

3-1948

The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, Volume 30, Issue 3, Complete Issue

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



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

Recommended Citation

Delta Sigma Rho. (1948). The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, Volume 30, Issue 3, Complete Issue. The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, 30(3), 43-60.

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 The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

The *GAVEL*
of Delta Sigma Rho



March, 1948
Volume 30 Number 3

THE GAVEL

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho, National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT ALBION, MICHIGAN

Editorial Office: School of Speech, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

THE GAVEL has been entered as second-class matter at Albion, Michigan, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Issued in November, January, March, and May. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them to: The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho.

The membership fee is \$7.50. The official key of 10K gold (size shown in cut on this page) is \$4.00. A gold-filled key is available at \$3.00. The pin attachment is \$1.00 additional. Cut diamond in key is \$5.00 additional. (Add 20% for federal tax.)

The names of new members, those elect-

ed between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of THE GAVEL. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive THE GAVEL for life beginning with the issue in which their names appear, provided they keep the Editor informed of any changes in address. When a copy of THE GAVEL is returned by the Postal Service marked "Moved — Left No Forwarding Address", the member's cards are removed from the "active" file and placed in the "dead or missing" file. Each member will greatly assist the Secretary and Editor, as well as guarantee receipt of the journal, if he will keep the office notified of his change in address or change of name in case of marriage.



THE NATIONAL OFFICERS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO

PRESIDENT

E. C. Buehler
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

SECRETARY

Kenneth G. Hance
School of Speech
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

EDITOR OF THE GAVEL

Kenneth G. Hance
School of Speech
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

ACTING TREASURER

Kenneth G. Hance
School of Speech
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

TRUSTEE

Gilbert L. Hall
843 Investment Building
Washington, 5, D. C.

TRUSTEE

Harold F. Harding
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

VICE PRESIDENTS

W. Roy Diem
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio

Hugo E. Hellman
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Leroy T. Laase
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Charles W. Lomas
University of California
Los Angeles, California

N. Edd Miller
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Richard T. Murphy
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Brooks Quimby
Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

President's Page . . .

"William Jennings Bryan - - An Eye-Witness Report"

This is a request number. For some time our editor has been urging me to tell some of my personal experiences with the boy orator of the Platte. I have always admired Mr. Bryan as an orator. He was from my home state and lived 35 miles from us. Therefore, I had several opportunities in my early youth to hear Mr. Bryan at political meetings and at the Lincoln Epworth Assembly. Later I was crew boy on the Redpath Horner Chautauquas, and Bryan was a sure-fire feature attraction. Although I heard him many times, there are three incidents which stand out above all the others. The first was a political stump speech, the second a Chautauqua oration "The Prince of Peace," and the third a double feature lecture on "Evolution" and "Prohibition," which was delivered shortly before his death.

The first time I heard Mr. Bryan was in 1908 on his Presidential campaign tour against William Howard Taft as he spoke from the rear platform of a railroad train. I was in the seventh or eighth grade of the country school, and we were in the midst of the corn husking season. However, on the day when Mr. Bryan was scheduled to appear at the nearest town, almost everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike, took time off to hear the great Commoner. There was an immense crowd at the little railroad station, mostly country folks in calico and overalls. To me the crowd was a bit awesome and terrifying. Flags and buntings were flying everywhere. The train was a little late, and the engineer seemed to be worried about the masses which were over-running the railroad track. His whistle shrieked wildly when the train was still blocks away, but the people finally managed to get off the tracks and I presume for safety reasons he over-ran the station some hundred yards. There was a wild scramble as hundreds rushed to get a close-up view of Mr. Bryan. My cousin, who was a few years older than I, had the good fortune to be in the front ranks and being fleet of foot was among the first to reach the rear platform of the train. Mr. Bryan was standing there waving and smiling and at once reached out to shake hands with a few of his admirers. Among the few that shook his hand was my cousin, Arthur. I recall how we looked with awe and admiration on my cousin for having touched the hand of Mr. Bryan, for to us Mr. Bryan was more than a political candidate running for the Presidency. To many of us he was greater than the President of the United States. We somehow felt that he had Providence on his side

and that he had a divine calling to lead the common people against the evils of Wall Street. In our simple faith, Mr. Bryan was a man of high ideals and unquestionable character. His speech on that day was only five minutes long; and of course, no one ever remembered anything he said, but I am sure no one could ever forget the friendly manner and the spiritual warmth which radiated from him. He won many hearts and many votes in that Republican community.

The second incident I want to tell about took place several years later on the Chautauqua platform. Although Mr. Bryan was defeated three times at the polls, he still was a great American hero. He was considered by almost everyone to be the greatest orator of the day. He drew vast crowds on the Chautauqua, and his success on the platform was unrivaled. On this particular Sunday night he was appearing at eight o'clock at Fort Scott, Kansas, as our headline feature. It was a hot day with a temperature of 106 in the shade. On that Sunday afternoon he spoke at Parsons, Kansas, which was some seventy miles away. It was all in a day's work for Mr. Bryan to make two or three speeches and drive from town to town in a model-T Ford over the dusty, hot Kansas roads. When Mr. Bryan stepped out of the model-T Ford, he was no weary traveler. After going promptly to his hotel room to freshen up, he would enjoy a hearty dinner. He was a big eater, often placing a double order with the waiter. On this particular evening when he stepped on the platform all fresh in his white flannel trousers, he looked as clean and fresh as a bathed and powdered baby. His cool, calm appearance was almost breath-taking to his perspiring audience.

This was my first experience in preparing the stage for Mr. Bryan. The instructions were to have a simple background of flags with no furniture, no chairs or speaker's stand on the stage. All he wanted was a simple, four-legged stand with a wash basin containing a big cake of ice beside which there was a tall glass water pitcher full of ice water and a tall glass tumbler. I recall that it took some time to round up these few simple stage properties. As the moment arrived for Mr. Bryan's appearance that evening, the audience seemed to polarize itself into a mood of hushed expectancy. Hundreds of people were standing. Suddenly people seemed to stop talking. Conversation died down, and everyone was waiting for the dramatic and impressive entrance of the Chautauqua Superintendent and the speaker of the evening. At

last the moment arrived, but the Superintendent stepped out on the platform alone. There were muffled groans. People began to wonder if Mr. Bryan had failed to make it in his trusty Ford. The Superintendent made a short introductory speech of about thirty seconds, but Mr. Bryan kept out of sight. He was hiding behind the backdrop of bunting and flags.

He waited about fifteen seconds after the Superintendent stepped off the platform and then modestly and in stately manner strolled towards his place beside the water pitcher and the cake of ice, carrying a big palm leaf fan. There was a long, loud swell of applause which Mr. Bryan acknowledged with the grace of a prima donna taking curtain calls at a premier performance. How he charmed that audience with his bows and smiles even before he said a word! He was the most impressive person on the platform. We felt about him as Carlyle felt about Webster. We wondered if any man could be as great as Bryan looked.

I'll never forget that speech. The setting with respect to the mental attitude of the audience was perfect. The European War with its hate and destruction gave an ironic background to this rhapsody of love and peace. It was just what the people wanted to hear. For a whole hour and a half Mr. Bryan poured forth in his best style and grandest oratorical manner his story about mankind living at peace. He gave words of comfort and assurance. There was that spiritual glow to the ideas of love and brotherhood. How perfectly his manner blended with his message! It was poetry for the eyes as well as for the ears. Here was this magnificent figure against the background of the Stars and Stripes. His every movement was an expression of grace and poise. With his left hand he fanned himself with his big palm leaf fan, and with rhythmical regularity with his other hand he would wet his fingers on the cake of ice and soothingly stroke his brow and bald head. It was soothing and cooling for the audience just to watch him. From time to time he would reach the climax of a point, and the audience would punctuate his oratorical highlights with bursts of applause. Mr. Bryan would take advantage of these moments and pour out a tumbler full of water and gulp it down in two swallows, almost unnoticeably. Before long the pitcher of water was empty, and the flannel trousers had a big perspiration spot a foot long on each knee. He lost himself in his message as he approached the climax, and forgot about his fan and his cake of ice. There was a magic spell over all listeners as he took them out of this world. For both speaker and audience, there was that "flying at the moon" that no speech teacher or psychologist can yet explain.

The third incident which I want to

tell about is a striking contrast to the former two. It took place in Evanston, Illinois, when I was a graduate student in the School of Speech at Northwestern University. It was four o'clock Sunday afternoon on a particularly bright day in the month of May in the 20's. It was a perfect day to be out of doors, and to spend such a beautiful afternoon in a stuffy old church didn't make sense. But Mr. Bryan was scheduled to appear on a community lecture course at four o'clock in the Methodist Church. At three o'clock the church was full. Standing room only! People wanted to hear the former Secretary of State, the thrice defeated Presidential candidate, the man who still was perhaps the most influential politician on the American scene and who undoubtedly was the greatest orator of the time. It was a different Bryan from the Chautauqua days. Here was a man, mellowed by years of rich experience in public life, filled with the sense of comedy. He was still the master orator. He talked about Evolution. Perhaps not one in ten agreed with what he said. Any college debater could detect the holes in his arguments, and yet he charmed his listeners and held them spell bound for an hour and a half. After the close of his address, there was generous applause, and Mr. Bryan gulped down two or three glasses of water. Then smiling graciously, he turned to the Chairman and calmly announced that he would now make a second speech on his favorite subject, Prohibition, and for another hour and fifteen minutes he continued to cast the magic spell over that packed house. The standing audience did not leave. I recall walking back towards the campus with Mr. Ralph Dennis, Dean of the School of Speech of Northwestern University, after this double feature. The Dean offered one final word of appraisal. "There is only one man who could hold this smug complacent audience of Evanston for two hours and forty-five minutes on a beautiful Sunday afternoon, and that man is William Jennings Bryan."

