

11-1958

Complete Issue 41(1)

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 41(1). *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho*, 41(1), 1-16.

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.

✓ Scott

the gavel

volume 41

number 1

**of
delta
sigma
rho**



november

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, Speech Dept., 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: Herold Ross, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

Secretary: Paul Carmack, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

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: Eugene Chenoweth, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Bob Griffin, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada; Bob Newman, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Paul Boas, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; P. Merville Larson, Texas Tech College, Lubbock, Texas; Brooks Quimby, Bates College, Lewistown, Maine.

EDITORIAL STAFF OF THE GAVEL

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 41

NOVEMBER, 1958

NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From The Editor	1
Passing The Gavel by <i>Herold Ross</i>	2
Report On The Gavel—1954-58	3
Direct Clash Debate As A Teaching Procedure by <i>J. Garber Drushel</i>	5
What It Takes To Build A Good Forensic Program: The Urban University by <i>Ronald F. Reid</i>	7
A Local Forensics Conference—Some Advantages by <i>Dale E. Wolgamuth</i>	9
Words Are Deeds by <i>James Robbins</i>	11
Suggestions For Judging Debates by <i>Donald O. Olson</i>	13
The Case For Two Propositions by <i>Richard Gregg</i>	15

From the Editor . . .

An era has passed. John Keltner, after many years of service as both Secretary and Editor, is now in the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Delta Sigma Rho and college teaching have lost a valuable asset.

A new era has started. Editorial policy will remain basically the same as it was under Keltner. It is the hope of the editorial staff that sufficient material will be available for every issue to enable a degree of selectivity. This will insure the continued high caliber publication which the society had under the old editor.

Controversy is invited. If you have something to say, say it. As the official organ of a Forensic Society, the *Gavel* will always publish ideas, whether the editor agrees with them or not. And we will also publish the answers and retorts. A special call is issued for letters to the editor.

May 7, 8, and 9, 1959, Delta Sigma Rho will hold a debate tournament at John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio. Until

further notice D.S.R. will hold a national meeting every year, the odd numbered years being debate, the even years being the student congress.

For this new program to be a success, the cooperation of every chapter is necessary. A new rotating idea will be used, with the meetings being held East—Central—West—Central. This means that chapters that have not attended in some time should find several opportunities in the near future.

The 1959 D.S.R. tournament is still in the planning stage. However, there are a couple of things which might prove of interest. The national debate topic probably will *not* be used, but rather a new topic selected at the SAA meeting in December. There will also be extemp, discussion and either oratory or persuasive speaking. More information will be forthcoming in the January issue, with full details in the March issue.

Your comments are invited.

President's Page . . .

Passing The Gavel

BY HEROLD ROSS

One of the exciting and thrilling moments in a relay race is the moment the baton is passed from one runner to the next. The first runner, after covering his distance, approaches the passing zone with his arm outstretched and his baton held forward to gain every coveted inch; the second runner, with his arm held back and his fingers opened to grasp the baton. Then for a brief period both runners run stride for stride as the baton is passed safely from runner to runner. Then with an initial spurt, the second runner is off on his course.

In many ways, passing the gavel of authority in an organization, such as Delta Sigma Rho, from the past officers of administration to new officers is similar to the relay race. For several months letters and telephone calls, the transfer of files and equipment and discussion of immediate problems has found the incoming officers travelling side by side with the retiring officers, attempting to effect a smooth and gradual transfer of authority. Now with this period passed, the spurt for advantage on a big job is under way.

In a relay race, after the first leg, each successor must take up from the relative position of his predecessor. This may give him a comfortable margin of leadership which it will be easy to hold or it may give him a handicap of distance lost which must be recovered if at all possible. Regardless of advantage or disadvantage, each runner must start from the position in which his predecessor finishes.

If the analogy were to be continued in the case of Delta Sigma Rho, it is evident that the new officers start with the impetus of a dynamic and virile forward movement. Under the wise and aggressive leadership of president after president and the patient and efficient services of secretary after secretary, together with the constant and pertinent cooperation and advice from the other officers, Delta Sigma Rho has maintained a position of positive leadership and widespread influence. Delta Sigma Rho is not just "another organization," it is a nationally

recognized honor society whose membership is coveted and whose key is a symbol of forensic excellence not only on the campus but wherever college men are found. In this transitional period the loyal service of preceding officers should be recognized—services rendered by men like past presidents Buehler and Fest and by past secretaries Hance and Keltner. Our society enjoys a tremendous advantage which must be maintained by the new officers who are now firmly resolved to maintain that advantage and to enhance the prestige of the society whenever possible.

