

1-1958

Complete Issue 40(2)

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. (1958). Complete Issue 40(2). *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho*, 40(2), 17-32.

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

✓
Bob Scott

the gavel

volume 40

number 2

**of
delta
sigma
rho**



**january
1958**

THE GAVEL

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho, National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS

By THE ALLEN PRESS

Editorial Address: Delta Sigma Rho, Box 245, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas

THE GAVEL has been entered as second-class matter at Lawrence, Kansas, 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 orders. 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 \$10.00. The official key of 10K (size shown in cut on this page) is \$6.00, or the official keypin of 10K is \$7.00. Cut diamond in key is \$7 additional. **Prices include Federal Tax.**

The names of new members, those elected be-

tween 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 two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive **The Gavel** may subscribe at the following rates: \$1.50 per year for the standard subscription; \$5.00 per year for those who wish to contribute to the work of **The Gavel** and who will be listed as sponsors in each issue; and \$25 for a lifetime subscription.



NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: Thorrel Fest, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

Secretary: John W. Keltner, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas.

Treasurer: Kenneth G. Hance, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Trustee: E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Honorary Trustee: Gilbert L. Hall, 1208 N. Wayne, Arlington, Va.

Vice Presidents: P. Merville Larson, Texas Tech College, Lubbock, Texas; Paul Boas, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; Brooks Quimby, Bates College, Lewistown, Maine; Winston L. Brembeck, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin; Herald T. Ross, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana; Clayton H. Schug, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania; Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon.

EDITORIAL STAFF OF THE GAVEL

Editor: John W. Keltner, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas.

Assistant Editor: Charles Goetzinger, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas.

Associate Editors: Halbert E. Gulley, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; Clayton Schug, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.; Paul Carmack, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Austin Freely, Boston, Mass.; Robert A. Lang, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

THE GAVEL

of

DELTA SIGMA RHO

VOLUME 40

JANUARY 1958

NUMBER 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Promised Land by <i>Charles Goetzinger</i>	17
President's Page	18
Gustavus Loevinger, 1881-1957	19
Mt. Mercy Forensic Activities in High Gear	20
Delta Sigma Rho Student Congress	21
Errata	22
When'er You Speak by <i>Howard T. Hill</i>	23
Possible Formats for presenting Debate to TV Audiences by <i>N. Edd Miller</i>	25
Subscribers' List	32

The Promised Land

BY CHARLES GOETZINGER*

The feeling of many individuals is that the launching of Sputnik I has marked the end of the so called anti-intellectual era.

Therefore, life on the college campus should now be moving back toward the good old days when brains were at least comparable to brawn, beauty and liquid capacity.

Sure sounds wonderful, even if it is only idle speculation. Because even if those statements are true (and this is a big IF), there is doubt that we will be around to enjoy this Renaissance.

There are three basic considerations that should be looked into before any conclusion can be reached. These are:

1. The fashionable art of being an intellectual may be just a passing fad.
2. Wanting to be an intellectual and pursuing the work necessary to achieve this status are two different things.
3. And last but not least, will the educational system be able to handle the strain of this intellectual resurgence.

In a country so dedicated to fads in everything from food to music, there is always the danger that this desire to be "Eggheads" will soon fade away. After all, we pleasantly ignored a crying for a revised educational system all these many years. Now under the pressure of an outside influence, everybody wants to make education tougher. "Let's go back to the three 'R's' and turn out a Thinking Individual" seems to be the password.

Those few solitary voices that have been crying in the wilderness lo these many years must feel like prophets vindicated.

However, what happens when the day arrives (as it will assuredly) that the United States once again goes into the lead for supremacy of space? Will the voices that now cry out in pain over our so-called mediocre education still be so concerned? Or, when the immediate objectives are reached, will we peacefully go back to business as usual?

*Charles Goetzinger is sponsor of the chapter at Kansas State College and Associate Editor of *The Gavel*.

(Continued on Page 20)

President's Page . . .

What Kind of Education?

The National Student Congress which meets April 10-12 in the Kellogg Continuation Center at East Lansing, Michigan, will be a most significant event to launch Delta Sigma Rho's second half century of forensic leadership. I sincerely hope that all chapters will be represented.

The Student Congress has always served as a symbol of democratic philosophy and self-direction. It represents the culmination of collegiate forensic training. This year its impact will be intensified as we meet in an atmosphere of international uncertainty and fear. The peril to our way of life and to our physical survival is real. The Student Congress will discuss education, one of the key factors in our ability to survive. In science and technology Russia has achieved more than many have been willing to recognize and possesses a capability of which only a few are aware. Thus the question, "What should be done to meet the challenge to American education posed by today's scientific struggle?" is vital. Federal aid to education seems certain. The question concerns the amount of aid and the areas in which it will be used. The defense of the free world will necessitate that science, mathematics and technology receive the most favorable treatment, for at the moment the race is being run in the laboratories, drafting rooms, and production engineering conferences.

Clearly our education is going to put more emphasis on mind and less on personality and physique, but with this increasing emphasis on intellectual aspects, what philosophy will govern and what balance will develop as the program is being carried out across the nation? What will happen to non-scientific areas of education? How much emphasis will be placed upon the humanities? What attention will be given to the more cultural aspects? How will all this be trans-

lated into training for the elementary and secondary school child? And perhaps of most importance, what types of teachers will be found in our classrooms?

These are the questions being asked by scholars, legislators and laymen. The answers may well affect the lives of both present and future generations. Constructive contribution to developing these policies is not only the right but the obligation of both students and faculty. I hope that representatives from your chapters will have the opportunity to share in these discussions.

We anticipate having as participating guests representatives from several institutions that are not presently members of Delta Sigma Rho. In addition, a charter will be presented to Michigan State University and a group initiation has been arranged to include all nominees from any chapters. Conveniently located in modern facilities that are modest in price, this Congress should find all chapters participating. I hope you have had this on your calendar and provided for it in your budget. The schedule appears elsewhere in this *Gavel*. Information from the Congress Committee, under the co-chairmanship of Charles Goetzinger and Victor Harmack, has already gone forward or will reach you soon. The rules will appear in the March *Gavel*.

This is also the time of the Biennial General Council meeting, when your chapter participates in reviewing the society's work and developing policies and programs for the next two years. The Nominating Committee under the chairmanship of Brooks Quimby, will welcome your suggestions concerning individuals to fill the various offices. Join us in East Lansing for the most important forensic event of the year!

THORREL B. FEST
National President

Gustavus Loevinger

MARCH 4, 1881—AUGUST 28, 1957

The Honorable Gustavus Loevinger, retired judge of the District Court of the State of Minnesota and the first secretary treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho passed away on August 28, 1957. Judge Loevinger was active in the work that went into the formation of Delta Sigma Rho and represented the University of Minnesota at the first meeting of the General Council of the society.

In those early years Judge Loevinger was responsible for publishing the original series of folders describing the nature and purpose of our society. The first folder is dated June, 1906. He became the third president of Delta Sigma Rho in 1909.

