

3-1949

## The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, Volume 31, 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. (1949). The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, Volume 31, Issue 3, Complete Issue. The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, 31(3), [41]-56.

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, 1949*  
*Volume 31      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  
Municipal Court 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 Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Richard T. Murphy  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

Brooks Quimby  
Bates College  
Lewiston, Maine

## President's Page . . .

### "The State of Delta Sigma Rho and the Fourth Congress"

#### PART I

First, a brief word about the present state of Delta Sigma Rho.

A. *Our financial status is good.* We have gone through the lean years of the war and the post-war inflation period in relatively good shape. We have kept out of the red without drawing from our capital investments. In spite of the sharp rise in the cost of labor and materials, we have not missed a single issue of the *Gavel*, or raised the initiation fee one cent. The fees for installation of chapters have remained the same. The little cabinet, composed of Gilbert L. Hall, Kenneth G. Hance, and myself, has held numerous meetings during the course of the last five years. At these meetings, we figured out various methods and means for cutting corners and putting our modest investments to the best possible use. These efforts have, in the main, worked out for the financial good of our Society.

B. *The forensic picture among the chapters in general is encouraging.* A review of the chapter news as reported in the January issue of the *Gavel* is indeed heartening. Probably never have so many chapters reported so glowingly in one single issue of the *Gavel*. A total of 23 chapters gave excellent reports. Although there are a number of chapters which have not regained their pre-war forensic status, it is evident that in most cases, we are coming back to normalcy.

Here are a few phrases selected from these reports, which hint of the dynamic nature of these local forensic programs:

"With 72 debates, 3 tournaments, numerous radio broadcasts, and public discussion, X University has concluded one of its busiest first semesters in history." "Over 120 speakers from 13 schools participated." "One of the largest tournaments held at X University in recent years." "X University debaters have had an unusually busy fall semester." "The usual four-fold program . . . intercollegiate forensics, extension visits, coffee forums, radio panels." "Ninety-four men and women tried out for Varsity debate." "Eleven debates on the Varsity calendar for December." "Between 35 and 40 women were accepted for the women's squad." "1948-49 will be one of the busiest of recent years." "We have had 203 intercollegiate debates in '47-48." "Interest in debate and discussion is increasing during the current season."

C. *Our National Society is consolidating its position by continuing our policy of taking out the dead wood.* Several dying or dead chapters have been dropped entirely from our roster. A few dormant or inactive chapters have revived activities and are now carrying on strong forensic programs. Two new chapters, University of Hawaii and University of Nevada, have come into our fold during the last two years.

Several applications from promising colleges and universities are now being processed, and the Executive Council will deliberate on these at the Chicago Congress.

#### PART II

##### The Fourth Delta Sigma Rho Congress

And now a few words about the coming Fourth Delta Sigma Rho Congress. The merits of this type of forensic venture need not be repeated here. The place of the properly directed and supervised legislative discussion in a well-balanced forensic program has been well established. The coming Congress gives promise of being the best one we have ever had. The student congress has now "come of age." We have had enough experience with this activity that the "bugs" are now pretty well worked out. A special committee of experts has spent many hours in conference to work out the final blueprint for the coming Congress. Professor Thorrel Fest of Colorado, general director of the Congress, with the able assistance of William Howell of Minnesota, John Keltner of Oklahoma, and Jeffrey Auer of Oberlin, have worked most diligently and enthusiastically to give us the rules of procedure and a detailed formula for conducting a high quality Congress within a period of two short days. I do not think that I exaggerate when I say that the Congress has the makings of the best of its kind held in this country during this forensic year. The quality of this forensic venture will give the student delegate a rich and unusual experience which may be the high spot of his entire college career.

Although the central and primary purpose of the Congress is to benefit the students, let us not forget that its purpose is also to benefit the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho. It is our one single act by which we, as a National Society, may come together to discuss our mutual aims and problems. The Congress poses as an excellent medium by which we, as a national body, may reappraise our work in the presence of each other, and thus strengthen our bonds of unity, and make us all more conscious of the larger meanings of our Society.

In these days honor societies everywhere are being weighed in the balance, and we may expect that tomorrow educators and college administrators will ask us to give some account of ourselves. It is evident, therefore, that Delta Sigma Rho needs the Congress, and the Congress needs Delta Sigma Rho.

As President of this Society, I sincerely hope that every chapter will make a sincere effort to have at least one representative at our meeting in Chicago.

E. C. BUEHLER  
University of Kansas  
March 1, 1949

## What Happens to College Debaters?\*

H. L. EW BANK (OW)

Sponsor, University of Wisconsin Chapter

A partial answer to this question is that a good many have attained positions entitling them to inclusion in *Who's Who in America*.

According to our 1928 Directory, there were about 5,500 members of Delta Sigma Rho at that time. Of this number, at least 551 are included in Volume 25 of *Who's Who*. In addition, I find 57 members whose biographies appear in earlier editions but not in the latest. This list consists of those who have died and those who for a time held positions automatically entitling them to listing in *Who's Who*. The total of 608 means that about one-ninth of our membership in 1928 have achieved considerable distinction.

Of the 551 whose biographical sketches appear in Volume 25, slightly more than half (52%) are members of Phi Beta Kappa.

A complete analysis of the positions held by our 608 alumni is not yet available. I can report, however, that there are 53 college or university presidents; 25 judges, including two

justices of the United States Supreme Court; 61 business executives; 43 members of governmental boards and commissions; 45 who hold, or have held, elective office as congressmen, governors, or senators; 46 churchmen, including 5 bishops; and 32 authors, journalists, or publishers.

Of special interest, though it is not clear whether he is a member of Delta Sigma Rho, is the biographical sketch of Carl Schurz Vrooman. He represented Harvard in debate with Yale in 1893 and Oxford (England) in debate with Cambridge in 1895. He spent seven years abroad investigating social and economic conditions, reporting his findings in *McClure's*, *Review of Reviews*, *Atlantic Monthly*, etc. From 1914 to 1919 he was assistant secretary of agriculture. He is "scientifically farming 4,300 acres of land in central Illinois and Iowa."

\* This is a preliminary report of a more complete study in progress at Wisconsin.

## The Fourth Biennial Student Congress . . .

PLACE—Congress Hotel, Chicago, Illinois

DATES—March 31, April 1 and 2, 1949

Plans are being completed for the Fourth Biennial Student Congress, and it is expected that this meeting will be the most successful of its kind in the history of Delta Sigma Rho. A full report of the Congress, including a photograph of the General Assembly, will be presented in the May issue of the *Gavel*.

The Faculty Committee on Arrangements has chosen as the public question for consideration: *What Federal legislation should be enacted regarding civil rights?* Committees will be organized around the four basic rights considered by the President's Committee on Civil Rights in its report, *To Secure These Rights*. The four sub-topics are:

1. The right to safety and security of the person.
2. The right to citizenship and its privileges.
3. The right to freedom of conscience and expression.
4. The right to equality of opportunity.

The Faculty Committee on Arrangements is composed of Professors J. Jeffery Auer, sponsor of the Oberlin chapter; William S. Howell, sponsor of the Minnesota chapter; John W. Keltner, sponsor of the Oklahoma chapter; and Thorel B. Fest, sponsor of the Colorado chapter, chairman. The Faculty Committee on Local Arrangements is composed of Professors William N. Birenbaum, sponsor of the Chicago chapter; Hugo E. Hellman, sponsor of the Marquette chapter; and Glen E. Mills, sponsor of the Northwestern chapter, chairman.