E. C. Buehler,

University of Kansas

NOTICE TO ALUMNI

Do you have any items which would be of interest to the other readers of the GAVEL?

If you have personal notes about your activities or those of other members, news items about Speech events, or articles pertaining to uses of Speech in the business and professional world, please send them to the Editor. Your assistance in the editing of the GAVEL will be appreciated.

Thomas Brackett Reed - Exemplification of Effective Debating . . .

KIRT E. MONTGOMERY
University of Oregon

Thomas B. Reed served the First Maine District in the House of Representatives for twenty-two years, from 1877 to 1899. Although he is not remembered today as well as his contemporaries Blaine, McKinley, Beveridge, Lodge, and Roosevelt, he achieved great prominence in the 1890's because of his ruling over the House of Representatives as Speaker "Czar" Reed during the 51st., 54th., and 55th. Congresses. Beginning with 1887, he was nominated for the Speakership in six consecutive Congresses and elected in three. His name thus became one of the nine Speakers who were elected for three or more Congresses. (1) Actually, he was the acknowledged leader of the Republican party for the twelve year period from 1887 until his retirement in 1899. (2)

Reed was accused of many things during his life, but never did anyone say he lacked ideas. Besides speaking on a variety of subjects, he wrote considerably. In a series of articles in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, he discussed the function and nature of debate. Congressional debate, he said, was speaking "made and listened to for the purpose of elucidating the principles of a law proposed or of settling its details, and . . . for the purpose of enlightening the outside world." (3) Or, as he explained further and more vividly: "Debating . . . is not in itself an end or aim. A Pullman car is a most admirable adjunct to travel, but staying in a Pullman car which does not go out of the station is not travelling. Endless debate which leads no whither is just as much a prorogation of parliament as if the veriest tyrant did it." (4) In other words, the paramount function of debate, in Reed's opinion, was to evaluate legislation so as to make its passage or defeat possible.

What was the nature of debate which would achieve this function?

First, it should be short. Reed distinguished between speech making and debate. Speech-making was the long, oratorical outburst which a Congressman made to satisfy himself and his constituents. Debate, on the other hand, consisted of short speeches—usually not exceeding ten minutes (5)—dealing with reasons why legislation should be passed or defeated. (6) As he expressed it: "When debate becomes the rule and speech-making the exception, we shall have a better state of things in that regard; for speech-making contributes more than anything else to the ruin of debate." (7)

Second, debate should be impromptu speaking. A Congressman then would say "only such things as he knew well enough not to need a manuscript to aid his faltering brain." (8)

Third, it should be fresh. It should not consist of "solemn repetitions of stale arguments" nor should it "meander through the dreary hours with oft-repeated platitudes." (9)

Lastly, it should arise out of the rough and tumble of Congressional combat. It required an audience so that it could fulfill its function of aiding in deliberation. "Deliberation implies thought, and not necessarily words, except as they are food for thought." (10) If an audience is absent, there can be words, but no interplay of thought. A Senator might deliver a great oration to four bare walls, but this would not be debating. (11)

This, then, was Reed's conception in brief of the function and nature of debate. How well did his speaking exemplify his own standards of effective debating?

According to one of his biographers, "Reed fulfilled all his own requirements for the first class debater." (12) If one studies the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he becomes aware of this fact. Reed's speeches were frequent, short, spontaneous rejoinders. For example, in the 52nd Congress alone (1891-'93), Reed arose on ninety separate occasions to take part in debate. (13) As a matter of fact, during his twenty-two years in the House, Reed gave only three long so-called "set speeches" which were carefully prepared in advance. (14)

Furthermore, there were in his debating no repetitions of "oft-repeated platitudes" nor "stale arguments." His spoken as well as his written style was "punchy", epigrammatic, possessing a kick. One of his Congressional associates, J. H. Walker of Massachusetts, once said that should the Book of Proverbs be lost, Tom Reed would be the best man in the world to rewrite them. (15)

In addition, he possessed a cutting, satirical wit which enraged his opponents and delighted his colleagues. His replies to incidents which occurred in the House were instantaneous. It seemed as though he thought in a satirical vein and could not change the habit. It was a natural tendency he was unable to control. (16) Once a member of the House hesitantly began a speech with "I was thinking, Mr. Speaker,—I was thinking—" when in the brief pause Reed replied: "The Chair begs that no one will interrupt the gen-

tleman's commendable innovation." (17) One of his special targets for sarcasm was Representative Springer, from Illinois. On one occasion, Springer asked for unanimous consent to correct a misstatement. Reed, then not the Speaker of the House, piped up: "No correction needed. We didn't think it was so when you made it." (18)

Reed also possessed the ability to state precisely the heart of an argument stripped of all its verbiage. For example, when Congress was debating paying indemnity to the College of William and Mary for Civil War damages, Reed opposed the measure in these words:

"You may bring together Bunker Hill and Yorktown, Massachusetts and Virginia and tie them together with all the flowers of rhetoric that ever bloomed since the Garden of Eden, but you cannot change the plain historic fact that no nation on earth ever was so imbecile and idiotic as to establish a principle that would more nearly bankrupt its treasury after victory than after defeat." (19)

Joe Cannon once remarked about this ability of Reed's to state a proposition succinctly: "I have never heard my distinguished friend from Maine take the floor upon any subject but that I did not feel sometimes regretful that I could not crystallize an idea, if I had one, as he does, roll it up with my hands into proper shape and hurl it at the head of my opponent." (20)

Henry L. Stoddard's tribute to Reed as a debater is particularly significant because Stoddard rode the Blaine, Harrison, McKinley bandwagons and was therefore less attracted to Reed: "No Congressional leader was ever so perfectly adapted to the function of leadership in majority or minority. . . . He knew the peril of too great brilliance and too little facts, and always thoroughly prepared for debate. . . . My judgment is that he was the ablest debater the Republicans ever had in Congress." (21)

We have seen that Reed had a clear notion of what Congressional debate should be and that his debating fulfilled these standards. Even more important was the fact that his whole Congressional career was devoted to the setting up of conditions in Congress which would make true debate possible. The outcome of this devotion was REED'S PARLIAMENTARY RULES. But what is left in history is the misconception that Reed was an enemy of debate who wished to gag and kill it. This idea arose no doubt from his own statement: "Thank God, the House is no longer a deliberative body." This was a facetious statement and what he really meant by it must be interpreted in light of the circumstances which gave rise to it. Beginning with

1882, Congress became, year after year, more and more impotent as a legislative body. The question was not what legislation should be passed, but whether Congress could legislate at all. (22) Obstructive tactics of refusing a quorum, putting dilatory motions and using indefinite speech-making literally stopped the wheels of Congress. In 1889, Representative Weaver of Iowa, by the illegitimate use of legitimate parliamentary motions, completely tied up Congress for eight days. Reed himself estimated that in the 50th. Congress, with the taking of 458 needless roll calls, at least thirty legislative days were wasted! (23) These obstructive tactics, which hindered debate and prevented the passage of legislation, were things Reed was determined to stop.

The means he employed as Speaker were revolutionary. He refused to recognize any member whose purpose, he thought, was to make a dilatory motion. On the "no quorum" tactic, he simply instructed the Clerk to add enough names to the roll of those members present but not voting so that a quorum existed. (24) The irony of this whole situation was that had those who refused to vote, voted in the negative, whatever was proposed would have been defeated and Reed's rulings would not have been necessary. What he did in the 51st. Congress was to curtail mere talk and to restrict irrelevant and time consuming speech-making which he would not admit to be deliberation. Thus, through his Rules, Congress was streamlined so that "men will have less temptation to irrelevancy, and true debate will flourish." (25)

Looking at Reed today over a perspective of fifty years, we do not perhaps completely sense his contributions to American life. His contemporaries, however, eulogized him as "a distinguished statesman, a lofty patriot, a cultured scholar, an incisive writer, a unique orator, an unmatched debater, a master of logic, wit, satire, the most famous of the world's parliamentarians, the great and representative citizen of the American Republic." (26)

(1) Alexander, De Alva Stanwood, HISTORY AND PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Houghton Mifflin Co., N. Y., (c 1916), pp. 393-5. These nine Speakers were Nathaniel Macon, Henry Clay, Andrew Stevenson, Schuyler Colfax, James G. Blaine, Samuel Randall, John Carlisle, Thomas B. Reed and Joseph Cannon.

(2) *IBID.*, p. 131

(3) Reed, T. B., "A Deliberate Body," NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, v. CLII, Feb. 1891, p. 154

(4) *IBID.*, p. 149

(5) Alexander, OP. CIT., p. 132

(6) Reed, T. B., "The House of Representatives, How It Does Business," SATURDAY EVENING POST, v. 122, no. 47, May 19, 1900, p. 1067

(7) Reed, T. B., "Obstruction in the Nation-

Discussion Method in War Industry . . . *

MILTON DICKENS (SC)

(Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc., and University of Southern California)

The most obvious difference between conferences held at a university and those at a war factory is usually—just noise. You are accustomed to tiptoeing about the main library. You frown at the unfortunate student who drops a book on the floor during class. Then, abruptly you enter a sprawling war plant and are escorted to a "conference room" made of plywood partitions in the midst of a work area. You conduct your meeting against a steady background of rumble and vibration, punctuated by occasional announcements over the public address system plus whatever unbelievable noise is peculiar to the nearest production department—the crash of drop-hammers, the scream of routers, the thunder of airplane motors, or the yammer of rivet guns. To create "an atmosphere of informality" at a conference where everyone must speak in loud shouts is a neat trick indeed.