According to the records of the society Judge Loevinger was elected to membership in the forensic honor society at the University of Minnesota in 1905. It was this society that became the charter chapter of Delta Sigma Rho. He was elected a delegate to the first meeting of Delta Sigma Rho on April 13, 1906 but was unable to attend.

It was the extreme pleasure of all those who attended the Golden Anniversary of Delta Sigma Rho in Chicago in April, 1956 to meet Judge Loevinger and to benefit from his knowledge and information relating the beginnings of our society.

Judge Loevinger was known as one of the outstanding legal minds in the state of Minnesota and the United States. He wrote the *Minnesota Exclusionary Rules of Evidence*, which was used almost universally by judges and lawyers in the state of Minnesota. In 1938 over 200 attorneys in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area prepared a petition to President Franklin Roosevelt to appoint him to the U.S. Supreme Court. At Judge Loevinger's own request this petition was withdrawn.

Judge Loevinger was a scholar of considerable stature. He developed one of the most comprehensive Shakespearian collections in the Northwest. He was a constant student of psychiatry and psychology as well as of several languages and the classics. His

scholarship was not without insight into the lighter side of life. For some years he wrote articles on "Humor in the Courtroom" that told of interesting and amusing incidents.

Representing the principles of Delta Sigma Rho in his daily living, Judge Loevinger was active in many activities of his community. His work in scouting, settlement house work, social planning programs, aid to the handicapped and in teaching is vital testimony to his constant application of the standards of the society which he helped to establish. His work in the Criminal and Juvenile Courts was outstanding for its insight into the problems of the individual and for its contribution to the development of individualized justice.

Gustavus Loevinger came to this country from Germany as a child. He lived for a time in South Dakota. His college work was done at Dakota Wesleyan and the University of Minnesota. The University of Minnesota later bestowed the honorary LL.D. in recognition of his contribution to the field of law and scholarship.

Judge Gingold, writing in the *Commercial Clubs' News* of St. Paul in September of 1957 said of Judge Loevinger, "Judge Loevinger was a champion of the law of love and he did not believe that good could be accomplished through hostility and recrimination. Judge Loevinger had unshakeable confidence in the dignity of man. He believed that man is basically good. He followed the adage, 'If you treat men greatly, they will be great; and if you trust them, they will be faithful to you.'"

Dr. Carl Storm, in his "Remarks in Appreciation of Judge Gustavus Loevinger" in St. Paul on August 30, 1957 said, "Across the years, Judge Loevinger did much public speaking, and it was ever an enjoyable privilege to hear him. Not only did he always have something of substance to say, but he laced it with lightness of touch and brightness of laughter. This, it seems to me, was

a natural expression of Judge Loevinger's own love and appreciation of life. He loved life and lived it to the full, and he wanted for all others a life filled with as much joy and goodness as might be possible."

Delta Sigma Rho is honored to have had such a man in its midst. The example and the challenge of this founder will be forever

engraved in the living society of which we are a part. One can say that here might be one part of that glorious eternity . . . when a man's contributions live forever as part of the life, the habits, the thinking of those who follow. And we can honestly say, "We would have been less had he not passed our way."

Mount Mercy Forensic Activities In High Gear

Recent reports from the campus of Mount Mercy College indicate that the Delta Sigma Rho activities on that campus are in high gear.

On December 1, 1957 Mount Mercy initiated three seniors into Delta Sigma Rho: *Kathryn Anderson*, *Mary Grace Brennan* and *Rose Marie O'Connor*. The initiating team was composed of *Peggy McGill McDonough*, *Louise Koenig*, *Carol Ertzman* and *Maureen Fits Scheurmann*. Faculty, friends and parents attended the initiation ceremonies. Among the guests was *Gloria Gallagher Berry*, a Mount Mercy graduate and one of the honored DSR members who were initiated at the Golden Anniversary Jubilee.

In addition to the regular DSR activities the forensic program at Mount Mercy has included an extempore contest for all Mount Mercy College varsity debaters. This was held on Monday, October 21. First place was

awarded to *Kathryn Anderson* and second place to *Mary Grace Brennan*.

For the first time, Mount Mercy is participating in the National Public Discussion Contest. Taking part are seniors *Kathy Anderson*, *Mary Grace Brennan*, *Rose Marie O'Connor* and junior *Marla Jean Cohen*.

A team of four cadets from the United States Military Academy debated four Mount Mercy novice debaters on Friday December 13. On December 14 the college sponsored a novice debate tournament. The winner of that tournament was St. Vincent College of Latrobe, Pennsylvania.

The varsity debaters of Mount Mercy tied for second place in the annual Delta Sigma Rho tournament held by Allegheny College on December 7. They also participated in the University of Pittsburgh cross examination style debate tournament on December 13 and 14.

THE PROMISED LAND

(Continued from Page 17)

In a nation so concerned with conformity, it wouldn't take a very large swing away from the immediate attitude to have public opinion shift back to the pre-Sputnik days. Suddenly other problems take on greater significance than that of a better educational system. That tremendous chorus of voices could trickle off to a few *isolated* individuals in a frighteningly short time.

But, for the sake of argument, let's assume that this trend is not temporary in nature. Then what do we have?

To become a true intellectual and properly educated is easier said than done. Now the

fun starts. "Everybody wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die," or in other words, everybody wants to be an "Egghead" but nobody wants to work. Sound cynical? It is in a rather loose sense of the word.

Today the average student discourages rather easily when faced with hard work. Society dictates (or did until Sputnik) that in many things the easy way is almost as good as the hard way. But if the pressure for intellectualism increases, how do we convince people there is no short cut to a real education.

To turn out a string of mass-produced Ciceros may sound nice to the average citizen,

(Continued on Page 31)

Delta Sigma Rho Student Congress

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

April 10-12, 1958

The 1958 Delta Sigma Rho Congress will be held at Michigan State University April 10, 11 and 12, 1958. Several important items should be mentioned now so as to allow ample preparation for the Congress.

1. The congress topic will be "What Should Be Done to American Education by Today's Scientific Struggle." While further information on the topic will be forthcoming, it will be wise for each school to start working immediately on its own.
2. The Congress will be held in the Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. A block of rooms in the Center's hotel have been reserved for those attending the Congress. When writing for reservations, tell them you wish rooms in this group.
3. The Student Congress proper is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Procedures. The chairman of this committee is Austin Freeley, now of John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio. All correspondence dealing specifically with the Student Congress is to be sent to him. Austin and his committee will have charge of setting up and running the committee sessions, legislative sessions and all other details dealing with student participation.
4. The over-all chairmen of the 1958 Congress are R. Victor Harmack, University of Colorado and Charles Goetzinger, Kansas State College.