### C A L E N D A R

#### Thursday, March 31

5:00-10:00	Registration Period	8:00- 8:30	Preliminary Assembly
	8:30-10:00		Preliminary Caucuses

#### Friday, April 1

8:30-10:00	Opening Assembly	6:00- 8:00	Official Banquet
10:00-12:00	Main Committee Meetings	8:00-10:00	Joint Conference Committee Meetings
12:00- 1:30	Lunch	8:00-10:00	Delta Sigma Rho Business Meeting
1:30- 5:00	Main Committee Meetings		

#### Saturday, April 2

8:30- 1:00	General Assembly	2:00-	Evaluations Committee
2:00-	Steering Committee	2:00-	Legislative Committee

# How An Observer Can Help A Committee . . . \*

JOHN W. KELTNER

Sponsor, University of Oklahoma Chapter

Too often someone says, "To kill an idea, appoint a committee." The applications of this thought are discomfiting and even dangerous. Committees are the heart and soul of the democratic system. Creative policy making and decision through committee discussion form the core of our way of life. We would expect, therefore, that the committee discussion would be one of the most efficient operations in our society. Too rarely is this true. The criticism of the "committee system" is forcing us to the disjunction of either abandoning committees in favor of authoritarian decisions or of exerting some concentrated effort toward their improvement. This latter alternative is obviously more desirable. To this end a system of group self-analysis is being developed by experiment and practice. Basic to this system is the work of the group observer.

Committee efficiency depends upon at least five basic criteria: 1. Clear objectives or goals; 2. Practical techniques of group thinking; 3. Effective personal orientation and interaction of the members; 4. Effective use of time; 5. High quality of the final product. The effectiveness of a committee can be improved as these standards are met. To meet these objectives, a committee may be trained or may train itself at three different points in its life; before it meets to discuss, during the discussion, and following the discussion. Both before and after the discussion the timeliness and expediency of improvement are rather hypothetical. During the discussion the committee faces the problem of improving its techniques under the immediate pressure of the active needs of the group.

## WHAT THE OBSERVER IS.

The effectiveness of a committee can be improved during the discussion by a special group agent called an observer. It is important that we recognize the observer as an *agent* of the group. He is not a "critic" as we commonly construe the term. He is neither pedant nor judge. His distinctive character is as a *reporter* whose major aim is to see *what is happening* and to report this to the group. He is, in a sense, a "mirror" whereby the group can see itself *as it operates*. The observer's role is as an impartial *examiner* of the group's methods of procedure and operation. He is interested in *how* the committee works rather than *what* it works on. His job is to help the group function more effectively by providing an insight into the inner machinery of the group process. This insight into the inner machinery of the process can best be provided by a person removed from the stress of participating in the discussion itself.

The observer may be a member of the committee who is given the special assignment of viewing the group in action. He may also be a specially trained person who observes the group without having the responsibility of title membership in the group. In either case, however, the observer must be considered as part of the group because he performs a vital func-

tion in developing group skill.

## WHAT THE OBSERVER DOES.

To assist the group the observer performs several functions of major importance. First, he *describes the process* used by the particular committee as it works. The well trained observer will be able to see and describe the various factors and variables of the procedure and operation of the committee as it attacks the problems on its agenda. The job of evaluating the worth of the process must eventually be done by the committee itself. Only in rare cases and only at the request of the chair or members of the committee should the observer be required to evaluate the procedure explicitly. We do not deny that there is a distinct element of evaluation in describing the processes and calling attention to obstacles and problems in method. These, however, are for the most part still at the descriptive level for the observer and should be reported only as observed facts.

The second function of the observer is to *record the progress* of the group toward its stated goals or objectives. This job may be shared with a special recorder or secretary who keeps a running account of the content of the discussion. The observer, however, is responsible for checking on the appearance of goals and of the progress of the group toward reaching those goals. While this at first may seem to involve more attention to the content of the discussion than is consistent with the purpose of the observer, it is nevertheless a vital part of the functional procedure. The observer is concerned with how the group arrived at its goals and not with the goals themselves as matters of content.

The third function of the observer is to *report his findings* to the committee. These reports consist of summaries and descriptions of the group as it operated. In many cases it is desirable that the observer report his findings orally and also in writing. The written reports then become part of the journal of the group and are valuable as training and reference sources in the study of each group. Such written reports also provide the committee with a source to which they may return to discover how they have progressed over several sessions.

The fourth function of the observer is to *stimulate the committee to work toward more efficient operation*. In this respect we must keep in mind that the observer should be considered a *member of the group*. Even though his contributions are limited to the matters of procedure, he should have regular member status. As an agent of the group he should be able to use the pronoun "we" instead of

\* As a special feature of the 1949 Delta Sigma Rho Congress, a corps of observers is being trained to meet with the several committees. It is expected that the educational values of the Congress will be greatly increased by this innovation. Professor Keltner is in charge of this feature of the Congress.

"you" in his reports to the group. This relationship should be a real one and not artificially imposed upon the committee. (We don't deny that the use of the pronoun "we" often helps to create the feeling of belonging, but it should grow deeper roots than a mere title.)

Stimulation of the group requires that the observer know the members well. It requires him to be aware of the motives of the members of the committee and of the group as a unit. This he must determine before and during his observations of the active group process.

Finally, the observer tries to *work himself out of a job*. His function is to sensitize the members of the group to their own processes and procedure. When active members of a committee become able to assess their own procedures the observer becomes less necessary. The more his work can do to develop self-observation on the part of the members, the more effective the discussion becomes and the committee depends less on the observer. Ideally, a committee which reaches the maximum efficiency does not need his service. Unfortunately we have never encountered such a committee.

#### HOW AND WHEN THE OBSERVER WORKS.

The functions of the observer require him to have a system of observation and recording. He is present at all sessions of the committee; at special sessions as well as the regular agenda meetings of the group. He is introduced at the first session, and a short time is given to him to explain what he is doing and how the group can use his services. From this point on, he is considered as an integral part of the committee.

In order to describe the process, the observer keeps a running account of the progress of the discussion. This account includes at least six factors of importance to the group function.

A record of *participation* is made. This record includes an identification of the persons speaking and of the number of times that a given member speaks. It also includes a classification of the nature of the contributions. Each contribution may be identified as to its particular role in the discussion. Contributions are placed in classes such as fact giving, fact question, opinion giving, testimonial, personal attack, procedure suggestion, etc. The observer thus has an idea of the typical "role" played by each member of the committee in the process of group thinking. This material is vital to the process of group growth. This participation record also includes observations as to the speaking techniques being used by the members.

Drawing from the participations of the group members, the observer attempts to *identify the various attitudes* of the members. He needs to identify those attitudes that are cooperative, antagonistic, "signalized", prejudiced, over-critical, and the like. This job is difficult and the results must be reported with care and good will.

The observer also records the *evidences of group unity*. He sees the group as a unit and points out those places in the discussion at which unity was broken by conflict and division. When possible, he identifies those factors in the group procedure that are causative

in developing undesirable division. At the same time he avoids the dangers of evaluation as such by merely describing the events as cause.

The *progress of the group toward the statement of and understanding of its goals* and its progress toward these goals is noted. Instances where the group breaks away from its goal-direction without intent or meaning are pointed up and the time and cause identified.

*Leadership functions* are a part of the observer's record. The methods and techniques of asking questions, making suggestions, handling conflict, and stimulating discussion are noted and reported back to the group.

