

International/Intercultural Annual Available

The second edition of the SCA-sponsored publication, *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, is now available. Edited by Fred Casmir, *Pepperdine University*, the volume includes the following:

"Implications of Cognitive Norms for The Study of Social Change," by Rosalie Cohen; "The Study of Communication Messages and The Conflict Over Global Eco-Patience," by Donald G. Douglas; "Language and Ethnicity in Intergroup Communication," by Edna L. Koenig; "Intercultural Communication Vistas: Description, Concept, and Theory," by Jerry L. Burk; "Research Methodology in Another Culture: Some Precautions," by Henry M. Brashen; "Perception of Self and Others: An Approach to Intercultural Communication," by Eileen Newmark and Molefi K. Asante; "Implications of Intercultural Communication for Bilingual and Bicultural Education," by Nobileza C. Asuncion-Lande; "The Multinational Business Organization: A Schema for the Training of Overseas Personnel in Communication," by Fathi S. Yousef and Nancy E. Briggs; "International and Intercultural Communication Annual Minoritarianism and Ethnic Groups Communication," by Robert L. Nwankwo; "A Model for the Study of Intercultural Communication in Colleges and Universities of the United States," by William S. Howell; "A Two-Week International Workshop in Cross-Cultural Counseling," by Paul Pedersen; "Critical Review of Recent Literature," by William J. Starosta; and "Directory of Organizations Concerned with International/Intercultural Communication Study, Teaching, Research, Practice, Sponsorship," by Corinne K. Flemings.

The publications is sponsored by the SCA Commission on International and Intercultural Communication; publication costs have been partly underwritten by Pepperdine University. Corinne Flemings, William Starosta, and J. M. Womack have assisted Editor Casmir.

Copies of the *Annual* at \$3.00 each prepaid may be ordered from: Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041. (Postage and handling charges added to order not prepaid.)

Spectra, a publication of the Speech Communication Association, is sent to all members in October, December, February, April, June and August. Copy deadline: six weeks before the 1st of the publication month. Annual subscription rate for non-members: \$5.00. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, William Work, Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041.

Report of the 1975 Association Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee* of the Speech Communication Association submits the following nominations in keeping with Article VI of the Constitution and Article IV of the By-Laws. A mail ballot will be distributed to all members of the Association.

For Second Vice-President (one to be elected)

R. R. Allen, *University of Wisconsin—Madison*
Gerald R. Miller, *Michigan State University*

For the Legislative Council (four to be elected for three-year term)

Robert P. Heimerl, *Stillwater (Minnesota) High School*
Mary-Frances Hopkins, *Louisiana State University*
Don Marine, *Illinois Central College*
Irene Matlon, *Amherst (Massachusetts) Regional High School*
James H. McBeth, *University of Southern California*
Bonnie R. Patton, *University of Kansas*
Sam M. Smiley, *Indiana University—Bloomington*
Jo A. Sprague, *San Jose State University*

*Note: The Nominating Committee report appeared in the February issue of *Spectra*.

Computer Understands ZIP Codes (Only)

When corresponding with SCA (5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041) about membership and/or Placement Service mailing problems, **please always include the ZIP code—home or office—that you use for your SCA mailings.** Our computer print-outs are all organized by ZIP code; correcting mailing list difficulties is often impossible without knowledge of the correct ZIP. **Placement Service members are reminded that they must use the same address for their Placement and for their SCA membership mailings.**

Whenever possible, include an SCA mailing label (or labels) when corresponding about mailing difficulties.

1975 Presidential Address Herman Cohen

I am pleased that in this political year the SCA has not chosen to follow the political model by arranging for an inaugural presidential address. For my purposes a valedictory address is much more suitable. I now have the opportunity to review our progress and to tell you how honored I feel to have served as President of SCA during 1975. If you will pardon me a personal, even sentimental note, I speak to you on the eve of my 51st birthday. (I have, for some time, measured my age by attendance at the SCA Conventions. After the 1976 meeting at San Francisco when our meetings will be in November, I don't know what I will use as a base mark.) I have now come to the point where over half my life has been spent in our profession and as a member of SCA. This occasion is, therefore, very significant for me.

