

JOURNAL OF THE



Arizona  
Speech and Drama  
Association



THE JOURNAL OF THE  
ARIZONA SPEECH AND DRAMA ASSOCIATION

Volume I

Winter 1971-1972

Number 1

Editors

John Monsma and James Edward Sayer  
Northern Arizona University

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| A Message From The President. . . . .                            | 1   |
| Harold Hancock   |     |
| Speech: An Academic Discipline--Reviewed . . . . .               | 2   |
| Daniel J. Julien, Jr.  |     |
| The Audience: Research Potential for the Oral Interpreter. . . . | .10 |
| David A. Williams  |     |
| Contemporary Forensic Dialogue. . . . .                          | .13 |
| John Monsma & James Edward Sayer                                 |     |
| Edits . . . . .  | .18 |

A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Dear Colleagues:

I am very pleased to be able to speak to you through the pages of the new Arizona Speech and Drama Association Journal. The renewal of this publication is, I think, a most optimistic sign of the state of the profession in Arizona. It reflects the determination of many people, most particularly its editors: James Sayer and John Monsma. Arizona has the potential for a strong and truly professional state association; there are many reasons to be encouraged. We have just finished an exciting meeting in Sedona and the program chairman, Clifford White, is making plans for an even more interesting meeting in Casa Grande in February. The constitution has again been revised.

We have reasons for optimism, but there is no room for complacency. There are too many pressing questions concerning the relationship of Speech and Drama to the educational process and to society in general that we need to discuss and investigate together. How long can we continue when legislators and school boards seem to view us as essentially an education frill? Is their view justified? If not, how can we change that view? What do we in Speech and Drama accomplish that is so fundamental and unique that it cannot be done better someplace else by someone else? What arguments and lines of reasoning can we use to justify our existence? There is every reason to believe that if we cannot answer these questions for ourselves that they will be answered for us in ways that will not be pleasing to us.

All of us in Speech and Drama are convinced that our interests and activities are too fundamental to the human condition to be overlooked or slighted, but it also seems that it is precisely the centrality, the pervasiveness of our concerns that make them invisible to much of the public. We need to discover timely ways to demonstrate our usefulness. A way to begin is through the nurturing of a strong professional association, but, of course, no association can be stronger than its membership. We will find strength in numbers and we will strengthen each other through association. I urge you to participate and to encourage your colleagues to do likewise.

Harold Hancock, President

SPEECH: AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE--REVIEWED

Daniel J. Julien, Jr.

The following article was difficult for the writer to put together in the fear that the motive might be misinterpreted. The intent of the paper is to mobilize the dedicated members of the speech profession to the point that they will want to do something about what seems to be a tragic trend--the dissolving of a grand old discipline.

Rhetoric and drama readily can be traced back to ancient times--to the rhetoricians, Greeks and Romans. If identifying one's roots is the sole criterion for the existence of an academic discipline, there should be little question about oral communication and its other related segments. Speech, as a field of study, grew from an academic tradition as old as the history of western education.

The use of the term "speech" to identify an academic discipline emerged in the first two decades of this century. The first M.A. degree in Speech was granted in 1902, and the first Ph.D. degree in 1922. The national professional society, The Speech Association of America, was founded on 1914 as The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking.<sup>1</sup>

But for a moment, let's examine ourselves. Who are we? What are we? What do we represent? Do we have the right to identify ourselves today as an academic discipline substantive enough to stand upon its own laurels? From the ancient times, the academic discipline of rhetoric has been proliferated to the point where many view all of the educational process as a form of rhetoric; all of the communication process as a form of oral communication. What academic discipline, in fact, does not use some form of oral communication as its vehicle in the pursuit of knowledge?