You will have to compete against various other distractions. Thus, in the midst of one session at which I presided, workmen arrived and without a word of explanation proceeded to remove a wall of the room. Another time four plumbers entered with long pieces of pipe, ladders, and tools, and installed a sprinkler system in the ceiling. Members of the conference group shifted their chairs as the plumbers shifted the ladders, or ducked their heads as the plumbers swung the pipes into place. No one seemed to consider the incident the least bit extraordinary.

Despite the noise and inexplicable interruptions you begin to study the people, looking for fundamental differences between them and college students. But you don't find any! Of course, you notice some superficial contrasts. In appearance, workers are older and have grease on their clothes. Their speech is less grammatical and sometimes profanely colorful. Their ideas come from the shop rather than books.

None of these differences, however, is fundamental. The important thing about conferences in war industry, therefore, is that they are not basically different from other conferences.

I

One of the most startling facts about war industry conferences is that there have been so many of them. Within a year several thousand persons were given a concentrated, standardized course in

conference leadership. They in turn went out into the plants and conducted tens of thousands of standardized conference series. Within two years more than 1,500,000 foremen and key workers were formally "certified" as having satisfactorily participated in these conference series. It is probably conservative to estimate that by the middle of 1944 over 16,000,000 hours of organized group discussion were held.

These figures do not include the uncounted thousands of spontaneous or informal job conferences which are a part of the daily routine in any large industrial establishment; nor do they include the meetings of such groups as labor-management committees, grievance boards, labor unions, or the like. The figures are limited to one program, created and executed by governmental and industrial agencies, aimed at the solution of a specific problem. Thus, it is probably the largest single discussion project ever attempted.

II

During the months following Pearl Harbor, American war industries not merely expanded; they exploded. Plants which formerly had numbered their employees by hundreds, suddenly began to count them by thousands. New buildings and equipment were hastily constructed or installed. Complicated tooling was built. Enormous production schedules were set. Slogans were adopted. And the great drive was on.

The crop of new workers was mostly green. There were the women, from their kitchens; high school boys; white collar men from non-essential businesses. There were "floaters" and "shoppers," the physically handicapped, and oldtimers called back from retirement.

These new workers needed good supervisors—people to organize them into working groups, assign them to the jobs for which they were best fitted, teach them the skills of riveting, drilling, welding, or operating the punch press. To secure this necessary supervision, hundreds of skilled prewar workmen were promoted from the bench or the line. Many of these men totally lacked experience or talent for supervisory responsibilities. Good at handling tools, often they were poor at handling people. Able to do given jobs themselves, they might be unable to teach others how to do them.

To bolster these inexperienced supervisors with assistance and advice, many plants sought personnel experts. But

* Adapted from QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, Vol. XXXI, No. 2, April, 1945, by permission of Professor Dickens.

here again there was an acute shortage of qualified and experienced men. Consequently, a good many ex-promoters and high-pressure salesmen "sold" themselves into the industries.

Thus, shop work was done by ex-housewives who knew nothing of shop work, supervised by ex-shopworkers who knew nothing of supervision, trained by ex-salesmen who knew nothing of training. A favorite gag was, "You don't have to be crazy to get along here but it helps." And the most puzzling question among thoughtful newcomers was how the planes and ships were produced at all.

This was the much publicized "manpower crisis." It was the problem which was attacked and partially whipped by the organized mass-application of the conference method.

III

The War Manpower Commission set up a branch called Training Within Industry (T.W.I.). Four experts in industrial training were borrowed to head up T.W.I.'s program—C. R. Dooley of Soccon Vacuum, Mike Kane of Bell Telephone, William Conover of U. S. Steel, and Walter Dietz of Western Electric.

T.W.I. began by creating a formula. It is a simplified, step-by-step formula for teaching a worker to do a particular job. On the basis of experimental trials in a few war plants, it was believed that if every foreman and leadman faithfully followed this formula workers could be taught specific jobs more thoroughly and in a fraction of the usual time.

This raised the question as to how this formula could best be taught to the leadmen. Of course, it could easily have been written up in pamphlet style and copies distributed wholesale. Most of the lower level of supervisors, however, were newly promoted from the bench and were not "the readin' type." Furthermore, the basic principle of the formula was that we learn by doing. The possibility of spreading the gospel by means of lectures was likewise discarded. These men were not trained listeners, were not likely to take notes, would resent "being sent back to school." It was, therefore, decided to use conference techniques.

But where could T.W.I. get several thousand conference leaders? Since almost none appeared to be available, T. W. I. decided to train some. They figured on drawing a few talented men from industry itself—men who could temporarily be spared from production and loaned to training departments. They could also draw upon a considerable pool of professional men, mostly above draft age—lawyers, salesmen, teachers, or others with some experience in dealing with people. From such raw recruits they hoped to shape a huge army of trained conference leaders, capable of going out

into war plants and teaching groups of leadmen the T.W.I. formula.

Recognizing that the prospective leaders would generally know very little about the subject matter to be taught, or about the workers, or about conference devices, T. W. I. did not attempt to cover all this ground. Instead, they prepared a conference leader's outline in extraordinary detail and then simply taught the prospects how to use the manual. In other words, they did not try to teach how to lead conferences in general but how to lead **one particular series of conferences.**

The presentation of the formula was entitled Job Instruction Training and was known as J.I.T.¹ It was decided to present J.I.T. as a series of five, two-hour conferences for groups of about a dozen leadmen or workers. A minute-by-minute outline of these five sessions was written. T.W.I. leaders then rushed about the country holding "Institutes" in which would-be conference leaders were taught to use this outline.

An Institute was limited to about ten learners and lasted one week. It was a hectic, grinding week—eight to twelve hours a day. To open the Institute, the T.W.I. representative would ask the group to imagine themselves as factory leadmen or foremen and to "act the parts." He would then run off the five sessions exactly as though in a war factory. The remainder of the week was devoted to the practice efforts of the group members to duplicate what the T. W. I. man had done. It was drill, drill, drill. No deviation from the manual was permitted.

"Frank, will you please step to the head of the table? Take that section starting on page 14. Now, I want the rest of you fellows to act your parts. Remember you are supervisors. Okay, Frank, let's go. . . . Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Go back to where you are supposed to draw that circle on the blackboard. You fellows are going to have to practice drawing those circles. Try this way. . . . Jack, will you take the chair? Go back again to page 14. We'll try the same section once more. . . . Does someone have a question? Wally? Well, don't worry about why, just do what the manual says. Does that answer your question? Stick to the manual, gentlemen, **STICK TO THE MANUAL.** Do I make myself clear?" And so on by the hour.

Those who survived a week of this were given certificates designating them as War Production Trainers. They began to roll out of the Institutes by the scores. Although not considered finished products, they were sent immediately into war plants where they were expected to pick up the finer points of discussion leadership through actual per-

formance. To assist them, follow-up men from T.W.I. went out to observe, criticize, and coach.

As the War Production Trainers infiltrated industry, they began to run off J.I.T. series in wholesale lots. The criterion by which their success was judged by Management was quite simple. Did the program increase production? Management did not know or care about artistically conducted conferences. They wanted results—results in terms of man-hours per production pound. Judged in such terms, there were plenty of failures but there were also plenty of successes. After taking J.I.T. some foremen and leadmen were using the formula with phenomenal success. Hundreds of enthusiastic testimonials began to pour in like this:

The treasurer of a Texas Oil Company reports that he personally observed the work of two "rough-necks" on a drilling jig. They had J.I.T. instruction and were doing an outstanding job although it was only their sixth day of employment. The driller in charge said that the quality of their work was higher than that of many employees after twenty years of experience.

J.I.T. could be used like any other production tool—like a jig, lathe, or die. Perhaps Department 950 is behind schedule on the outer wing assemblies. Investigation reveals that the cause is too much rework because of faulty workmanship. What to do about this? Answer: J.I.T. In such a fashion the conference became a tool with which ships, planes, and tanks were built.

The immense popularity of J.I.T. encouraged the leaders of T.W.I. to create another program. This time they tackled the problem of job-simplification.² The basic idea was to teach a few thousand leadmen and key workers how to invent faster, better methods for doing specific jobs. In this way fewer workers or less skilled workers could be utilized, widening manpower bottleneck a bit further. Again a formula was constructed, this one based upon the familiar techniques of time and motion study. The formula was expanded into another manual covering five two-hour conference sessions. The program was called Job Methods Training, or J.M.T.

By the end of 1942 a third program was ready for "production." This time the attack was upon personnel problems. The strategy was to teach supervisors how to handle such matters as wage grievances, racial frictions, or absenteeism.³ In this way manpower utilization might be improved by removing obstacles from the path. And so a formula was created, based upon the principles of applied psychology. It was elaborated into the customary manual for five two-hour

conferences and was christened Job Relations Training, or J.R.T.