A year ago in Chicago, when Sam Becker passed the SCA presidential gavel to me, I recall making some vague remarks, even promises, about my hopes for the SCA in 1975. Not enough time has elapsed for me to assess definitively all of our accomplishments in this year. I can tell you, however, that we are a profession and association with challenges to face and problems to solve, such as declining or stable membership, severe financial limitations and the future direction of the profession. During the presidential years of Lloyd Bitzer, Wallace Bacon, Jane Blankenship and their successors, we will live in interesting days in the second half of the 1970's. We have lived in interesting days before, however: we have faced challenges and solved problems and we have matured greatly as a profession.

During the past year as I have spoken with members of state and regional organizations and as I have attended to the concerns of our association, two matters have assumed increasingly greater importance in my mind. They are the directions in which our profession should move and our responsibility for free and open communication. I hope that you will perceive a relationship between these concerns—they both grew out of our professional history. Perhaps instead of a presidential address you will hear two or more mini addresses.

I have no intention of pontificating with you this morning (there is, after all, little papal about me). Rather it is my hope that I will be able to share some of my thoughts with you in an informal way. I trust that we may understand where our historical development has led us and what we need to watch for in the future.

Since 1954 when I received my Ph.D. both our attitudes about our profession and about free and open communication have changed radically. Let me see if I can put these

continued, page 4

"The Communication of Knowledge" will be the focus of the June 27-30 forum of "PROJECT: Knowledge 2000," sponsored by the National Science Foundation, the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and the Xerox Corporation.

Cohen, cont. from page 3

concerns in their historical context. The view of our field then was much simpler, even simplistic, compared to our present perspective. Some of us, however, fresh from graduate school thought we were on the cutting edge (so to speak) of the most sophisticated kind of thinking about oral communication. We were, in retrospect, a field largely concerned with the teaching of public speaking and some group discussion. We were in our scholarship much concerned with attempting to explore our historical heritage of speech-making and rhetorical theory. As I look back we seemed to be involved in applying Aristotelian proofs and canons to every conceivable rhetorical event. I am afraid that such activity told us more about Aristotle than it did about any speech. Our work was pretty unsophisticated. But we had come a long way from our days as elocutionists.

We are not certain who the members of our profession are or what kind of profession we are. It sometimes seems that the discussions of whether we are an educational or scholarly profession have been almost endless. Nevertheless, we must come to some resolution because the answer has significant implications for our future. I am particularly sensitive on this point because I failed to make myself clear earlier this year in SPECTRA and my views on the subject were misunderstood—at least those who understood me didn't write me angry letters. Let me try to be clearer with the hope of being less misunderstood.

I do not mean to overestimate the schism in our profession but we all know that some members of our profession are convinced that our future lies in the direction of generating and disseminating our research. They see us as a scholarly profession which has as one of its most important missions the improvement of scholarship and the refinement of our knowledge. Other members, happily growing in numbers and articulateness, see us as an educational and professional group concerned with instruction in communication at all levels and with expanding rather than constricting our membership. A third group, myself included, feel there is no reason why our field cannot be both scholarly and professional. The real question, I suppose, is what relative emphasis should be given to these positions keeping in mind our meager resources.

What that balance should be is clear, at least to me. For years we had been benignly neglectful of the high school and community college teachers. In our desire to establish our professional respectability we stressed our research and our scholarship. We needed to improve our status and we did, but at the expense of some valuable elements to which we did not pay much attention. We did not remember that our concern should be with study, teaching and research in Speech Communication at all levels. Once we are clear about that a number of questions answer themselves. We no longer need

to ask questions which assume a dichotomous polarity. We can, as a profession, simultaneously advance scholarship and improve the communication competencies of all. We no longer need to ask who belongs to our profession or whether high school teachers and research scholars can co-exist in the same profession and professional organizations.

