

3-1958

Complete Issue 40(3)

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(3). The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho, 40(3), 33-56.

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

volume 40

number 3

**of
delta
sigma
rho**



march

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; Herold 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

MARCH 1958

NUMBER 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

President's Page	34
Schedule of 1958 Congress	34
Eighth Delta Sigma Rho Congress	35
Rules of the Eighth Congress	36
The Northwestern University-Owen L. Coon National Debate Tournament by <i>Russell Windes</i>	42
John Stuart Mill and the "Utility" of Debate by <i>Nels Juleus</i>	43
What the Students Say About Forensics by <i>Lee Granell</i>	45
Psychiatric Nursing and Debate Training by <i>Doris Schmidt</i>	47
The Missouri Valley Forensic League by <i>E. Chris Buehler</i>	49
The Intramural Program—A Means of Increasing Participation in the Speech Activities by <i>Don Williams</i>	51
Lifetime Subscribers	56

CONGRESS ISSUE

This issue of the Gavel contains the rules of the Eighth Congress and the schedule of events.

Plan to Attend!

President's Page . . .

As we gather at East Lansing, Michigan, April 10-12 for meetings of the National Student Congress and the General Council of Delta Sigma Rho I hope that all chapters may be represented by at least one student and one faculty member. This promises to be a meeting of importance second only to our Golden Anniversary Commemoration. Problems of carrying forward and strengthening the work of the society, electing new officers and discussing issues of significance are the broad framework of our task. A new chapter will be installed at Michigan State University and our meetings will be held in the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education, which provides in one central place excellent and modestly priced facilities for meetings, housing and food. A number of institutions that are prospective chapter applicants have been invited to participate in the Congress.

Co-chairmen Charles Goetzinger and Victor Harnack are being assisted by a committee of sponsors. In addition to information already contained in *The Gavel*, you will receive by mail materials and directions from this committee. The Congress problem area,

"What Should Be Done To Meet The Challenge to Education Posed By Today's Scientific Struggle," is one of the most vital confronting our nation today. The nature of our education may well determine the survival of our nation and our way of life. I am confident that students will find in both the committee meetings and legislative sessions challenging content and valuable speaking experiences. The rules covering the Congress appear elsewhere in this issue of *The Gavel*. Sponsors should note that in the calendar of events a large block of time has been devoted to General Council meetings. I cannot over-emphasize the importance of the policy matters which must be discussed and decided by chapter representatives. Letters to sponsors from both the secretary's and president's offices have touched on some of these points from time to time.

I believe there has never been greater need and opportunity for forensic activities to make contributions to the training and development of leaders than exist in our present national world situations.

THORREL B. FEST

Schedule of Congress

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1958

1:00- 4:30 p.m.	Registration; Coffee
5:00- 6:00 p.m.	Opening Session
6:15- 7:15 p.m.	Dinner
7:30-10:00 p.m.	Caucuses
7:30-10:30 p.m.	Sponsor Forum
7:30-10:30 p.m.	Executive Committee Meeting
10:30-11:30 p.m.	Opening Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1958

7:30- 8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30-12:00 Noon	Main Committee Meetings
8:30-12:00 Noon	General Council Meetings
12:15 1:15 p.m.	Lunch
12:15- 3:00 p.m.	Joint Committee Meetings

1:30- 3:00 p.m.	General Council Meeting
3:15- 4:00 p.m.	Reception
4:30- 6:00 p.m.	Legislative Assembly II
4:30- 6:00 p.m.	General Council Meeting
7:00- 8:30 p.m.	Banquet and Installation of Michigan State Chapter
10:00-11:00 p.m.	Initiation of New Members

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1958

7:30- 8:00 a.m.	Breakfast
8:30-11:00 a.m.	Legislative Assembly III
8:30-11:00 a.m.	Sponsor Forum or continuation of General Council Meeting
12:00- 1:00 p.m.	Lunch

Eighth Delta Sigma Rho Student Congress Michigan State University

April 10-12, 1958

MELBY AND HILBERRY TO BE FEATURED SPEAKERS



Kellogg Center, MSU, Site of Eighth DSR Congress

The beautiful Kellogg Center on the campus of Michigan State University at East Lansing, Michigan will be the site of our eighth Student Congress. Plans are nearly completed for this event.

The topic to be examined at the congress is: *"What Should Be Done to Meet the Challenge to Education Posed By Today's Scientific Struggle?"* Subtopics to be considered in the deliberations are: Scientific training at the College and University level; The plan of the Liberal Arts Course; The problem of providing teachers and facilities at all levels—elementary, secondary and college; Improvement of elementary and secondary education.

Two outstanding speakers have been secured to appear before the Congress. Dr. Clarence Hilberry, president of Wayne State University will be the banquet speaker. Dr. Hilberry became president of Wayne State University in 1953. Previous to that he was Dean of Administration at Wayne State from

1945 to 1953. From 1930 to 1945 he was Professor of English at Wayne. From 1927 to 1930 he was on the YMCA College faculty in Chicago. From 1925 to 1927 he was a member of the English faculty at Albion College.

Dr. E. O. Melby, Distinguished Professor of Education at Michigan State University will be the keynote speaker of the Congress. Dr. Melby was formerly Dean of the School of Education at New York University. From 1941 until 1945 he was President of Montana State University and during the year of 1943-44 was Chancellor of the University of Montana. Dr. Melby was Dean of the School of Education at Northwestern University from 1934 to 1941. Previous to that he was Professor of Education at Northwestern University.

An item of considerable significance at this congress is the series of meetings sched-

(Continued on Page 53)

Rules of the Eighth National Delta Sigma Rho Congress

As Revised by the Committee on Rules and Procedures, Austin J. Freeley, Chairman and Congress Director.

Purposes

1. To provide broad, intensive, and realistic educational opportunities for college speakers.
2. To increase opportunities for intensive investigation of significant contemporary problems.
3. To promote the use of logical reasoning and the use of the best available evidence in dealing with these problems.
4. To stimulate the students to honest and original effort.
5. To provide specific opportunities in the arts of public speaking, persuasion, discussion, and debate.
6. To help young men and women become more effective citizens by promoting an understanding of the legislative procedures fundamental to the democratic way of life.
7. To use the competition inherent in a free society to motivate students to their best efforts in attaining these objectives.

I. Name

The name of this organization shall be THE EIGHTH NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO.

II. Dates of the Meetings

1. The business of this organization shall occupy three (3) consecutive days.
2. Members of this organization shall convene biennially.
3. The exact dates for each meeting shall be fixed as hereinafter provided, but shall usually fall on a Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of April.

III. Powers and Duties of Faculty Sponsors

1. This organization shall be sponsored by the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho.
2. At least twelve (12) months prior to each meeting of the Student Congress, the National President of Delta Sigma Rho shall appoint a committee of not less than five (5) faculty or alumni representatives. This committee shall be known as the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
3. The Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall have the following powers and duties:
 - a. To revise these rules, if they deem such revision necessary and desirable.
 - b. To fix the exact dates for the Student Congress.
 - c. To determine the place at which the Student Congress shall meet.
 - d. To decide upon and phrase problem(s) of significant contemporary interest which shall be studied and acted upon by the delegates attending the Student Congress as hereinafter provided; and to notify all colleges of these problems at least two (2) months prior to the start of the Congress.
 - e. To receive from all Faculty Sponsors, at least thirty (30) days before the opening of the Student Congress the names of all students nominated for Speaker of the Assembly, Clerk of the Assembly, Party Floor Leader, Party Whip, and the names of all students recommended for appointment as Chairmen Pro Tem of the Caucuses, and Temporary Chairmen of the Main Committees. Candidates for these positions must

be certified by their Faculty Sponsors as qualified to discharge the duties of office in a manner which will reflect credit both of their college and on Delta Sigma Rho.

- f. To appoint one or more Faculty Sponsors to serve as Parliamentarian(s) during the Student Congress with advisory powers as hereinafter specified.
- g. To appoint such other subordinate officers and committees as hereinafter specified and such other subordinate officers and committees as they shall deem necessary or desirable to provide for the effective conduct of the Congress and to delegate to these officers and committees such powers and duties as they deem proper.
- h. To discharge all other duties hereinafter specified.

IV. General Structure

1. The Official business sessions of the Student Congress shall be known by the following names:
 - a. Caucuses
 - b. The Opening Legislative Assembly
 - c. Main Committee Meetings
 - d. Joint Conference Committee Meetings
 - e. Legislative Assemblies
2. In addition to the above sessions there shall be a Registration Period and various Delta Sigma Rho Business Meetings.
3. The order and number of events, together with the exact times and places, shall be determined by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.

V. Registration

1. The Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall call for advance registration, to be made not later than thirty (30) days before the opening of the Congress. The advance registration shall include the names of all student delegates, their party affiliation as provided in Article VI, Section 1; candidacy for Chairman Pro Tem of their Party Caucus as provided in Article VI, Section 3; or candidacy for Speaker of the Assembly or Clerk of the Assembly as provided in Article III, Section 3-e; and sub-topic preference for committee membership, as provided in Article VIII, Section 1.
2. The Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures may require the use of such forms as it shall prepare for both Advance and Final Registration and shall publish and enforce closing dates and times for the filing of such forms.
3. At the Final Registration each delegation shall confirm its Advance Registration. Change in delegates shall be permitted only for serious cause. No additional nominations or applications for assignments to committees or offices may be made at this time. Only students whose registration is confirmed during the Final Registration may take part in any of the activities of the Congress except by special permission of the Congress Director.