The observer also notes the *reactions of the members* to each other. Evidences of strain and stress between members, of cliques, of attractions, and of isolation are important to the understanding of the group process. These notes are made as the evidence appears in the group. They can rarely be in great detail but are clearly and accurately identified. The margin for error here is great. Good observers explain these observations with care and reservation.

Reporting the observations is done in two ways. The first is through oral "feedbacks" to the group *during* the meeting. These reports are made at those times when the observer is called on by the chairman or a member of the group. (The usual question is, "How are we doing?") The chairman should watch for points at which the group can absorb the "feedback" with greatest benefit and advantage.

At the end of the discussion, the observer presents a summary report. *Time is set aside in each meeting to discuss the report of the observer and to work out methods of improving the work of that committee.*

The second method of report is through the written record, which becomes a part of the journal of the group. The observer presents his report to the secretary as soon after the meeting as he can. There is usually opportunity for members to check these notes personally prior to subsequent sessions of the committee. The observer is often available to interpret these and to answer questions. In no case should the observer be placed in a position to defend his report. It should be viewed as one man's point of view. The degree to which a group will have confidence in his work depends upon the skill that he demonstrates in his reports.

The reports of the observer are objective and explicit. They are concerned with telling a group what it did. At the same time, however, he may use several techniques of *stimulating the group* to do something about improving its discussion. The "shock" method consists of laying out the faults with blunt precision. This method is full of danger unless there is a good spirit in the group. It can be very effective. The "good and bad" method consists of pointing out those factors that seem to work and then the factors that were inhibiting the discussion. This is a valuable method of reporting. The "problem" technique is the third and probably the most effective of the devices. It consists of presenting the observations as factors of a problem in group development and as important in getting good results.

# Do We Teach English?

W. ROY DIEM (PS)  
Sponsor, Ohio Wesleyan Chapter

Not long ago I listened to a speech by the mayor of one of the large cities of America. He gave a thoroughly interesting talk, one that held the rapt attention of an audience of six or eight hundred people. He was vigorous, fluent, concrete. But his language was marked by the syntax of a semi-literate person, though he is a college man. Such expressions as "he who I was the guest of" and "I was setting across the table from him" made one wince who was sensitive to correct English.

So far as I know, the mayor had never been trained in debating; but when I listen to the garbled English used by many of our intercollegiate debaters, and too often, I am afraid, allowed to go uncorrected by coaches and judges, I wonder if we teachers of speech are doing what we can to induce the use of correct and effective English.

I have just sat through the six rounds of a state debate tournament, in the capacity of critic judge. I kept a record of the objectionable English used by the debaters, jotting down verbatim the grammatical errors, the unclear sentences and clauses, the examples of typical debaters' jargon, the illustrations of locutions correct in themselves, but objectionable from too frequent use.

I think it might be helpful to try to classify, at least roughly, the types of error, as we can better teach our students good English if we can make them understand why certain expressions they use are objectionable. It may be helpful also for the benefit of students who are working to improve their English to suggest preferable methods of expression, where the error is not at once obvious. In the following paragraphs, I have so treated the errors I culled while listening to the six debates of the tournament.

In the first category are listed grammatical errors: failures to secure agreement between subject and verb, or between antecedent and pronoun, wrong use of verb tenses, wrong forms of relative pronouns, etc. Here are illustrations of this type of error:

"The taxes collected by these states *is* not as high as. . ."

"In a report from NEA News, *it* stated that. . ." (*it was stated*; better, A report in NEA News of such and such a date stated. . .)

"Equal educational opportunities *is* needed."

"The low educational figures in the South *is* due to. . ."

"It would be drawn up after all the data *was* in" (data is plural)

"They are not near-sighted enough to not want to improve the education of the people" (They are not so near-sighted as not to wish to improve. . .)

"The taxes that Ohio are not putting on the states are these" (These are the taxes that Ohio is not levying)

"States *who* because of inadequate financial

power" (*which*---resources)

In the second category, I place errors of diction. Here are illustrations:

"There are *inequities* in our educational system" (The context showed that *inequalities* was meant)

"The states are not *giving* as much *finances* to the cities as they could" (*financial help*)

"We believe that education is a states' right" (a function of the states)

"Let's take the control *angle*; let's see exactly what that means" (Let's take the argument that federal aid to schools would lead to federal control of the educational process)

"*irregardless*" (no such word: regardless)

"*maintainance*" (maintenance, accent on the first syllable)

"I have just proven the need, due to the shortage of teachers" (I have just called attention to the need for federal taxes which arises from the shortage of teachers)

"School equipment is in bad *shape*" (condition)

"The *amount* of dollars . . . *amount* of people" (number)

"the *amount* of control" (degree or extent)

"*subsidation*" (subsidization)

"*particulary*" (particularly)

"We *feel* that money is no criterion" (contend, maintain, insist, submit, etc. Many debaters use *feel* too much and too loosely)

"A large *portion* of her people come in from other states" (proportion)

"This is merely a scattered statement" (a vague, loose, or unsupported statement)

In the third category, I list a few expressions which seem to be peculiar to debaters:

"I have this quote of Benjamin Fine, in regard to . . ." (Here is a statement made by. . .)

"To quote Dr. Benson, *he* has stated. . . ." (*who* has stated; or better still, To quote Dr. Benson:)

"They must prove to *us*. . ." (Debaters are not required to prove things to their opponents; their arguments are addressed to the judge or the audience. The word *prove*, a very important one in the vocabulary of debaters, is generally abused by them. It means to generate conviction in the minds of the judge or audience. It is ridiculous and inaccurate for debaters to say, as they constantly do, "I have proved." Only the judge or the audience knows if you have proved. Better say, "I hope I have proved," or "I have tried to prove")

"I have pointed out" (Debate speeches often sound like exercises in the conjugation of "point out", I have pointed out, you have pointed out, he has pointed out, etc. There are many alternative expressions that may be used instead of "point out": show, argue, state, demonstrate, contend, etc. Occasionally the expression "point out" is used in a wrong sense, in the sense of "contend" or "argue": "Our opponents have pointed out. . . This is not true." The

(Continued on Page 51)



## And Now To Define The Terms . . .

ROY C. NELSON  
Colorado A & M College

The quality of any debate depends to a large extent on a concise, accurate, and honest appraisal of the main terms in a resolution. Although almost all textbooks on argumentation carry chapters on definitions of terms and principles to be followed, yet many high school and college debaters are perfunctory in analyzing the questions they debate. In listening to hundreds of debates over a period of years, I have observed many recurring deficiencies in the interpretation of the resolution. Among the most common faults have been:

1. Strained and limited definitions for purpose of strategy.
2. Quibbling over terms when no issue is at stake.
3. Failure to contend definitions when they are issues.
4. Failure of affirmative plan to correspond to the terms as defined.
5. Reliance on dictionary definitions.
6. Inefficiency in the use of language.
7. Confusion over the meaning of the word "should".

### STRAINED DEFINITIONS

In any debate it is good argumentation to find areas of agreement so that the real areas of disagreement can be located and discussed. The meaning of the proposition should be one of these areas of agreement, and this agreement should be reached as early as possible in the debate. Often standing in the way of reaching agreement is a timidity on the part of the affirmative to accept the burden of advocating a far-reaching change. Frequently a question of policy is a statement calling for a bold solution, and the first of the faults mentioned above results when the affirmative shrinks from its responsibility by torturing the proposition to mean something less than it really does. If debate is merely an intellectual sport with a favorable decision from a judge as its major goal, then the affirmative is right in assuming as little burden of proof as possible by obscuring the real issues with fuzzy definitions. But if debate consists of informative and persuasive speaking, which seeks to clarify the thinking of an audience on an important problem, the affirmative should thoroughly analyze the proposition so that the discussion which follows will be significant.