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1958

Registration and Coffee	1:00- 4:30
Opening Session	5:00- 6:00
Dinner	6:15- 7:15
Caucuses	7:30- 9:00
Sponsor Forum	7:30-10:30
Executive Council Meeting	7:30-10:30
Opening Legislative Assembly ..	9:30-11:00

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1958

Breakfast	7:30- 8:00
Main Committee Meetings	8:30-12:00
Business Meeting	8:30-12:00
Lunch	12:15- 1:15
Joint Committee Meetings	12:15- 3:00
Business Meeting	1:30- 3:00
Reception	3:15- 4:00
Legislative Assembly II	4:30- 6:00
Business Meeting	4:30- 6:00
Banquet and Installation of Michigan State Chapter	7:00- 8:30
Initiation of New Members	10:00-11:00

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1958

Breakfast	7:30- 8:00
Legislative Assembly III	8:30-11:00
Sponsor Forum	8:30-11:00
Lunch	12:00- 1:00

Tentative Faculty Committee Assignments

1. Committee on the Investigation of Subject Matter:

Chairman:

Lillian Wagner, Iowa State Teachers College

Members:

Gale Richards, University of Washington
 Rollin G. Osterweis, Yale University
 George F. Henigan, George Washington University
 Paul Boas, Oberlin University
 Thomas A. Hopkins, Mt. Mercy College
 Charles Parkhurst, Brooklyn College

2. Committee on Rules and Procedures:

Chairman:

Austin Freeley, John Carroll University

Members:

Edd Miller, University of Michigan
 Paul A. Carmack, Ohio State University
 Russel Windes, Northwestern University

Ex officio Members:

Charles Goetzinger, Kansas State College
 R. Victor Harmack, University of Colorado

3. Committee on Local Arrangements:

Chairman:

David Ralph, Michigan State University

Members:

Jack Bain, Michigan State University
Huber Ellingsworth, Michigan State University

4. Committee on Sponsor Activities:

Chairman:

Robert Newman, University of Pittsburgh

Members:

Rev. Robert F. Purcell S. J., Creighton University
Leroy Laase, Nebraska University
Stanley Kinney, Colgate University
Herman Cohen, University of Oregon
Harold Ross, DePauw University

Ex officio Member:

Thorrel Fest, University of Colorado

5. Committee for Banquet, Speakers and Installation:

Chairman:

Kenneth Hance, Michigan State University

Members:

R. Victor Harmack, University of Colorado
Charles Goetzinger, Kansas State College
Thorrel Fest, University of Colorado

6. Committee on Initiation:

Chairman:

Robert Weiss, DePauw University

Members:

Joe Lane, Marquette University
E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas

7. Committee for Evaluation:

Chairman:

Ronald Reid, Washington University of St. Louis

Members:

William Vanderpool, Grinnell College
Roger Nebergall, University of Oklahoma
James McBath, University of Southern California
George Sparks, University of Arizona

8. Committee on Alumni Relations:

Chairman:

Earl Wells, Oregon State College

Members:

Rupert Cortwright, Wayne University
John Keltner, Kansas State College

Errata

I.

On page 11 of the November issue of *The Gavel* the listing for the new members was titled ". . . 1957-1958." This should read ". . . 1956-1957." Several sponsors have written about this. In order to be listed in that particular list members should be approved in the secretary's office not later than August 31, 1957. Those coming into the secretary's office after that time will be listed in the 1957-1958 list which will appear in November of 1958.

II.

Through an error in our proof reading we

listed three new members in the wrong place in the November issue. Philip Frank Beach, Richard Walter Clark and Joyce Burdon Craig were listed from the Washington and Jefferson chapter. They should be listed with the Washington University chapter. Thus, the Washington University listing would be as follows:

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (3)

Philip Frank Beach, 1343 Thayer Drive,
Richland, Washington
Richard Walter Clark, 2132 White Cloud
Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming
Joyce Burdon Craig, 3719 40th, S.W.,
Seattle 16, Washington

"Whene'er You Speak"

BY HOWARD T. HILL*

Kansas State College

The current general catalogue of Kansas State College lists for the Department of Speech sixty-nine courses. This statement is made, not to enlist your interest in taking the courses nor to suggest quantitative comparison with other fields, but to emphasize that it is practically within one life-span that work in speech has achieved such recognition as to receive college and university credit.

The present academic acceptance of speech might cause you to wonder why its late recognition. The reason is not hard to find. Prior to the life-span to which I referred, there was no reason why academic recognition should be given. Training in speaking was an artificial process which produced what was known as "Elocution." As a boy I participated in some of the tragic ceremonials resulting from such training. I use the term "tragic ceremonials" advisedly. "Tragic" is defined by Webster as "involving the suffering implied in tragedy." And by definition "ceremonial" carries a strong implication of "stiffness and decorousness."

Some of you have experienced, and the rest can imagine the effect of this stiff, prescribed method of training. The impression upon an audience is reminiscent of a comment by the late humorist, George Ade. He said he had attended a concert which featured a certain soprano singer. "She was not," Mr. Ade reports, "a regular city soprano, but one of the kind used to augment the grief at funerals."

But it is characteristic of the world that it improves, though there is sometimes a doubt. So with the business of being trained to communicate with an audience. With complete and enthusiastic recognition of the several allied areas in the field of speech

training, with which I have neither the time nor the expert knowledge to deal, I shall speak primarily of Public Speaking, which is now dignified and made more academic, (and probably more stuffy) as "Public Address." Indeed for many years, and until other areas were recognized, departments were known by the title "Public Speaking." Such was the case at Kansas State when I arrived and it remained so for some years. The logical, indeed inevitable, inclusion of other areas caused the universal adoption of the title "Speech."

The realization that speaking is the process of oral communication of thought turned a few intelligent pioneers from the froth of elocution to the substance of practical public speaking.

Among the first of these were Thomas C. Trueblood, and Robert I. Fulton.

Trueblood, like many a youngster today, became interested in speaking while in high school in a little Quaker academy near Salem, Indiana. "On Friday afternoons," he writes, "from three to four, we recited poems, passages of eloquence from the great orators, and occasionally dramatic selections." Later, at Earlham College, he found his only opportunity to participate in speaking in the Ionian Literary Society. He committed to memory and recited Will Carleton's poem "The Chicago Fire" which he presented several times with success.

Then Mr. Trueblood made a very wise decision. He put himself in the hands of James E. Murdoch, an eminent actor of the day. He later studied with S. S. Hamill, a pupil of Murdoch's. Studying with Mr. Hamill at the time was William Jennings Bryan. One may disagree violently with Mr. Bryan's theology, yes, even his politics, but no one can gainsay that he was the "peerless orator" of his day, and that he spoke to more people in that era than any other American, with the possible exception of Theodore Roosevelt.

Among the students of Mr. Fulton were the late President Woodrow Wilson, Senator

*Howard T. "Doc" Hill is the former head of the department of speech at Kansas State College. He retired from administrative duties in 1954 and since that time has been actively teaching in the department. The article here is an abridgment of his remarks at a dinner held in his honor on December 10, 1957. At that time "Doc" Hill was being honored as one of the outstanding teachers at Kansas State College. He was chosen for this honor by vote of his faculty colleagues. We are privileged to have "Doc's" permission to print here some of the parts of his speech.

William E. Borah, and James Whitcomb Riley.