J.I.T., J.M.T., and J.R.T. were of, by, and for mass production. They did what they taught. The entire project was characterized by principles of simplification, standardization, and acceleration. This aspect was emphasized by the shop talk of the War Production Trainers. At the Institute they were "processed." Each program was a "package." Sessions were not taught nor led but "pitched." Coaching by follow-up men was "quality control." Everything possible was handled with machine-like precision. Thus when one Trainer was forced to leave a group in the midst of a session, another Trainer was hastily called. The new man glanced at the Manual to see how far along the conference had progressed, then picked up at the precise sentence with which his predecessor had left off. Truly mass production—interchangeable parts. Discussion by the package!

IV

All three Manuals are recommended reading for anyone interested in clever discussion devices. Even in the hands of inexperienced leaders these techniques are likely to hold the attention of group members, draw out considerable active participation, and put across the main ideas.

As an example we may consider the use of a dramatic illustration with stage properties as prescribed for the opening session of J.I.T. The purpose of this device is to demonstrate to the group that in teaching a worker to do a mechanical job, just telling him is not enough, merely showing him is not enough, but that there is a "sure-fire" method consisting of telling, showing, and doing it in proper sequence. The illustration begins with the leader standing in front of a member of the group who has volunteered to be the "learner." The leader then tells the learner how to tie the fire underwriter's knot, a job from the electrical trade. (The Manual is careful to insist that the Trainer "KEEP BOTH HANDS IN POCKETS.") Now, the job of tying this knot is really very simple, once you know how. Any attempt to describe the operation in words, however, soon degenerates into incomprehensible double-talk, featuring distinctions between the right and left hands, holding the cord vertically or horizontally, and forming loops with a clockwise motion. At the conclusion of his description, the leader unexpectedly produces some lamp cord from the table drawer, hands it to the learner, and asks him to tie the knot. Usually the victim refuses even to make the attempt.

At this juncture a bit of humor is interjected. The leader says, "I know it couldn't happen at this plant, but I have heard that at other plants there are fore-

men who put new starts on a job merely by telling them what they are expected to do." Members of the group rise to the bait and relates cases they have seen.

Securing another volunteer, the leader silently shows him how to tie the knot. "Now you try it," he says, handing over the cord. Usually, the learner makes a brave attempt, but his struggles merely produce a series of weird-looking tangles, all highly amusing to his colleagues. Again the leader points the moral, condemning the practice of putting green workers next to experienced ones and simply instructing them to watch the operation until they learn how to do it.

Calling for a third volunteer, the leader proceeds to teach him in about ten minutes how to tie the knot. Then, by means of a nice set of leading questions, the group is encouraged to analyze the steps in this teaching sequence. In the ensuing discussion, the foremen bring out every point while the leader appears merely to write them on the blackboard in the words of the speakers. At the end, however, the trainer suddenly reaches into the desk for some small cards which he distributes. Printed on the cards is the J.I.T. formula—almost word for word like the blackboard notes. To some, the process seems magical.

A teacher of speech is likely to conclude that the whole thing is completely cut-and-dried. In fact, a colleague recently referred to them as "pseudo-conferences or conference-like instruction" in contrast to "genuine conference where ultimate conclusions are not determined in detail in advance." This, however, is an inaccurate impression. A J. T. session is an example of the learning group and the problem-solving group, interestingly combined. Thus in J.R.T. the primary purpose is to teach the participants a method for handling personnel. As in any other learning group, the material to be taught is predetermined. In order to practice this method, however, the foremen bring in to the group actual on-the-job problems. Neither the problems they bring in nor the solutions for such problems are determined in advance by the leader. The technique used to control the method without controlling the result is called Standard Case Procedure. It is worth describing.

A dozen foremen are gathered and one of them has been called to the head of the table. He is about to tell a case from his own experience, perhaps a problem which he is even now attempting to solve.

It will involve one or more of the workers he is supervising. It will involve twisted human relations—wage disputes, marital difficulties, jealousies, drunkenness, failing health. No matter what the case is, the discussion leader must guide the group through a logical, step-by-step analysis. He must do this in such a way

that the members will learn the pattern and want to apply it to future problems on-the-job.

The supervisor says, "I got a worker, a Mexican fellow, who came on about eight months ago and was doin' a pretty fair job. I never paid much attention to him till yesterday. He comes into the department half an hour late and throws his coat and hat on the floor. I go to him and say, 'You know it's against the rules to leave things on the floor. Then, loud enough for all the other workers to hear, he says to me, 'If you don't want them on the floor, pick them up yourself.' Well . . ." At this point the foreman pauses to look around the group, "If you had been in my place, what would you have done?"

Before anyone can answer this question, the leader is on his feet talking and heading for the blackboard. At the top he writes, "Just What is This Supervisor Trying to Accomplish? This may lead to quite a discussion. Finally, he writes, "To get X on the beam," and "To set a good example for the other workers."

"All right," says the leader, "What's the first thing we do?" Most of them know the answer. "Get the facts," they recite. The leader prints on the board: FACTS. Then the foreman is questioned about his case. As each fact emerges, the leader jots it down briefly on the board. Soon he has a list something like this:

X is a fair worker
Been here 8 months
Etc.

And so the analysis progresses. Presently, they reach the point: POSSIBLE ACTIONS. Another list is developed. It may include:

Fire him
Pick up coat yourself
Call him to office for private talk
Etc.

Eventually the whole case is neatly charted on the blackboard with proper headings and a few dotted lines and arrows. According to the Manual, the leader must carry his group through 22 steps during the whole performance which is supposed to take an average of 35 minutes per case. In the hands of a novice, this Standard Case Procedure can bog down and become quite a mess. In the hands of a skilled conference leader it can become a beautiful instrument for the stimulation and guidance of the process of group thinking.

The rapidity with which the J.T. programs spread through American industries is hard to appreciate without actually having observed some of the process in action. T.W.I. sent its staff from coast to coast. Like parts on an assembly line, War Production Trainers flowed through the Institutes. The Trainers

(Continued on Page 53)

Outline of Procedure for the English-Style of Debate . . .

DOUGLAS EHNINGER (NO)

The Ohio State University

Late last summer when plans were being made for the visit of the Oxford debate team to the Ohio State campus, it was suggested by a member of our forensics staff that we invite the British speakers to participate with us and the representatives of certain neighboring institutions in an English-style debate.

Upon searching the available literature, however, we were unable to find recorded any set of rules for conducting this type of debate. Accordingly, requests for help were dispatched to Mr. Anthony Neil Wedgewood Benn, a member of the Oxford team and President of the Oxford Union Society, and to Mr. F. S. Curzon, Chief Clerk of the University Union Society at Cambridge. Both of these gentlemen not only replied at length, but were kind enough to send us copies of the statutes governing their societies.

Working upon the basis of the information which they furnished, a set of rules was devised and used with considerable success in an English-style debate held on our campus on the afternoon of October 28, 1947.¹

Since other institutions may wish to experiment with the English-style, it seems desirable that these rules be made generally available in the pages of THE GAVEL. It should, however, be observed that in certain instances we have modified the regular British procedure in order to bring the debate within suitable time limits. We have also attempted at several points to introduce controls calculated to maintain orderly procedure, and to reduce the danger of "unbalanced participation" which may well result when no restriction is placed upon the number of times any one speaker may address the House.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

(1) The President calls the House to order and announces the motion for debate.

(2) Ten-minute speech by a previously designated speaker moving the adoption of the motion.

(3) Ten-minute speech by a previously designated speaker opposing the motion.

(4) Seven-minute speech by a previously designated speaker seconding the adoption of the motion.

(5) Seven-minute speech by a previously designated speaker opposing the motion.

(6) At this point the floor is open to any member of the House who desires to speak. The time limit on these speeches is five minutes. **No member may speak more than once**, points of order or information excepted. Members favoring the motion and those opposing it speak alternately. The President indicates the side entitled to the floor by announcing, "I will now recognize a speaker for the motion," or "I will now recognize a speaker opposed to the motion." (Insofar as practicable, each school represented splits its delegation so that it has an equal number of speakers favoring and opposing the motion.)

(7) Any speaker except the one who opens the debate may be interrupted by any member of the House at any time. Such interruptions take one of two forms.

(1) If the rules have been infringed, a member is entitled to rise and point this out to the President, at the same time describing the infringement which he believes to have taken place. (2) The second type of interruption permitted is a direct request for information addressed to the speaker who has the floor. To make this sort of interruption a member must first rise to his feet in such a manner as to attract discreetly the attention of the President. The speaker, if he wishes to be interrupted, will sit down. If he does not sit down, and ignores the member who desired to interrupt, the latter must resume his seat. An interruption on a point of information must be made in the form of a question, and is addressed to the speaker **through the President**. The interrupter may not himself impart information to the House; he may only seek to elicit information from the speaker. The President will rule the speaker out of order if his interruption does not constitute a genuine request for information.

(8) The debate on the motion proceeds in the fashion outlined for one hour and thirty minutes, at which time the speaker who originally moved the adoption of the resolution presents a five-minute speech answering the arguments which have been presented against it and summarizing the discussion. Immediately following this speech there is a division of the House. Abstentions are intimated by informing the tellers. The numbers having been added up, the President announces the results from the Chair.

(9) Members favoring the motion
(Continued on Page 53)

With the Alumni . . .

Roy C. McCall (L), formerly in charge of Speech at the College of the Pacific, is now chairman of the Department of Speech, University of Oregon.

Nelson F. Norman (ST) is a member of the faculty of the Department of History, University of Illinois.

Charles L. Freeman (W) is Executive Secretary of the Rockford, Illinois, Memorial Hospital.

Andrew C. Scott (CH) is an attorney with the Burlington Railroad, with headquarters in Chicago.

Victor M. Powell (MN) is a member of the faculty of the Department of Speech, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana.