VI. Caucuses

1. At the time of Advance Registration for the Congress, each delegate shall register as a member of one of the following parties:
 - a. Conservative
 - b. Liberal
2. At the time designated in the Calendar, each of the parties shall hold a Caucus for the purpose of selecting party candidates for Speaker and Clerk of the Assembly, respectively, and for the

- purpose of electing a Party Floor Leader and a Party Whip.
3. Each Caucus shall be convened by a Chairman Pro Tem who shall preside over the caucus until the candidate for Speaker of the Assembly has been selected. The roll call vote of the individual delegates shall be recorded by a Clerk Pro Tem. The Pro Tem officers shall be appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
 - a. Delegates wishing to be considered for Pro Tem offices shall so indicate at the time of Advance Registration as provided in Article III, Section 3-e, and shall also submit a statement of their qualifications.
 - b. The Chairman Pro Tem of each Caucus shall be selected from colleges not nominating candidates for the office of Speaker.
 4. The Caucuses shall proceed in accordance with the following rules:
 - a. No student may be nominated whose name has not been submitted in advance by the Faculty Sponsor of his college to the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures, as provided in Article III, Section 3-e, except that when the number of such properly certified candidates for an office is less than four, nominations for such office may be made from the floor, but in no case shall there be more than a total of four candidates for any one office. In all cases nominations shall be closed automatically after the nomination of a fourth candidate for any office.
 - b. Delegates placing names in nomination shall be allowed not more than five (5) minutes to describe the qualifications of their candidates.
 - c. Nominations may be seconded, but seconding speeches may not be given.
 - d. When all nominations for Speaker of the Assembly have been heard, each candidate shall be allotted five (5) minutes in which to state his views on the public problem(s) to be considered by the Congress.
 - e. When all candidates have spoken, the vote shall be taken by roll call of the individual delegations.
 - f. If no candidate receives a majority on the first vote, the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes shall be voted upon again in a second roll call vote.
 - g. The Clerk Pro Tem shall act as timekeeper for the above speeches, and shall conduct the roll call vote(s).
 5. When a candidate for Speaker has been elected, he shall immediately assume the chair as presiding officer of the Caucus. The same procedure shall be followed in the election of the candidate for Clerk, except that there shall be no campaign speeches by the nominees.
 6. When a candidate for Clerk has been elected, he shall immediately assume the duties of Clerk of the Caucus. The same procedure as described in Article VI, Section 5, shall be followed in the election of a Party Floor Leader. It shall be the duty of the Party Floor Leader to seek to coordinate the efforts of the party in securing passage of bills endorsed by party members.
 7. When a Party Floor Leader has been elected, the Caucus shall proceed to the election of a Party Whip. The same procedure as described in Article VI, Section 5, shall be followed in the election of a Party Whip. It shall be the duty of the Party Whip to assist the Party Floor Leader.
- ### VII. Opening Assembly
1. The Opening Assembly shall be called to order by the Temporary Chairman, who shall be a faculty member appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
 2. The Temporary Clerk, who shall be a faculty member appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures, shall call the roll.
 3. The Temporary Chairman shall preside during the election of the Speaker of the Student Congress. The election shall proceed in accordance with the following rules:
 - a. Delegates nominating the candidates of the respective parties for Speaker of the Student Congress shall be allowed not more than three (3) minutes to describe the qualifications of their candidates.
 - b. Nominations may be made from the floor under the following conditions: First, a nominating petition signed by not less than twenty-five (25) properly registered delegates who have not signed nomination papers for more than one candidate must be filed with the Temporary Clerk. Second, the Temporary Clerk shall accept nomination papers only for candidates qualified as provided in Article III, Section 3-e. Third, if the Temporary Clerk determines that the nomination petition is in order the candidate may be placed in nomination as provided in Article VII, Sections a and c.
 - c. After the nominating speeches for Speaker of the Student Congress have been made, the candidates shall be allowed two (2) minutes each in which to state their views to the Opening Assembly on the public problem(s) to be considered by the Congress.
 - d. When the candidates have spoken, the vote shall be by roll call of colleges. Each delegate is free to vote as an individual, but for each college a delegation leader shall respond to the roll call and report his delegation's vote.
 - e. The candidate receiving the majority of votes shall be declared elected.
 - f. If no candidate receives a majority on the first vote, the two receiving the greatest number of votes shall be voted upon again in a second roll call.
 - g. The Temporary Clerk shall act as time keeper for the above speeches and shall conduct the roll call vote(s) to determine the winning candidate.
 4. The newly elected Speaker shall preside during the election of the Clerk of the Student Congress. The rules of this election shall be the same as those for election of the Speaker, except that nominating speeches shall be limited to two (2) minutes and that the candidates shall not speak.
 5. A member of the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall announce the assignment of delegates to their proper committees as hereinafter provided in Articles VIII and XI.
 6. The only other business which shall be in order at the Opening Assembly shall be the hearing of messages, communications, and announcements, a list of which shall have been prepared by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
- ### VIII. Main Committee Meetings
1. At the time of Advance Registration for the Congress, the delegates may indicate preference on sub-topics for committee membership. Delegates without preference shall so indicate.
 2. The Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall divide the delegates into as many Main Committees as may seem appropriate to the number of delegates registered in the Congress.
 - a. In determining the number of Main Committees on each sub-topic, the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall give consideration to the number of expressed preferences and to the number and nature of Advance Bills submitted.
 - b. Delegates shall be placed where needed to help equalize the size of committees.
 - c. In assigning delegates to the Main Committees, the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures will follow the principle of proportional distribution according to advance party registrations.
 - d. No more than one delegate from the same college will be assigned to the same committee.
 - e. In order to provide a workable distribution of membership on the several committees, the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall have full and final authority

- to select delegates by lot to be placed wherever necessary.
3. Each Committee shall be called to order by a Temporary Chairman appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures. The Temporary Chairman of each Main Committee shall be responsible for securing from the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures copies of the Advance Bills assigned to his committee.
 4. The Temporary Chairman shall preside during the election of the student chairman and student Secretary for the Committee. He shall also assume the duties of Temporary Secretary during this time.
 5. It shall be the essential purpose of each committee to discuss the problem to which the Committee has been assigned and to develop a legislative solution to the problem stated in the form of a Bill which shall represent the consensus of the Committee.
 6. As the construction of such a well conceived Bill is to be the basis of the work of the Committee, the order of business shall be:
 - a. The definition and delimitation of the problem to which the Committee has been assigned.
 - b. The analysis of the problem to which the Committee has been assigned. This shall include both a consideration of the causes of the problem and the establishment of criteria which the Committee shall use to evaluate proposed solutions.
 - c. The consideration of proposed solutions. The Secretary shall distribute copies of the Advance Bills to the members and shall read the titles of the Advance Bills submitted to the Committee in the order numbered by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures. The Committee shall determine whether one of the Advance Bills shall be used as a basis for their deliberations, or whether the Committee shall construct a new Bill, using the Advance Bills merely as guides and suggestions.
 - d. The construction of a Bill which, in the considered judgment of the Committee, shall represent the best possible legislative solution to the problem.
 - e. Action upon any Advance Bill, or portion thereof, or upon any motion which proposes a new Bill or portion thereof, shall consist of either the rejection of the item, or the acceptance of it with or without amendment.
 8. As soon as the essential content of a Bill has been decided upon, which must not be later than thirty (30) minutes prior to the adjournment of the last meeting of the Committee, the Chairman shall conduct the election of three (3) members whose duty it shall be to give the Majority Bill its final form and phrasing, and to represent the Main Committee at the meetings of the Joint Conference Committee. At least one of the three so elected shall be other than a member of the majority party of the Assembly.
 9. While at all times it shall be the objective of delegates to adhere to the highest standards of Parliamentary debate, the size of the Committee admits of greater informality than is possible on the floor of the Assembly; members shall be permitted to speak as often as they wish subject to recognition by the Chairman, and to such limitations as may be decided upon by the Committee itself. The use of more formal Parliamentary procedures and voting should be as infrequent as possible in this informal situation.
 10. If for any reason a minority of the Committee shall find that it cannot support the Bill approved by the majority of the Committee, it may draft a Minority Bill and elect a representative whose duty it shall be to represent the Minority at meetings of the Joint Conference Committee.

IX. Joint Conference Committees

1. At the time designated in the Calendar, the Joint Conference Committee(s) shall convene.

The number of such Joint Conference Committees shall be determined by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures, taking into account, (a) the number and nature of the public problems considered by the Congress, and (b) the number of delegates working in Main Committees which the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures designates as constituting an appropriate unit. The election of members of the Joint Conference Committees shall be as provided in Article VIII, Sections 8 and 10.

2. Each Joint Conference Committee shall be called to order by a Temporary Chairman appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
3. The Temporary Chairman shall preside during the election of the student Chairman and student Secretary of the Committee. He shall also assume the duties of Temporary Secretary during this time.
4. The Secretary shall immediately read the Majority and Minority Bills submitted by delegates representing the Main Committees. After the Bills have been read, the Chairman shall preside over the deliberations to determine whether one of these bills shall be used as the basis for Committee action or whether the Committee shall construct a new Bill using these Bills as a basis.
5. If in the deliberations it becomes apparent that there is a fundamental cleavage of opinion the minority may withdraw. In such cases the minority delegates shall meet separately in another room where they shall organize in accordance with Article IX, Sections 2 and 3, and they shall be known as the Joint Conference Committee of the Minority. The majority delegates shall be known as the Joint Conference Committee of the Majority.
6. It shall be the duty of the Joint Conference Committee of the Majority to frame a Bill which shall express their views.
7. It shall be the duty of the Joint Conference Committee of the Minority, if such a Committee be formed, to frame a Bill which shall express their views.
8. Any delegate, whether or not he be a member of a Joint Conference Committee, who dissents from any portion of the Majority Bill and whose views are not satisfactorily expressed by a Minority Bill may draw an amendment to be proposed from the floor of the General Assembly.

X. General Assemblies

1. The Speaker shall call the meeting to order; the Clerk shall call the roll, read the Minutes of the preceding Assembly, and all communications or announcements submitted by the Steering Committee or the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
2. The Speaker shall announce the order in which the committees shall report; and shall make any further necessary announcements regarding the division of time for debate or clarification of rules.
3. Each committee shall report its bills and amendments in the following manner:
 - a. The Majority Bill shall be read by a member of the majority, who shall move its adoption, and who shall immediately give a copy of the bill to the Clerk, and distribute copies to the Assembly.
 - b. The Majority Leader, or delegates appointed by him, shall be allowed a total of not more than ten (10) minutes in which to explain and defend the bill.
 - c. The Minority Bill, if there be one, shall be read by a member of the Minority, who shall move its substitution in place of the Majority Bill, and who shall immediately give a copy of the bill to the Clerk and distribute copies to the Assembly.
 - d. The Minority Leader, if there be a Minority Bill, or delegates appointed by him, shall

be allowed a total of not more than ten (10) minutes in which to explain and defend the bill.