I mention the actor-teacher background of these pioneers to point out one of the fundamentals of effective speaking which so many modern teachers, preachers, and lecturers have discarded or never realized. No effective speech has ever yet been made that did not have in it some elements of the dramatic, modulation of the voice, gesture, posture.

After various experiences of practical training they set out to find a location for what was then known as a School of Oratory. They were impressed with Kansas City as a growing town. So they rented quarters on Baltimore Avenue and opened the school. However, as I have heard Mr. Trueblood say, it soon became evident that the landlord was more anxious for his rent than the people of Kansas City were for instruction in speaking. The partners therefore agreed that one of them would keep the doors of the School open, while the other sought to organize classes in some of the nearby college towns. Trueblood went to the University of Kansas. This work was conducted, by the partners in turn, at Washburn, Park College, the University of Missouri and on other campuses.

Finally, Mr. Trueblood, after various negotiations, was placed on the faculty of the University of Michigan and Mr. Fulton at Ohio Wesleyan, college credit was given for their work, and the academic status of training in Public Speaking was established.

Another pioneer, who came from the East in 1868 and was a longtime friend of Dr. Trueblood was Dr. R. L. Cumnock, who established the Cumnock School which has developed into the Northwestern University School of Speech. In his first year Dr. Cumnock received forty dollars in salary from the University, and for the next three years one hundred dollars each year. He reports that it was not until 1915 that Northwestern allowed any academic credit for work in Public Speaking.

Imagine, if you will, a College Dean bundled in a coon skin overcoat, his sleek bald head exposed to the winter winds off Lake Michigan, careening around the street corners in a bright blue convertible, the terror

of the Evanston Police. That was Ralph Dennis, Dean of Northwestern's School of Speech for many years and a major contributor to the recognition of Speaking and to its improvement. It was Dennis who, approaching his retirement was asked by a student what he planned to do when he retired. "I'm going to do what I've always wanted to—buy an airplane and learn to fly it." As the book of Genesis records, "There were giants in the earth in those days."

I now turn to myself. I have neither the age nor the record of accomplishment to permit claiming the status of a pioneer. However, a few notes as to my experience in Kansas may prove interesting to someone besides me.

One September evening I had just finished the chores on the Iowa farm where I grew up, when a long Mitchell touring car screeched into the drive on two wheels and out jumped Professor Arthur MacMurray, my teacher in Public Speaking at Iowa State. Said he, "Howard, do you want to teach Public Speaking for a year in a State University?" In keeping with the way Mac and I always did things, I replied, "Yes, where is it and when do we start?" He told me that it was at his Alma Mater, the University of Kansas. A few days later he called me to say "Governor Hoch wants to see you at the Eldridge Hotel in Lawrence tomorrow morning at ten o'clock."

I met the distinguished ex-Governor, who with the late Mrs. Cora G. Lewis of Kinsley and Ed Hackney of Wellington, constituted the Board of Administration, now the Board of Regents.

I spent the day with Governor Hoch, one of the most memorable days of my life, made so by that engaging personality and stalwart character, and, by the way, a powerful speaker. After lunch we went to the Governor's room. Like Clarence Buddington Kelland's short story character, Scattergood Baines, Governor Hoch "could think better with his shoes off." So off they came, and with his head propped by pillows and his stockinged feet on the foot board of the bed, he prepared me for Kansas.

(Continued on Page 26)

Possible Formats For Presenting Debate To TV Audiences

BY N. EDD MILLER*

The essential problems in presenting a debate on television are those which have long been recognized in debate formats on radio. In his *Argumentation and Debate*, Crocker states these two essential considerations as time element and ear-appeal.¹ We can, in television, add, of course, eye-appeal. Most of the formats used in presenting debate on television have been keenly aware of these special considerations. With these in mind, let us consider briefly some possible formats for presenting debate to television audiences.

(1) *Orthodox forms*—The orthodox type of debating with alternating affirmative and negative speeches can be used as one possible format for television debating. Often, however, this type of presentation presents problems in conforming to the time element, and often it lacks both ear-appeal and eye-appeal. Consequently, some modifications are frequently made in this style of debating before putting it before television cameras. One interesting variation has been described by Glen Mills for the program called "Debate" and presented weekly on a Chicago station. Debaters were not college students, but adults who were themselves authorities on the topics debated. This procedure, however, is one that could well be used in a college debate program. For each debate, there were two debaters, three judges, and an announcer. Mills outlines the procedure followed:

In his opening continuity, the announcer defined debate, stated the speaking order and time limits, announced the judging procedure, and introduced the two debaters and three judges. The speaking order was as follows: eight minutes for the affirmative, eight minutes for the negative, three and one-half minutes for affirmative rebuttal, and three and one-half minutes for negative rebuttal. Each judge then told which side he voted for and why. In closing, the announcer

thanked the principals, asked for comments, and announced the next debate.²

These modifications suggest ways in which the conventional debate pattern can be modified for television.

(2) *Cross-question debates*—The cross-question type of debating is apt to be of somewhat greater interest than the conventional type of debate with its straight public speaking. Wayne State University has used the cross-examination type of debating with each speaker giving a speech, standing for questions from an opponent, and asking questions of an opponent. The debate has been concluded with a five minute critique and a decision from a critic judge.

(3) *Courtroom debates*—Modified courtroom procedures have been used as a format for televising debate. At Michigan State University, for example, while the debate itself has elements of both the orthodox and cross-question styles, a court setting is used with a chairman or moderator sitting in the position of a judge, debaters, and an audience-jury. Each of the debaters gives a short speech, alternating between affirmative and negative. After the speeches, the jury asks questions of the debaters. An interesting factor added to this is the presence of a clerk with a telephone, so that viewers of the program may call in questions which the judge asks the debaters.

The University of Michigan has also experimented with televised debating in a courtroom setting. A judge, jury, debaters, and witnesses are present. The debaters act as attorneys and present their cases by calling witnesses and by cross-examining the witnesses of the opposition. The viewing audience is asked to respond by postcard in rendering a decision on the debate.³

(4) *Discussion-debate programs*—Many televised debates have used the informal give and take of discussion with its greater variety as a vehicle for the presentation of debates. This may be done, for example, in a format

*Edd Miller is sponsor of the chapter at University of Michigan. He has been active in the affairs of our society and directed the Golden Anniversary Congress in 1956.

which would call "for a short speech from each of the panel members (usually two affirmative and two negative), followed by a period of cross-questioning or informal round table type discussion."⁴

At the University of Illinois, a two-program format was used. Brockriede and Strother described it in this way:

We devote two telecasts to a current public problem. On the first, four panelists defined terms, explored historical background, analyzed cause-effect relationships, formulated goals, and considered possible solutions. On the second, two panelists returned to engage in a cross-examination debate on some issue which had emerged in the previous discussion.⁵

We may conclude that debate may be presented under the guise of discussion, or that problem-solving discussion followed by advocacy debate may be used.