In listening to a debate before the war on the proposition, "Resolved: That the United States should form an alliance with Great Britain," I heard an affirmative define "alliance" as a mere trade treaty. True, this affirmative presented an air-tight case for a trade treaty; but in so doing, it missed an opportunity to enlighten the audience on a possible military course of action for our nation in those critical days.

### QUIBBLING

Many negative teams accept the principle that definitions of the affirmative must in every case be challenged. Some negatives attack affirmative definitions ostensibly to take up time

so as to prevent the affirmative from developing its case. These practices cannot be defended as good strategy; certainly they are not good debate. The writer remembers what might have been an excellent debate on the proposition, "Resolved: That the federal government should provide a system of complete medical care available to all citizens at public expense," marred by the negative's insistence in its four speeches that "complete" meant total in an absolute sense. From the audience's viewpoint, such quibbling is tedious and dull. If the affirmative has interpreted the question fairly, the negative can do no better than to accept that interpretation, compromising on minor differences, if necessary.

### FAILURE TO CONTENT DEFINITIONS

Because of the nature of the wording of some propositions of policy, there may be an honest disagreement over the meaning of a term or of a term or of the entire resolution. In such case the meaning of the term becomes a bone of contention. When this occurs, the issue is primary. Agreement must be reached before going on to other arguments. There can be no real debate when each team is, in fact, debating a different proposition. In the proposition, "Resolved: That labor should be given a direct share in the management of industry," disagreement over the meaning of "direct share" was frequent. Once the author heard an affirmative team define "direct share" by advocating a plan of labor-management advisory committees, similar to those adopted by industry during the war. Without challenging this definition, the negative presented the same idea in a counterplan as a solution to the need which it had admitted. Of course there was no debate. This negative could have saved the time of everyone concerned with an announcement that it was in complete agreement with the affirmative solution, and then sat down. Here was a case in which a term should have been the main issue.

### PLAN NOT CORRESPONDING TO TERMS

If the affirmative argues a specific plan, it is traditionally presented in the second affirmative constructive speech. Intervening between the definition of terms and the plan are nearly all of the first constructive speech of the affirmative and all of the first constructive speech of the negative. The affirmative plan must meet the terms of the proposition, but sometimes the affirmative is remiss in that it ignores its own definitions and presents a plan which does not fulfill the requirements it has previously set up. This error could be overcome by the first affirmative speaker's sketching the affirmative plan immediately following the definition of terms and at that time showing how the plan meets the obligations of the affirmative under the proposition. By using this method of explication, the affirmative plan could also be the means of defining the proposition, for there is no better way of making meaning clear than by specific example. Wishing to

keep the negatives from attacking their plans as long as possible, affirmative teams may object to this procedure for reasons of strategy. But if an affirmative has a good plan, there can be no point in keeping the negative from debating it. When need is admitted by the negative, as it sometimes is, the main issue of the debate centers on the affirmative plan. There can be no logic in allowing two constructive speeches to be wasted before the real issue is presented to the audience.

#### RELIANCE ON DICTIONARY

Many college and high school debaters do not always realize the limitations of a dictionary as an authority for obtaining the meaning of terms in a debate proposition. Too often *Webster's International Dictionary* is the only source quoted. Semantics has demonstrated that words do not have absolute meanings; that some words have many meanings; and that words are modified by context. It is quite obvious that "federal", "world", and "government" standing by themselves mean something different from "federal world government" phrased as one term. The proposition must be interpreted as a whole; and to do that, the aid of specialized authorities in the fields of government, education, law, or to whatever field the proposition may apply must be drawn upon.

#### ECONOMY OF LANGUAGE

Perhaps one of the most frequent errors in defining terms is inexact verbiage. To define terms so that they may be comprehended with the least possible mental effort by the listeners and at the same time to make the meaning unmistakably clear is the goal toward which both teams should strive. A word cannot adequately be defined by a mere synonym. Neither can a term be made clear by explaining it in more technical language than the original. Nor should it be necessary to use up the major portion of the first constructive speech to explain the meaning of the proposition. Purely personal judgments and loaded labels add little to debating and certainly need to be avoided in defining terms. Economy of language results from a careful choice of specific, concrete, and objective symbols. To achieve this result, definitions cannot flow from the inspiration of the moment but must be thoughtfully prepared beforehand.

#### MEANING OF "SHOULD"

As the word "should" appears in almost every question of policy, its meaning ought, therefore, to offer no problem to the experienced debater. However, anyone who listened to the debates on "Federal World Government" last year knows that this auxiliary verb caused considerable perplexity. Even in some of the debates at the West Point National Tournament, quibbles arose over the meaning of "should". To avoid confusion over the interpretation of "should" may perhaps be one of the reasons the N.U.E.A. Committee eliminated it entirely from the current national high school question: "Resolved: That the United Nations now be revised into a federal world government." Nevertheless, "should" is implied even in this proposition.

Then what does "should" mean in a question of policy? Does it mean the policy *would* be

adopted? Does it mean the policy *could* be adopted? Does it merely mean that morally and ethically the proposal *ought* to be adopted? To answer these questions, the author believes that the affirmative is under no obligation to show that its plan would be accepted and written into law; however, the affirmative must demonstrate that the proposal is feasible, practicable, and possible, or that it could be adopted. Legality and constitutionality must be waived by both sides. The affirmative may argue that its proposal ought to be adopted for ethical and moral reasons, but it must do more; the affirmative must show that its plan is attainable and the necessary instruments can be created to put it into operation. In support of the proposition, "Resolved: That the federal government should adopt a policy of equalizing educational opportunity in the tax supported schools by annual grants," the affirmative may advocate equality of educational opportunity as a desirable democratic goal, but the practical means of achieving this ideal must be demonstrated.

With the prevalence of various public opinion polls, negative teams have frequently used these polls as evidence. They argue that a particular proposal *should* not be adopted because a majority of the people are opposed to it. To accept this argument would be to make debating *per se* ridiculous. Carrying this argument to its logical conclusion would result in replacing a discussion of the merits of a policy by a sampling of public opinion by Dr. Gallup. It should be remembered that many federal and state statutes were once bitterly opposed by an overwhelming majority. One of the purposes of debate is, of course, to convince that majority of the wisdom of the proposed course of action. Public opinion, continually responding to argument in our press, radio, and legislative halls, is seldom static. That is as it should be. Public opinion becomes a "should" factor only when widespread acceptance is necessary to insure the practicability of the plan. Prohibition of manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages illustrates a case where such an argument is valid.

An article well worth the attention of every coach and debater is one by F. W. Lambertson, entitled, "The Meaning of the World 'Should' in a Question of Policy," appearing in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* for December, 1942. After examining the viewpoints of many authorities in argumentation, Professor Lambertson concludes: "A plan 'should' be adopted if it is wise, good, desirable and practicable; if, of all the alternate courses of action, it will most adequately remedy the existing or threatened evils."