Stuart N. Smith (ISC) is Research Director of the Reid National Corn Company, with headquarters in Ames, Iowa.

Leo Rhodes (K) is a certified public accountant with offices in Wichita, Kansas.

Russell S. Dozer (WO) is Acting Executive Officer, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

Verne C. Amberson (M) is an attorney with offices in Detroit, Michigan.

G. Lowell Field (WES) is a member of the faculty of the Department of Government, Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan.

Elizabeth Ann Murphy (WIS) is Professor of English, College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minnesota.

Eileen Dondero (SY) is City Clerk of the city of Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

F. Dale Hoecker (ORS) is county 4-H Club Agent in the state of Oregon, with headquarters at Astoria.

Alan C. Christner (AL) is Trust Officer in the organization of the Mellon National Bank and Trust Company, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Howard C. Ackley (ND) is President of Green Mountain Junior College, Poultney, Vermont.

Don Smith (MN) is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin.

Walter J. Moore (H) is Supervisor, Professional and Scientific Training, in Branch 12 of the Veterans Administration, with headquarters in San Francisco, California.

Martin C. Kriewaldt (WIS) is a member of the firm of Wallman, Kriewaldt, and Palmer, barristers and solicitors, Adelaide, Australia.

E. Thayer Curry (IU), formerly of the Department of Speech, University of Oklahoma, is now a member of the faculty of the Department of Speech, University of Washington, Seattle.

Wayne N. Thompson (L), formerly of the University of Missouri, is now in charge of the work in Speech at the Navy

Pier (Chicago) Branch of the University of Illinois.

Roy L. Garis (V) is Professor of Economics in the University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Robert Kingsley (MN), is Professor of Law in the University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Ralph L. Sieben (KX) is Vice President and General Manager of the United Cities Utilities Company, with headquarters in Chicago.

E. T. Leavitt (ISC), whose home is in LaGrange, Illinois, is Editor of the publication TRACTOR FARMING.

Dorothy J. Irwin (WAY) is Instructor in Speech at Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan.

James R. Irwin (WAY) is Instructor in Speech, Marygrove College, Detroit, and also Instructor in English, University of Detroit.

Edward E. Markert (W) is coach of debate at Washington, University, St. Louis, Missouri.

Rev. Paul M. Hillman (AL) is now District Superintendent of the Omaha District, Nebraska Conference of the Methodist Church, after having served as minister of the First Methodist Church, Fremont, Nebraska, for six years. He is also Secretary of the South Central Jurisdictional Conference of the Methodist Church, which embraces eight Middle Western and Southwestern states in which are located 17 annual conferences.

Lyle E. Mantor (ITC) is Chairman of the Department of Social Science, State Teachers College, Kearney, Nebraska.

Natt N. Dodge (L) is Regional Naturalist, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, with headquarters at Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Roscoe C. Edlund (COR) is Manager, Association of American Soap and Glycerine Producers. His home is in Tuckahoe, New York.

Oscar A. Ahlgren (BE) is an attorney in Whiting, Indiana. His address is 1900 Indianapolis Blvd.

Robert W. Smyres (OW) is a student at the Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

Dr. Gladys L. Borchers (WIS) is Professor of Speech at the University of Wisconsin.

John H. MacLeod (WO) is a student at the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

Robert F. Lee (SW) is an attorney with offices in the Guardian Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.

Melvin H. Miller (A) is a teacher of English and Assistant Debate Coach in the Alpena (Michigan) High School.

Robert E. Jacobson (KX) is an at-

(Continued on Page 53)

torney with offices in the Hospital Trust Bldg., Providence, Rhode Island.

Jerome N. Curtis (WR) is an attorney with offices in the Union Commerce

Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.

Gordon Mills (WAY) is Director of Forensics at Los Angeles (California) Junior College.

Thomas Brackett Reed . . .

- al House," NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, v. 149, October 1889, p. 425
- (8) Reed, "A Deliberative Body," OP. CIT., p. 150
- (9) IBID., p. 151
- (10) IBID., 1. 150
- (11) LOC. CIT.
- (12) Robinson, Wm. A., THOMAS B. REED, PARLIAMENTARIAN, Dodd, Mead and Co., N. Y., (c 1930), p. 257
- (13) By actual count, taken from the INDEX to Vol. 23, Parts 1-7, 52nd Congress, 1st Session, Dec. 7, 1891 to Aug. 5, 1892, and INDEX to Vol. 24, Parts 1-3, 52nd Congress, 2nd Session, Dec. 5, 1892 to March 3, 1893.
- (14) These speeches were: (1) Against the Mills Tariff Bill, May 19, 1888; (2) In favor of repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act, August 26, 1893; (3) Against the Wilson Tariff Bill, Feb. 1, 1894.
- (15) Robinson, OP. CIT., p. 262
- (16) Leupp, Francis E., "Personal Recollections of Thomas B. Reed," THE OUT-LOOK, v. 96, Sept. 3, 1910, pp. 36-40

- (17) IBID., p. 37
- (18) Alexander, OP. CIT., p. 126
- (19) Robinson, OP. CIT., p. 261
- (20) IBID., p. 262
- (21) Stoddard, Henry L., AS I KNEW THEM, Harpers, N.Y., (c 1927), p. 192
- (22) Roosevelt, Theodore, "Thomas Brackett Reed and the Fifty-First Congress," THE FORUM, v. 20, December 1895, pp. 410-418.
- (23) Reed, "A Deliberative Body," OP. CIT., p. 155
- (24) The complete story of this dramatic battle is told in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, First Session, Cong. 51, vol. 21, January 29, 1891, pp. 948-1024.
- (25) Reed, "A Deliberative Body," OP. CIT., p. 156
- (26) Resolution by Rep. Sherman, N.Y., in the House of Representatives, upon the death of Reed, December 8, 1902.

Discussion Method in War Industry . . .

taught the leadmen. The leadmen taught the workers. Handed down in this fashion, the J.T. formulas reached ten million workers in a matter of months.

It is important to know that the democratic method of group discussion had again proved itself an effective educational and problem-solving device. It is important to know that this effectiveness was demonstrated on a nation-wide scale. But probably most important of all is the fact that the job was done so quickly.

Democracy has been criticized for being slow. To convey information or to solve problems by means of group and public discussion, it is said, requires a distressingly long time. By contrast, the propaganda methods of authoritarian societies are thought to be inherently quicker-acting and more efficient. The T.W.I. project stands in rebuttal.

Teachers may well face this fact: So vast a project in group discussion was conceived and effected by leaders from the fields of industrial training and industrial engineering rather than from the field of speech. The speed with which

the War Production Trainers were produced is especially provocative. To teachers of speech the idea of covering the art of conference leadership in a one-week course may seem absurd. A year's course in Fundamentals of Speech, followed by a year in Public Discussion and Debate, plus about two years of extra-curricular speech activities, might not seem excessive. Thus, T.W.I. measures in days what we measure in years. Perhaps theirs is "too little" and our "too late." It is a stimulating challenge to re-examine our whole approach. For despite many limitations and failures, the T.W.I. Institutes have demonstrated that adequate conference leaders can be trained in a much shorter time than many of us had previously thought possible.

1. Stuart Chase, "Show-How: A Revolution in Management," READER'S DIGEST, October, 1943.
2. Stuart Chase, "To Do It Easier and Do It Better," READER'S DIGEST, November, 1943.
3. Stuart Chase, "Teaching Foremen That Workers Are People," READER'S DIGEST, September, 1943.

English-Style of Debate . . .

sit facing those who oppose it, the former ranging themselves on the President's right, the latter on his left.

President



Pro



Con



Spectators

- (10) The speeches are clocked by a

timekeeper. Members must bring their remarks to a close upon receiving his signal.

(11) A member may speak on any phase of the subject he desires. The President will, however, rule out of order any member who attempts to introduce material which is obviously not germane to the discussion.

- (1) Representatives of Denison University, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Otterbein College, Oxford University, and The Ohio State University participated.

With the Chapters . . .

BATES

During the sabbatical leave of absence of Prof. Brooks Quimby, Norman Temple, Bates '46, has been Director of Forensics at Bates.

During the first semester, the Bates debating team resumed its international debates with the University of New Brunswick. The series was interrupted shortly after the debate on Nov. 27, 1941, on the entrance of the United States into the war.

CARLETON

In addition to its usual custom of sponsoring the campus oratory and extempore speaking contests, the Carleton chapter of Delta Sigma Rho is planning to hold two interschool debate tournaments this year. On February 14, Carleton sponsored a tournament for 15 Minnesota high schools; and on February 28, an inexperienced division college tournament was also held.

CHICAGO

Two Student Forum debating teams returned from Florida recently after a seven round tournament at the University of Miami. The teams amassed the greatest team-total of any of the participating schools.

Winning five out of seven rounds, Curt Crawford and Ray Marks took top affirmative honors. Howie Schuman and Dave Ladd upholding the negative took third among the negative teams.

The debating culminated in an exhibition debate between the University of Chicago and the University of Miami, the high teams on the respective sides of the proposition. That evening under the stars and the palms of Miami the hosts gave a banquet at which the team awards were presented.

Ray Marks, accepting the gold trophy indicative of affirmative honors, thanked the Miami students and faculty for their thoughtfully planned and thought-provoking tourney.

The Miami officials were so happy over the outcome of the affair that they proposed that it become an annual affair with different schools being special guests. All of the participating schools—Alabama, Georgia, Stetson, South Carolina, Florida, Miami, and Chicago seconded the proposal.