(5) *Other types*—Other types of televised debate, of course, can be used. The University of Illinois has successfully presented a parliamentary debate on television.⁶ The formats of popular television shows like "Meet the Press" and other inquiry, interview, or hearing types may be adapted easily

for the presentation of national or controversial subjects. Brockriede and Strother suggest the use of the "direct clash debate and the presentation of readings on a current topic from critical journals most audiences have not read."⁷ We might add to that many more types—for example, the use of a dramatic vignette to present the issues on a controversial subject, to be followed by some type of debate; tape recordings or film clips of statements of leading public figures as the starting point for debate, etc. In brief, the only limiting factor to the multitude of possible debate formats for television is the imagination of the debate director.

FOOTNOTES

1. Lionel Crocker, *Argumentation and Debate*, (New York, American Book Company, 1944) p. 224.
2. Glen E. Mills, "Debate as Educational Television," *The Good of Delta Sigma Rho*, 39 (May, 1957), 87.
3. Edward Stasheff and N. Edd Miller, "Televising a Debate in a Courtroom Setting," *The Speech Teacher*, 3 (September, 1954) p. 215-219.
4. William M. Sattler and N. Edd Miller, *Discussion and Conference*, (New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 252.
5. Wayne E. Brockriede and David B. Strother, "Televised Forensics," *The Speech Teacher*, 6 (January, 1957), p. 31.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
7. *Ibid.*

"WHENEVER YOU SPEAK"

(Continued from Page 24)

That evening Governor Hoch took me to the top of Mount Oread from which we could view the quiet, moon-drenched valleys of the Wakarusa and the Kaw. About eleven o'clock we started back to town. En route we went through the little park across the street from the Douglas County Court House and sat down on a narrow, rusty old iron bench. There we sat, unmindful of any discomfort, until two o'clock in the morning. It was there that the Governor told me what the Regents wanted done.

He related an incident from his home town, Marion. A question of policy or project had arisen which caused the whole community to take sides, to argue, to quarrel with neighbors. A general community meeting was called and the issue discussed. Said the Governor, "The graduates of the University and of the State Colleges sat crouched in their corners and said nothing, or timidly

mumbled their disorganized opinions. Then there came to the platform a young man who had had practical training in speaking. He took the most ridiculous side of the question imaginable, but so effective was he that the community voted overwhelmingly for a project which will take them twenty-five years to pay for and fifty years to forget." The Governor continued, "We cannot prevent the skilled but unwise speaker from speaking, but we want our college graduates prepared to say their say effectively as well."

So, I was launched in teaching. As I recall, only two courses were offered. The Regents soon requested me to inaugurate two new courses. I wrote Professor MacMurray, who had decided to come to the University the next year, and asked him to send me brief outlines of the courses and catalogue copy so that, green as I was, I would at least be working along the right lines. MacMurray always wrote (when at all) on half sheets of paper with a brilliant purple typewriter

ribbon, the letters being punched out with his two index fingers. This was the reply I received—"Dear Howard, you know how to do that, go ahead and do it. Sincerely, Mac."

That letter taught me one of the most valuable lessons of my life. I began to think, well, if the old boy thinks I can do it, maybe I ought to think so, too. From that valuable lesson and from Mr. MacMurray's continued attitude as my Department Head, I developed a policy during my period of headship of the Department here.

As each new staff member was employed, I told him two things: first, "you were hired because I am sure you can do the job. Do not do it Hill's way, do it yours. I shall not stand behind your chair, breathing down your neck, but if I see something going wrong I'll call you in and if you have a question, bring it to me and I'll look up the answer." The second instruction was this—"if you can get a better job somewhere else, and we cannot or will not meet the offer, I shall not stand in your way; I'll help you get it."

Word of this latter policy caused some minor explosions: "You are deliberately making it easy for the best instructors to leave our boys and girls." To this I responded: "Of course, in our judgment we have the finest young people in the world, but an unbiased observer might find that there are equally good ones in Oregon, Texas, or Indiana. And the people in an admittedly underpaid profession should, not only for their own advantage, but for that of the students, be given every encouragement for improvement of their status." Interestingly enough, the opposite result from that feared by the critics occurred; the best people stayed longest because of the policy of freedom for them and their work.

At this point I should like to pay tribute to four men who have profoundly influenced my life and work in Kansas. At the University was Professor Arthur MacMurray. Not only was he an able administrator and delightful associate, he was a profoundly inspiring teacher. When he passed away, Prof. J. Gordon Emerson (better known as "Mike"), now at Stanford, who was a fellow

student with me under MacMurray, wrote "he made us speak better than we were."

On the campus of the University of Kansas in front of the law building, Green Hall, is a statue. It is the statue of "Uncle Jimmy" Green, long dean of the K.U. Law School.

At Dean Green's gracious invitation I sat in on many of his classes. He proceeded with deliberation, slowly. I don't suppose he ever finished a case-book in a semester in his life. But when the Law graduates returned from taking the State Bar examinations I observed that nearly all of them had their best grades in the difficult subjects taught by Dean Green. I said to one of them, "How does this happen?" He straightened like a soldier, looked me in the eye and said, "we would be ashamed not to get our best grades in Uncle Jimmy's subjects." There was a teacher.

Soon after coming to K-State I met a lovable, helpful, dignified, distinguished professor. He was long the Head of the Department of Economics, and at one time administered both Economics and Speech. He wrote a good Speech text of which I have the original typed copy. For his counsel and care I owe him much. A former member of the faculty once remarked, "I wish our students had more opportunity to associate with gentlemen of the old school, like Dr. J. E. Kammeyer."

Among the distinguished men who have served the Kansas State faculty was my former college mate "Mike" Emerson. Emerson was a valued colleague and friend, a superb teacher, an understanding counselor, a gentleman.

To these four and to many others who have contributed generously to my well-being I owe a deep debt, but I speak of them not solely because of personal gratitude but also because of their direct influence on my work and that of many others in the field of Speech and speaking.

What is the field of speech training? At Kansas State and at most other major institutions it includes these areas:

1. *General speech* which is comprised of Public Speaking, Speech Education, Discussion, and Forensics.

It has always been my conviction that the chief business of a Department of Speech is to help people learn to speak. The college graduate is inevitably called upon to express himself in public.

Some years ago the Chairman of the Curriculum Committee for the School of Agriculture called me to report on the results of a questionnaire sent to 600 graduates of that school. (As I recall, the number of replies was an astounding 540). Given lists of their available courses, they were asked "if you had your college preparation to do over, for what you are doing now, in the place where you are doing it, would you want more, less, or about the same as you had when you were here? Please check the appropriate column." This questionnaire was sent to graduates scattered over a forty year period, were located in all parts of the world, and were doing a wide variety of things. Said my caller, "You will be interested to know that there was just one unanimous answer—'we would have more opportunity in Public Speaking.'"

This incident is related, not to furnish claim that Speaking is more important than anything else in college; it isn't, but to show the importance in all walks of life and in all locations of the ability to face one's fellows and communicate.