What are some of the splinters of the original art form of rhetoric? In America, the written language falls under the guise of the English Department. Large departments encompassing language arts, in its broadest concept, exist in schools and colleges. The social and behavioral sciences, as a study of man and his behavior in society--or specifically, history and its politics in action, constitute a form of oral communication. Sociology studies man and his society while psychology works with the behavior of man and philosophy describes the theories of

Daniel J. Julien, Jr. is Assistant Professor of Speech at Northern Arizona University.

man. There are those who find little distinction between man and the other beasts of the field (e.g., Julian Huxley) other than his ability to think creatively and to communicate those thoughts to his fellow beasts for the advancement of mankind. Obviously, our roots are deep. But, what are we today? What do we stand for today? In America, the task has been especially difficult to identify speech as an academic discipline.

In some schools and institutions, speech and the dramatic arts fall under the humanities department. In others they may be grouped together under the English department, in performing arts, or under any academic discipline where it's conceivable that the communicative arts might fall. It has only been in recent years that speech and the dramatic arts have been able to divorce themselves from other departments and to establish themselves as a separate entity. As a matter of fact, the split has not yet been fully realized in many situations.

What are we? That question in itself has caused considerable discomfort to many persons who are in the field. The word "speech" is probably to blame for many of our problems. "Speech" means many different things to different people within and without the discipline. "Speech", to many, is an all-encompassing term inclusive of the finite forms of the art such as drama, interpretation, broadcasting, speech sciences, public address, rhetoric, pedagogy, and forensic activities. To others, "speech" simply means public speaking.

A dramatic evolution took place in America when speech splintered from English to become a separate academic discipline. It was equally dramatic when theatre sought its own identity from speech. Theatre and drama as academic disciplines are of very recent vintage. Professor George Pierce Baker organized the first academic program in theatre and drama during the early years of this century, but only after years of struggle which finally resulted in his resignation from Harvard in 1925 and subsequent move to Yale. Although Thomas Wood Stevens operated the first Department of Drama at Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1914, as late as 1950, theatre programs were most often found in either English or speech departments.<sup>2</sup> Programs and departments have so multiplied today, however, that there are few colleges or universities without at least academic instruction in the field.<sup>3</sup>

Equally interesting was the organizing of the broadcasters as a separate organization. Speech science has also splintered away. In some states, such as Michigan, the specific forensic activities have broken away from the parent group. Even the Speech Association of America recently changed its name. To retain its very identity, it is now known as the Speech Communication Association (redundant, in the thinking of some.) The Western Speech Association is considering a similar change.

Many state organizations find it necessary to include the names of various parts of the discipline in the title of the organization in order to keep the subdivisions from splintering away. Arizona is no exception; its title includes the words "speech" and "drama." One might logically ask, why broadcasting, or more specifically yet--radio and television, is not also included. If speech science is expected to ally itself with the state organization for speech then why isn't speech science or therapy in the title? Why is pedagogy not included? It becomes very obvious after a while that all of these areas cannot be included in the name of an organization--instead, we need an encompassing term. The "speech" has served that purpose over the years; however, "speech" today is more commonly thought of as public address or, possibly, public address, rhetoric and pedagogy.

Considerable interest currently is being expressed in another area of the discipline--Communication Theory. Perhaps the theorists will have less discomfort than their brothers in the other specialized areas of the discipline indentifying with the word "speech." Frankly, we desperately need a term with which to identify. "Speech" apparently is not serving that purpose.

An umbrella term that is commonly used today is "communication." "Communication," if examined closely, is probably not an appropriate term either. Communication is too encompassing. How can one justify, for example, a Communication Department in a university if it does not include the written form of communication, i.e. the English Department? Our biggest problem seems to be that we do not know who nor what we represent.

What, then, are we really? Do we indeed have a right to exist as a separate discipline? Drama for example, could conveniently and legitimately exist as a part of a literature arm of the English Department. Rhetoric and public address were, not too many years ago, included in the English Department as part of the required college freshman program. Broadcasting and journalism are closely allied, and journalism is often a part of the English Department. Dramatics could exist as a subdivision of, or extension to, drama. (The words "drama," "dramatics" and "theatre" also cause confusion. Some people demand separation of the terms in that they are separate arts, while others recognize them as conjoint enterprises which attain their supreme effectiveness when conjoined.<sup>4</sup>) What about speech science; is it possible that speech science has no place in the discipline of speech? Would it be better placed with other laboratory courses in other specialized fields?