In summing up the University's experience at the tourney Wm. Birenbaum, Student Forum Director, said, "It is from the intimate discussion of these diverse sectional approaches to the proposition of world government, or of any other debate topic, and not from the incidental trophies that the true value of such a tournament arises."

The University has over 30 active debate teams competing for varsity positions. The schedule for the month of February includes meets with Mundelein, Northwestern, University of Pennsylvania, University of Miami, the Indiana University Tournament, and the Northwestern University Tournament.

COLORADO

Speakers Congress is now engaged in the most active year in the forensic history of the University of Colorado. Over a hundred students are engaged in at least one and usually more of the Congress' varied activities.

Highlight of this year's debating will be the trip of two Colorado debaters this spring to the Hawaiian Isles to debate with representatives of the University of Hawaii. Competition is keen among the many experienced debaters for the laurels of making the trip. Colorado will send three other speakers as far as the West Coast. The debaters will depart April 7 and will return April 17.

Many other intercollegiate activities have been completed or are planned. Fall quarter debating was climaxed by the trip of seven students and the two Speakers Congress advisors, Roy C. Nelson and Thorrel B. Fest, to Salt Lake City during Christmas vacation to participate in the Western Speech Association tournament. Don Davis and Roger Cozens entered the team debate finals in the senior men's division. Other Colorado speakers were Joan Willis, Virginia Kasdorf, Larry Travis, Jim Anderson, and Ed Kendrick.

On January 17, eleven participants from Colorado were entered in the winter quarter Colorado-Wyoming Forensic League meet at Colorado Springs. Cecil Jones, Bernard Shapson, Daniel Sklar, and Jim Friedlander brought home the top honors in debate for CU; and Marjorie Bertholf, Harvey Weeks, and Phyllis Silvio placed second, third, and fourth respectively in the extempore speaking sequence. Arthur Taylor, Leslie Polk, James Cruse, and Courtland Peterson were the CU teams that tied for third place.

Twenty-six speakers participated in the Rocky Mountain Speech conference in Denver, February 12, 13, and 14. Also on the agenda for this year are the University of Nebraska tournament at Lincoln, February 27 and 28; the Savage Forensic tournament at Durant, Oklahoma, March 5 and 6; the Colorado-Wyoming legislative assembly at Greeley on April 16 and 17; and several dual meets with schools of this region.

A University oratorical contest known as the Klinger Contest will be held April

5, and an extempore contest sponsored by the Colorado chapter of Delta Sigma Rho is planned for April 19.

The Public Information and Discussion division of the Congress has sent a program containing a list of available speakers and subjects to organizations in every part of the state. Speakers have spent the fall quarter preparing over thirty subjects. Requests for programs are being handled by Bill Eaton, student chairman of the program.

Three forensic clinics for high school students have been conducted by Speakers Congress members this year. These clinics are held in conjunction with the Colorado State Debating League. Speakers Congress members will serve as judges at the Colorado State Debating League festival to be held the 19th and 20th of March on the Boulder campus. In April the University will be host to the District National Forensic League tournament.

The Public Forums division has presented two forums on the campus so far this year, and plans to hold one a month for the remainder of the season. The questions discussed at the forums by campus leaders have been "academic freedom" and "institution of an honor system" at the University of Colorado.

The local chapter plans to elect new members during the winter quarter.

HAMILTON

"For the first time in over five years, the Hamilton College Debate Society has entered into big-time competition. During the year 1946-47, the varsity debaters held forensic clashes with such colleges as R.P.I., Colgate, Syracuse, West Point, Temple, Princeton, Haverford, Columbia, Vassar, Wells, Ursinus, Williams, and many others.

"The year's activities were highlighted by four week-end debate trips. In December, Hamilton sent four teams to the annual tournament at the University of Vermont. During February, Hamilton toured colleges in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. The end of the semester concluded our trips with a trip to New England.

"At various times during the year, single debates were held on a home-and-home basis.

"Debating activities ended in May with a banquet and election of officers."

HAWAII

Major forensic events at the University of Hawaii during the second semester will be a series of debates with visiting debaters from the University of Missouri and the University of Colorado. The team from Missouri will spend the last week of March in the Islands, debating Hawaiians on Federal World Government and "Resolved: That Hawaii contributes

more to the nation than does Missouri." University of Colorado debaters will arrive the second week of April to debate on the national question, plus one debate on "Resolved: That the Federal Government should provide for the economic security of all citizens."

Hawaii Union, campus forensic organization, is sponsoring a mock state constitutional convention for the "49th State" during March and April. The entire student body will have a part in this convention, which will in so far as possible follow the exact procedure the Territory of Hawaii will use when statehood becomes a reality. The Territorial Statehood Commission has offered its services and support for the project. An extensive series of campus forums has been arranged to bring information to the student body on the problems to be dealt with in the convention.

The last two forensic events before the forensic banquet and Delta Sigma Rho initiations will be a campus-wide humorous speaking contest and the annual campus Berndt Extemporaneous contest.

IOWA

Iowa's intercollegiate forensic activities for January consisted of the Western Conference League women, home-and-home series with the University of Wisconsin and Minnesota. On January 20, Maureen McGivern and Virginia Rosenberg represented Iowa on the negative of the Federal World Government proposition against two women from the University of Wisconsin before an audience in the senate chamber of Iowa's Old Capitol. The audience ballot indicated a shift toward the negative. On January 22, Eleanor Kistle and Georgianna Edwards traveled to Minneapolis, where they defended the affirmative of the World Government question against the University of Minnesota. The audience vote following the debate was for the affirmative.

Iowa's February intercollegiate program includes two Western Conference home-and-home debates for the men. On February 19, Evan Hultman and Sherwin Markman are upholding the affirmative of World Federation in a cross-examination debate with the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. February 26, Walter Johnson and John Oostendorp, on the negative of the national high school question on Compulsory Arbitration of Labor Disputes, meet a team from the University of Illinois.

The February program at Iowa is concluded with the second Intercollegiate Conference on Post-War Problems for the academic year 1947-1948. On February 27-28, fifteen universities and colleges are participating in four rounds of debate and discussion, contests in extempore and after-dinner speaking, orig-

inal oratory, and a parliamentary session.

IOWA STATE

The Iowa State Chapter of Delta Sigma Rho has been playing an active part in forensic activities on the Ames campus this term. Members are prominent in the Iowa State Debaters Club, and the chapter is sponsoring a contest in original oratory for the Spring.

President of the local group is Lee Windheim, with Jacqueline Everett as secretary. Dinners are held every second week to which actives invite prominent alumni members of Delta Sigma Rho.

Discussion and debate, centering in Iowa State Debaters, are once more in full swing on the campus under the direction of Professor Ralph A. Micken. Mr. Robert Underhill is assisting with the big job of keeping two weekly half hours of Radio Discussion going over WOI, traveling over Iowa on Community Current Topic Discussions, conducting weekly Coffee Forums in the Union, and debating at Drake, Kansas, Cornell, Coe, Simpson, Nebraska and Iowa.

For such a program, Debaters have a membership of between fifty and sixty. Topics discussed in community visits are Universal Military Training, the Marshall Plan, Revision of UN, Inflation Control, Missouri Valley Authority, and the Partition of Palestine. On the Coffee Forum the subjects have been a little more restricted—Liberal Arts vs Technology, Should Big Name Bands be Brought to the Campus, Teacher Rating Scales, and others.

MICHIGAN

Before 1600 people, the University of Michigan debaters opened their forensic season with Oxford University. Michigan then played host to six colleges in a tournament which featured eighteen debates before speech classes. Other campus debates included engagements with Michigan State College, Ohio State University, University of Iowa, Purdue University, University of Illinois, Georgetown University, and McMaster University.

The demand for exhibition debates and discussions before high school assemblies, community gatherings, and business organizations has been unusually heavy. Thus far, the group has participated in thirty such performances.

The style of debate which has been used for all these occasions and which has proved successful in maintaining audience interest is as follows:

- First Affirmative speech—8 minutes
- First Negative cross-examines First Affirmative—5 min.
- First Negative speech—8 minutes
- Second Affirmative cross-examines First Negative—5 min.

Second Affirmative speech—8 minutes
Second Negative cross-examines second Affirmative—5 min.

Second Negative speech—8 minutes
First Affirmative cross-examines Second Negative—5 min.

Negative summary—4 minutes
Affirmative summary—4 minutes

NORTHWESTERN

Resuming forensic activity the day after the opening of the winter quarter, six teams met the Lake Forest College squad here on January 6 in practice debates.

Two teams from the women's squad won eleven of twelve debates to place first in the experienced division of the annual invitational tournament at Illinois Normal University January 9-10. Marilyn Serr, '49, chapter vice president, participated in six victories. Joyce Dix, '48, the president, was unable to make the trip. Nancy Gossage, '50, Vicki Gustafson, '50, and Dorothy Swanson, '49, completed the foursome.

Four first-year men met two teams from Western Michigan here in decisionless debates January 10.

On January 13, Charles Sohner, '50 and Art Davis, '50 debated a Lake Forest team before the annual dinner meeting of the Highland Park Chamber of Commerce. This is an annual event on our forensics calendar.

Northwestern's Columbia School of the Air series continued on January 16 with a four-man panel on Juvenile Delinquency. The network show originated in WBBM.

