¹⁸ McGovern's indecision on the Shriver in Paris question caused "considerable waffling of language and blurring of image."¹⁹ This waffling diluted his springtime image.

Goffman explains: "A correctly staged and performed scene leads the audience to impute a self to a performed character. . . . The [self] is a dramatic effect arising directly from a scene that is presented, and the characteristic issue, the crucial concern, is whether it will be credited or discredited."²⁰ The pragmatic effect is described by George Gallup, Jr. "The thing that concerns people is not his [McGovern's] stand on issues but his credibility. They need to be persuaded of that before they examine his positions seriously."²¹ McGovern's image became the issue.

This examination of the 1972 campaign indicates that the Republican play was correctly staged, the Democratic was not. In any play the actors must present a unified show if the desired outcome is to be achieved. As Goffman observes, the actors must show discipline and discretion. Because of the uncertain image of McGovern, "when voters looked over the nominees, they responded overwhelmingly to the Nixon image. . . ." ²² Of course, any candidate running against an incumbent President with his large public relations staff²³ and massive funding faces great obstacles. Not all elections have the candidates changing an image quite as dramatically as McGovern did in 1972. In most presidential elections, each actor attempts to unmask the other before the audience of voters.

The understanding of the effect of the political image on the outcome of presidential elections is important. We already know that the charismatic candidate such as John Kennedy, or the safe candidate such as Lyndon Johnson, or the heroic candidate such as Eisenhower can successfully win the image issue. We also know that the use of "issues" is one means of changing the image. We need to look at the presidential campaign as a staged event. Our rhetorical criticism should not be centered on the speeches or party platforms but instead on the quality of performance given by the various candidates. In addition, we should accept that different scripts presented to different audiences—such as local versus national—require different dramatic abilities and lines. In judging the quality of a particular campaign, the ability of the actor to analyze the scene correctly in order to present the proper image should be a major factor in judging the quality of the performance. The lines each actor delivers would clearly be useful in judging the impact of the candidate. However, this "issue analysis" would be only one part of the critic's overall study and evaluation.

The dramaturgical perspective allows us to view presidential campaigns as staged events. The candidates are the leading performers and the campaign staff is the supporting cast. If the presentation before the voters is in-

¹⁸ "A Crisis Named Eagleton," *Newsweek*, Aug. 7, 1972, p. 12.

¹⁹ Max Lerner, "Eagleton Affair Hurt Image of Senator McGovern," *Philadelphia Bulletin*, July 5, 1972, p. 9.

²⁰ Goffman, pp. 252-3.

²¹ Rosenthal; Peter Goldman and Richard Stout, "McGovern's Politics of Righteousness," *Newsweek*, Nov. 6, 1972, add: McGovern's last, best assets—his credibility and his competence—came into question and with them the whole premise of his challenge. 'McGovern became the issue,' said one senior adviser last week, 'and we haven't been able to turn that around.'"

²² Frankel, p. 35.

²³ Thomas E. Cronin, "The Swelling of the Presidency," *Saturday Review of the Society*, Jan. 20, 1973, p. 36.

correct, uneven, or unacceptable, the consequence on election day is defeat. If the character is accepted, the audience (voters) bestows national office on the candidate. The explanatory power of this perspective is its ability to focus on the candidates as actors engaged in a presentation that must come off well to be accepted. Rather than isolating messages and speeches, spending, ghostwriters, press conferences, or campaign strategies as the causal agent, this approach looks to the entire event called the campaign and provides us with an explanation of the effect of the different performances on the electorate and the election results.

Thomas F. Hozduk, past president of the University of Southern California chapter of DSR-TKA and former Captain of the Trojan Debate Squad, was recently selected by the SCA Committee on International Discussion and Debate as a member of the 1976 United States International Debate Team. Thomas, who is now serving as a member of the faculty at U.S.C., toured the British Isles in January and February.

THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE NEGATIVE: AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

Joseph J. Hemmer, Jr.

Theorists have contributed a substantial body of literature which defines the nature of comparative advantage debate in terms of the logical and structural requirements of both affirmative case construction and negative refutation. Writers generally agree on the affirmative team's approach to comparative advantage cases, but disagreement exists regarding the "ideal" negative strategy. This essay discusses the logical and structural responsibilities of affirmative case construction, the potential refutative effectiveness of proposed negative approaches, and the integrated approach to the comparative advantage negative.