If the inferred alliance with English bothers the reader, then perhaps we could move to the even more broad conceptual title of "Humanities" which would encompass all of the communicative arts: "literature, music, architecture, fine arts, all forms of communication. In essence, we, the members of the discipline, have indeed created a Frankenstein monster--

something with which we are not able to cope.

A note of warning from experiences of the past may be appropriate. When speech was a part of another department, it was often treated like an unwanted stepchild, as great leaders like Professor James M. O'Neill observed as far back as 1914. O'Neill's conclusions that experts are needed to train in the area of oral communication can be reaffirmed today. Teachers of speech (in its broad concept) do not lack tradition, subject matter, scholarship, pedagogical know-how or experience.<sup>5</sup> Certainly the departments of speech have proved that they have as much right to exist, have as important a function, and deserve as much recognition as any other department. On the other hand, we need to guard against disintegration and degradation.

We so sorely sought our identity that we divorced ourselves from our parent. This rebellious attitude, this spirit of revolution has been so deeply instilled in us and we have been so insecure and so engrossed in our search of this thing called "identity" that we are in the process of actually splintering ourselves beyond identity.

How often have we heard it stated that once we leave the English Department and get off on our own that we will be able to progress, to grow, and to mature? That split being accomplished, what do we find next? Nothing less than increased dissension within our own ranks. The very rationale for our split in the first place now makes it difficult for us to live with one another. The very reasons that we wanted to split from another discipline are used by the members from within the group and are virtually impossible to answer with any degree of logic.

Unless we can find that common thread that binds us all together it will be only a matter of time before we dissolve as an academic discipline. Braden refers to this process as "hyper-departmentalism." For example, when departments assume that their primary function is the training of actors, stage, technicians, radio announcers, speech clinicians, and speech teachers, it often results in the multiplication of course offerings with the course content becoming thinner and thinner. This "hyper-departmentalism" results in a splintering into more specialized departments of public speaking, departments of drama, departments of radio, departments of television, and departments of speech pathology.<sup>6</sup>

What precisely is an academic discipline? Other subject areas have gone through a similar questioning process in trying to establish themselves as an academic discipline. For example, this has been an endless struggle for the College of Education in many universities. Marc Belth proposes the following criteria for a discipline: disciplines are distinct from one another in one or more of the following:

1. In the level of abstraction of the concepts with which they are concerned.



2. In the modes of thinking by which they are characterized.
3. In the objectives they seek.
4. In the types and manifestations of the moral rules by which they are limited and evaluated.<sup>7</sup>

This writer would challenge even the most astute student of speech to demonstrate that speech as a separate discipline is distinctively different from other related disciplines in any one of the above criteria.

A discipline must be rigorous, continuous, graduated, and systematic. Theater and drama; therefore, in order to justifiably exist as a discipline on its own, must include the development of aesthetic discrimination and skill in the expression of human emotions. Hubert Heffner, Distinguished Service Professor at Indiana University, Past President of American Educational Theatre Association, and former Editor of Educational Theatre Journal states, "Academic curricula in theatre and drama, especially when not integrated with the actual stage production of plays, are, more often than not, hapazardly organized, taught by individuals who have no genuine interest in worthy academic instruction and therefore substitute showmanship for the hard effort necessary to real teaching."<sup>8</sup> Heffner adds additional salt to the wound when he states:

"It is not surprising, therefore, that we have enrolled in our departments too many mere 'theatre bums', academic beatniks, who, whatever little narrow talent they may possess, are a detriment to scholarship...we (also) have too many of these 'theatre bums' on our faculties. Clever as some of them might be as designers, technicians, or directors, they will never become great teachers, much less great scholars. They degrade the academic dignity of our profession" (discipline).<sup>9</sup>

Apply Marc Belth's criteria to the theater and drama arm of the discipline, what are your conclusions?