One new feature has been added to the debate schedule. This is the Chicago Area Debate Series, which began on January 30 and has continued each succeeding Friday night. The Series of debates will continue through February and March, culminating in a Chicago Area Debate Tournament. Participating schools are: DePaul University, Loyola University, Mundelein College, University of Chicago, St. Xavier College, University of Illinois (Navy Pier Branch), and Northwestern University. Representing Northwestern in the Series are 16 members of the Freshman Debate Squad, directed by James McBath, '47, a graduate assistant in Speech.

Twelve colleges and universities were represented in a four-round invitational tournament here February 14: Georgetown, Marquette, Chicago, Illinois (Navy Pier), Wisconsin, Knox, North Central, Mundelein, Mt. Mary, Lake Forest, Wheaton, and Lyons Junior College. Fifty-eight debates were scheduled. Twenty of our teams participated in twenty-two debates.

The following items comprise the remainder of our calendar: March 4, Canisius here; March 5-6, tournament at Terre Haute; March 19-20, tournament

at Wisconsin; March 18, Duquesne here; March 30, Denver here; April 2-3, Western Conference tournaments for men and women at Purdue.

OBERLIN

Public discussion and debate activities at Oberlin are now in the second year of postwar revival with an active group of 35 students. Professor J. Jeffery Auer is director of forensics; associated with him in forensic work are Professor Robert G. Gunderson, and Mr. J. Thomas Dutro, Jr., graduate assistant.

In the intercollegiate phase Oberlin has taken part in 52 debates during the first semester, most of them in tournaments. In the annual novice tournament of the Northeast Debate Conference four teams won first place with only two losses in sixteen debates. Oberlin teams tied for second place in the College of Wooster Invitational Direct Clash Tournament, and for fourth place in the annual state tournament for women.

On January 17th the annual Legislative Assembly of the Northeast Ohio Debate Conference was held on the Oberlin campus with more than 100 student delegates from eleven colleges. Committees were established to consider problems of U. S. foreign policy in Europe, in the Far East, and on international organization. Following a full morning of committee meetings the afternoon was devoted to parliamentary debate of resolutions in each of these areas.

Climax of the first semester forensic program was a split team debate with the men from Oxford University on the question of nationalizing basic industries. J. Thomas Dutro, Jr., president of the Oberlin Forensic Union, teamed with Mr. Kenneth D. Harris, of Oxford, on the affirmative; on the negative were Robert M. Kingdon, of Oberlin, and Sir Edward C. G. Boyle, of Oxford. The Hon. Anthony N. W. Benn, president of the Oxford Union Society, presided over the debate, which was held before the largest campus debate audience in the past decade.

In addition to its intercollegiate activities, the Oberlin Forensic Union has carried on an active public discussion program, providing service clubs, high schools, womens' clubs, farm and church groups in north central Ohio with discussions of half a dozen current public questions.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

The 1948 winter quarter intercollegiate debate program at Ohio State University has included the following events: Men's debates with Ohio Wesleyan on Jan. 15, with the University of Wisconsin on Jan. 15 at Madison, with the University of Minnesota on Jan. 30, with Pennsylvania State College on Feb. 18

and 19, with Wittenberg on Feb. 11, and participation in the Mount Mercy Tournament (Pittsburgh) on Feb. 21. Also, women's debates with Ohio Wesleyan on Jan. 15, with Wittenberg on Feb. 11, with Drew on Feb. 19, with the University of Michigan on Feb. 26, and participation in the following tournaments: Purdue Novice, Feb. 7; Buckeye, Feb. 14; and Washington and Jefferson, Feb. 27.

Plans are being completed for the Ohio State University Conference on Public Affairs, to be held on March 4, 5, and 6. Over 30 colleges and universities from 11 states are expected to participate in the discussions and debates on "What Should be Our Policy Toward Russia?" (There will be a complete account of this Conference in the May issue of THE GAVEL.)

OHIO WESLEYAN

"There have been many unusual aspects connected with debating this year. The squads have been operating with the impetus they developed last year in the effort to recover from the wartime slump. The size and spirit of the squads have been excellent. The increased membership has been kept busy with an active program.

"On October 28, some of our debaters took part in debates held at Ohio State. The guests of honor were some debaters from Oxford University, England. The proposition, "That the danger of war can best be averted by an all-purpose Anglo-American Alliance," was debated by the rules of debate used in the Oxford Union.

"Our women debaters have attended two tournaments. The first was a Direct Clash tournament held at Wooster on November 15. The Ohio Women's Debate was held December 5 and 6 at Capital University. The proposition was, "Resolved, That a Federal World Government should be established." Jean Lemal and Ann Boggs represented the affirmative, and Joyce Boyher and Mary Boyers represented the negative. Misses Boggs and Lemal repeated their performance of last year by coming through the tournament undefeated. Ohio Wesleyan placed third among twelve colleges. Last year, four schools, including Wesleyan, tied for first place. This year, since the results were so close, all four schools were awarded plaques.

"The men's debate season is scheduled to begin later than the women's. Using the timely question, "Resolved, That the foreign policy of the present administration be condemned," they will take part in a series of triangle and dual debates.

"A new departure in speech activities this year at Wesleyan is the Speech Forum, a club organized to promote interest and participation of students in debate and public discussion. It allows a

real opportunity for student expression on current issues."

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma sent five debaters on Dec. 5 and 6 to the East Central Forensic Tournament at Ada, Oklahoma. Oklahoma won first place in the Senior Men's Division and in the Mixed Division, and second place in the Junior Men's Division. Arlen Specter and Roswell Clark represented Oklahoma in the first group, Betty Massman and Marlan Johnson in the second group, and Gerald Hornung and Bill Bowles in the third. Several Oklahoma entrants also won first places in the individual events.

In the Oklahoma University Invitational Tournament, held on Jan. 30 and 31, Oklahoma withdrew after qualifying three teams for the elimination rounds, believing that the host should make way for the guests.

On Feb. 6 and 7, Oklahoma sent three teams to the Baylor Forensic Tournament at Waco, Texas. Harry McMillan and Bill McGeehee won second place, losing in the finals to Seminole Junior College in the Junior Men's Division.

The new Director of Forensics is E. A. Kretsinger; Dr. William M. Sattler continues as Chapter Sponsor.

OREGON

The rapid post-war expansion of the University of Oregon Department of Speech and Drama is producing a commensurate growth in the department's forensic activities. The 13 year old Symposium program is now being complemented by full-scale participation in debate; and the traditional emphasis on individual participation in extemp, oratory, impromptu, and discussion is being continued. The department is now headed by Dr. Roy C. McCall; the forensic division is directed by E. Ray Nichols, Jr.

During the 1946-47 season Oregon symposium speakers addressed over 12,000 people in 130 different audiences in discussions on the problems of Government Control of Labor, State Taxation and Public Service Facilities, and the United Nations. Thirty-four undergraduate students were active participants in this unique speech program, which provides unparalleled training in realistic speech situations and which fulfills a part of the service duty of a state university toward the civic groups, service organizations, and high schools of the state.

Oregon debate activity in 1946-47 was limited to practice debates with Oregon State College and one exhibition debate with the University of California. The latter event was a successful experiment in three-man debating conducted before an audience of 200 people.

In the intercollegiate competition in individual events, Oregon speakers coached

by Prof. K. E. Montgomery placed first in the Men's Extempore contest sponsored by the Intercollegiate Forensic Association of Oregon and second in the Women's Division of the same contest. A first place award was won in Women's Extempore in the San Jose tournament, as were two second place awards in Women's Oratory and Discussion. The San Jose winners were directed by Robert D. Clark. First place was won at the Linfield invitational tournament in Senior Men's Discussion. Oregon also placed first in the State Peace Oratorical, and the entry won second place in the national contest. The final award of the year was first place in Extempore at the Pacific Forensic League tournament held at the University of Arizona. Oregon's PFL entrants were coached by Prof. Walfred A. Dahlberg.

In the first three months of the 1947-48 season, 30 students have participated in 40 debates and have taken part in 24 symposium engagements, addressing over 2000 people in symposium audiences. Oregon winners in the Western Association of Speech Northern Division tournament at Whitman College collected first place awards in Lower Division Women's Impromptu and After-Dinner Speaking, and in Senior Men's Extempore. A third place was won in Lower Division Women's Oratory. Lower Divisions entrants were coached by Prof. John Baird.

Oregon also made a clean sweep of the State intercollegiate extempore contests, with contestants coached by Prof. Montgomery winning first place in both the Men's and Women's divisions. Second place was awarded to Oregon in the State After-Dinner Speaking contest.

Plans for the remainder of the 1947-48 season include: a series of discussions to be presented throughout the state, a weekly radio symposium to be broadcast during the winter quarter, participation in the Linfield College tournament, the Pacific Forensic League meeting at the University of Nevada, and the State Peace Oratory and I.F.A.O. oratory contests.

PENN STATE

"To date, the Penn State Women have had but one major trip during which they encountered four men's teams in cross-examination style debate at Pennsylvania, St. Joseph's, Temple, and Fordham. Although we have debates scheduled up to May 1, the bulk of our debating will take place early in the second semester, from the middle of February through the middle of March, during which period we anticipate over sixty debates in which ten of our women's teams, using the squad system, will participate."

TEXAS

Texas has an unusually active debate

squad during the current season, 32 men debaters participating in practice debates and intercollegiate contests. Prior to Feb. 17, Texas participated in 99 intercollegiate debates; three were non-decision, and of the remainder Texas won 63, lost 32, and tied one.

On Dec. 5, Herbert Taylor and William Darden, recently initiated into Delta Sigma Rho, debated Oxford University before an audience of more than 1000 persons.