After comparing traditional with advantage affirmative case construction, Zarefsky properly advises that "theorists who have tried to identify a logical difference between traditional and comparative advantage cases have, it seems, been working on a pseudo-problem."¹ Both approaches require a significant and inherent rationale for change, a proposal which meets that rationale, and a proposal which is more advantageous than disadvantageous.²

However, structural requirements differ. The traditional affirmative usually meets each stock issue separately. The case establishes a significant harm, shows inherency, and presents a practical and workable solution to alleviate the harm in separate contentions. The comparative advantage case achieves several *prima facie* obligations with the establishment of each advantage. As Cragan and Shields note, an advantage affirmative, by developing "an advantage that is significant, and that also flows uniquely from the plan, . . . meets what would be in the traditional case the burdens of need, inherency and meet need."³

Negative teams seem handicapped when confronting the advantage affirmative structure. Cragan and Shields indicate that debaters "display inability to adapt their negative strategy to the organization of the 'plan-advantages' format."⁴ According to Brock et al., "the utility of the traditional approach to negative case construction seems to be quite low."

Joseph J. Hemmer, Jr. (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1969), is Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech Communication, Carroll College. He is former Director of Debate at Marquette University.

¹David Zarefsky, "The 'Traditional Case'—'Comparative Advantage Case' Dichotomy: Another Look," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 6 (Winter 1969), 20.

²For a discussion of traditional affirmative case construction see Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede, *Decision By Debate* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1963), pp. 223-8. For consideration of comparative advantage affirmative case construction see Bernard Brock, "The Comparative Advantages Case," *Speech Teacher*, 16 (March 1967), 118-123; James W. Chesebro, "The Comparative Advantages Case," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 5 (Spring 1968), 57-63; and Vernon E. Cronen, "'Comparative Advantage': A Classification," *Central States Speech Journal*, 19 (Winter 1968), 243-9.

³John F. Cragan and Donald C. Shields, "The 'Comparative Advantage Negative'," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 7 (Spring 1970), 86.

⁴*Ibid.*, 85.

Adaptation to the plan-advantages format means the negative team should abandon the idea of specialization. Ideally, both negative debaters should be able to present and defend any of the potential negative issues.⁵

An approach which integrates the attack rather than divides the labor seems desirable.

Several approaches for the comparative advantage negative have been suggested. Cragan and Shields recommend a method in which the first negative deals with plan topicality, workability, uniqueness, as well as the advantages. The second negative stresses plan disadvantages.⁶ By dividing labor, this approach fails to equalize the affirmative structural advantage. David Thomas, defending the division of labor, offers two methods: Approach A has the first speaker examine the rationale for change while the colleague deals with the proposal. Approach B reverses the division.⁷ Neither approach copes with the affirmative structural advantage. Brock et al. suggest three negative alternatives. The traditional direct-clash approach divides labor: the first speaker considers plan uniqueness/topicality and attacks advantages while the second treats plan workability, practicality, and disadvantages. The costs-benefits approach requires one speaker to focus on plan while the other considers advantages. The system to system method, although it enables both speakers to deal with the advantages, still forces the second debater to be a plan specialist.⁸

Overall, each approach divides in differing ways, never overcoming the burden which stems from the affirmative ability to meet several *prima facie* obligations with the establishment of each advantage. This condition cannot be offset by a division of labor—it requires, instead, an integrated approach.

An integrated comparative advantage negative rejects division of labor and requires each negative speaker to deal with essentially the same logical obligations. The method attacks the affirmative in a structural fashion which resembles affirmative case construction.

First Negative

1. Introduction

- a. State negative philosophy
- b. Explain negative organization
- c. Plan considerations
 - (1) Topicality
 - (2) Operation—consider general workability and practicality of plan

2. Attack each advantage

- a. *Significance*—consider value of the estimated progress of affirmative case over status quo.
- b. *Inherency*—consider status quo proposals and repairs that can achieve advantage.
- c. *Operation*—consider availability, workability, and practicality of plan in achieving advantage.