Belth further defines his concept with, "What all disciplines have in common, are models by means of which materials of the world are transformed into subject matter bearing the meanings of men's inventions and explorations."<sup>10</sup> We have models, but do we use them? Can we really put our finger on our "subject matter" as advanced by our "leaders?" Or are we content to continue using ourselves as our own "experts?"

We are so engrossed in our private little traditional, protective world that we continually leave innovative concepts in our field to be stolen away by our sister disciplines. Examples of the above would include: film, interpretation,

and drama to English; public relations and broadcasting to journalism and business; conference techniques, interpersonal communication, dynamics of discussion, and interviewing to psychology; industrial education to almost anyone who wants it; business communication to business; classroom communication techniques to education; and communication problems of various minority groups to sociology and psychology. The list is endless.

Belth continues by identifying the parts of a discipline:

"First, there must be some ways of contemplating experienced events free of the loom of those events. This sets the role for models. Second, these models supply the forms of theories developed to account for events, as well as laws from which predictions can be deduced. Third, there must be some materials on which operations of the first two types can be performed... One of the necessary characteristics of any independent discipline is that it have some self-corrective procedures."<sup>11</sup>

The very conceptions of the discipline must be such that, employed properly, the theories themselves become the critical tools by means of which both results and methods are tested and corrected continuously.

Philip Phenix searches for academic disciplines which can be identified by their representative ideas. After studying Phenix, one could conclude that if speech is to exist then it must exist as a part of the discipline called "Language." Representative ideas, according to Phenix, are those broad conceptualizations that identify the discipline; concepts that are advanced and agreed upon by the leaders or so-called experts in the field. How many of us can identify our "leaders?" How many of us, for that matter, can even identify those fundamental concepts that distinguish us from other disciplines?

Representative ideas should not be confused with goals, aims, or ideals which are often extraneously imposed--usually by society. Nor should they be confused with major issues or topics which are generally methodologically approached.

Perhaps part of the problem rests with the fact that such vast amounts of knowledge have been acquired in recent years accounting for our inability to harness the discipline. Have we reached the point where we have grown so large that our cloak will now no longer cover us, or have we become so specialized that we have lost sight of the very principles or distinctions which made it possible for us to exist in the first place as an academic discipline?

Disciplines arise because knowledge has certain inherent natural growth structures. Even though educators may experience difficulty accepting one another as authorities, some defensible canons are essential to justify the very existence of a given

discipline. In other words if one cannot distinguish his discipline from another then his discipline may have no justifiable right to exist. Perhaps this is the very cause of much of the splintering of disciplines which has fogged the identity of our discipline. Oftentimes what develop historically as distinct disciplines later prove to be varieties of one discipline. Physics and chemistry are a case in point. It may be difficult to combine the disciplines of physics and music, even though they have some common ground; it may prove to be equally difficult to justify the divorce of physics and chemistry or of physics and mathematics.

We desperately need to find ourselves--to identify ourselves. We need to agree upon our field of phenomena--our domain. We should agree upon a set of rules which would apply to a scholar's attempt to create knowledge within our field. We need to become familiar with our history, our leaders, and most importantly our fundamental concepts. We need to locate a term to describe our discipline.

Speech has some built-in difficulties as departments, but most of the problems have been, and are being, created by speech people themselves. They can be solved within the generally designed framework most departments now have. It has taken over fifty years to raise departments of speech to their present level. They were created for a purpose, and that purpose is still valid. Speech is a fundamental part of liberal education, and if properly taught provides a thread which binds together all other disciplines. This writer holds considerable faith in the speech profession and is convinced that if the profession remains united it will emerge as the backbone of the entire educational process. On the other hand, we stand a good chance of collapsing if we allow ourselves to splinter and become fragmented. This paper, then, is intended to be a call to all dedicated members of the profession to unite and rally in support of their profession. Perhaps if others are equally concerned, a future A.S.D.A workshop might be devoted to this search for identity.

FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>S.A.A. Committee on the Nature of the Field of Speech, "The Field of Speech: Its Purposes and Scope in Education," The Speech Teacher, Vol. XII, No. 4, (November, 1963), p.331.