- e. Any delegate desiring to amend either the Majority or the Minority Bill shall present a written copy of his amendment to the Clerk not later than at the close of the time allowed the Minority Leader. At the conclusion of the Minority Leader's time, the Speaker shall ask if there are any proposed amendments not on the Clerk's desk. After this time, no more amendments may be received.
- f. Each Joint Conference Committee shall choose a representative to assist the Steering Committee in screening proposed amendments that have been properly submitted and shall impartially consolidate such amendments as may be considered identical.
- g. The Speaker shall announce the time fixed by the Steering Committee for debate on the motion to substitute the Minority Bill for the Majority Bill. He shall make this announcement before either bill has been presented to the Assembly. At the expiration of time for debate on the substitute motion the vote must be taken, and it shall be on the motion to substitute.
- h. Having completed its work of screening the amendments, and taking into account the number to be considered by the Assembly, the Steering Committee shall determine, and the Speaker shall announce, the time to be allotted to each amendment, including amendments to that particular amendment. When the allotted time has expired, the vote must be taken.
- i. Delegates who have submitted amendments to the Minority Bill may then be heard in the order in which they have submitted their amendments to the Clerk. If any amendments have been consolidated by the screening process, the Steering Committee shall determine the order in which such consolidated amendments shall be heard.
- j. A maximum of three (3) minutes shall be allowed each proposer of an amendment in which to read, explain, and defend his proposed amendment.
- k. Other delegates wishing to debate the amendment shall be allowed two (2) minutes each and the Speaker shall recognize favoring and opposing delegates in alternation insofar as possible.
- l. Amendments to amendments may be presented from the floor without the necessity of early presentation in written form to the Clerk.
- m. If the Minority Bill is not adopted as a substitute for the Majority Bill, amendments to the Majority Bill shall be heard and acted upon in the same manner as provided for debate on the Minority Bill.
- n. Throughout the debate upon any given Bill and its amendments, the Speaker shall not recognize any delegate who has previously spoken unless no other delegate is requesting the floor.
- o. The Speaker, or a delegate appointed by him, shall time the delegates during all debates. No delegate may exceed his time without consent of the Assembly by two-thirds vote.
- p. The Speaker may ask the advice of the Parliamentarian, as provided for in Article III, Section 3-f, but the Parliamentarian shall act in an advisory capacity only.
- q. If during the second session of the Legislative Assembly it seems to be desirable to refer a matter to committee the following motions shall be in order: a motion to refer to a specified Joint Conference Committee or a motion to refer to a Special Committee, Motions to refer to a specified Joint Conference Committee or to a Special Committee may or may not include instructions to the committee. Unless a motion to refer to a Special Committee specifies the number

of members, how the members are to be chosen, and who is to be chairman, these matters shall be determined by the Steering Committee and shall be announced by the Speaker. A motion to refer an amendment to a committee shall take with it the motion to which the amendment applies.

- r. After all debate has been heard, or the time limits reached, or the previous question moved and passed, the Bill before the Assembly for adoption shall be voted upon by roll call as provided in Article XIV. It may be approved with or without amendment, or be rejected. If rejected, no new Bill on the same topic may be offered to the Assembly, but the Speaker may entertain a Resolution stating that the Assembly is unable to recommend action upon the problem at issue.

XI. Committee on the Evaluation of Legislative Procedure

1. There shall be a Committee on the Evaluation of Legislative Procedure composed of not more than fifteen (15) members of whom ten (10) may be students and five (5) may be faculty members.
2. Faculty members shall be appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
3. Student members shall be appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures in the manner hereinafter described. At the time of Advance Registration colleges desiring to be represented on this Committee may nominate one student delegate for membership. Selection to membership on this Committee shall be made in order of receipt of registration. Upon the registration of the allotted number of members all subsequent registrars for this Committee will be notified that the Committee is closed.
4. The function of this Committee shall be to evaluate the procedure, work, and effectiveness of the Congress, and to make recommendations for the improvement of future Congresses to the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
 - a. This Committee shall have the authority, if it wishes, to conduct an attitude analysis of the delegates, solicit reactions from the delegates, or engage in any other research relevant to an evaluation of the Congress.
 - b. This Committee shall also have the right to invite regular delegates, faculty sponsors, guests, and such other persons as are available to appear before it to testify concerning the matters being considered by the Committee. Such invitations must be made in writing by the Chairman of the Committee upon the direction of the Committee and shall be delivered to the witness a reasonable time in advance of his requested appearance. No invitation is to be considered a summons upon a person and may be declined by him at the time of its receipt.
5. This Committee shall be in continuous session during the entire Congress except for such recesses as are necessary for purposes of study, report, and schedule. The final meeting of this Committee is provided for in the Calendar of the Congress at the close of business on the final day. At that time this Committee shall frame and transmit its final report to the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.
6. Members of this Committee shall not participate in any other assemblies, committees, or caucuses of the Congress. They may, however, observe and attend these meetings as the study of the Committee requires.
7. A student delegate serving on this Committee shall not be counted as one of the four (4) participating delegates to which his college is entitled.
8. This Committee shall be convened at the time scheduled for the Preliminary Caucuses by a Temporary Chairman appointed by the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures. At that time a Chairman and Secretary shall be elected.

9. This Committee shall be empowered to organize and appoint such subcommittees as are necessary to carry on its work most efficiently.

XII. Membership

1. Any college or university included on the current chapter roll of the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho or any college or university specifically invited by the National President of Delta Sigma Rho is entitled to send delegates to participate in the Student Congress.
2. Student delegates must be bona fide undergraduate students of the college they represent. They need not be members of Delta Sigma Rho in order to participate in the Student Congress meetings, but they must be members of Delta Sigma Rho in order to participate in Delta Sigma Rho Business Meetings.
3. Each participating college shall be entitled to a maximum of four (4) participating student delegates at any one time except as provided in Article XI, Section 7. Not more than two (2) student delegates shall be assigned to the same sub-topic of the public problem(s) under consideration.
4. Any college may send as many students as it wishes, to be designated as alternates or observers, but in that capacity they may not participate in any of the business of a Committee, Caucus, or General Assembly, except as defined in Article XII, Section 5.
5. The participating delegates representing a given college during the various committee meetings, need not be the same students for meetings of the Assembly. When a participating delegate and an alternate thus exchange status, it shall be at the discretion of the Faculty Sponsor of the college involved and written notification of this exchange must be submitted to the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures and to the Clerk of the Assembly.
6. At the Delta Sigma Rho Business Meeting each chapter may be represented by one (1) participating member. This representative shall be the Faculty Sponsor of the chapter if he is present. If the Faculty Sponsor or other faculty representative cannot be present, the chapter may designate a student member of Delta Sigma Rho as its representative. Any student so instructed shall not be eligible for election to any of the Joint Conference Committees.
7. Questions regarding the rights of any person to represent a given college or to participate in any business session shall be referred to the National President of Delta Sigma Rho for settlement.

XIII. Bills, Amendments, Resolutions

1. Advance Bills may be prepared by delegates before the Congress convenes to be submitted to the appropriate committees at the time they convene as tentative proposals for the committees to consider.
2. Delegates desiring to submit Advance Bills shall observe the following procedures:
 - a. Each college may submit one bill for referral to each of the Main Committees. (Thus for the 1958 Congress, each college may submit a total of four (4) Advance Bills.)
 - b. Any delegate desiring to submit an Advance Bill shall submit ten (10) identical copies to the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures not less than twenty-one (21) days prior to the opening of the Congress. (Thus for the 1958 Congress, Advance Bills bearing a postmark later than midnight March 20, 1958, may be rejected.) All such bills must be drafted in accordance with the rules hereinafter specified.
 - c. Any delegate submitting an Advance Bill may circulate copies of his bill to all chapters of Delta Sigma Rho and to other invited participating colleges in advance of the Congress.

- d. Each delegate submitting an Advance Bill must deposit one hundred (100) identical copies of the bill with the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures during the Final Registration period.
 - e. The Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures shall sort the Advance Bills in terms of the Committee to which they are submitted and shall number them in order of their receipt as provided in Article XIII, Section 2-b.
3. All Advance Bills must be presented in the form hereinafter described:
 - a. They must be typewritten, duplicated, and double spaced upon a single sheet of white 8½ × 11 inch paper.
 - b. The first line shall consist of these words: "Congress Bill Number"
 - c. The second line shall consist of these words: "Referred to the Committee on (herein state the name of the appropriate Committee)."
 - d. The third line shall give the name of the student introducing the bill together with the name of the college he represents.
 - e. Commencing with the fourth line, the title of the bill must be stated, beginning with the words, "An Act," and continuing with a statement of the purpose of the bill.
 - f. The text of the bill proper must begin with the words: "Be it enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho." The material following must begin with the word, "That." Each line of the material which follows must be numbered on the left margin of the page, beginning with "1."
 - g. Every section shall be numbered commencing at one. No figures shall be used in the bill except for the numbers of sections and lines. No abbreviations shall be used.
 - h. The following form is an illustration of the prescribed form for drafting bills:

Congress Bill Number
 Referred to the Committee on The Providing
 of Teachers and Facilities.
 by John Doe of University
 AN ACT to provide for the increasing of
 teachers' salaries.
 BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CON-
 GRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO

 1. Section 1. That the
 2. Section 2. That also
 4. Bills prepared by each Committee for recommendation to the Joint Conference Committee shall follow the same form as prescribed for Advance Bills with the following exceptions:
 - a. They shall not be limited as to length.
 - b. The second line shall consist of these words: "Referred to the Joint Conference Committee on (herein state the name of the appropriate Committee)."
 - c. The third line shall consist of the words: "Majority (or Minority) Bill by" followed by the names and colleges of the delegates supporting the bill.
 5. Bills prepared by each Joint Conference Committee for recommendation to the General Assembly shall follow the same form as prescribed for Advance Bills with the following exceptions:
 - a. They shall not be limited as to length.
 - b. They shall omit the second line as described in Article XIII, Section 3-c.
 - c. The next line shall consist of the words: "Majority (or Minority) Bill of the Joint Conference Committee on (herein state the name of the appropriate Committee)" followed by the names and colleges of the delegates supporting the bill.
 6. The proper form for amendments shall be one of the following:
 - a. "I move to amend by striking out the words . . ." or
 - b. "I move to amend by substituting the words . . ." or
 - c. "I move to amend by adding the words . . ." or

- d. "I move to amend by inserting the words . . . " or
- e. "I move to amend by dividing the . . . "
7. Bills passed by the General Assembly shall be signed by the Speaker and Clerk, and three (3) copies shall be delivered to the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures, who shall have copies sent out to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of appropriate Committees of the Congress of the United States, to the Presidents of the participating colleges and universities, and to such organizations and individuals as he shall deem appropriate.
 8. In the event the Assembly fails to pass any bill properly brought before it, no bill may be offered to the Assembly. If the Assembly wishes to express itself with regard to matters other than those relating to the official Committee problems but within its proper range of action it may consider such motions as are approved by the Steering Committee in the form of Resolutions.