The need for intelligent discussion in conference and committee is now recognized and expert training in its techniques is provided. By this process perhaps we can get away from the early-type panel discussion which too often consisted of five people sitting around a table interrupting each other.

Speech Education, studying the long and significant backgrounds of speakers and speeches, and preparing teachers to teach others to speak grows rapidly in importance, as we lay on our public, parochial, and private school teachers an increasing responsibility for developing the whole boy and the whole girl.

Forensics occupies a position of special significance. In a democracy questions are settled by the persuasions of argument, and groups are moved to decisions by the eloquence of the public speaker. Indeed, many

college Departments of Speech owe their origin directly to a growing activity in Forensics.

2. Speech departments offer training in *Dramatics and Interpretation*, allied fields with much to contribute to public entertainment, to the ability to speak, and upon occasion, to the building of public sentiment on important issues, as for example, was the case of the play, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

3. With what distress, perhaps amounting to terror, would you greet a sudden realization that *your* child was the victim of a speech handicap which interfered with his communication, embarrassed the child and would perhaps result in a maladjustment to life? Early in this century *speech therapy* emerged as a new profession. It was born with the birth of new techniques in medicine and public health. The Speech Therapist does not practice medicine, surgery nor psychiatry, though he often collaborates with the practitioners of each. He works on the speech handicap.

More than 65 American universities offer advanced degrees in Speech and Hearing Therapy. The profession is a member of the National Education Association and is recognized by the American Medical Association as an appropriate certifying agency for therapists.

4. The fourth area of speech training, with opportunity for the greatest expansion because of the rapid growth of the industry, is *Radio and Television*.

These are the closely interrelated areas of Speech Training, each contributing to the other, and all to the improvement of oral communication.

Speaking is not a science, it is an art. (Of course, in the more comprehensive field of Speech, there is much science, especially in Therapy.) But Speaking is an art. As Webster defines an art, it is "skill in performance." Success in it depends on a few, very few, fundamentals which remain as constant as Jack Benny's age. We need to proceed with caution in the modern effort to analyze, dissect and diagram lest we lose sight of these fundamentals and find ourselves lost in a confusing welter of statistics and regulations.

The first fundamental is "know your subject," this in order to be able to impart information, and there is another important reason. There is no better support for the speaker's self-confidence than the feeling that "I know my subject" and no surer invitation to butterflies in the stomach than the consciousness of poor preparation.

I recently judged a student speech contest in which a fine, intelligent freshman (though not of the \$64,000 Question variety) spoke on "The Social Significance of Sputnik," a subject which is baffling the leading thinkers of our time. He was surprised to be defeated by a lad whose subject was "Do Your Feet Hurt?" This young fellow was an experienced shoe salesman.

The second fundamental is "feel your subject." No one should be permitted to make a speech who is not convinced on the issue he presents or on the importance of the thing he is describing. He will not transmit to an audience a conviction which he does not have.

The third fundamental is "urge the subject upon your audience, make them feel it." Men do the greatest, or the worst things they do, not primarily because of what they know but because of what they feel.

The speaker must make his audience experience an impulse, feel an urge, want to do something. The early textbooks on speaking listed from five to eight "ends" or "aims" of speaking. The last one was usually "action." Isn't that the aim of all effective speaking? The preacher in the pulpit wants the congregation not only to understand the Scriptures but to stay sober, stop lying and do good. The teacher, (who is said to be a person paid to study the sleeping habits of students), wants those students not only to pass the examinations, but to prepare themselves to live happy lives, to support the pretty girls they will marry, to be active in their churches and to contribute to the United Fund. The debater wants the listener to believe, so that he can act on that belief. The actor wants his audience to laugh or to cry, rather than to concentrate on eating peanuts from the shell.

This college used to have an annual campus

chest day. An Assembly was held, an outside speaker was brought in, and contributions were solicited for off-campus causes. On one occasion the State University had just declared a vacation because of some sort of flu epidemic. A group of enterprising Kansas State students decided that we ought to have an epidemic. The word was passed. The Auditorium was filled to the roof and such a bedlam of coughing had not been heard before or since. The speaker, the Reverend Ernest Collins, then pastor of the Central Congregational Church of Topeka, proceeded. Within five minutes the epidemic had completely subsided. Reverend Collins had made the students *feel the needs* of those to whom they later contributed generously.

Like the fundamentals of speaking, the process of teaching the art is simple. All that the teacher has to work with are a normal mind and a normal voice. The student need not have Einstein's brain nor Herbert Marshall's vocal chords. He needs only normal mental and vocal equipment, both of which he can improve by study and practice. The lawyer who made the eloquent speech of nomination for the Presidency of General Douglas MacArthur was blind and had lost both his legs.

As a youngster I attended a Democratic National Convention in Baltimore. I felt a bit like the late William Allen White when, as a newspaper man he wandered into a Democrat dinner held in Kansas City in honor of the late Senator Jim Reed. Just as White entered the door, the master of ceremonies, who had been vainly casting about for a minister to offer the invocation spotted Mr. White and said, "I note that our distinguished neighbor, William Allen White, has just come in. Will you please offer the invocation, Mr. White?" White replied, "No, I don't want God to know I'm here."

It was a hot July night in Baltimore. We had, after a full day, spent the entire night listening to a debate, then to nominating speeches. The roll call of states reached "Oklahoma." From the balcony came a rich, commanding voice, "on behalf of the state of Oklahoma, I wish to speak seconding the nomination of Woodrow Wilson for the

Presidency of the United States." It was 5:30 in the morning. After more than half an hour, the speaker ran his fingers over the raised dial of his watch, and said, "Oh, I apologize, I had no idea I had spoken so long." He started to sit down, and more than one hundred men in that enthralled audience sprang to their feet shouting "Go on, go on!" The speaker was the blind Senator Thomas Pryor Gore.

Equipped with normal mind and voice the speaker must choose a subject in which he is enthused. He then gathers material from many sources. (Too many of my students review one article from the Reader's Digest, which has already been pre- and re-digested and which I have read.)

The material must be arranged in logical order. Various critics of the Americans assign various faults. Some say we eat too much, some that we hurry too fast, some that our TV commercials are revolting. My opinion is that our chief trouble is a lack of logic, the ability to go in orderly fashion from one idea to another. It makes our lectures confused and our textbooks too long.

There is one more requisite for effective speaking—frequent, conscientious, one might almost say incessant, oral practice. Not sitting on the back of the neck in an overstuffed chair, with feet on desk and the TV set going full blast, but on the feet, with an actual or imagined audience, vigorously, vocally presenting a speech that was prepared with an audience in mind.