#### AGREEMENT THROUGH PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

In seeking to remedy these troublesome areas in determining the meaning of a resolution, various forensic tournaments have experimented with a short conference preceding the debate. With the critic or judge acting as moderator, the two sides discuss the proposition to iron out any differences in interpretation. This method is effective in helping the participants reach agreement before the formal speeches begin,

(Continued on Page 51)

## Forensics At The Grass Roots . . .

RALPH A. MICKEN (L)

*Sponsor, Iowa State College Chapter*

In cooperation with the adult education section of the Extension Service, Iowa State Debaters have for the past several years carried on an interesting series of debates and discussions called the Community Visits. These visits are made throughout the state, to Farm Bureau township halls, adult education classes, church clubs, high school assemblies, and service club dinners. Since the second year of the program we find that we have a core of steady customers—communities to which we are invited year after year, but each winter we add to our list and take on new visits. Trips vary in length from over one hundred miles to four or five miles. They come at night or noon as a rule. Last winter we limited the number of sessions to thirty, but even this limitation left us with one hundred and twenty participations from a Debaters personnel of about eighty.

Procedure for setting up this program is well established. In the fall the off-campus committee of Iowa State Debaters selects five or six current issues of state, national, or international interest and puts them in the form of discussion topics. These are then talked over with the Agriculture Extension Sociologists. What this really amounts to is clearing the subjects with Dr. William H. Stacy, Delta Sigma Rho '17, who is one of the mainstays of the Community Visits program. From the preceding process comes the final list of subjects, and the club immediately sets out to study these. This year's list of subjects, which is fairly representative, is as follows:

1. What should be done about national farm price supports?
2. What constitutes a good home?
3. Should educational opportunities be equalized through Federal grants?
4. What is the present status of Russian-American relations?
5. Should the Taft-Hartley Law be repealed?
6. How is E. R. P. working out?
7. What should be our attitude toward the Chinese conflict?

Frequently a subject is a follow-up on some topic of the preceding year. An example of this is our current E. R. P. subject, which has been called for in communities where speakers discussed the pro and con of the Marshall Plan a year ago. As an endorsement of the timeliness of the National Debate subject concerning Federal Aid to Education, we find that it is usually in demand in the various communities even though we make no deliberate attempt to use this activity as a training ground for inter-collegiate debate.

A letter is prepared for state-wide distribution. This letter goes to the county extension directors of the state, to certain superintendents of schools, and to program directors of service clubs. The limiting factor on our mailing list is accessibility of the community. Early in the series we were forced to decline invitations to

some places because of the time it would have taken to reach them. We avoid overnight trips.

The student reaction to these trips has been very interesting. They are probably our most popular form of forensic activity at Iowa State. As a matter of fact, in an ordinary season twelve or thirteen of our speakers limit their participation almost entirely to community visits. Reasons for student enthusiasm go well beyond the fact that visitors are frequently treated to wonderful country dinners. Debaters like the idea that there is much vigorous participation from the floor. There is none of the feeling of taking part in a little performance or entertainment which sometimes characterizes the appearance of "college boys" on an adult program. The setting for these meetings engenders the feeling of getting down to cases. The fact that speakers could reach out and put a hand on members of the audience at any of these meetings seems to encourage free interchange of comment. Whenever a call goes out for volunteers for one of these trips, we are forced to disappoint several speakers, but in the course of the winter all of these are taken care of.

It has been of some interest to us to discover what methods of presentation are most popular with our audiences. Originally the meetings were organized on a panel discussion basis. Our speakers, and occasionally one or two speakers from the community, formed a panel to discuss a subject for twenty minutes to a half-hour, after which participation from the audience was invited. As time went on we turned to the methods of debate. People wanted cases presented for and against the various proposals. In response to this desire for "pro" and "con" presentation, most of our meetings begin with a series of five to eight-minute speeches—two affirmative and two negative. After this the presiding officer invites audience participation. What happens after that is unpredictable but almost always interesting. Heated discussions are the rule, with citizens of the community taking sides and vigorous give and take continued until late at night. Often a vote is taken, and occasionally the minority members for the evening are not satisfied with one vote but demand another ballot. Not at all infrequently certain members of the community have been warned in advance and come with overwhelming proof in defense of their chosen side. Such speakers have been known to make things very uncomfortable for seasoned veterans of intercollegiate advocacy.

Frequently the objection has been advanced that the kind of activity of which we have been talking encourages haphazard preparation and mediocre presentation. With some topics this criticism might be justified, but debaters have discovered that if they are to discuss the topic of Farm Price Supports before a group of Iowa farmers, it would be just short of suicidal to prepare carelessly and to present the argument

ineffectively. If ever there was a tendency on the part of our speakers to take a casual attitude toward community visits, it has been beaten out of them by bitter experience. Each new year's participants are reminded of an occasion fairly early in the history of community visits when a couple of our "big city slickers", casually presenting the subject of Free Trade, found themselves surrounded by an entire audience of articulate farmers who were completely loaded on the subject. If this doesn't produce the right results, we tell them of a panel which appeared in another Farm Bureau meeting to present the case for and against the

Marshall Plan, only to discover that three members of the audience had recently returned from an extended tour of inspection of Europe. As a matter of fact, most speakers would be more willing to take on intercollegiate competition under-prepared than to take a trip to the township hall at Rustic Center, Iowa, in the same condition.

By and large, Iowa State Debaters' attempt to carry forensics to the grass roots has been an instructive and beneficial experience, and we should like to hear more about the methods and experiences of other chapters along similar lines.

## Do We Teach English?

expression properly used implies that that which is pointed out is true.)

"There are great inequalities in the states that have not been taken care of." ("Take care of" is frequently used by debaters to mean "reply to" an argument: "Our opponents have not replied to our argument that great inequality of educational opportunity exists in the several states.")

"We find that 77% of the people are opposed" (Omit "we find." "It is unnecessary, and it weakens the force of the statement by putting the more important idea in the subordinate clause.)

Of the final category of miscellaneous garbled and unclear expressions I shall list only a few. It would prolong this paper unduly to set down all I collected. Many of them are the result of the haste and excitement that often afflict the more inexperienced debaters. Others are the result of the too great brevity of style which debaters affect as a result of the fact that they are constantly discussing the same subject before their debate classes. Vague allusions to an idea that has frequently been discussed in the class are thought to be sufficient. The only way to overcome this type of looseness of expression is the practice of rigorous criticism by the debate teacher. Here are some illustrations of these garbled and loose expressions, or of expressions too compact to be clear:

"They brought up the political football argument" (They introduced the argument that a program of federal aid to education would become a matter of political manipulation)

"It is a problem of reorganizing things within the state" (The real problem to be solved is

the problem of improving the efficiency of the state educational systems).

"Education is being retarded because of this lack of money that is being placed in the hands of educators" (The chief need of education is a more adequate financing program)

"The teacher situation is very low" (There is a critical shortage of teachers)

"We have seen this work in foreign countries, which I have shown by England" (. . . as I have shown by citing the experience of England)

I am sure that the expressions I have listed as examples of the kind of English our debaters use are familiar to every debate teacher. I have suggested that one way in which we can secure a constant improvement in the use of English by our debaters is the practice of rigorous criticism. One thing else we can do, and that is to hold before our students the idea that it is vastly better to say a few things well than to say many things badly. Our debaters are too much obsessed with the notion that they will be judged by the amount of material, evidence, statistics, etc., that they can pour forth in ten minutes. Let us give them a different idea and a different ideal, the idea that quality counts more than quantity, and the ideal of English as a medium that can be beautiful as well as utilitarian, that can contribute to aesthetic appreciation and to understanding at the same time. We do not want to promote a formal or pedantic style, but we have a right to demand correctness, accuracy, and clarity in the use of language. The pleasure that the judge or audience may receive from listening to limpid and graceful language will be so much clear gain, even though the main end of the debater must always be to gain conviction.