<sup>2</sup>Burnet M. Hobgood, "Theater in U.S. Higher Education: Emerging Pattern and Problems," Educational Theatre Journal, Vol. XVI, No. 2, (May, 1964), p. 144.

<sup>3</sup>Hubert C. Heffner, "Theater and Drama in Liberal Education," Educational Theatre Journal, Vol. XVI, No. 1, (March, 1964), pp. 17, 243.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>Waldo W. Braden, "Whither the Department of Speech?" The Speech Teacher, Vol. III, No. 2, (March, 1954), p. 123.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 122.

<sup>7</sup>Marc Belth, Education as a Discipline (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965), p. 6, 221.

<sup>8</sup>Heffner, op. cit., p. 20.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>10</sup>Belth, op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 170.

THE AUDIENCE: RESEARCH POTENTIAL  
FOR THE ORAL INTERPRETER

by  
David A. Williams

While interpretation is usually defined in terms of the writer-reader-audience trinity, modern theory of interpretation has left the role of audience almost untouched. I would like to suggest that this void needs to be filled. One of the conclusions of a recent dissertation in oral interpretation by Martha Thomson Barclay was "that the audience was the most neglected consideration."<sup>1</sup> John Gray, editor of Perspectives On Oral Interpretation, points out several questions which need to be asked: "How valuable is audience behavior and attitude change to the oral interpreter? What communication barriers are involved in the writer-reader-audience relationship?"<sup>2</sup> Writing in 1965, Mark S. Klyn points out that we have unique opportunities for research in the performer-audience relationship.<sup>3</sup>

Actually, as early as 1917, Charles Woolbert attempted some basic experiments on the reader-audience relationship. His first concern was the difference in time it took for a reader to read a selection without looking at the audience, and then reading again while glancing out at the audience. Then he changed the position of the audience, changing the front row to the back and dispersing the middle row along a diagonal from front to back. He then timed the reader under this condition to determine whether there was any correlation. He explains that the "results are too meagre as yet to be worth anything, though they are at least interesting."<sup>4</sup>

He then instructed the audience to compute simple problems of arithmetic,  $2 + 2$ , while listening to the reading. He found the reader was affected and "he could not help feeling that he did not have an audience before him."<sup>5</sup> He then had the audience listen for a certain consonant at the beginning of a word and count the number of times he heard it. "But we found again that the attention though rapt -- was not of the right kind..."<sup>6</sup> Again, the reader could feel or sense somehow that the audience was really not listening to him.

Until recently, no one has experimented further on the reader-audience relationship. Three experiments are tangentially related to the basic concern of "eye to eye" contact. Wulftange compared the response to the oral interpretation of short stories presented face-to-face, by videotape, and by audio recordings. Although she found that the face-to-face method was rated higher than the audio method, she did not find any significant superiority for the face-to-face method over the audio method in degree

David A. Williams (Ph.D., Utah, 1971) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Arizona. Professor Williams also served as Director of Forensics at Northern Arizona University from 1965-1968.

of interest or technique.<sup>7</sup> One can deduce from this study that audience response did not enable the reader to perform any better in face-to-face communication than when his audience only heard the audiotape.

Warland, Trauernicht, and Gruner further explored the difference between response to live and to tape recorded oral interpretation. They used one male and one female reading prose and poetry. They found that the live performance was rated significantly higher on aesthetic response (in agreement with Wulftange) and on degree of interest (in opposition to Wulftange). However, only the live performance of the female reading prose was rated higher than her recorded performance on "technique." The experimenters felt that the literary differences affected the results.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, in another related study, Cobin found that an audience preferred eye-contact by a reader over no eye-contact. However, he suggests that a speaker's eye-contact is essentially a symptom rather than an independent factor.

In other words, it is possible that when an audience reacts negatively to a speaker with poor eye-contact, it reacts not to the eye-per se but to underlying conditions -- such as the speaker's indifference to his audience, his failure to prepare adequately, et cetera-- which may be manifested in certain externals among which poor eye-contact is included. If this were the case, a skilled speaker or reader who prepared, and who was concerned with being communicative, might avoid eye-contact by arbitrary prearrangement but, nonetheless, succeed in achieving rapport and conveying information.