XIV. Voting

1. In the Assemblies, the Committees, and the Caucuses each individual delegate is entitled to one vote. He is free to vote as he chooses without regard to how any other delegate or delegates cast their ballots.
2. Roll call votes should be used only in electing officers or in taking final action upon whole bills. In the Assemblies all roll calls will be by colleges, and one delegate from each college should respond and report the votes of his delegation.
3. In all meetings of the Congress no delegate shall be privileged to change his vote after the vote has been declared by the presiding officer. Any change of vote prior to that moment shall be reported from the floor by the delegation making the change. This should be made through the delegation representative.
4. In the event that official responsibilities require that a delegate be absent for a portion of a meeting he may vote by proxy by submitting his vote to the Clerk or Secretary in written form, but only in the case of specific motions pending at the time of the delegate's departure. Such proxies shall be void if the motion to which they apply shall be changed in any manner.
5. In the Assemblies, Committees, and Caucuses the participating delegates shall be seated together in an area from which all others are excluded. Guests and observers shall be seated in an area clearly separated from that of the participating delegates. This makes possible more efficient conduct of business and accurate determination of votes.

XV. Powers and Duties of Officers

1. The Speaker of the Assembly shall call the meeting to order; he shall preserve order and decorum; he shall name the one entitled to the floor; he shall decide all questions of order, subject to appeal to the Assembly; he shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings except where his vote would be decisive; he shall put questions; he shall certify to all bills passed by the Assembly.
2. The Chairman of a Committee shall call the meetings to order; he shall preserve order and decorum; he shall name the one entitled to the floor; he shall decide all questions of order, subject to appeal to the Committee; he shall not be required to vote, except where his vote would be decisive; he shall put questions; and shall conduct the election of members to the Joint Conference Committee.
3. The Clerk of the Assembly shall have the care and custody of all papers and records; he shall serve as Clerk of the Steering Committee; he has arranged in its proper order, as determined by the Steering Committee, from day to day all the business of the Assembly; he shall keep the journal of the Assembly; he shall conduct

voting by roll call, and tabulate and announce the results; he shall receive and list in order of receipt, amendments to bills; he shall certify to all bills passed by the Assembly, and shall deliver three (3) copies of all such bills, together with copies of the minutes to the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures.

4. The Secretary of a Committee shall have the care and custody of all papers and records; he shall conduct all roll call votes, and tabulate and announce the results; he shall keep the minutes of the sessions of the Committee, and shall send a copy of those minutes to the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures within one week of the adjournment of the final session of the Congress.

XVI. Steering Committee

1. There shall be a Steering Committee composed of the Speaker of the Assembly, the Clerk of the Assembly, the Majority Party Floor Leader, the Minority Party Floor Leader, the Majority Leaders of the Joint Conference Committees, the Minority Leaders of the Joint Conference Committees, if any, a member of the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures, and a faculty Parliamentarian who shall be chairman of the Committee. This Committee shall:
 - a. Determine the agenda for meetings of the General Assembly. The Steering Committee shall have the power to limit the agenda, selecting from the bills reported from the Joint Conference Committees, so that thorough debate on the measure(s) may occur.
 - b. Receive and approve for placement on the agenda any resolutions, memorials, communications, or similar matters which individual delegates or Congress Committees wish to bring before the Assembly.
 - c. Designate the order in which the Committees shall report to the Assembly.
 - d. Fix the total time allowed for debate on each Committee's bill and amendments, subject to appeal of the Assembly as provided in Article X, Section 6.
 - e. Formulate and present to the Assembly any resolutions, memorials, or similar matters which it feels should properly come before that body.
 - f. Meet with the Editor of the *Gavel* subsequent to the adjournment of the Congress for the purpose of editing and transmitting any bills and resolutions adopted by the Congress in accordance with Article XIII, Sections 7 and 8, to the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Rules and Procedures and through him to the President of the United States, the Chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States, to the Presidents of the participating colleges and universities, to the Editor of the *Gavel*, and to such other organizations and individuals as he shall deem appropriate, or as shall be specified by the Rules of the Congress or action of the Assembly.
 - g. Have primary responsibility for recommending any action which the Committee believes will expedite the work of the Assembly.
 - h. All decisions of the Steering Committee regarding the agenda and time limits on debate shall be published and distributed previous to the legislative session to which they apply.
2. All Committee action shall be subject to appeal to the Assembly.

XVII. Miscellaneous

1. In the Assembly, the unqualified motion to adjourn is a main motion because its effect would be to dissolve the Congress *sine die*.
2. In cases not covered by these Rules, the presiding officer shall follow H. M. Robert, *Rules of Order* (Rev.) Scott, Foresman and Company, New York, 1951.

The Northwestern University-Owen L. Coon National Debate Tournament

BY RUSSELL WINDES (NO)*

On February 7 and 8, 1958, more than two-hundred and fifty debaters and coaches from forty-nine colleges and universities took part in the Northwestern-Owen Coon National Debate Tournament held on the Northwestern campus in Evanston, Illinois. The tournament is one of the largest elimination-type tournaments held anywhere in the country. The students and coaches represented at the tournament travelled more than 103,000 mile collectively to attend the tournament, and they represented colleges and universities in eighteen States having a total enrollment of more than 270,000 students. We could not help but feel that this was superior tribute paid to the educational values claimed for tournament debating.

Although debating at Northwestern is in its 102nd year, and this year's tournament was our twenty-fifth tournament, this was the first year for the Owen Coon Tournament. Owen L. Coon was a student debater at Northwestern from 1914 to 1918. He was president of the Gavel and Rostrum Society in 1914 and 1915. After graduating from Northwestern, Mr. Coon founded an automobile finance company, which subsequently developed into the General Finance Corporation, one of the largest finance companies in America. Mr. Coon believed that he owed much to his training in forensics and the tutelage of great teachers, such as Professor Clarion DeWitt Hardy of the Northwestern School of Speech, and he wanted other students to have the opportunity for such stimulating and valuable training. Accordingly, in 1935 he established the Clarion DeWitt Hardy Scholarships in Forensics, "in honor of the teacher who contributed most to my education."

Eight Hardy Scholarships were established by Mr. Coon, and these eight scholarships have continued in an unbroken series since their founding. More than sixty young people

have been graduated from Northwestern as Hardy Scholars under Mr. Coon's "influencing others for good" philosophy. After Mr. Coon's death in 1948 the Owen Coon Foundation carried out his belief that training in forensics was an important factor in the development of responsible citizens. The Hardy Scholarship program was continued, and the Foundation began to sponsor other forensic activities at the University. The annual high school debate seminar held each fall on the Northwestern campus, and the popular International Debate each spring are both sponsored by the Owen Coon Foundation.

Northwestern felt that a rather large debt of gratitude was owed to Mr. Coon and the Foundation. Thus, the national debate tournament was named in honor of Owen L. Coon.

Several schools came early Thursday evening for the kick-off event of the tournament, a Western Conference Debate between Northwestern and Minnesota on the proposition that President Eisenhower Should Resign Immediately.

Friday night the tournament banquet was staged at the Grand Ball Room of the North Shore. The guest speaker, Willard Wirtz, gave an address that will be long remembered by those 300 people who attended the banquet, an address on "Public Address and Politics." Mr. Wirtz is a prominent Chicago attorney, a member of the Northwestern Law School faculty, and was speech advisor to Adlai Stevenson in the last two campaigns.

A panel composed of Dr. Glen Mills, Dr. Wayne Minnick, Dr. Elmo Hohman, Wirtz, and moderated by Dean James H. McBurney of the School of Speech, discussed the tournament debates they had heard that afternoon on Right-To-Work Legislation.

Butler University, Notre Dame University, St. Olaf College, Southern Illinois University, the University of Kansas, Washburn University, Augustana College, and the United States Military Academy were the quarter-final

(Continued on Page 53)

*Russell Windes is sponsor of DSR at Northwestern University.

John Stuart Mill and the "Utility" of Debate

BY NELS JULEUS*

A healthy spirit of debate pervades the works of John Stuart Mill. His economic and political theories, based on the philosophy of Utilitarianism, died with him; but his philosophy of debate lives after him, as personified by his life and illustrated in his works.

Quintilian has for generations excited man with the possibilities of education. James Mill set out to test the theory. With the birth of John Stuart on May 20, 1806, James Mill launched his son on an academic program incredible in scope. His intentions were twofold: first, he would develop a man of reason; and, secondly, he would indoctrinate his heir with the philosophy of Utilitarianism. His purpose was to create an advocate, and the core of his plan was to train his son in the skills of the debater.

By the time he was twelve years old, John Stuart Mill had read an astounding number of works. His studies had encompassed the classics, history, higher mathematics and some work in the experimental sciences. His father had not failed to introduce him to those classical works which would develop in him a theory of expression. He had read Plato, Isocrates, the orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, Cicero's work on oratory and rhetoric, Dionysius and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which he had cast into synoptic tables.

At twelve years of age, Mill's education in logic began with the study of Aristotle's *Organon*. This work was supplemented with a study of the scholastic logic and Hobbes. By explanation and patient questioning the elder Mill drilled his son in the importance of syllogistic reasoning. During this period of his education, Mill was required by his father to analyze the orations of Demosthenes in terms of how they illustrated the skill and art of oratory. At this time, too, he read Quintilian and more of Plato.

One other aspect of this early education, as it relates to our subject, must be touched upon. Mill's father thoroughly grounded him

in the principles of reading aloud. Reproached when his reading did not come up to the standard set by his father, Mill grew to know the importance of articulate speech.