⁵ Bernard L. Brock, et al., *Public Policy Decision-Making: Systems Analysis and Comparative Advantages Debate* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 135-6.

⁶ Cragan and Shields, 89-91.

⁷ David A. Thomas, "Response to Cragan and Shields: Alternative Formats for Negative Approaches to Comparative Advantage Cases," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 8 (Spring 1972), 205.

⁸ Brock et al., pp. 137-9.

- d. *Generation*—consider ability of plan to provide advantage.
 - e. *Uniqueness*—consider whether proposals other than affirmative plan or status quo can achieve the advantage.
 - f. *Disadvantages*—consider whether achieving advantage.
 - (1) Precludes maintaining present benefits
 - (2) Achieves additional disadvantages
- Negative Block—Second Negative and First Negative Rebuttal
1. Attack each advantage—extend arguments initially presented by first negative (second negative constructive may add new arguments to the integrated attack).

The following statement might be representative of a first negative speaker's summary of refutation of each advantage.

The negative has demonstrated that the affirmative failed to provide a rationale worth achieving, but even if the advantage is (1) *significant*, status quo programs can achieve the advantage, but even if the advantage is (2) *inherent*, the affirmative plan is unworkable and impractical, but even if the plan is (3) *operative*, the plan cannot gain the advantage, but even if the plan is (4) *generative*, other proposals gain the advantage, but even if the plan is (5) *unique*, the plan produces advantage that is outweighed by (6) *disadvantages*.

The speaker is not compelled to use all lines of analysis in attacking each advantage; only those arguments which effectively damage the affirmative case should be selected. The lines of analysis should be viewed as a list of topoi which apply to the affirmative case with varying degrees of strength. The speaker advances the strongest topoi against each particular affirmative advantage.

Critics will probably offer objections to this approach. First they might claim the integrated approach encourages redundancy between and within speeches. Division of labor requires speakers to handle matters separate and distinct from those covered by their colleagues, thereby discouraging repetition of arguments. However, duplication is not necessary to the integrated approach. Extension of arguments, not simply restatement, is obviously encouraged.

The integrated negative appears to encourage redundancy within speeches. For example, when considering the first advantage of an affirmative case, a debater might argue a particular plank of the plan is unworkable and impractical in achieving the advantage; the speaker may later attack the second advantage on the same ground. The attack on the plan is duplicated, creating apparent redundancy. However, the argument should be stressed and documented only as it relates to the first advantage. Redundancy occurs only at the level of re-enumeration, not resubstantiation. Limited duplication seems acceptable because each affirmative advantage must be justified in terms of the workability and practicality of the plan. The workability/practicality argument is damaging in both instances.

Second, critics might suggest that an integrated approach fails to specify the tasks of the negative speakers, thereby creating difficulty for the judge who evaluates the strength of each debater. Actually, the speakers' tasks are clear. In the constructives, the first negative levies the initial attack

against the affirmative case; the second speaker extends those arguments. The negative team should approach the block (second constructive plus first rebuttal) as a single speech with the second constructive considering approximately two-thirds of the case and the first rebuttal tackling that which remains. The second negative rebuttal should review the entire case.

Third, critics might contend that the integrated approach lessens the affirmative burden of defense by apparently reducing the total number of arguments that a negative team can advance. However, the number of potential arguments remains the same; all that differs is the location in the debate where they are presented. Arguments relevant to the first advantage are presented when the negative considers the first advantage. Arguments relevant to succeeding advantages are offered when the negative examines succeeding advantages. The integrated approach enables the negative to better adapt arguments to the "plan-advantages" organizational format.

Fourth, critics might see a benefit in the specialization system because affirmative debaters must leave their case structure in order to deal with negative plan arguments. This is not a benefit; the affirmative can select the ground (plan or advantage) on which to defend its case. Such a system places the negative at an undue strategic disadvantage.

An integrated approach improves the quality of the debate by increasing the amount of clash. The role of plan attacks is enhanced. The popular negative approach which assigns plan attacks to the second speaker allows the first affirmative, in rebuttal, to give partial answers because of the impossibility of responding to fifteen minutes of argument in five minutes. The integrated approach denies this "escape" to the affirmative team. A more complete airing of the plan arguments is encouraged.