The Cobin study is relevant because it demonstrates the preference for eye-contact by the audience. Eye-contact may be important for the reader in perceiving response, and/or feedback for the audience.

One of the more important questions which might come out of research in the reader-audience relationship might just be some definition of how audience response effect the reader. We have only intuitively "guessed" that the audience does indeed have an effect on the reader. Actually, scholars are far apart in many respects concerning the reader-audience relationship. Ideas range from suggesting that the interpreter like the speaker should be very "audience-centered," to scholars who feel that the literature is the only concern of the reader. Some theorists feel that the reader himself can constitute the audience, while others feel that communicative reading involves two or more people. Some writers believe that the reader should "play" to his audience and that feedback can enhance or destroy a reading. Others feel it is dangerous to play to an audience because of the possibility of sac-

rificing the real communion with the literature. Intuitively, writers in oral interpretation have suggested that the audience has a tremendous effect on the reader. Intuitively this theory seems sound. But like many other theories in communication, it needs to be tested. The audience is a research potential for the oral interpreter.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Martha Thomson Barclay, "Major American Emphasis in Theories of Oral Interpretation from 1890 to 1950," Speech Monographs, XXXVI (August, 1969), p. 311.

<sup>2</sup>John Gray (ed.), Perspectives on Oral Interpretation (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1968), p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Mark S. Klyn, "Potentials For Research In Oral Interpretation," Western Speech, XXIX (Spring, 1965), p.111.

<sup>4</sup>C. H. Woolbert, "Suggestions As To Methods In Research," The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, III (January, 1917), p. 18.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>7</sup>Keith Brooks and Sister I. Marie Wulftange, "Listener Response to Oral Interpretation," Speech Monographs, XXXI (March, 1964), 73-79.

<sup>8</sup>Steven Guy Warland, Maxine M. Trauernicht and Charles R. Gruner, "Audience Response to Visual Stimuli in Oral Interpretation," Southern Speech Journal, XXXII (Summer, 1967), p. 289-295.

<sup>9</sup>Martin Cobin, "Response to Eye-Contact," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLCIII (December, 1962), p. 418.

CONTEMPORARY FORENSIC DIALOGUE

by  
John Monsma and James Edward Sayer

While musing on the contents of this journal, your editors fell into what seemed to be a deep trance, only to be awakened by strange visions. As true academicians, they took copious notes of what took place and report the findings to you.

Scene One opened near the headquarters of a major tournament.

Scene I: Pairings and judging assignments for the first round of oratory have just been posted; Sir John Petty, debate coach at Marmaduke High School, is busily engaged in a heated discussion with the Tournament Director.

Sir John: What do you mean by having Ferndock judge my orator first round?

Tour. Dir: What?

SJ: How dare you use Ferndock to judge my orator?!

TD: What's wrong with him?

SJ: What's wrong with him?? Everybody knows that Ferndock hates me, hates my school, and will travel anywhere to give my students a loss!

TD: I've never heard anything like that.

SJ: Where have you been? I've got this little notebook-see?-and I keep a record of how everyone votes on my students. (Turning pages in book) Ferndock hasn't given my students, any of them, a win since 1967!

TD: But, he's been out of the state for the past three years. This is his first Forensic judging since 1967.

John Monsma (Ph.D., Indiana University) is Associate Professor of Speech at Northern Arizona University. James Edward Sayer (M.A., University of Arizona) is Director of Forensics at Northern Arizona University.



SJ: That doesn't matter. The point is that he hates me, he hates my school, and he'll never give my orator a win.

TD: Look, how do you know that he'll "dump" your student?

SJ: It just figures. He went to Alton High School where he was coached by Tom Cauley who hated me since I threw a rock at him in boot camp in '43. Cauley told Ferndock that I was no good and that anything I touch is bad. All that had to rub off. I'll guarantee that Ferndock will "dump" my orator.