This then was the preparation of a debater. It should be pointed out, however, that we have dealt with the core of Mill's education and not its meat. Through his father's diligent guidance, Mill had been introduced to those works intended to instill in him the Benthamic principle of the "greatest happiness." It was in the works of his father and Bentham that Mill found a unity into which he could consolidate his learning.

At seventeen, in 1822, with an education which would have amply qualified him for the bar, John Stuart Mill, following in his father's footsteps, entered India House as a clerk, where he remained until his retirement in 1858.

The year 1822 marked another significant event in Mill's life. The Union Debating Society was in full swing. Here, Mill met Macaulay, Romilly, Hyde and Villiers and discussed philosophical and political questions at the weekly meetings. Mill was so impressed with the Debating Society that he formed one of his own, the Utilitarian Society. This group was made up of young men agreeing in the fundamental premise of utility as their standard of ethics and politics. They met once every two weeks in the home of Jeremy Bentham to read papers and discuss questions relative to their fundamental beliefs. By the time the group disbanded in 1826, Mill had benefited greatly from the practice in oral discussion the meetings had afforded.

From 1825 to 1830, public speaking and debating filled a large part in Mill's life. The young Utilitarians challenged a group of Owenites to a series of public debates. Mill took an active part in these exciting debates between political economist and Owenite. With this experience behind them, Mill and his friends organized the Speculative Society and held a series of debates. They met every two weeks, and the list of participants in-

*Nels Juleus is sponsor of the chapter at Allegheny College.

cluded members of Parliament as well as the most noted speakers of the Cambridge Union and the Oxford United Debating Society. Mill debated at almost every meeting. Through these debates, Mill greatly increased his power of effective expression.

Mill spent the remainder of his life in the service of written rather than oral argument with the exception of one interlude occurring almost at the close of his life. In 1865, he represented Westminster in Parliament. In Parliament, he took an active part in debates on Disraeli's Reform Bill, the reform and land tenure in Ireland, representation of women, the reduction of the national debt and the reform of London government. It was said of Mill that his presence in Parliament elevated the tone of debate.

Mill's theory of debate is not systematized in any of his works. Through the examination of several of his writings, however, we can derive some notion of what he believed with respect to the "utility" of debate.

It is significant that his first major work was the *Logic*, published in 1834. While the *Logic* is an attempt to restate the fundamental tenets of Utilitarianism, Mill's purpose was also to educate. He firmly believed that for those who would decide issues, logic was the basic and essential tool. The purpose of logic, Mill believed, was the clarification of one's own thinking. All sound debate must be founded upon logic. The effectiveness of debate is dependent upon the participant's ability to define, classify, support, refute and conclude reasonably. These are the tools provided by logic. This must be the debater's starting point. This was where Mill began in his systematic presentation of Utilitarianism.

On Liberty is perhaps the most popular of Mill's works. It is important to realize that the essay depends for its development upon a sound treatment of the "utility" of debate. This material is dealt with in the section of the essay in which Mill tried to establish the relationship of thought and discussion to liberty.

Debate, or discussion—Mill uses these terms interchangeable, is essential for liberty for four reasons:

First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.

Secondly, though the silenced opinion be in error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth; and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinion that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.

Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who received it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds.

Fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct: the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground and preventing the growth of any real and heartfelt conviction from reason or personal experience.

In addition to these considerations and skillfully interwoven into the essay is a presentation of the responsibility of the debater seldom equalled in clarity and force.

Mill believed that mankind in general was essentially rational both in conduct and opinion. The reason for this rested in man's ability to rectify his mistakes through experience and discussion. Not, however, by experience alone; because only through discussion can experience be interpreted. Argument provides a means of testing wrong opinions and practices. And reliance must be placed in argument; because of the effect it produces on the mind, and because facts by themselves mean little until interpreted by the arguer.

The essential qualities of the arguer are rationality and open mindedness. These characteristics help to give us confidence in his judgment. His mind is open to criticism. His practice is to hear out his opponents, profiting by what is just and ferreting out the fallacies for his own benefit and, when practical, expounding them to others. The effective arguer attempts to know the whole of a subject by studying every conceivable opinion held by those of a variety of points of view. After going through this process, never shut-

(Continued on Page 54)

What the Students Say About Forensics

BY LEE E. GRANELL*

Few issues of our professional speech publications appear without an article or comment upon the status and value of competitive debate and individual events. The writings usually represent a wide range of opinion. This situation may exist because we are not completely certain about a number of questions concerning forensics. Some individuals even are uncertain that forensics are of any value to the students concerned, or society as a whole. Others feel that tournaments are of value, but that the giving of awards detracts from, or even negates, that value.

Are we then left with no alternative but to continue our speculation? Forensic activities cannot be smeared on a slide and examined under a microscope. Have we, however, explored all likely areas which might give us more information about our field?

While we have spoken enthusiastically of what forensics may do for the student, we have seldom asked the student what he thinks about the activities in which he is engaged. Thus, it was my task in a recent survey to discover students' opinions on a number of questions that have interested educators for some time.

The University of Southern California each year hosts over five-hundred high school students at the largest forensic tournament in the state of California. These students represent more than fifty-five high schools from Los Angeles County and the surrounding area. This seemed a good opportunity to learn what students in Southern California thought about forensics. While it would be presumptuous to consider the replies indicative of opinions of all high school competitors, this sampling could at least provide clues to speaker attitudes.

The questionnaire submitted to the contestants was relatively short and simple to complete. It consisted of five questions. Each question allowed the student to merely check an answer that best reflected his opinion.

Consideration was given to the possibility that all relevant answers were not listed on the questionnaire. Thus an additional choice for *other* answers was afforded the subject on three of the questions. In the case that none of the offered answers was appropriate, he could write in his answer. The other two questions called for value-judgments with answers ranging from one extreme to the other.

The questionnaires were distributed to high school directors as they registered at tournament headquarters. The coaches, in turn, distributed them to their own students. To promote genuine expressions of student opinion, questionnaires were unsigned and returned directly to this writer.

Briefly, it was my objective to determine five things: (1) why students enter a particular tournament, (2) how students had become attracted to forensic competition, (3) what the students considered to be the greatest value of forensic activities, (4) the motivation of awards, and (5) student satisfaction with what they had derived from forensic tournaments.

Two hundred-fifty-nine students responded to the questionnaire. However, all replies could not be utilized for purposes of the survey. Twenty-six were disqualified; eight of these for obviously bumptious entries written in the *other* choice, and eighteen for failure to follow instructions.

Figures I through V represent the questions given and the number of students that responded to each alternative. As students participating in debate and students entered only in individual events took the questionnaire on different days, it was possible to tabulate the responses separately. The first figure indicates the total for individual events contestants, and the second figure indicates the total for debate contestants.

It was interesting to note that despite the fact that this was a state-qualifying tournament, a large preponderance of the students entered "to gain speaking experience." No other alternative for question 1 gained enough responses to be seriously considered.

*Mr. Granell is a teaching fellow at the University of Southern California.

This is the first surprise in the tabulation.

Question 2 gave us a variety of responses, including a large number of *other* choices. This seems reasonable as we have long been aware that the students come to us via a number of paths. The fact that classes seemed to have slightly more effect than other possibilities might lead us to believe that our courses make the subject somewhat interesting to our students. It also might encourage us to continue searching basic courses for students that display an aptitude for extracurricular participation.

The third question provides the results that should be expected—relative indecision. Few educators agree completely upon the greatest value of forensics; we might expect similar division of opinion among students. While students entered only in individual events did favor personality development by a fairly substantial margin, debaters favor intellectual competition, but by a lesser margin.

Contrary to popular belief, awards and decisions may not play as important a role in providing incentive as most educators would have anticipated. Only forty-five per cent of the respondents confirmed the stimulus of decisions and awards. The remaining fifty-five per cent at least *predicted* that they might expend as much effort if self-satisfaction were the only reward.

Question 5 provided us with the greatest margin of agreement, with nearly seventy-eight per cent of the students affirming that they had received more than they had expected from forensic competition. Though they do not agree on what they have gained, they do express general satisfaction with the outcomes.

From these data several generalizations seem warranted. First, students become interested in forensics for a number of reasons. Second, they compete to improve their ability to speak and to acquire a more well-rounded personality. Third, the experience itself is rewarding for many students; many others are strongly motivated by decisions and awards. Fourth, regardless of how or why they have entered forensics, they are pleased with what forensics has done for them.

Perhaps these students in Southern California are not typical of students throughout

the nation. If they are not, I am eager to hear of the results from similar studies in other localities.

FIGURE I
QUESTION 1
WHY DID YOU ENTER THIS
TOURNAMENT

	Individual Events Speakers	Debaters
A. I hope to win a medal or trophy.	7	6
B. Tournaments are fun.	15	6
C. I think it will be educational.	16	13
D. To gain speaking experience.	87	57
E. This is a State-Qualifying Tournament.	3	6
F. Other (Specify)	6	10

FIGURE II
QUESTION 2
HOW DID YOU FIRST BECOME
ATTRACTED TO FORENSICS?

	Individual Events Speakers	Debaters
A. The coach asked me to compete.	26	13
B. Through a class I took.	53	23
C. Friends recommended it.	15	11
D. I read about it.	1	3
E. I feel it important for my chosen occupation.	28	30
F. Other (Specify)	10	16

FIGURE III
QUESTION 3
WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE
GREATEST VALUE OF FORENSICS?

	Individual Events Speakers	Debaters
A. Worth-while topics are discussed.	6	5
B. It develops a student's personality.	61	23
C. Students have an opportunity to win medals and trophies.	2	4
D. It prepares the student for many jobs.	35	17
E. It is recreational	3	0
F. Intellectual competition is stimulating.	22	43
G. Other (Specify)	5	7

(Continued on Page 56)

Psychiatric Nursing and Debate Training

BY DORIS SCHMIDT (MM '55)*

My choice of psychiatric nursing as a profession was influenced by the background I had received in the liberal arts, the sciences and by practical experience in various hospitals in caring for both physically and mentally ill patients. My four years experience in collegiate debate also had considerable influence on my choice.

In debate I had found an opportunity to talk (I am quite fond of the habit), to discuss controversial issues, to test new ideas, to prove old ones, to meet interesting people and to discover their manner of thinking. In general, I had hoped I could discover in psychiatric nursing an opportunity to further these same interests.