The affirmative must rebuild the case from a total perspective, no longer separating plan from advantage or plan from status quo or advantage from disadvantages, depending upon which "parts" of the issue rest with the affirmative side. The affirmative team must make comparisons between the plan and status quo, the plan and advantage, the plan and disadvantages, the advantage and disadvantages simultaneously. The integrated negative guarantees that issues are presented, refuted, compared, and extended in terms of all *prima facie* obligations, encouraging more intensive clash, thereby promoting better debate.

MINUTES OF DSR-TKA NATIONAL COUNCIL

Houston, Texas, December 27, 1975

Present for all or part of the meeting: Ziegelmuller, Andersen, Matlon, Cook, Cox, Kane, Hudgens, McGuire, Howe, Roth, Greg, McBath, Morello, Callaway, Huber, Weiss, Gross.

Report of the Secretary, Bert Gross. The transfer of records has been completed. Minutes of the April 4, 1975 meeting were approved.

Report of the Treasurer, Jack Howe. The transfer of office should be completed during the SCA Convention.

Report of the Standards Committee, Norma Cook. Early responses to the questionnaire from chapter sponsors have been distributed to National Council members. Several schools have expressed an interest in establishing chapters. There is an extensive list of delinquent chapters. A motion by McGuire/Hudgens to accept the requests of Idaho, Montana, SUNY-Binghamton, Washington (St. Louis) and Washington (Seattle) that their charters be revoked was passed. Further correspondence will be conducted with Hawaii and Miami (Florida) which have requested charter revocation. There is a group of 36 schools which have neither initiated members in the last three years nor paid chapter dues. A letter will be sent to the Director of Forensics at each of those schools to encourage their renewed participation. Regional Governors will be apprised of the status of chapters in their region.

A discussion of the value and necessity of chapter dues ensued. Finally it was reported that a 1974 motion to drop some chapters was not pursued. The schools were not notified. In the meantime, some schools have made payments of chapter dues. Further correspondence aimed at reviving DSR-TKA participation at these schools will be conducted.

Report of the Editor, Kenneth Andersen. There is a shortage of good manuscripts; potential contributors should take note. The Xerox Corporation has proposed to microfilm the *Speaker and Gavel*. The Editor was authorized to further investigate the proposal and sign a contract with Xerox if he saw no problems.

Report of the National Conference Committee, Thomas Kane. The National Conference will be held at the University of Tennessee, March 24-27, 1976. Weiss/Andersen moved that the National Conference Committee be advised to retain a vote of the participants in the selection of the topic for the four-person division. The motion passed. Matlon asked the Committee to seek student opinion of including a Lincoln-Douglas format for the 1977 Conference. Kane requested that the requirement that a chapter sponsor attend the conference be abandoned. Howe/McGuire moved that no school be permitted to participate in the National Conference which is not a member or does not have a charter application pending. The motion passed. Kane/Matlon moved that the invitation of the University of Utah to host the 1977 Conference be accepted. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting, December 29, 1975

Present for all or part of the meeting: Ziegelmüller, Cook, Gross, Howe, Roth, Callaway, Morello, Hudgens, Weiss, Moorhouse, Huber.

Reports of Regional Governors:

Region 3, John Morello: A regional tournament was held on November 7, 1975, at the University of Virginia. Halford Ryan, Washington and Lee University was elected the new Regional Governor to begin in September, 1976.

Region 5, Robert Weiss: The Miami University Tournament, January 23-25, 1976, will have special awards for Region 5 DSR-TKA schools. Gary Owen Turner, Miami University, is the Lieutenant Governor of the Region.

Region 7, Mel Moorhouse: Special awards to DSR-TKA schools were offered at the Wichita State Tournament.

Region 9, Wayne Callaway: Special awards to DSR-TKA schools will be offered for the first time next fall at the Colorado College tournament.

Region 1, Richard Roth: No regional events are planned at the present time.

Report of the Speaker of the Year Committee, George Ziegelmüller for Kassian Kovalcheck. Howe/Moorhouse moved to offer \$100 toward expenses for the Speaker of the Year Award recipient to attend the National Conference. If the Speaker of the Year cannot attend, an effort should be made to have him speak at the Conference banquet by telephone. The motion passed.