In recent years we have begun to change our orientation. Teachers in public schools and community colleges are beginning to play more important roles in the decision making of the SCA, for example. At the same time we must recognize, however, that some errors have been committed in the past and need to be rectified. For too long the SCA has been dominated by faculty from four-year and graduate institutions. Program participants and officers are overwhelmingly from senior institutions. We have begun to change but we must make more decisive efforts to bring public school and community college teachers into more active professional roles.

We have displayed another kind of elitism. As our field changed we became seriously concerned about the directions in which we should move. Extremely worthwhile conferences were held at New Orleans, Pheasant Run, Wingspread, Airle and Sedalia charting the future growth of our field and very thoughtful volumes were produced as outcomes of these conferences. Unfortunately, no really serious attempt was made to see that the results of these conferences were disseminated and the implications made clear to practitioners in schools and colleges.

Although this neglect was perhaps not deliberate, nor even conscious, it grew out of a patronizing attitude toward schools and community colleges shown by us in senior institutions. We did not show much interest in determining the views of active practitioners or in sharing our thoughts on matters of mutual concern. This attitude, it seems to me, is changing. Those of us in graduate departments and in influential professional positions however, must work more actively at establishing communication with community colleges and public school teachers. We need to understand the problems of classroom teachers and, more importantly, we need to listen to them. They have advice to offer us. We must not assume that we will always be consulted as experts. We must understand that we can learn from high school teachers.

As we face the future none of us should feel either disdain or awe for other members of our field. These are tough times for the academic world and our profession. We can grow and flourish but it will take a unified effort from a unified profession. We must regard ourselves as an integrated profession concerned with improvement of human communication in all spheres.

One aspect of human communication to which we have not given our full attention is the climate in which it occurs. Some of us recall that in the early days of our profession

we held to some simplistic notions, one of which was the relationship of speech and democracy. Almost every beginning high school and college textbook contained an obligatory chapter on "Speech in a Democratic Society". Discussion texts and argumentation texts emphasized the importance of their subject matter for training citizens to function in a democratic nation. Our prescriptions were simple but even some of us who were somewhat cynical believed them.

We are in 1975 a much more complex and sophisticated field. Our interests are much broader, our research techniques are much more refined. We know much more about human communicative behavior. As we became social scientists we began to change our role from policemen to observers. We became much more proficient at explaining what occurred in a rhetorical situation but we also became more reluctant to evaluate public communication in a democratic society. None of this was particularly surprising since we were now social scientists. Social scientists are, after all in their professional lives, certainly not in their personal lives, value free. We must approach the questions we ask without personal or cultural bias. Above all we are reluctant to draw conclusions which cannot be inferred from our data—particularly conclusions which have an ethical or moral component. Thus, the commitment which we had towards the importance of speech in a democracy gradually eroded. Of course, many of us individually felt as strongly as before about this commitment. We were fully in favor of free and open communication in a free and open society but we seldom said so professionally. Such matters increasingly became the concern of lawyers, philosophers, journalists and organizations such as the A.C.L.U.

I do not mean to say, or even suggest, that we are not concerned about public communication. Quite the contrary is true. As we matured our analysis of public discourse became more systematic, more thorough and more objective. Where formerly we were frozen into an Aristotelian analytical refrigerator we now have an abundance of approaches available to us. In the 50's we discovered the existence of Kenneth Burke and I. A. Richards, for example. In the 60's our own colleagues found imaginative ways of looking at discourse.

In spite of, or perhaps because of, our critical refinement we lost some of the evaluation even moral tone, of an earlier generation. I am perfectly aware that there are many of us who, on balance, consider this development a good thing. I suppose for the most part I do too. Nevertheless, I regret that we have chosen not to comment on the communicative climate of our country; that we have chosen not to comment on possible restraints which have been placed on our freedom to communicate; that we have chosen not to comment on public issues or

Cohen, cont. from page 4

public figures which have implications for free and open communication.