Other debates included a series of six engagements with the University of Florida and a series of six encounters with Texas A and M., held in Austin. On Feb. 6 and 7, Texas sent seven teams to the Baylor University Tournament and met with considerable success. Sam Smith and Kleber Miller won six debates before being eliminated in the semi-finals; Meredith Long and Ronnie Dugger won five before losing in the quarter-finals; Herbert Taylor and Thomas Taylor won five and lost one before losing a second time in the quarter-finals.

Plans for February and March were equally extensive. On Feb. 23, four Texas teams met Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge and later entered the Glendy Burke Forensic Centennial at Tulane, in New Orleans. Visits were also made to Baylor, Southern Methodist University, and Texas Tech; and two teams were sent to the Missouri Valley Meet during the last week in March. Baylor and the University of Missouri also visited Austin during March.

On April 16 and 17, Texas will serve as host to a large tournament in Austin, in which contests will be held in debate, extempore speaking, oratory, and after-dinner speaking. There will be Junior and Senior Divisions and Men's and Women's Divisions in debate, with similar groups in the other events. The Texas chapter extends an invitation to all Delta Sigma Rho chapters to attend this tournament. Inquiries should be addressed to Prof. Thomas A. Rousse, Director of Forensics, or Mr. Edgar G. Shelton, Jr., Men's Debate Coach and Chapter Sponsor. The deadline on entries will be April 12.

WASHINGTON

This year Washington University debate activities are expanding. The squad coached by Mr. E. E. Markert is made up of twenty-four active members. Weekly meetings are modeled after the parliamentary style, and through these meetings members of the squad are developing proficiency in all phases of debate.

The highlight of the season was the Oxford debate on November 10th, in which John Montrey and Don Waldemer of Washington met Anthony Benn and Kenneth Harris of the English school. The topic was: Resolved, That the argu-

ments in favor of nationalization of basic industry are overwhelming. Other intercollegiate debates have included a round-robin series of debates February 6 at St. Louis University in which Washington, represented by six teams, met teams from St. Louis, Westminster, and William Jewell. The same topic, Federal World Government, was debated that evening with Missouri University with Don Waldemer and Bob Karsh of Washington upholding the affirmative. In addition to these intercollegiate debates, a number of programs have been presented before various civic groups and high schools in the St. Louis area. The subjects debated have included the Nationalization of Basic Industry, Federal World Government, Russian Foreign Policy, Compulsory Arbitration, the Marshall Plan, and Woman's Place is in the Home.

WHITMAN

"Whitman College sent Bonnie Marolf, Carmen Gleiser, Bob Nelson, and George Shields to the recent Inland Empire Debate Meet. This was a Freshman-Sophomore meet and was held at the University of Idaho in Moscow. It proved an interesting experience to the younger debaters although Gonzaga University took sweep-stake honors.

"The next activity for Whitman debaters was participation in the Eighteenth Annual Intercollegiate Tournament at Linfield College in McMinnville, Oregon. We are sending fifteen contestants to take part in all divisions including debate, extempore, oratory, interpretative reading, after-dinner speaking, and impromptu. The tournament took place February 26, 27, and 28."

YALE

During the fall of 1947, the Yale chapter elected to membership Donald H. Rivkin, member of the University debate team, class orator of the class of 1948, and a recently elected Rhodes Scholar from Iowa.

The Yale varsity debate team has defeated Columbia and Dartmouth in home-and-home contests, and split with Harvard in a similar arrangement. World Federation, the Taft-Hartley Labor Law, and Truman for President have been the favorite topics.

With the teams divided up, Yale lost to the predominantly Oxford University team on the subject of an Anglo-American Alliance when the English debaters visited New Haven in October.

The freshman team recently split with the Taft School in a home-and-home series on World Federation, both negative teams winning. A Yale team visited Boston the week-end of February 13-15 to participate in the annual Boston University Debate Tournament.

Delta Sigma Rho . . .

Chapter Directory

Code	Chapter Name	Date Founded	Faculty Sponsor	Address
A	Albion	1911	James W. Brock	Albion, Mich.
AL	Allegheny	1913	Hubert V. Cordier	Meadville, Pa.
AM	Amherst	1913	S. L. Garrison	Amherst, Mass.
AMER	American	1932	Gordon D. Brigham	Washington, D. C.
AR	Arizona	1922	W. Arthur Cable	Tucson, Ariz.
B	Bates	1915	Brooks Quimby	Lewiston, Me.
BE	Beloit	1909		Beloit, Wis.
BK	Brooklyn	1940	Marvin G. Bauer	Brooklyn, N. Y.
BR	Brown	1909	Guy H. Dodge	Providence, R. I.
BU	Boston	1935	G. M. Sneath	Boston, Mass.
C	California	1922	Jacobus ten Broek	Berkeley, Calif.
CA	Carleton	1911	Leland B. Schubert	Northfield, Minn.
CH	Chicago	1906	William N. Birenbaum	Chicago, Ill.
CLR	Colorado	1910	Thorrel B. Fest	Boulder, Colo.
COL	Colgate	1910	Donald S. Williams	Hamilton, N. Y.
COR	Cornell	1911	H. A. Wichelns	Ithaca, N. Y.
CR	Creighton	1924	Fr. James Orford, S. J.	Omaha, Nebr.
DP	DePauw	1915	Herold T. Ross	Greencastle, Ind.
EL	Elmira	1931	Geraldine Quinlan	Elmira, N. Y.
GW	George Washington	1908		Washington, D. C.
H	Hamilton	1922	Willard B. Marsh	Clinton, N. Y.
HR	Harvard	1909	E. M. Rowe	53 State St., Boston, Mass.
HW	Hawaii	1947	Clifton Cornwell	Honolulu, Hawaii
I	Idaho	1926	A. E. Whitehead	Moscow, Idaho
ILL	Illinois	1906	Richard T. Murphy	Urbana, Ill.
ISC	Iowa State	1909	Ralph A. Micken	Ames, Iowa
IT	Iowa State Teachers	1913	John W. Keltner	Cedar Falls, Iowa
IU	Iowa	1906	A. Craig Baird	Iowa City, Iowa
K	Kansas	1910	E. C. Buehler	Lawrence, Kansas
KX	Knox	1911	William E. Donnelly	Galesburg, Ill.
M	Michigan	1906	G. E. Densmore	Ann Arbor, Mich.
MH	Mt. Holyoke	1917	Donald G. Morgan	South Hadley, Mass.
MN	Minnesota	1906	William S. Howell	Minneapolis, Minn.
MO	Missouri	1909	Bower Aly	Columbia, Mo.
MQ	Marquette	1930	Hugo E. Hellman	Milwaukee, Wis.
N	Nebraska	1906	Leroy T. Laase	Lincoln, Nebr.
ND	North Dakota	1911	John S. Penn	Grand Forks, N. D.
NO	Northwestern	1906	Glenn E. Mills	Evanston, Ill.
O	Ohio State	1910	Harold F. Harding	Columbus, Ohio
OE	Oberlin	1936	J. Jeffery Auer	Oberlin, Ohio
OK	Oklahoma	1913	William M. Sattler	Norman, Oklahoma
OR	Oregon	1926	Walfred A. Dahlberg	Eugene, Oregon
ORS	Oregon State	1922	E. W. Wells	Corvallis, Oregon
OW	Ohio Wesleyan	1907	W. Roy Diem	Delaware, Ohio
P	Pennsylvania	1909	Sculley Bradley	Philadelphia, Pa.
PO	Pomona	1928	B. D. Scott	Claremont, Calif.
PR	Princeton	1911		(Inactive)
PS	Pennsylvania State	1917	Clayton H. Schug	State College, Pa.
PT	Pittsburgh	1920	Fred S. Robie	Pittsburgh, Pa.
R	Rockford	1933	Mildred F. Berry	Rockford, Ill.
SC	Southern California	1915	Alan Nichols	Los Angeles, Calif.
ST	Stanford	1911	J. Gordon Emerson	Stanford University, Calif.
SW	Swarthmore	1911	E. L. Hunt	Swarthmore, Pa.
SY	Syracuse	1910	Ordean G. Ness	Syracuse, N. Y.
T	Texas	1909	Edgar G. Shelton, Jr.	Austin, Texas
VA	Virginia	1908	H. Hardy Perritt	Charlottesville, Va.
W	Washington	1922	Donald C. Bryant	St. Louis, Mo.
WAY	Wayne	1937	Rupert L. Cortright	Detroit, Mich.
WEL	Wells	1941	Dorothy C. Dennis	Aurora, N. Y.
WES	Wesleyan	1910	John Crawford	Middletown, Conn.
WHIT	Whitman	1920	Lloyd R. Newcomer	Walla Walla, Wash.
WICH	Wichita	1941	Forest L. Whan	Wichita, Kansas
WIS	Wisconsin	1906	Henry Lee Ewbank	Madison, Wis.
WJ	Washington and Jefferson	1917	Leslie A. Foust	Washington, Pa.
WL	Washington and Lee	1913		(Inactive)
WM	Williams	1910	George R. Connelly	Williamstown, Mass.
WO	Wooster	1922	J. Garber Drushai	Wooster, Ohio
WR	Western Reserve	1911	Warren A. Guthrie	Cleveland, Ohio
WVA	West Virginia	1923	Lloyd Welden	Morgantown, W. Va.
WYO	Wyoming	1917	W. E. Stevens	Laramie, Wyoming
Y	Yale	1909	Rollin G. Osterweis	New Haven, Conn.
L	At Large			