It may seem incongruous that I chose such a field to satisfy my interests in logical thinking, argument and discussion. Nevertheless, I was attracted by the personal freedom that this field offered: the freedom to talk, to discuss and to think in a self-directed manner. I do not mean to imply that there are no limits or rules in the different types of psychiatric nursing but, comparatively speaking, the rigid codes that govern so many other types of nursing are absent. Here, too, as in all nursing, I could work with the most fascinating of all God's creatures—man. I might add the rhetorical question, "Where else could they possibly be more interesting?" Perhaps a few examples from my past experiences will illustrate that my expectations have on the whole been well fulfilled—and challenged.

One of my first contacts with an acutely disturbed person, a very intense young man, is still vivid in my memory. I discovered him on one occasion, staring straight ahead with a tormented expression on his face. All too eagerly I wanted to help so I met the situation by applying the traditional psy-

chiatric nursing principle, "get him to talk about his troubles." I asked the proverbial question, "Why are you feeling this way?" He answered without hesitation, "I'm in hell, that's why." Automatically I flaunted another question as bait, "What makes you think you're in hell?" His piercing blue eyes did not waver and he replied, "Hell is eternal frustration and I'm always frustrated."

Dumbfoundedly I stood there and attempted to respond to this simple, truthful and seemingly logical statement. I don't remember exactly what reply I gave to him but I do remember that the succeeding verbal exchanges between us provided enough mental stimulation to satisfy the debater's love for discussion in me and at the same time challenged the nurse's desire in me to understand people.

In addition to the personal interests I have found common in my college debating and my present occupation there are what I call "academic common denominators" in both areas. I refer to some of the basic principles of speech and communication which I utilized in debating while in college and which I now use in psychiatric nursing. Most of these basic concepts are taught in the general speech course.

In psychiatry, I find it necessary to keep close to recall at all times the elements of communication because of the major role they play in most psychiatric disorders. One obvious example of incongruous communication is employed by the adult who constantly speaks "baby talk." I was personally impressed with the faulty communication that I received from a sweet old soul who smiled pleasantly at me and spoke kindly to me and then in the next instant belted me with a right jab.

Understanding why such behavior occurs is naturally the prime object of concern to people in a psychiatric or mental health setting but before a situation can be understood it must be recognized for what it is. I draw heavily upon past speech training to

*Miss Schmidt is a charter member of the Mt. Mercy chapter. She is now employed as a mental health staff nurse at the Clinical Center of the National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland. Her remarks are particularly interesting in light of the coming National Mental Health observance in April.

help me recognize these breaks in valid communication, many of which are not as obvious as the two given in the examples.

Another "common denominator" is the area concerned with the content of speech. In the above, the emphasis was placed on *how* a thought is expressed. It is equally important to listen to *what* is being said. Perhaps the practicality of this can be demonstrated by some parallel examples. In a debate one was always faced with the emphatic statements of the opponent that the entire world would go to ruin if his plan were not enacted. It was a profitable experience to learn to examine the factual aspects of such sweeping statements and to learn to view them for what they are worth. All too frequently such statement could be countered simply by labeling them "mere assertions."

The psychiatric world is also rampant with such "assertions." The terminology is slightly different, however. In a debate we asked for proof, in psychiatry we seek *reality*, i.e. that which should be based on fact. Many of the psychosomatic ailments are certainly assertions without proof: the "fever" with no temperature elevation, the excruciating pains which conveniently come and go, the limp with no neuromuscular impairment. Usually more easily recognized are the cases of the persons who claim to be famous personages or who tell of wild schemes to save the world. The reality factor is obviously missing in these cases. Once this is recognized then the next step is to decide how to respond to the individual case.

Unfortunately there are no patented formulas describing the method of handling such situations. The first step, locating and recognizing the "assertion," in the process is basic—the succeeding steps are highly debatable. Just as each affirmative plan is tailored by the individual debate team to best suit the stated contentions so the individual psychiatric approach or treatment reflects the various schools of thought on the situation.

There are other areas in psychiatry which demonstrate faulty communication processes. The interesting problem of irrelevant conversation lies in this area. For example, the

syntax of the sentence may be fine, the thought may be beautiful but the thought expressed actually may have nothing to do with the subject at hand. A typical example may sound as nonsensical as: "Please show me where you put the newspaper," and the reply, "Yes, thank you, I will take some of Aristotle's chewing gum."

It is not too difficult to imagine, in the same category (less pronounced), some of my past debate experiences in which friend foe went off on a tangent to evade a strong point. As a debater I had to learn to recognize evasiveness and attempt to get the discussion back to the pertinent point. Similarly it is the everlasting task of a psychiatric nurse to evaluate such responses as the above and to respond as close to reality as the individual case will permit.

For what it is worth, I will admit that many times I have been side-tracked into arguing on the opponent's tangent but I've never yet gone out looking for a piece of Aristotle's chewing gum!

Obviously the examples I have given are over-simplified and there are many ramifications which I have not mentioned. What lies beneath these confused communications? What do they all mean? The complexity of the problem is one that has baffled civilization for centuries. It is still unsolved.

I have attempted to share with you some of my observations in this field, in particular those in which I have found corresponding similarities in my debate experiences. Each of us depends upon his own personal reservoir of knowledge and experience to help him function in his particular job. It has been a great help to me to have my debate experiences to augment my personal resources. I have found it very beneficial to recognize the many facets of communication—whether in their natural, exaggerated or negative states.

At present I am doing psychiatric nursing in a research setting. The theory is comparatively new and untried; the methods of operating are unorthodox. The project is in a sense like the affirmative team advocating something extreme and radical. The position of the "burden" of proof is quite clear; it

(Continued on Page 54)

The Missouri Valley Forensic League

(1958, Its Silver Jubilee)

BY E. CHRIS BUEHLER*

The Missouri Valley Forensic League, composed of fourteen member schools (ten Delta Sigma Rho) boasts a tradition which in many respects is unique in the annals of American competitive college forensics.

For the past twenty-five years, the League featured only three standard events: (1) six rounds of debate on a special subject other than the national college or high school question. Debaters keep the same side during the tournament. (2) formal oratory where the orators are required to appear in formal dress and submit copy of their oration to be filed with the secretary. (3) extempore speaking, two students from each school. The topic is always the same—"The American Political Scene."

The present League is the amalgamated product of two separate organizations—The Missouri Valley Oratorical Association which was formed in 1917, and the Missouri Valley Debate League which was organized in 1925. The union of these two groups was consummated apparently without fuss or formalities. The secretary's minutes of the Annual Missouri Valley Oratorical Association Business Meeting held at 2:00 p.m. Thursday, March 23, 1933, in the Boone Hotel, Columbia, Missouri, give perhaps our best recorded clue as to how the present Missouri Valley Forensic League came into being. This item simply reads: "Professor Griscom of Texas extended an invitation to the Association to hold the Annual Oratorical Contest next year at Austin, Texas, in conjunction with an invitation debate tournament and an extempore speaking contest. After discussing the pro's and con's of the practical aspects of holding the contest at Austin, Texas, it was moved by Professor Young (of Washington University) and seconded by Professor Lyon (of South Dakota) that the Association should accept Professor Griscom's invitation. The motion was carried unanimously." March 23, 1933,

marks the official birthday of the League, although the first meeting featuring three forensic competitive events; oratory, debate and extempore speech, did not take place until March 22-24, 1934, at Austin, Texas. The present member schools are: University of Arkansas, University of Colorado, Creighton University, Iowa State College, University of Kansas, Kansas State College, Louisiana State University, University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma, University of South Dakota, University of Texas, Washington University, University of Wichita, and Baylor University.

The trials and tribulations of the old Missouri Valley Oratorical Association and the Missouri Valley Debate League before their union in 1933, should be of interest to speech and forensic students of this day.

Oratory was a forerunner of debate among American colleges. The Northern Oratorical League composed largely of what is now known in athletic parlance as "Big Ten Schools," was formed in 1890—more than twenty years ahead of a debate league for this cluster of schools. Oratory a half century ago was most highly regarded. In the chapter reports of *The Gavel* before World War I, the college orator frequently was even more glorified than the debater.

The Missouri Valley Oratorical Association found it much easier to carry on its activity in a harmonious peaceful manner than did the Debate League. The first contest in oratory was held in 1917. The schools forming the Association were eight in number: Iowa State, Nebraska, Kansas, Kansas State, Missouri, Washington, Drake and Oklahoma. The second contest was held in 1918 at Iowa State, and the third at Lincoln, Nebraska, in 1919. The writer has been unable to obtain essential data for the following five years. Some light is thrown on the activity of the Association in a letter by its secretary dated March 4, 1926. The Secretary's Bulletin No. 2 reads: "The following are essential points

*Professor Buehler is Trustee of D.S.R.

taken from the minutes of last year: (1) Admission of Texas, South Dakota and Colorado. (2) The dropping of Iowa State and Nebraska." This bulletin indicates that one copy of the oration must be provided instead of four. Tuxedos are mandatory, word limit reduced from 1,700 to 1,500, no orator can win twice. Annual dues were \$10.00. The correspondence shows that University of Washington at St. Louis was the most popular location and the contest was held there more than at any other school. The constitution set the third Friday in March as contest date. It specified only male undergraduate students in good standing were eligible.

There was insurrection deep in the heart of Texas when Missouri entered a woman student in 1928. The peace and harmony of the Association was momentarily shattered, but chivalry prevailed and the young lady was extended equal rights to free speech with the men, the constitution notwithstanding.

The Missouri Valley Debate Conference was formulated largely through the labors and leadership of Professor Harry B. Summers, Director of Debate at Kansas State College during the fall months of 1925. A long, complicated construction was drawn with 4,000 words of rules and regulations which proved a source of entanglements, misunderstandings, as well as personal and institutional frictions which foreshadowed troubled times and possible doom to the young League. Eight schools were in the select League: Colorado, Drake, Kansas, Kansas State, Oklahoma, Texas, South Dakota, and Washington.