## And Now to Define the Terms . . .

and it is successful in eliminating many of the deficiencies which grow out of defining terms. When this procedure is used, it should be remembered that for the debate to be intelligible to the audience, the audience must possess the same understanding of the meaning of the resolution as the two teams. Any preliminary discussion of terms should, then, be conducted so as to benefit the listeners as much as the participants.

## GOOD DEFINITIONS MAKE FOR GOOD DEBATING

Proceeding with a sound philosophy of debate and knowledge of the principles of the use of language, the debater need have no difficulty in defining the proposition. If in any debate the state of the controversy is sharply delineated so that the real dispute of the matter can be attacked, then good work in grasping the meaning of the resolution has been accomplished. When this is true, proponents and opponents of the proposition, critics, and audience will enjoy stimulating argument.

## The Oberlin College Forensic Union . . .

J. JEFFERY AUER (L)

*Sponsor of the Oberlin College Chapter*

Discussion and debate are the essential tools of a democracy. Since the earliest town meetings in New England, the American people have relied upon these tools to guide them to effective and intelligent action. Today we discuss our common problems, the nation's business, in service and civic clubs, farm and church groups, high schools, women's clubs, community forums, and similar organizations. The foundation for this discussion should be a bedrock of carefully integrated facts and honest opinions, freely expressed and critically considered.

One of the contributions we believe a college may take to this widespread public discussion is to furnish trained student speakers, capable of providing provocative and critical analyses of current public questions. Since 1927, Oberlin College, through the Forensic Union and the Department of Speech, has offered such a service. This service is available without charge to organizations within a reasonable distance of Oberlin; there is no tariff on public discussion. Organizations are requested to furnish transportation for the speakers or to reimburse them for their travelling expenses, but otherwise the service is a contribution of Oberlin College.

The Forensic Union programs for 1948-1949 center in six major public questions or topics. These topics are presented in discussions or debates by two, three, or four speakers, who welcome a forum period for comments or questions by members of the audience. The length of the programs may be arranged to fit the time schedule of the participating organization. The six public questions for 1948-1949, as named and described in a folder sent to a large number of organizations in northern Ohio, are:

1. "Do We Want Federal Aid for Education?"  
(Ohio spends much more money per pupil for its schools than does Mississippi. Can local communities and states offer equality of educational opportunity? Should federal funds balance the account?)
2. "Should We Outlaw the Communist Party?"  
(The authors of the Mundt-Nixon Bill claim that Communism is today's greatest threat to America? Is it true? What can we do about it? Is suppression the

- American way to meet the problem?)
3. "Is the UN Out of Date?"  
(“Yes!” say those who believe that only a federal world government can survive the atomic age. “No!” say those who still have faith that the United Nations can keep the peace.)
  4. "How Can We Safeguard Our Civil Liberties?"  
(What basic freedoms are threatened in America today: minority rights? Free speech and press? The right to vote? Religious tolerance? How can we make these freedoms everybody's business?)
  5. "What's Holding Up the Peace?"  
(“Cold war . . . get tough . . . appeasement. . .” What are the real problems that create crises in Berlin, China, Palestine, Korea, and the Balkans? Is America's foreign policy adequate to solve them?)
  6. "Should We Revise the Taft-Hartley Law?"  
(Candidates in '48 faced this question; now it belongs to the new Congress. What changes are being advocated? What will they accomplish for labor? For management? For the public?)

Since 1927, when the Oberlin College Forensic Union went into the business of providing public discussion programs for clubs and organizations, its members have visited communities in almost every section of northern Ohio and in three neighboring states. The following is the list: Amherst, Ashland, Attica, Avon Lake, Bellevue, Berlin Heights, Berlinville, Birmingham, Brighton, Brooklyn Heights, Brunswick, Castalia, Chardon, Chatham Village, Chicago (Illinois), Clark, Cleveland, Cleveland Heights, Columbus, Conneautville (Pennsylvania), Crestline, Cuyahoga Falls, Doylestown, Elyria, Fairview, Florence, Fostoria, Galion, Gibsonburg, Greencastle (Indiana), Haskins, Henrietta, Homerville, Huron, Lake Forest (Illinois), Lakeside, Lakewood, LeRoy, Litchfield, Lorain, Loudonville, Mt. Gilead, Mansfield, Marblehead, Medina, Minerva, Monroeville, Napoleon, Niles, North Canton, North Ridgeville, Norwalk, Oberlin, Penfield, Pittsfield, Polk, Port Clinton, Ravenna, St. Charles (Illinois), Sandusky, Seville, Shreve, Spencer, Sullivan, Toledo, Valley City, Vermilion, Wadsworth, Wakeman, Wellington, Willard, York.

## With the Chapters . . .

### ALLEGHENY

Highlighting the first semester of forensic activities at Allegheny was a thousand-mile, five-day debate tour the first week in February. Nine debaters participated in eighteen contests at Dickinson College, Shippensburg State Teachers' College, Lafayette College, Lehigh University, Temple University, Swarthmore College, LaSalle College, and St. Joseph's College in

Philadelphia. Although most of the debates were non-decision, Allegheny won five of the six decision debates. Members of the debate squad making the trip were Jean Isherwood, Patricia O'Connell, Robert Blomquist, Jeff Hopper, Mark Funk, Al Krall, Barbara Bounds, Evan Engstrom, and Austin Swanson.

Debating in the annual Mt. Mercy Tournament on February 19 were Jean Isherwood, Pat

O'Connell, Barbara Bounds, and Don Wargo. Allegheny is also planning to send debaters to the annual tournament at Washington and Jefferson College and to the Penn State Debaters' Convention.

Plans for the Second Annual Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Forensic Tournament at Allegheny on March 11-12 are complete. Twenty-four members of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges have entered 28 teams in debate, twenty contestants in oratory—seven in the women's division and 13 in the men's and 23 contestants in extemporaneous speaking—eight in the women's division and 15 in the men's.

The Allegheny chapter of Delta Sigma Rho initiated two members on January 21, Raymond McCall and Frank Fitch. The former, a varsity debater since his freshman year and twice president of Philo-Franklin Union, was winner of the Men's Extemporaneous Speaking Contest this year and will represent Allegheny in the state tournament. The latter, also a varsity debater since his freshman year, is one of the five Allegheny juniors chosen to participate in the Washington Semester plan of study at American University in Washington, D. C. He will return to Allegheny next fall for his senior year—and another year of debating. Varsity debater Louis Meyer, who graduated in January, is a member-elect. Participating in the initiation ceremony were Alleghenians Dr. Chester A. Darling (A), professor emeritus of biology and geology; Dr. John E. Cavelti (WES), professor of chemistry; and Dr. Paul B. Cares (AL), associate professor of history; and Miss Mildred Ann Ditty (IU), the chapter sponsor.

#### BATES

Bates is again carrying on the tradition of international debating which was begun many years ago. On March 22, two Bates men, William Stringfellow and Charles Radcliffe, upheld the affirmative of the Federal World Government proposition in a debate with Cambridge University, England. The debate was held at Lewiston. The first international debate of the year was held on January 19, when a Bates team faced the University of New Brunswick in a non-decision debate. Bates also met New Brunswick during the 1947-48 season. The Bates speakers, who upheld the affirmative of the Federal World Government question, were Rae Stillman and Max Bell.

Both the annual Sophomore and Freshman Prize Debates were conducted in two divisions this year. There were two debate topics up for discussion in each case, with the winning teams and the best individual speakers chosen by the faculty judges. Max Bell and William Dill were chosen the best sophomore speakers; and David Moore and Roderick Nicholson, the best freshman speakers.