Do you recall, a few years ago, when you joined millions of both Democrats and Republicans at the radio to hear the fireside chats? Do you recall their rhetorical perfection and their convincing appeal? Could you not see the President of the United States at the transmitter, his paralyzed legs in steel braces, his mind stirred by his message? Do you think that those addresses were given "off the cuff?" Those who knew report that the President spent hour after tedious hour practicing, changing an inflection here, polishing a phrase there, perfecting by practice. And in four consecutive elections the majority cast its vote for Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Is there a type of person who can learn

to speak well while others can't? Sometime since a professor conducted a survey to determine whether the extrovert or the introvert would excel. He found no appreciable difference. He then sought comparison between the man with hyperkinesis and the one with hypokinesis. (No, I didn't know either until I looked them up.) If you have hyperkinesis, you have abnormally increased muscular development; you crave physical activity. If you have hypokinesis, which appeals to me much more, you are like my friend who said that when he felt the urge to take exercise coming on, he lay down for a while till the feeling passed off. Whether you are hyper or hypo makes no material difference in your potentiality as a speaker. Professor, be you hyper or hypo, extro or intro, red-head, blond, brunette, or bald, you can learn to communicate effectively.

Of what importance to education is effective speaking? It is of vital importance. If any professors of education are present, let me at once assure them that I am not about to discuss the techniques of that challenging field. I don't know anything about education. I just teach.

Most students have some degree of desire to learn. If, as sometimes happens, I face a student who is asleep, it may be that he works nights, or that he had a late date with Marguerite, but probably it is because the teacher is listless and his presentation dull. If the teacher believes in the worthwhileness of his subject and in his obligation to the future of his students, he will know his subject, he will arrange his material logically, he will present it with a rich vitality. He will not grunt "uh" at every other word, while his mind wanders unattended over the landscape of intellectual uncertainty. He will respect the sense of good taste of his class audience and eliminate profanity and questionable illustration. He will teach as a gentleman. A recent graduate of this college wrote to one of his teachers "You made me want to work and learn. Much of what I learned from you had little to do with the subject matter of the course, but was that extra something which enables a student to leave the classroom a better person in every sense."

There it is. I have tried to give you, as a matter of interest, a bit of the history of

pioneering in the field of speech and have mentioned a few of the pioneers and our debt to them. I have suggested something of the scope of the field to which important research is constantly contributing. I have tried to encourage those who have assumed that the ability to speak is a unique and for them impossible attainment.

On your programs you will note that the title of this address is "Whene'er You Speak." It is quoted from the late United States Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story in his "Advice to Young Lawyers:"

"Whene'er you speak, remember every cause stands not on eloquence but stands on laws . . ." Those laws are few and fundamental. They are natural. They encompass not only the voice and body, but the mind and the heart. Observed and followed, they produce their own eloquence.

Who knows, by observing the laws of communication among men, we may make some contribution to peace on earth. We may in some far day and in some singular way help to lead mankind to the foot of the Cross.

THE PROMISED LAND

(Continued from Page 20)

but the art of neo-sophistry is not an educator's idea of intellectual honesty. A sudden demand on the part of a large segment of students for training in a highly specialized area such as debate could mean a rapid deterioration of the standards now in operation.

The logical retort is naturally that a teacher's job is to teach, and thus such a situation should be welcomed with open arms. From an idealistic standpoint this would be true. Another element, however, makes this a questionable theory.

Even without this newest surge of intellectualism, the colleges and universities of the nation are faced with a grave crisis. The increase in students coupled with the lack of facilities and faculty makes the future look rather bleak. Add to this the facts that have been discussed above and it would seem that an increase in desire will have to take its place in line with several other limiting factors.

So long as all the student (and the public) desired was a college degree, there was hope that we would survive the next ten years without reducing our educational system to shambles. However, if the trend is to incorporate a true education as well as a degree, a solution appears to be almost impossible.

A more specific case in point is that of our own personal problem. Debate work is rather specialized and requires a great deal of open contact with the individual student. If the concept which is rapidly gaining prom-

inence—that of extra large classes—takes hold, we will find our job changing in nature.

Instead of trying to stimulate intellectual curiosity and increase ability to reason and communicate, ours will become a job of book-keeping and number counting. If the additional staff becomes available, the problem will become less of a concern. However, considering the circumstances today, this appears to be a highly unlikely answer.

So here we sit, almost like the proverbial "clay pigeon," waiting for something to happen which would be a tremendous event in any area of education. That these three possibilities will ever be more than conjecture is a matter of opinion. No one will deny, however, that the last several months have started a movement in this direction. How far it will travel one can only guess.

At the same time, if we are honest, they present a series of problems which could make our jobs even more frustrating than they are today.

WANTED!

Alumni Notes and Anecdotes

Short Interesting Articles on Speech

Feature Articles

News of Special Events

Send these at once to the editor of
THE GAVEL

Lifetime Subscribers

Stanley I. Adelstein (WR)	Walter K. Koch (CLR)
Lloyd V. Almirall (H)	Robert I. Kopper (CLR)
Kenneth E. Anderson (IT)	Thomas V. Koykka (M)
Nazareth Arslanian (OB)	A. W. Leonard (SC)
Joseph R. Barse (NO)	Carl Wesley Painter (MN)
James E. Bednar (N)	Rev. Schuyler Pratt (WM)
Rae F. Bell (WIS)	Robert J. Preston (P)
Stanley O. Beren (HR)	John W. Rohrer, III (WJ)
Rev. Thomas F. Berry (MQ)	Richard S. Schweiker (P)
E. C. Buehler	Albert E. Sheets (ND)
Ned Chapin (CH)	Vincent Starzinger (IU)
Albert L. Davis (NO)	Arthur McLean Stillman (BR)
Guy W. Davis (SW)	Lulu E. Sweigard (IT)
Richard B. Drooz, M.D. (COR)	Margaret Louise Taylor (DP)
Samuel G. Fredman (PS)	Charles Torem (AM)
Alpheus J. Goddard (AM)	Robert Van Pelt (N)
William J. Hagenah (WIS)	Philip Wain (CH)
Carl A. Hassen (ND)	William Henry Warmington (NO)
Walter G. Huber (N)	Henry S. Wingate (CA)
Theodore Kellogg (ND)	

Subscriptions - Sponsor

Annette Anisman Abramson (WIS)	Milton C. Minor (K)
Christine Altenburger (PS)	Leah Mae Nefzger (IT)
William Saffell Barber (SC)	Helen Newman (GW)
William A. Benitt (MN)	Alan Nichols (SC)
S. Garton Churchill (OW)	Arthur E. Pollock, M.D. (PS)
Charles J. Cole (M)	Clarence B. Randall (HR)
Louis F. D'Elia (SC)	Bishop Marshall R. Reed (A)
Ivan J. Fenn (IT)	Irwin Jay Robinson (M)
William D. Flaskamp (M)	Theodore Schussler (BK)
Richard Glenn Gettell (AM)	Bardi G. Skulason (ND)
Frederick F. Greenman (HR)	Loren E. Souers (WR)
Harriett E. Grim (CH)	Lewis D. Spencer (DP)
Charles D. Hamel (ND)	Helen Strong (EL)
Harlan Harrison (ISC)	Milo K. Swanton (WIS)
May Yeoman Hoshal (A)	John Thorpe (ND)
Gordon F. Hostettler (AL)	Max R. Traurig (Y)
V. Earl Irons (Y)	Chester D. Walters (PT)
Miriam Mitchell Jorgensen (M)	H. A. Wichelns (COR)
George Edward Leonard (K)	Harold R. Willoughby (WES)
Karl D. Loos (IU)	John Fletcher Wilson (WAY)
William M. Lordi, M.D. (COL)	Josephine Spencer Wilson (OW)
J. S. Loynd (Wj)	Moses Winkelstein (SY)
Laurence T. Mayher (AM)	Thomas Yoseloff (IU)
Mrs. Robert C. Meissner (NO)	William E. Young (B)
Dr. Karl P. Meister (OW)	Abner D. Zook (WO)
Dr. John E. Miksicek, M.D. (WA)	