An Executive Secretary of the czar type was elected each year. The first secretary was J. R. Horner of Oklahoma (1925-26). The second was William O. Moore of Texas. The third was E. C. Buehler of Kansas, and by the fourth year, the League began to fall apart and Harry K. Summers was drafted to serve as temporary secretary of the League. Travel schedules seemed to cause most of the trouble. The secretary set up the schedule and a school caught with long trips found its meager forensic budget ruined. All schools were required to have four debates, all judged by three judges who must be paid

by the host school \$5.00 and expenses, or a single judge could be used, but his minimum honorarium was \$20.00 and expenses. The teams were composed of three men unless by mutual consent when two-member teams could be used. A bitter feud developed on this point between Texas and Oklahoma. Texas threatened to withdraw if it had to send a three-man team to Norman, Oklahoma. Oklahoma insisted upon its constitutional rights to use three men. This dispute was the Gaza Strip of that day. Constructive speeches were fifteen minutes and rebuttals five minutes for three-member teams. If two were on a team, the speeches were sixteen and eight minutes in length. In the second year, Professor Moore of Texas wrote, "I believe we will have to drop some of our absolute rules to keep the League intact."

The League started out to give championship awards based upon four debates. Drake won the first year, Kansas the next two and by the fourth year, the schedule bogged down so badly that no clean-cut victory could be determined. The fourth year, 1928-29, the Missouri Valley Debate League was on a temporarily suspended basis with Harry Summers as secretary. On March 21, 1929, at St. Louis, Missouri, this organization met jointly with the Missouri Oratorical Association. Howard Hill read at this time a new constitution submitted by Professor Summers. This new document was discussed at great length and finally was rejected. Summers' proposal as indicated in the secretary's minutes, "called for administrative cooperation which seemed impractical and useless." Yet, the group felt much could be gained by definite affiliation with the conference that would lend prestige to debate in general. An important part of the minutes read as follows:

"When it was apparent that the proposed constitution of Mr. Summers would not be accepted and that some organization should be retained, the following measures were enacted:

"1. Membership: Moved by Griscom of Texas, seconded by Buehler of Kansas University, that the basis for the membership of the Missouri Debate League for the first

(Continued on Page 55)

The Intramural Program—A Means of Increasing Participation in the Speech Activities

BY DON WILLIAMS*

In the spring of 1954, the Texas chapter of Delta Sigma Rho joined with the Oratorical Association of The University of Texas in an attempt to find a means of increasing participation in the extracurricular speech program. With increasing frequency the complaint was being heard that the existing program, consisting mostly of intercollegiate debate, could not be justified in terms of the relatively small number of students participating.

After considering several proposals, the two organizations decided to concentrate their efforts on the revitalization of an intramural speech program. Such a program had existed on the University campus for some time, but in the years immediately prior to 1954 had been lagging badly. Contests were held irregularly and infrequently; organization and administration were haphazard; publicity was almost nonexistent; participation was usually limited to members of the debate squad. In the academic year 1953-1954 the largest number participating in any one contest was fourteen.

In the fall of 1954, the two organizations launched the "new" intramural speech program. Since that time the growth has been constant and most gratifying. In the fall of 1957, thirty campus organizations provide more than three hundred entries in the four contests held during the first semester.

In essence, the structure of the program is a simple one. Contests in four speech events are held each semester. Preliminaries and finals for each contest are scheduled on Thursday evenings, beginning with about the third class week and extending no later than the fourteenth week. Participation is open to all students in the University with the exception of those who have won letters in the intercollegiate program.

Advance registration is not required. On the night of a preliminary contest, the students wishing to enter report to a designated room in the Speech Building. There they are asked to fill out entry sheets giving their names, addresses, and the names of the organizations which they are representing. The entries are then divided into groups of from ten to fifteen each and are sent with judges to other rooms where the preliminary contests are held. Judging in the preliminary contests is done by members of Delta Sigma Rho and members of the intercollegiate speech squad.

From each preliminary group one to three finalists are selected. In the final contest, usually held one week later, judges drawn from the faculty and the city of Austin select first, second, third and fourth place winners. At the end of each semester awards are made to the three campus organizations whose members have compiled the largest number of points in the four contests.

Those of us who have worked with the program for the past three-and-a-half years attribute the greater portion of its success to two factors: (1) a carefully planned design to encourage competition both among individuals and organizations; and (2) a continuing series of experiments endeavoring to discover the contest types and formats which attract maximum participation.

Whatever may be the merits of cooperative speech activities in other contexts, the *sine qua non* of the intramural program at The University of Texas is competition. In each of the individual contests, the first place winner receives an engraved wall plaque. Second, third, and fourth place winners receive miniature cups. At one time medals were given to all individual winners. Although the plaques and cups now given are more expensive, we have felt that the increased expenditure has been worthwhile. Medals are likely to be tossed into desk

*Don Williams is chapter sponsor at the University of Texas.

drawers; plaques and cups usually are to be displayed where they will attract the attention of other students.

The point system by which the organization winners are determined at the end of each semester was designed to strike a balance between "quantity" and "quality" of participation. For each of its members who enters a preliminary contest, the organization receives five points; for each member who qualifies as a finalist, the organization receives twenty-five points. Organizations whose members win first, second, third and fourth places in any contest, receive three hundred, two hundred, one hundred, and fifty points respectively. Thus, while the point system encourages an organization to enter a large number of contestants, it is impossible to win one of the awards on entries alone. On the other hand, it is virtually impossible for an organization to win on the basis of one or two "star" performers.

Perhaps the most important reason for the growth of the intramural program, however, lies in what we have learned about the types of contests which attract student participation. At first, several of the conventional activities were included in the program. *Extemporaneous speaking* attracted very few; *oratory* and *debate* attracted virtually no one. One year we tried *declamation*. This is the most popular speech activity in the Texas secondary schools and we felt that it might draw considerable interest from students who had participated in their high schools. The results were disappointing. From talking to many persons, we came to the conclusion that the average student considers these conventional contests to be for the "experts." Rightly or wrongly, he feels that they require a degree of talent and skill beyond his capacities.

Each semester we try one or more new activities. If a contest proves popular it is given a regular place in the program; if it fails to draw a sizeable number of contestants it is revised or abandoned.

Since their introduction in the fall of 1954, *poetry reading* and *impromptu speaking* have been the two most popular contests. Both are now included in each semester's program. Although we were a little surprised the first

time nearly one hundred students showed up on one night to read poetry, we had suspected that it would prove popular. We were completely unprepared, however, for the extreme popularity of *impromptu speaking*, particularly in view of the rather dismal response to *extemporaneous speaking*. As a final test, both contests were included in the schedule for one semester. Except for the time allowed for preparation, the rules were identical. In both contests, topics concerned campus activities; in both, the student drew three topics and from these selected one; in both, he was asked to speak for a maximum of five minutes. The only difference was that in *impromptu* the student had thirty seconds to prepare; in *extemp* he had thirty minutes. The *impromptu* contest outdrew *extemp* by more than three to one. Regretfully, *extemporaneous speaking* was abandoned.

Often we have found that the most popular contests were those which tied in with current campus interests, events, and topics of discussion. The Student Assembly at Texas has a Grievance Committee before which students may appear and voice their complaints. Last fall *The Daily Texan* carried a story to the effect that few students were appearing before the committee. The directors of the intramural program immediately set up a *Stereophonic Fussbudgeting*—the title came from the comic strip *Peanuts*—contest in which students were invited to give five minute talks on any "gripes" which they had concerning the University. Members of the Grievance Committee were asked to serve as judges. The idea caught the interest of the campus; a large number of students participated; *The Daily Texan* gave front page coverage, with pictures, to both the preliminary and final contests; and the entire extracurricular speech program was brought favorably to the attention of the Student Assembly.

During the past semester we experimented for the first time with a *news analysis* contest in which the students read items from a newspaper and then comment upon them. The event was moderately popular and we think that with some minor changes it may become a permanent feature of the program. During the spring semester we will experiment with a *prose reading* contest.

I suppose that there may be some who will complain that in our drive for maximum participation we tend to emphasize the "easy" contest which takes little advance preparation. We, however, have no apologies. The intramural program is designed for the student who would not otherwise participate in speech activities; it is intended for the many rather than the few. The few who have the time and talent for such things as debate and oratory can, and do, find an outlet in the intercollegiate program and in the several endowed prize contests which are held throughout the year.

During a meeting of the Student Assembly at which a motion to increase the appropriation to the extracurricular speech program was being debated, the president of one of the fraternities which recently had won an intramural speech award rose to his feet. "Our speech trophy," he said, "has attracted more attention from parents and alumni than any other award we have ever won. More than anything else, it has convinced them our fraternity's activities consist of something besides parties and beer-busts." The motion to increase the appropriation carried.

EIGHTH DSR STUDENT CONGRESS

(Continued from Page 35)

uled for the *General Council*. The General Council is composed of the officers of the society and representatives of each chapter. This council will be meeting to deal with some of the serious issues facing the society. It is hoped that *every* chapter will be represented in these deliberations. A large agenda of items relating to the work of the society is being prepared by President Fest and the Executive Committee.

Many chapter sponsors and members are active in the preparations for the Congress. Dr. Charles Goetzinger of Kansas State College and Dr. Victor Harnack of the University of Colorado are co-chairmen of the Congress activities. Austin Freeley of John Carroll University is Director of the Student Congress. Assisting in the preparatory and on-the-scene activities are several committees as follows:

Investigation of Subject Matter: Lillian Wagner (IT) ch., Gale Richards (WA), Rollin G. Osterweis (Y), George F. Henigan (GW), Paul Boas (OB), Thomas A. Hopkins (MM), Charles Parkhurst (BK).

Rules and Procedures: Austin Freeley, Ch., Edd Miller (M), Paul Carmack (O), Russel Windes (NO).

Local Arrangements: David Ralph (MS) ch., Jack Bain (MS), Huber Ellingsworth (MS).

Sponsor Activities: Robert Newman (PT) ch., Rev. Robert F. Purcell (CR), Leroy Laase (N), Stanley Kinney (COL), Herman Cohen (OR), Harold Ross (DP).

Banquet, Speakers and Initiation: Kenneth Hance (MS) ch., R. Victor Harnack (CLR), Charles Goetzinger (KA), Thorrel Fest (CLR).

Initiation: Robert Weiss (DP) ch., Joe Lane (MQ), E. C. Buehler (K).

Evaluation: Ronald Reid (W) ch., William Vanderpool (GR), Roger Nebergall (OK), James McBath (SC), George Sparks (AR).

Alumni Relations: Earl Wells (ORS) ch., Rupert Cortwright (WAY), John Keltner (KA).

NORTHWESTERN . . .