During the first semester of the current season, 22 Bates debaters participated in 34 intercollegiate contests, the largest number of debate contests in any one semester in Bates' history. The contests included three intercollegiate forums, four high school debate clinics, two radio debates, one intercollegiate match, and six recorded debates. Bates debaters won nine

varsity decision debates, and won five and lost three junior varsity debates.

#### DEPAUW

Thirteen schools attended DePauw's Delta Sigma Rho Invitational Tournament on February 5. They were Ball State, Butler, Capital, Georgetown, Indiana State Teachers, Knox, Manchester, Taylor, Purdue, University of Illinois (Chicago), Wabash, Wayne, and DePauw. Five schools entered two four-man teams. The best record of 7-1 was made by Wayne Georgetown, Wabash, and DePauw. DePauw's second team made the only 6-2 record. Bob Zimmer, Carlton Hamm, and Bill Gildner served Coach Forrest Seal as chief assistants.

At the Bowling Green (Ohio) Tournament, January 7 and 8, Ray Payne and Bill Brown made a 4-1 record in the preliminaries, entered the quarter-finals, and were defeated there by the University of Illinois (Chicago). Howard Downs and Hugh Hawkins won three in the preliminaries.

On January 15, Coach Seal's squads emerged from two tournaments in second place. At Illinois Normal, Reg Arvidson, Ray Payne, Howard Downs and Hugh Hawkins won eleven out of twelve. Meanwhile, Henry Lewis, Jim Cobb, Roger Ragan, and Rex Ragan won second at Indiana University with a 6-2 record.

Sixteen debaters from Greencastle attended the Purdue Novice Tournament, February 12. They won twenty, dropped twelve, and had three of the tourney's five undefeated teams.

At Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, DePauw used free substitution and entered sixteen debaters in the three rounds. They brought home a 6-6 record. Jim Cobb placed third in extempore speaking.

Next on the DePauw schedule is the Wabash-Earlham-DePauw meet. This annual affair is the oldest triangular meet in the Middle West. Ray Payne, Reg Arvidson, Howard Downs, and Hugh Hawkins will attend the University of Wisconsin Tournament, March 18 and 19.

Members chosen to attend the Delta Sigma Rho Congress are Carol Firchau, Roger Ragan, Howard Downs, and Hugh Hawkins. Dr. Herold Ross, chapter sponsor, will accompany them.

#### ILLINOIS

"The Illinois Chapter has six undergraduate, three graduate, and six Speech staff members active this year. Officers are: President, Dorothy Hawver, BA '49; Secretary, Vincent Thompson, Law '52; Treasurer, Arno Hill, Grad. The chapter has undertaken this year to trace all alumni members. A letter has been sent to the alums, with a request for information concerning their activities and achievements. As soon as this information is collected, we hope to be able to answer the question, "What happens to Illini Delta Sigma Rho Alums?" The chapter again sponsored a campus parliamentary institute, this year at the request of, and in conjunction with, the Student Senate.

"Directing the debate program this year are Halbert E. Gulley, King Broadrick, and Howard Shuman. Mr. Gulley is Supervisor of Forensics, having succeeded Richard Murphy to that position. Membership and program have been expanded, and Men's and Women's De-

bate has become the Illini Forensic Association. Seventy-five student members are active in the debate program, about a third of that number having already participated in intercollegiate meetings. The weekly radio forum on the University station, WILL, has now become a regular part of the program. Debaters attended conferences at Iowa, at Bradley University, and had a number of individual debates and forums on the campus.

"Featured in the second semester will be international debates with Toronto, Hawaii, and Cambridge Universities. Coming the second semester, also, will be the Western Conference meet in Chicago. Illinois plans to send a full delegation to the Delta Sigma Rho Congress in Chicago on March 31."

#### IOWA

Both at home and away, Iowa debaters and discussers are having their most active forensic season since the war.

On campus, in addition to the half-hour weekly radio University Student Roundtable on questions of the day, Iowans are also engaging in many intercollegiate activities. On February 10, four debaters, George McBurney, Murray Kniffen, Edward Diekmann and Charles Thodt, presented a demonstration debate before classes in argumentation at Grinnell College. On February 11, the debaters from William Jewell College engaged Iowans in two practice debates on the intercollegiate question; Iowa debaters were Henry Clark, Sherwin Markman, Gilbert Pearlman, and Charles Thodt.

On March 4-5, the University again sponsored an invitational Intercollegiate Conference on World Problems. Some sixteen universities and colleges participated during the two-day sessions in four rounds of debate, four periods of discussion followed by a student senate, extempore, public and after-dinner speaking.

The annual Hancher oratorical contest to determine Iowa's representative in the Northern Oratorical League will be held in early April. President Hancher will award a cash prize to the winner, who will be chosen through a series of preliminaries and a final contest, at which the President will preside.

Away from home, Iowans are participating in two invitational forensic meets. On February 25-26, four students participated in debating, discussion, extempore speaking, and oratory at the annual Nebraska tournament at Lincoln. On March 18-19, another group is participating in similar activities at the University of Wisconsin tournament at Madison.

Iowa's spring forensic season on the intercollegiate level closes with the two main events of the year. On March 25-26, four men and four women will participate in the annual Western Conference League men's and women's debate tournaments held simultaneously on the University of Chicago campus. One week later, four students will return to Chicago for the National Delta Sigma Rho Student Congress.

#### MARQUETTE

Marquette's debate program for the current season includes participation in five major tournaments, attendance at the biennial Student Congress, about a dozen exhibition debates, and

playing host to a dozen visiting teams in practice debates on the campus.

Marquette's season was officially opened with attendance at the Iowa Intercollegiate Conference in World Problems at Iowa City. After Christmas, activity began with the participation of two teams in Northwestern's "Grand Western Tournament." On March 3 Marquette entered two teams in the Northwest Tournament at St. Paul, and on March 18 four teams were entered in the Delta Sigma Rho Tournament at the University of Wisconsin.

Four delegates and four alternates will be sent to the Delta Sigma Rho Student Congress on March 31.

On March 12 the Marquette Chapter sponsored and conducted the Archdiocesan Senior Debate Tournament for Catholic High Schools in the Wisconsin-Illinois area. Sixteen high schools participated in the tournament which ended in the crowning of a regional debate champion.

Members of the Chapter, under the direction of Dr. Hellman, the chapter sponsor, working as the Varsity Debate Researchers, are again at work preparing a background book for high school debaters on next year's high school debate question. This book will be off the press in September, and will again be made available to high schools all over the country at cost as a service of the Marquette Chapter.

#### NORTHWESTERN

Since the last copy was prepared for this column, the varsity men's debate squad has competed successfully in three large tournaments and has furnished programs for community audiences. Early in January, four men won 13 of their 15 debates at Bowling Green State University and received the gold trophy symbolizing first place in the Great Lakes Area Tournament. A few weeks later, 10 men won 14 of their 18 debates at DeKalb to place first in the experienced division of the Golden Anniversary Tournament sponsored by Northern Illinois State Teachers College.

On February 12, Northwestern entertained the Grand Western Tournament. Two-hundred fourteen debaters from 41 colleges in nine states engaged in a total of 260 debates. The University of Florida received the trophy for winning nine out of 10 debates. Purdue was awarded second-place medals for eight wins. Northwestern varsity men, who conducted the tournament, won nine out of 10; but they declared themselves ineligible for the trophy when the tournament began.