I hope you understand that I am not suggesting that we individually or collectively respond as knee-jerk liberals or conservatives by taking collective stands on particular questions. As an advocate of free speech and open discussion I hope our responses will be as diverse as our own individual beliefs. I am, I suppose, a rhetorical Maoist. "Let a thousand critical flowers blossom". Because of my views I find it regrettable that we have publically said so little about issues and events which affect the American climate of communication. I have heard a lot of private talk but I have read or heard little public comment on the implications for us of Spiro Agnew's Des Moines speech about the control and bias of T.V.; or of the Pentagon Papers and the manipulation of information during the Vietnam War; or that very intricate web for which we have adopted the rubric "Watergate". All of these matters raised serious questions about the communicative atmosphere in this country and they deserved our serious attention.

The communicative implications of these events have not gone unnoticed. Elizabeth Drew in her recent *Washington Journal* has written perceptively about the restraints on communication and information during Watergate. Jonathan Schell in a six part article in the *New Yorker* has analyzed the ways in which messages were manipulated from the early days of Vietnam to the last days of Richard Nixon. The late Hannah Arendt in "Lying in Politics" has looked carefully at the communicative implications of the Pentagon Paper controversy. All of these critics offer their views of what happened to our communicative climate in our recent history and they offer explanations for why it happened. Whether we agree with their analyses or not we owe these writers from other fields our thanks for dealing with questions so vital to us.

Perhaps these critics have seen what we knew long ago but have partially forgotten. As some of you know I spend part of my life living in my own "Brigadoon" in 18th century Scotland. Those Scots were an odd lot. In fact they still are. They were moralistic and cranky and opinionated. They did, however, have a profound respect for what they quaintly called "Democratical Government". Moreover, they perceived that the more free a society is the more flourishing is its "eloquence", which we would translate as "speech" or "communication". When restraints are placed on freedom the quality of public discourse declines. They also understood that the first concern of governmental rhetoric is the welfare of its citizens. Robert Wallace writing in the 1750's noted:

charge . . . His speeches therefore ought first to be addressed from his own enlightened mind to the understanding of others . . . before attempting to touch their hearts, to interest their affections or to influence their passions.

These Scots were keen historians for their time. Hugh Blair noted the correspondence between the rise and fall of rhetoric in Greece and Rome and the rise and fall of freedom and liberty. David Humé felt that ancient rhetoric was superior to 18th century British rhetoric because Greece and Rome were, when rhetoric flourished, freer and more open societies.

The 18th century was, of course, an optimistic time in the history of the West. The best was expected of humans because they were innately good. Great progress for the human race was not only predicted it was expected.

Perhaps those old Scots were wrong but we must remember that ours is an 18th century country founded on the premises which animated that time. It was this spirit which informed our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is almost mythic in our culture that our nation is a huge town meeting where open discussion in an open society results in popular decisions. I am reminded in this context of Randolph Churchill's political advice to his son, Winston—"Trust the People".

This spirit also for a long time provided us with a rationale for the teaching and study of speech. We felt there was no more effective training for participation in a democratic society than training in public speaking. A citizenry trained in communication would be able to debate and analyze public questions and the popular will would be manifest. Lord Roseberry in the 19th century noted the much greater emphasis on "popular oratory" in America than in Britain and remarked on the American notion that "everybody must have his say". We placed great faith in our ability to participate in a democracy and influence policy through speech.

I am, of course, speaking of a simpler time when our society and the climate of communication were less complex. I realize that we cannot return to a naive "frontier" conception of rhetoric. We have learned, sadly perhaps, that neither the world nor rhetoric are as simple as we once thought. Some European political scientists and Daniel Patrick Moynihan in the U.S. are writing that the American notion of what they call "liberal democracy" is an obsolete artifact from the 18th and 19th centuries. I am unconvinced and believe the changes in our society should not deter us from doing all we can as a profession to maintain an atmosphere conducive to openness and honesty in public communication.