(Continued from Page 42)

teams. The winners of the quarter-final rounds, and the four teams to reach the semi-finals were: United States Military Academy and Augustana College; and Washburn University and the University of Kansas. Kansas and Augustana won the semi-final rounds and met in the final round. In a close decision in the final round, the University of Kansas defeated Augustana by a 2-1 decision to take first place and win the Owen Coon Trophy for one year.

The final round was judged by Dr. Glen E. Mills, Dr. Ernest J. Wrage, and Dr. Wayne E. Minnick, all of the department of public speaking.

PSYCHIATRIC NURSING . . .

(Continued from Page 48)

lies with those who are advancing the new theory. The business of conceptualizing theories, verbalizing them, making implicit ideas explicit, getting and recording accurate observations, organizing data in a logical manner—all lends to the building of the "case." The particular theory on which this project is based provides a "plan" to solve the riddle of mental illness. Only time will be able to judge if it is the best.

JOHN STUART MILL . . .

(Continued from Page 44)

ting his mind to the divergent point of view, the arguer can feel qualified to express his own side of the question judiciously and with confidence. We can accept his judgment, because he has made us aware of the process by which he arrived at his conclusions.

The truth of the debater's argument is not the only consideration to be made in judging him, but we must also consider the manner in which he expresses himself. Sophistic argument is the gravest offense of the debater. Yet, too, to betray one's self to drive home an argument is unforgivable. The debater must avoid misrepresentation of the opposite opinion, suppression of facts or arguments, misstatements of the elements of his case, invective, sarcasm, and personal attacks. Herein lies the morality of debate according to Mill.

The method most suitable for the training of the ideal debater, Mill believed, was to be found in the dialogues of Plato—the Socratic dialectic. His father had used the dialectic as a teaching technique, and Mill was a living testimonial to the effectiveness of that training. In Mill's essay on Grote's *Plato*, he argues for the importance of training in dialectic.

Mill shows that while dialectic is the negative arm of philosophy, it provides a positive means of establishing a case. To Mill, dialectic as exemplified in Plato as the means of making an abstraction concrete represents a discipline in precise thinking. The Socratic dialectic consists of a means of testing by "negative scrutiny," drawing from an opinion

objections or difficulties that must be successfully met before its adoption. This can be done only by oral discussion coupled with penetrating cross-examination. In his review of Grote's *Plato*, Mill contends, "Dialectic, thus understood, is one branch of an art which is the main portion of the Art of Living—that of not believing except on sufficient evidence; its function being that of compelling a man to put his belief into precise terms, and take a defensible position against all objection that can be made to it."

The other branch of dialectic, its positive arm consists mainly of the logical processes of definition and division. It represents the direct search for the common feature of things in the same class. It is the method by which vague generalities are submitted to the tests of logic and sense.

In Mill's review of Grote's *Aristotle*, he decries the failure of the educational system of his day to provide training in debate and dialectic. He strongly criticizes the teachers of "ready-made" knowledge who seldom feel it their business to train thinkers and truth seekers. In another essay, aptly entitled "Civilization," Mill has this to say,

The very cornerstone of an education intended to form great minds must be the recognition of the principle, that the object is to call forth the greatest possible quantity of intellectual power and to inspire the intensest love of truth; and this without a particle of regard to the results to which the exercise of that power may lead, even though it should conduct the pupil to opinions diametrically opposite to those of his teachers. We say this, not because we think opinions unimportant, but because of the immense importance which we attach to them: for in proportion to the degree of intellectual power, and love of truth, which we succeed in creating, is the certainty, that (whatever may happen in any one particular instance), in the aggregate of instances, true opinions will be the result; and intellectual power and practical love of truth are alike impossible where the reasoner is shown his conclusions, and informed beforehand that he is expected to arrive at them.

Today, in our mad scramble for brain-power, politicians and educators alike could well afford to reexamine some of Mill's ideas. Mill serves to remind us that there are values to other disciplines outside the realm of mathematics and physics.

From what we know of Mill's life and works, it can be said that he found debate's

"utility" in six values: (1) Debate is valuable as an exercise for disciplining the mind, (2) Debate is valuable as a means of acquiring greater effectiveness in oral and written communication, (3) Debate is a valuable educational experience, because it seeks knowledge in "dark corners" and through awareness of divergent opinion, (4) Debate is valuable as a safeguard against dogmatism, (5) Debate is valuable as the seed of liberty, (6) Debate is valuable in that it inspires a love of truth through its development of intellectual power and through an understanding of the great responsibilities which accompany that power.

Mill's critics are numerous, but most of them would be impelled to agree that a study of Mill's life and works could have a salutary effect, indeed, an elevating effect upon the debating of our own time.

MISSOURI VALLEY . . .

(Continued from Page 50)

year should include all schools of the former Missouri Debate League, and the schools of the old Missouri Valley Oratorical Association. This combined membership would include the University of Texas, University of Arkansas, University of Oklahoma, University of South Dakota, Washington University, Kansas State Agricultural College, University of Nebraska, University of Missouri, and Iowa State College."

From 1929 until 1934, the League was indeed a loose organization, indefinite in its functions and goals. Twelve schools cooperated in the selection of a common debate question and the secretary from time to time prepared a mimeographed bulletin of the house organ type reporting what personal news and forensic data he could collect. During all this time, however, the oratorical contest flourished as usual.

The reasons for the failure of the League as a pioneer debate conference are many. It apparently aimed to include only the larger universities and state schools. When Creighton University was suggested, Texas objected strenuously and threatened to withdraw from the League. The University of Missouri and

Nebraska, interested only in oratory, were warmly and hopefully invited to join the League. Both refused. A letter of October 26, 1927, by Professor H. A. White of Nebraska states, "Our reason is lack of funds and other uncertainties which influence us to hesitate—The University of Nebraska at present does not feel like having any regular judges for our debates, and from a contest point of view, inasmuch as judging is an important feature in the League, it would hardly help the situation in view of our custom here." About the same time, Wilbur E. Gilman of Missouri, submitted by letter official regrets. "After some discussion; the Debate Board of this University voted to decline your kind invitation to become a member of the Missouri Valley Debate League. Our reasons are as follows: 1. We do not wish to compete for championship honors. 2. We are unable to finance long trips. 3. We prefer not to have debates on Friday evenings. 4. We prefer two-man debates. 5. We prefer audience decisions. 6. We wish to remain free to arrange whatever schedule seems best for a particular season."

Eleven schools composed the new Forensic League in 1934. They were: Colorado, Drake, Missouri, Washington, Kansas, Kansas State, Oklahoma, Iowa State, Texas, South Dakota, and Arkansas. Some participated in oratory and extempore speech only, while others in debate only. Within a few years, Missouri and Drake were dropped and Creighton, Louisiana State and Wichita were added. Only championship awards were made in oratory and extempore speech during the first years. But as debate tournaments swept the country, the League soon succumbed to the pressure, giving championship awards to both schools and individual debaters. By 1950, both traveling and school trophies were provided. Originally, winning orators were awarded money—\$50.00 and \$25.00 for first and second places respectively. The policy of cash prizes gave way to trophies. Trophies were introduced also for extempore speech. Today, three trophies are awarded for each of the three events. Debate, however, has two trophies for the winning school, one of which is a traveling trophy held for only one year.

STUDENTS SAY . . .

(Continued from Page 46)

FIGURE IV
QUESTION 4CHECK THE ONE STATEMENT WITH
WITH YOU MOST AGREE.

	Individual Events Speakers	Debaters
A. If awards and decisions were not given, I would not enter tournaments at all.	13	10
B. If awards and decisions were not given, I would not prepare as much or try as hard.	22	18
C. If awards and decisions were not given, I would try as hard, but I would not prepare as much.	23	17
D. If awards and decisions were not given, I would try as hard and prepare as much.	74	49

E. I resent awards and decisions. If not for them, I would try harder and prepare more.

1 4

FIGURE V
QUESTION 5CHECK THE ONE STATEMENT WITH
WITH YOU MOST AGREE.

	Individual Events Speakers	Debaters
A. Forensics has been a waste of time for me.	2	2
B. Forensics would have been of greater value to me if I had tried harder and prepared more.	16	10
C. Forensics has not been of great value yet, but I expect that it will be after I have competed more.	24	20
D. I have gotten just what I expected from forensics.	17	22
E. I have gotten more than I expected from forensics.	71	44

Lifetime Subscribers

Stanley I. Adelstein (WR)
 Lloyd V. Almirall (H)
 Kenneth E. Anderson (IT)
 Nazareth Arslanian (OB)
 Joseph R. Barse (NO)
 James E. Bednar (N)
 Rae F. Bell (WIS)
 Stanley O. Beren (HR)
 Rev. Thomas F. Berry (MQ)
 E. C. Buehler
 Ned Chapin (CH)
 Albert L. Davis (NO)
 Guy W. Davis (SW)
 Richard B. Drooz, M.D. (COR)
 Samuel G. Fredman (PS)
 Alpheus J. Goddard (AM)
 William J. Hagenah (WIS)
 Carl A. Hiassen (ND)
 Walter G. Huber (N)
 Theodore Kellogg (ND)

Walter K. Koch (CLR)
 Robert I. Kopper (CLR)
 Thomas V. Koykka (M)
 A. W. Leonard (SC)
 Carl Wesley Painter (MN)
 Rev. Schuyler Pratt (WM)
 Robert J. Preston (P)
 John W. Rohrer, III (WJ)
 Richard S. Schweiker (P)
 Albert E. Sheets (ND)
 Vincent Starzinger (IU)
 Arthur McLean Stillman (BR)
 Lulu E. Sweigard (IT)
 Margaret Louise Taylor (DP)
 Charles Torem (AM)
 Robert Van Pelt (N)
 Philip Wain (CH)
 William Henry Warmington (NO)
 Henry S. Wingate (CA)

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	Wayne D. Johnson	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	Charles McNames	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	Orland S. Lefforge	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		Galesburg, Ill.
MQ	Marquette	1930	Joseph B. Laine	Milwaukee, Wisc.
M	Michigan	1906	N. Edd Miller	Ann Arbor, Mich.
MN	Minnesota	1906	William S. Howell	Minneapolis, Minn.
MO	Missouri	1909	T. L. Fernandez	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	1910	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. McBath	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	Mel Moorhouse	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

Entered as
Second-class matter

Return Postage Guaranteed