TD: That's just ridiculous. I cannot believe that a grudge can be carried over twenty-eight years to hurt your student.

SJ: And I'll tell you another thing. I have a list here of seventeen judges that are not to be allowed to judge my students. Every one of these people will stop at nothing to see that my students don't win. They hate to see my school win any tournament.

TD: But, as I recall your school has not won a tournament in the past eight or nine years.

SJ: Exactly! These seventeen people have been out to get me and they've succeeded. If you don't keep these people away from my students, I'll protest directly to your department chairman.

TD: The pairings stand; Ferndock stays.

(An hour later, the ballots come in and Ferndock has voted in favor of the Marmaduke orator.)

TD: There! Now are you convinced that your concern was ill-founded?

SJ: Ill-founded! One crummy decision in four years! I'm protesting! This tournament is fixed to rob me! Where's your department chairman?

The chairman arrives and escorts Sir John toward a conference room marked "MEN." Fine hail, similar to shotgun pellets, obscures the scene momentarily. When it dissipates, one can see two men in the office of a large factory. They are engaged in a heated discussion.

SceneII: Timothy Richard LaCrosse is interviewing the President of Sleezease, Incorporated, a national manufacturer of filing equipment.

TRL: But I tell you I need a file case with a 360 cubic inch V-16 engine.

Pres: Please, Mr. LaCrosse, listen to me for the thirteenth time. No one, but no one has ever ordered a motorized filing case, much less one with a 360 cubic inch V-16 engine!

TRL: Don't bother me with past history, I create the future!

Pres: But why??--I don't understand.

TRL: Of course, you don't. None of you common people know the value of copious evidence. Why, I recall a debate when...

Pres: (Interrupting) I don't see how that can prove your point.

TRL: (Obviously irritated at this attack by undocumented credibility) Don't try to reason with me! If you'll only allow me to get my four-foot brief case from our team pickup truck, I'll.....

Pres: (Interrupting again) Why don't we dispense with this evidence bit. Try telling me, preferably in plain language, what you want.

TRL: Well, I guess I can do it with only two points of concise analysis.  
(A) We need a motorized file case large enough to hold 16,000 pieces of prime evidence and 30,000 pieces of backup evidence. This would allow us to use 138.5 pieces of evidence per minute, especially if you include the 23 inch TV screen which flashes supplementary evidence as the speaker is reading his own.  
(B) We need a motorized file case big enough to support a computer capable of organizing and synthesizing this evidence and, preferably, capable of drawing new facts from internal analysis of the combined contents.

Pres: Thank you for your concise answer, but pardon me for expressing some doubt. I fail to see the need for all of this. I thought debate

taught participants to think on their feet, to extemporize. What value do you see in this?

TRL: Who cares? Winning is all, and to quote a famous anonymous author, "We will bury you." By the way, don't forget the variable speed control on the TV set. Subliminal evidence is more difficult to refute.

As Timothy Richard LaCrosse and the President slowly fade into a brilliant Western sunset, a third scene begins to emerge.

Scene III: Thomas Trophie, Director of Forensics at Bronze Haven University, is in consultation with his Assistant Director in preparation for an upcoming national tournament.

TT: Let's check to see that everything's ready. Are all the teams prepared to go?

AD: The kids are re-filing some evidence, but, aside, from that they're set.

TT: Have the responses to UCLA's case been briefed?

AD: They've been typed and xeroxed. Flimm and Evers have been having trouble getting those responses down so as to maximize the spread.

TT: Don't they realize that we've got to beat that case? If we can't spread that case with at least sixty points in the block, then they'll blow us out of the room with their counter-spread.

AD: Flimm and Evers feel that the more arguments they throw out, the less they are able to communicate effectively.

TT: Communicate! Who cares about effective communication? They've been around long enough to know that debate has no connection with communication. I brought those two boys to Bronze Haven to debate, not to communicate.

AD: But, they feel that they can beat UCLA's case with a few points that are well-developed and persuasively delivered.