This task will not be easy because there are aspects of our society which present serious obstacles to the maximization of open and free communication in the last quarter of the 20th century. The increasing complexity of society and of government has

given government much greater control of information with the consequent power to determine what we will or will not know. Thus government has not only been able to determine the grounds for debate but also what evidence will be used. This change is not simply a product of our age. It has come upon us perhaps more gradually than we realized. During times of crisis, particularly of wars, the rationale of national security has been used to control information.

Certainly examples of this change in relatively modern times, can be cited from the administrations of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt not to mention Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon. The matter is particularly vexing for us because we have lived under conditions where national security has been paramount since 1941. Only in the later days of the Vietnam War did the press begin to question what was being said and what was being withheld.

There is in all of this a hidden tribute to the Aristotelian conception of *ethos*. We have an almost innate tendency to want to believe and trust our leaders, particularly in times of crisis. We remember that during Watergate when President Nixon was desperately inventing new lies, the view was often expressed that we must not mistrust or doubt the word of our president—after all he is our president. During the Vietnam War those who doubted Johnson's or Nixon's credibility found that their patriotism was often suspect.

Now that Watergate and Vietnam are behind us many of us feel better about the state of public communication. After all most of the facts about Watergate and the Vietnam War are known. And Nixon is not even being kicked around. But I ask you to remember how intense was the struggle of congress and the press, how much litigation and threatened litigation occurred before we obtained the facts. We have no guarantees that we will not be misled again.

In spite of what I have said I have some optimism about the future. I am reminded that Carl Rowan, former director of the U.S.I.A. said that his wife's definition of an optimist is a woman who puts her shoes back on when a speaker says "in conclusion".

Let us see how optimistic you are while I try to draw some conclusions from my remarks. What morals can we, as professional persons in Speech Communication, draw? I am realistic enough not to propose that we try to change the way in which our leaders communicate with us. I ask though that we be aware of the need for maximum openness in our communicative atmosphere. The state of health of our nation and of our profession is dependent on a salubrious communicative climate. I ask that we, as teachers of communication, at all levels, understand that a free and open communicative climate is essential for the free dissemination and exchange of ideas and for the open discussion of public questions. Our students must

Cohen, cont. from page 6

understand that their freedom to speak is influenced by the atmosphere in which they live.

Finally, I ask that we be constant monitors of the communicative climate—communication meteorologists so to speak. We must always know what the conditions are that lead to greater or less communicative freedom. When those conditions change, for better or for worse, as a profession have the obligation to make those changes known. We must not be reluctant to criticize persons, institutions or bureaucracies which restrict the freedom and openness of communication. Nor should we be reluctant to praise those which act to improve our climate of communication. I am proud of the work done by the Commission on Freedom of Speech—but it is not enough. Our criticism and praise should be disseminated as widely as possible and it should be calm, well based and articulate. We should not take stands just to take stands but we have the obligation to respond when conditions demand a response.

Thank you for providing me with a platform for my free speech.

Editor's Note: The address printed above was delivered at the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association in Houston, Texas, December 28, 1975.

Needs Assessment Volunteer Sought

For some time, leaders in the Association have recognized the potential value of an assessment of member—and prospective member—needs. Such an inventory would reveal attitudes about the value of current goods and services—publications, conventions, special projects, the Placement Service, and so on—and it would also reveal needs that are presently unmet. In addition, valuable information could be collected about the professional needs of persons who had either dropped their memberships—or who had never joined SCA.

The Association will welcome inquiries from persons interested in designing and conducting such a study. Although the Association could provide some support (mailings to members, and so on), institutional support for the investigation would also be required.

Interested persons should write to the Executive Secretary: William Work, SCA, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041.

The Office of Continuing Education, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182 will send information about their 1976 readers theatre summer workshop in England.

Careers Brochure Available

An attractive brochure entitled "Careers and Speech Communication" is now available through the national office. The booklet, published by SCA affiliate organization the Association for Communication Administration, describes the field of speech communication, gives specific examples of the range of careers entered by graduates in the field, and identifies the major speech communication competencies needed in the world of work. Authors of the booklet—designed for use by students, counselors and employers—are James McBath, Alvin Goldberg, and Robert C. Jeffrey.