Old Business: Robert Huber spoke on the financial status of the Society.

A motion by Roth/Weiss that the society's representative to the Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate be instructed to change committee procedures to permit the committee to include a statement of substantive parameters of the propositions submitted for a vote was approved.

The meeting was adjourned.

U. S. POSTAL SERVICE STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION <i>(Act of August 12, 1970; Section 3685, Title 39, United States Code)</i>		
1. TITLE OF PUBLICATION		2. DATE OF FILING
3. FREQUENCY: SPEAKER AND GAYL		3A. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: \$7.75
4. LOCATION OF OFFICE OF PUBLICATION (Street, city, county, state and ZIP code) (Not printers)		\$5.00 per year
5. LOCATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS OR GENERAL BUSINESS OFFICES OF THE PUBLISHERS (Not printers)		
6. Same as above NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHER, EDITOR, AND MANAGING EDITOR		
PUBLISHER (Name and address) Delta Sigma Rho - Tau Kappa Alpha		
EDITOR (Name and address) National Honorary Forensic Society 1041 New Hampshire Street		
MANAGING EDITOR Kenneth E. Andersen, Dept. of Speech Communication, 244 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801		
7. OWNER (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.)		
NAME		ADDRESS
Delta Sigma Rho - Tau Kappa Alpha		1041 New Hampshire Street Lawrence, Douglas, Kansas 66044
8. KNOWN BONDHOLDERS, MORTGAGEES, AND OTHER SECURITY HOLDERS OWNING OR HOLDING 1 PERCENT OR MORE OF TOTAL AMOUNT OF BONDS, MORTGAGES OR OTHER SECURITIES (If there are none, so state)		
NAME		ADDRESS
None		
9. FOR OPTIONAL COMPLETION BY PUBLISHERS MAILING AT THE REGULAR RATES (Section 132.121, Postal Service Manual) 39 U. S. C. 3626 provides in pertinent part: "No person who would have been entitled to mail matter under former section 4359 of this title shall mail such matter at the rates provided under this subsection unless he files annually with the Postal Service a written request for permission to mail matter at such rates." In accordance with the provisions of this statute, I hereby request permission to mail the publication named in Item 1 at the reduced postage rates presently authorized by 39 U. S. C. 3626. (Signature and title of editor, publisher, business manager, or owner)		
10. FOR COMPLETION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AUTHORIZED TO MAIL AT SPECIAL RATES (Section 132.122 Postal Service Manual) (Check one)		
The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes	Have not changed during preceding 12 months <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Have changed during preceding 12 months <input type="checkbox"/> (If changed, publisher must submit explanation of change with this statement.)
11. EXTENT AND NATURE OF CIRCULATION	AVERAGE NO. COPIES EACH ISSUE DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS	ACTUAL NUMBER OF COPIES OF SINGLE ISSUE PUBLISHED NEAREST TO FILING DATE
A. TOTAL NO. COPIES PRINTED (Net Press Run)	1475	1400
B. PAID CIRCULATION		
1. SALES THROUGH DEALERS AND CARRIERS, STREET VENDORS AND COUNTER SALES		
2. MAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS	60	60
C. TOTAL PAID CIRCULATION	60	60
D. FREE DISTRIBUTION BY MAIL, CARRIER OR OTHER MEANS, SAMPLES, COMPLIMENTARY, AND OTHER FREE COPIES	1225	1299
E. TOTAL DISTRIBUTION (Sum of C and D)	1285	1359
F. COPIES NOT DISTRIBUTED		
1. OFFICE USE, LEFT-OVER, UNACCOUNTED, SPOILED AFTER PRINTING	190	41
2. RETURNS FROM NEWS AGENTS		
G. TOTAL (Sum of E & F--should equal net press run shown in A)	1475	1400
I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.	SIGNATURE OF EDITOR, PUBLISHER, BUSINESS MANAGER, OR OWNER Kenneth E. Andersen	

SPEAKER and GAVEL

Allen Press, Inc.
P. O. Box 368
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Return Postage Guaranteed

Second Class Postage Paid
at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.