The women's squad, which includes several freshmen, has been represented in three tournaments in 1949. Four women won ten out of 12 debates to rank among the best in the experienced division of the tournament at Illinois Normal University. Another foursome placed third by winning six of their eight debates in the tournament sponsored by Eastern Illinois State College. Ten women won 5 of ten debates in the Grand Western tournament on the Northwestern campus.

The junior varsity men tied for first place with 6 wins in 8 debates in the freshman-sophomore tournament at Purdue University. On the same day, other "jayvees" won 6 of their

ten contests in the Grand Western.

Future events include the St. Thomas, Wisconsin, Western Conference, and Grand National tournaments, and the Delta Sigma Rho Congress.

Sander Vanocur, who is a junior, a varsity debater, and a Hardy Scholar, won the annual prize of \$100 in the John B. Kirk Oratorical Contest, held in February. He will represent Northwestern in the Northern Oratorical League contest, to be held at Western Reserve University in May.

#### OBERLIN

The chief innovation in Oberlin's forensic program this season has been the Debate Clinic on World Government, attended by nearly 300 high school students from northern Ohio, and sponsored by the Department of Speech and the Forensic Union. The clinic opened on Nov. 23 with a symposium, "What are the Prospects for World Government?" with Col. M. Thomas Tchou, director of the World Citizenship Movement; Dr. Vernon Nash, vice-president of United World Federalists; and Dr. John B. Mason, visiting professor of political science, as speakers. An analysis of the high school debate topic (Federal World Government) was presented in a second symposium by William H. Vobach, James A. French, and William R. Catton, Jr., all members of the Forensic Union. Following a period of informal discussion, and a display of published materials relating to the debate subject, the clinic concluded with a debate on the desirability of Federal World Government. The visiting British Universities Debate Team, Messrs. Reginald Galer and Anthony Cox, upheld the affirmative; opposed to the motion were Robert M. Kingdon, president of Forensic Union, and Richard B. Anliot, president of Delta Sigma Rho.

High point in first semester intercollegiate debate was the first place won in the state women's debate tournament by an affirmative team of Eve Gorsuch and Nancy Sutton, undefeated in six contests, and a negative team of Nancy McCombs and Nancy Lewis, winning half of their six debates. In mid-January, Oberlin again played host to the annual Legislative Assembly of the Northeast Ohio Debate Conference. Delegates from fifteen schools considered the question of Civil Rights in a day of committee discussion and parliamentary debate.

The usual "circuit-riding" activities of Forensic Union members began early in the fall with a series of discussions of "Presidential Platforms of 1948," continued to the last minute with a program before the Elyria Rotary Club at noon on election day. Twenty-two discussion programs were provided during the first semester for clubs and forums in northern Ohio, and present indications are for even greater activity during the second semester.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

The Pennsylvania chapter is continuing its year's activity by making plans to send at least one representative to the Delta Sigma Rho Congress and also to hold the annual spring meeting of the undergraduate and alumni members. Some progress is being made in increasing the chapter membership, and it appears that a group

of six students will be eligible at the spring election.

An extensive debate schedule with several out-of-town trips has been maintained, this work being primarily under the auspices of the University Debate Council. The chapter members continue to be the most active leaders and debaters in the University Debate Council.

#### WHITMAN

The Whitman debate team entered the Linfield meet at McMinnville, Oregon on February 24, 25, and 26. Those participating were: Craig Esary, Gordon Jaynes, Carlan Heathcote, Bonnie Marolf, Carmen Gleiser, Joy Mott, Mary Jo Reed, Dona Gerstenberger, La Rene Bushnell, Edith Loss, Shirley Brown, Patty Jo Johnson, Herb Dykstra, Ernie Miller, Clayton Michaelis, John Pennington, Jack Doty, and Dave Allard. Those divisions which they entered were debate, oratory, interpretive reading, and after dinner, extemporaneous, experimental, and impromptu speaking.

A second important event is the meeting of the Pacific Forensic League, which will be held on the Whitman campus from April 12-15.

#### WISCONSIN

"As is its custom, the Wisconsin chapter of Delta Sigma Rho will sponsor the annual Delta Sigma Rho Forensic Tournament in Madison on March 18 and 19. Thus far over 25 schools have entered the tourney. The events that will be held are debate, discussion, oratory, and radio newscasting. The Wisconsin chapter sponsors the tournament with the aid of the Speech faculty and the Wisconsin Forensics Union, and it promises to be a very worthwhile tournament.

"Thus far this year, the debate squad of the University has entered tournaments at Northwestern and Eau Claire in addition to match debates with Toronto, Canada, Xavier, Northwestern, Mundelein, Loyola, Wheaton, and Marquette. The remainder of the calendar for the year will include the Western Conference Tournament at Chicago, the Delta Sigma Rho Congress in Chicago, and our own Delta Sigma Rho tournament."

#### YALE

"Our varsity squad has participated in home-and-home debates with Harvard, Wesleyan, Wellesley, and Amherst, winning seven of the eight contests involved. Our Freshman squad has split two home-and-home debates with the Taft School and the Choate School.

"In addition, the varsity entered the Boston University Invitational Tournament this February to defend the Austin Freeley trophy, won by us a year ago. George Washington University defeated us in the semi-finals and then went on to win in the finals against Notre Dame.

"During March, we shall meet Brown and Columbia in home-and-home debates and a team from Cambridge University, England.

"The Triangular Freshman and Varsity debates with Princeton and Harvard will probably take place in May."



## Delta Sigma Rho . . .

## Chapter Directory

Code	Chapter Name	Date Founded	Faculty Sponsor	Address
A	Albion	1911	J. V. Garland	Albion, Mich.
AL	Allegheny	1913	Mildred Ann Ditty	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 Qumby	Lewiston, Me.
BE	Beloit	1909		Beloit, Wis.
BK	Brooklyn	1940	Orvin P. Larson	Brooklyn, N. Y.
BR	Brown	1909	Ralph Renwick, Jr.	Providence, R. I.
BU	Boston	1935	G. M. Sneath	Boston, Mass.
C	California	1922	Jacobus ten Broek	Berkeley, Calif.
CA	Carleton	1911	Wilder W. Crane	Northfield, Minn.
CH	Chicago	1906	William N. Birenbaum	Chicago, Ill.
CLR	Colorado	1910	Thorrel B. Fest	Boulder, Colo.
COL	Colgate	1910	Carl A. Kallgren	Hamilton, N. Y.
COR	Cornell	1911	H. A. Wichelns	Ithaca, N. Y.
CR	Creighton	1934	Rev. Paul F. Smith	Omaha, Nebr.
DP	DePauw	1915	Herold T. Ross	Greencastle, Ind.
EL	Elmira	1931	Geraldine Quinlan	Elmira, N. Y.
GW	George Washington	1908	George F. Henigan, Jr.	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	Louise Goble	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	N. Edd Miller	Ann Arbor, Mich.
MH	Mt. Holyoke	1917	Clarice Tatman	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.
NEV.	Nevada	1948	Bonnie Yturbidie	Reno, Nev.
ND	North Dakota	1911	John S. Penn	Grand Forks, N. D.
NO	Northwestern	1906	Glen E. Mills	Evanston, Ill.
O	Ohio State	1910	Harold F. Harding	Columbus, Ohio
OB	Oberlin	1936	J. Jeffery Auer	Oberlin, Ohio
OK	Oklahoma	1913	John W. Keltner	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	Edward W. Carter	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 Drushal	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			