Delta Sigma Rho . . . Chapter Directory

Code	Chapter Name	Date Founded	Faculty Sponsor	Address
A	Albion	1911	J. V. Garland	Albion, Mich.
AL	Allegheny	1913	Nels Juleus	Meadville, Penn.
AM	Amherst	1913	S. L. Garrison	Amherst, Mass.
AMER	American	1932	J. H. Yocum	Washington, D.C.
AR	Arizona	1922	G. F. Sparks	Tucson, Ariz.
B	Bates	1915	Brooks Quimby	Lewiston, Maine
BE	Beloit	1909	Kirk Denmark	Beloit, Wisc.
BK	Brooklyn	1940	Charles Parkhurst	Brooklyn, N.Y.
BR	Brown	1909	Anthony C. Gosse	Providence, R.I.
BU	Boston	1935		Boston, Mass.
CA	Carleton	1911	Ada M. Harrison	Northfield, Minn.
CH	Chicago	1906	Marvin Phillips	Chicago, Ill.
CLR	Colorado	1910	Thorrel B. Fest	Boulder, Colo.
COL	Colgate	1910	Stan Kinney	Hamilton, N.Y.
CON	Connecticut	1952		Storrs, Conn.
COR	Cornell	1911	H. A. Wichelns	Ithaca, N.Y.
CR	Creighton	1934	Rev. Robert F. Purcell, S. J.	Omaha, Nebraska
D	Dartmouth	1910	Herbert L. James	Hanover, N.H.
DP	DePauw	1915	Herold T. Ross	Greencastle, Ind.
EL	Elmira	1931	Geraldine Quinlan	Elmira, N.Y.
GR	Grinnell	1951	Wm. Vanderpool	Grinnell, Iowa
GW	George Washington	1908	George F. Henigan, Jr.	Washington, D.C.
H	Hamilton	1922	Willard B. Marsh	Clinton, N.Y.
HR	Harvard	1909		Cambridge, Mass.
HW	Hawaii	1947	William Wantland	Honolulu, Hawaii
I	Idaho	1926	A. E. Whitehead	Moscow, Idaho
ILL	Illinois	1906	Wayne Brockriede	Urbana, Ill.
IN	Indiana	1951	E. C. Chenoweth	Bloomington, Ind.
ISC	Iowa State	1909	Ralph L. Towne	Ames, Iowa
IT	Iowa State Teachers	1913	Lillian Wagner	Cedar Falls, Iowa
IU	Iowa	1906	Orville Hitchcock	Iowa City, Iowa
K	Kansas	1910	E. C. Buehler	Lawrence, Kansas
KA	Kansas State College	1951	Charles Goetzinger	Manhattan, Kansas
KX	Knox	1911	Rene Ballard	Galesburg, Ill.
MQ	Marquette	1930	Hugo E. Hellman	Milwaukee, Wisc.
M	Michigan	1906	N. Edd Miller	Ann Arbor, Mich.
MN	Minnesota	1906	William S. Howell	Minneapolis, Minn.
MO	Missouri	1909	E. A. Rogge	Columbia, Mo.
MM	Mount Mercy	1954	Thomas A. Hopkins	Pittsburgh, Penn.
MU	Mundelein	1949	Sister Mary Antonia, B.V.M.	Chicago, Ill.
N	Nebraska	1906	Don Olson	Lincoln, Nebraska
NEV	Nevada	1948	Robert S. Griffin	Reno, Nevada
ND	North Dakota	1911	John S. Penn	Grand Forks, N.D.
NO	Northwestern	1906	Russel Windes	Evanston, Ill.
O	Ohio State	1010	Paul A. Carmack	Columbus, Ohio
OB	Oberlin	1936	Paul Boas	Oberlin, Ohio
OK	Oklahoma	1913	Roger E. Nebergall	Norman, Okla.
OR	Oregon	1926	Herman Cohen	Eugene, Oregon
ORS	Oregon State	1922	Earl W. Wells	Corvallis, Oregon
OW	Ohio Wesleyan	1907	Ed Robinson	Delaware, Ohio
P	Pennsylvania	1909	J. Harold Flannery	Philadelphia, Pa.
PO	Pomona	1928	Howard Martin	Claremont, Calif.
PR	Princeton	1911	Clarence S. Angell	Princeton, N.J.
PS	Pennsylvania State	1917	Clayton H. Schug	University Park, Pa.
PT	Pittsburgh	1920	Bob Newman	Pittsburgh, Pa.
R	Rockford	1933	Mildred F. Berry	Rockford, Ill.
SC	Southern California	1915	James H. McBeth	Los Angeles, Calif.
ST	Stanford	1911	Leland Chapin	Stanford, Calif.
SW	Swarthmore	1911	E. L. Hunt	Swarthmore, Penn.
SY	Syracuse	1910	J. Edward McEvoy	Syracuse, N.Y.
T	Temple	1950	Gordon F. Hostettler	Philadelphia, Pa.
TE	Texas	1909	Donald M. Williams	Austin, Texas
TT	Texas Tech	1953	P. Merville Larson	Lubbock, Texas
VA	Virginia	1908	J. Jeffery Auer	Charlottesville, Va.
W	Washington	1922	Ronald F. Reid	St. Louis, Mo.
WA	University of Washington	1954	Gale Richards	Seattle, Wash.
WAY	Wayne	1937	Rupert L. Cortright	Detroit, Mich.
WEL	Wells	1941	Evelyn Clinton	Aurora, N.Y.
WES	Wesleyan	1910	Donald Torrence	Middletown, Conn.
WICH	Wichita	1941	Les Blake	Wichita, Kansas
WIS	Wisconsin	1906	Winston L. Brembeck	Madison, Wisc.
WJ	Washington and Jefferson	1917	Frederick Helleger	Washington, Penn.
WM	Williams	1910	George R. Connelly	Williamstown, Mass.
WO	Wooster	1922	J. Garber Drushal	Wooster, Ohio
WR	Western Reserve	1911	R. A. Lang	Cleveland, Ohio
WVA	West Virginia	1923	Lloyd Welden	Morgantown, West Va.
WYO	Wyoming	1917	W. E. Stevens	Laramie, Wyoming
Y	Yale	1917	Rollin G. Osterweis	New Haven, Conn.
L	At Large	1909		

DELTA SIGMA RHO
Kansas State College
Manhattan, Kansas

Return Postage Guaranteed

Entered as
Second-class matter