TT: But the name of the game is SPREAD! Everyone expects debaters to throw out a lot of arguments.

Even the high schools do it now. Why, if we didn't spread, we wouldn't have a single trophy in our trophy case. Then, where'd we be?

AD: I suppose that this would be a good time to let you know that there's been some grumbling on the squad about those "trophy points" you've been keeping.

TT: It's important that everyone know how they're doing in aiding the squad trophy effort. Some people haven't won a single trophy and I hope those "trophy points" will put some pressure on those people to produce.

AD: The squad feels that it places too much pressure on the novices and makes them feel they're letting you and the University down.

TT: They are! I dream of the day when an entire wing of this building will be needed to store our trophies; and then, a hundred years from now people will know that I taught these kids something of value.

AD: But, aren't trophies only a superficial benefit of debate?

TT: No! Trophies are debate, and only good debaters win trophies. We've got to win more trophies and more trophies and MORE TROPHIES.

A blinding flash, perhaps the glint of sunlight on hundreds of trophies, awoke your editors from their trance. It was all a dream - or - was it?

EDITS

UofA HONORS ROBERT BURROUGHS

The Arizona Invitational Drama Festival, an annual event hosted by the University of Arizona's Department of Drama, chose its 1971 gathering to commemorate the activities of Robert C. Burroughs on the occasion of his twenty-fifth year with the University of Arizona. Mr. Burroughs, President of ASDA from 1960-1962, is the Art Director in the UofA Drama Department and has been responsible for many of the sets in its productions over the past years.

In addition to his activities at the University of Arizona, Mr. Burroughs serves as the Head of the Theatre Arts Department of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Michigan, and as the Director of the Imperial Players in Cripple Creek, Colorado. Three years ago, he directed Misalliance in its presentation at Ford's Theatre (Washington) for the American College Theater Festival.

All member of the ASDA wish to extend their congratulations to Bob for twenty-five fruitful years of drama activity at the University of Arizona and elsewhere.

UPCOMING FORENSIC ACTIVITIES IN ARIZONA

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Jan 13-15 | Fifth Annual Mountain States Classic - Phoenix College   |
| Jan 22    | Forensic League Tournaments - Camelback High School<br>Pueblo High School  |
| Feb 12    | Arizona Western Forensic Festival - Arizona Western<br>College   |
| Feb 19    | Championship Forensic Tournament - Arizona State<br>University   |
| Feb 24-26 | Twenty-first Annual Desert Invitational - University<br>of Arizona   |
| Mar 11    | Fourth Annual Spring Forensics Championships -<br>University of Arizona  |
| Mar 18    | Northland Speech Festival - Northern Arizona University  |
| Mar 24-25 | Third Annual NAU Invitational Debate Championships-<br>Northern Arizona University                               |
| Mar 25    | AIA District Tournaments - Coconino High School,<br>North High School, West High School, Catalina<br>High School |
| Apr 15    | AIA State Tournament - Coconino High School  |

SUMMER WORKSHOPS

Arizona State University

June 25 - July 8

Registration \$10.00

Tuition 50.00

Dorm 70.00

Debate, Interpretation; Oratory,  
Extemporary

University of Arizona

June 11-24

Room and Board \$125.00

Live at home 60.00

Grades 7-12

Speech, Drama, Music, Television

Dance, Photo, Architecture, Humanities

Call: Mike Hartrell

884-1452

Northern Arizona University

July 23 - August 5

Registration \$10.00

Tuition 60.00

Dorm 65.00

Open to grades 9-12

Some partial tuition scholarships  
available.

Debate, Theater, Oral Interpretation,  
Radio, Television. Individual Events

\*\*\*\*\*

The Editors welcome your response to these articles  
and will provide space for replies in future issues.

Have an idea? Want to express your thoughts about  
ASDA, our profession, or about related items? Send your  
manuscripts to:

James Sayer

or

John Monsma

Box 6006

NAU

Flagstaff

Arizona

86001

Manuscripts for the Spring issue must be submitted  
by March 15.