Copies of the booklet may be ordered (from the ACA/SCA National Office, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041) at the following rates:

1-10 copies45¢ each
11-99 copies40¢ each
100-999 copies35¢ each
1000+ copies30¢ each

Orders under \$10.00 must be prepaid. Postage and handling charges added to orders not prepaid.

Publications Board Invites Journal Editor Nominations

A major responsibility of the SCA Publications Board is to nominate editors for the Association's three quarterly journals. When the Legislative Council meets in San Francisco in December, the Board will present nominations for Editor of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1978-80, and for Editor of *Communication Monographs*, 1978-80.

All members of the Association are invited to submit nominations by June 15, 1976 for the two editorial posts. Self-nominations are welcome. Letters and supporting vitae may be channelled to the Publications Board through the Executive Secretary: William Work, SCA, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041. The willingness of nominees to serve will be assumed; indications of released time and/or other evidences of institutional support will be welcomed.

The 1976 Chairperson of the Publications Board is Rita Naremore, Department of Speech Pathology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47401. Inquiries may be directed to her or to William Work.

Write: National Shakespeare Company, 414 W. 51st St., New York, NY 10001 for information about their 1976 Summer Conservatory in Woodstock, NY.

1975 SCA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES 61st ANNUAL MEETING

Houston, Texas December 27-30, 1975

Presiding: Herman Cohen
Parliamentarian: Gregg Phifer

Council Members Present at One or More Sessions—With the Number of Sessions Attended Indicated: Malthon Anapol (3), Kenneth Andersen (4), Jerry Anderson (3), James Andrews (3), Ruth Arrington (4), Wallace Bacon (4), Samuel Becker (4), Lloyd Bitzer (5), Edwin Black (2), Jane Blankenship (5), John Bowers (4), Bernard Brommel (5), Carolyn Calloway (4), John Cambus (5), Karlyn Campbell (5), Timothy Choy (5), Herman Cohen (5), Robert Dixon (3), Judith Espinola (5), Don Faules (4), Carmendale Fernandes (5), Dwight Freshley (5), Gustav Friedrich (5), Patti Gillespie (5), Alvin Goldberg (5), Robert Hall (3), Tim Hegstrom (5), Linda Heun (5), Kathleen Jamieson (4), Lucy Keele (5), Carl Kell (3), Robert Kully (5), William Lashbrook (2), Barbara Lieb-Brihartz (3), Calvin Logue (5), Clarice Lowe (3), Marjorie McGregor (2), Don Marine (4), Arthur Meyer (4), Gerald Miller (5), David Mortensen (3), Roger Nebergall (4), P. Judson Newcombe (5), Michael Osborn (3), Robert Overstreet (5), Sharon Ratcliffe (5), Mary M. Roberts (5), Linda Romigh (5), Janice Sargent (4), Malcolm O. Sillars (5), Herbert Simons (1), John Sisco (3), Herman Stelzner (4), Anita Taylor (4), James Weaver (3), William Work (5), George Ziegelmueller (4).

Saturday, December 27—Morning Session

President Cohen called the meeting to order. He reported that questions had been raised about policy with respect to alternate delegates for Council members unable to attend. It was subsequently moved, seconded, and CARRIED that such alternate delegates be empowered to vote during the 1975 Council sessions, and that an amendment to the Constitution setting forth policy on alternate representation be drafted and submitted to the Council. (See below.)

The Council named Patti Gillespie as convener and representative on the 1975 SCA Nominating Committee.

The Council elected Kathleen Jamieson, Lucy Keele, and Herman Stelzner to membership on the 1976 Committee on Committees.

Elected by the Council to serve as the 1976 Resolutions Committee: Gus Friedrich, Tim Hegstrom, and Michael Osborn, the chairperson to be elected by the Committee.

President Cohen called attention to the written report which he had filed. He com-

continued, page 8