The last meeting of the General Council assisted with this forward movement by providing for a national Delta Sigma Rho tournament which will alternate with the well-established National Congress. Under projected plans, this tournament will be held in either the eastern or the western sections of the country. The congress will remain in the midwest. This will give more opportunity for the seaboard college chapters to participate in the national program of the society. Announcement of the forthcoming tournament this spring is carried elsewhere in *The Gavel*.

The General Council also took steps to adjust our financial resources to our needs. While the fiscal phases of the society are not the paramount concern, everyone will agree that a solvent organization is more apt to be a healthy one. A balanced program on a balanced budget might very well be our statement of administrative policy for the coming years. Here is provision for both stability and flexibility. With it we should be able to maintain the forward momentum which has made Delta Sigma Rho the outstanding honor society that it is today.

—HEROLD T. ROSS

We are all saddened to hear that Mrs. Kenneth Hance passed away October 9. She is survived by Kenneth and one son, Ken, who is a student at DePauw.

A Report on The Gavel—1954-58

At Michigan State last April, John Keltner presented to the Executive Council a summary report of the number of articles, the type of articles, and the percentage of space devoted to the various types for volumes 36-40.

While Keltner is no longer editor, the report has created sufficient interest to merit its publication in this issue. From this

summary it will be possible for you as a reader to see just what has gone into the last four years of the Gavel, and in addition to analyze the content categories to see just where more (or less) emphasis should be placed.

Based upon what you discover, we invite your comments as to what you feel should be stressed in future issues.

Key: #—Number of articles; P—Pages devoted to materials;
%—Percent of space devoted to material.

THE GAVEL—Volume 36

	ISSUE #1			ISSUE #2			ISSUE #3			ISSUE #4			TOTAL		
	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%
Society Business	2	.8	2.8	5	4.3	25.0	2	1.0	4.0	4	6.1	18.3	13	12.2	11.7
President's Page	1	2.	7.0	1	.8	5.	1	1.1	4.4	1	1.4	4.2	4	5.3	5.0
General Forensics	1	4.5	15.7	0	0	0	2	5.0	20.0	0	0	0	3	9.5	9.1
Oratory & Extemp.	1	1.3	4.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	1.2
General Speech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.6	4.8	2	1.6	1.5
Debate	1	3	10.5	0	0	0	1	2.5	9.0	3	6.4	19.2	5	11.9	11.4
Discussion	1	2.5	8.7	2	6.2	38.7	2	10.2	40.8	1	1.4	4.2	6	20.3	19.5
Alumni	0	0	0	2	.6	3.8	2	.5	2.0	2	2.1	6.3	6	3.2	3.0
Features	0	0	0	1	.2	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2	.1
Pictures	2	.8	2.8	0	0	0	1	.3	1.2	2	.6	1.8	5	1.7	1.6
Book Reviews	0	0	0	1	.7	4.4	0	0	0	1	.6	1.8	2	1.3	1.2
Chapter News	3	13.6	47.6	1	4.0	25.0	2	4.4	17.6	3	12.6	37.8	9	34.6	33.2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	.5	1.8	0	.2	1.2	0	0	0	0	.2	.6	0	.9	.9
Totals	12	29		13	17		13	25		19	33		57	104	

THE GAVEL—Volume 37

	ISSUE #1			ISSUE #2			ISSUE #3			ISSUE #4			TOTAL		
	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%
Business	3	1.9	7.9	1	2	10	3	6.6	27.7	8	18.4	57.0	14	28.9	28.9
President	1	2.1	8.7	1	1.5	7.5	0	0	0	1	1.3	4.0	3	4.9	4.9
Forensics	0	0	0	1	1.6	8.0	2	4.0	16.7	0	0	0	3	5.6	5.6
Oratory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen. Speech	4	2.7	11.2	1	.4	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3.1	3.1
Debate	2	4.7	19.6	3	9.3	46.5	4	11.9	49.6	0	0	0	9	25.9	25.9
Discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alumni	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feature	3	5.3	22.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.3	5.3
Pictures	4	1.5	6.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5	1.5	5	2.0	2.0
Book Reviews	1	.6	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.6	.6
Chapter News	2	4	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	31	3	14	14
Letters	1	1	4.1	1	4.6	23.0	1	1.5	6.2	1	1.2	3.7	4	8.3	8.3
Miscellaneous	0	.2	.8	0	.6	.3	0	0	0	0	.6	2.0	0	1.4	1.4
Totals	21	24		8	20		10	24		12	32		50	100	

THE GAVEL—Volume 38

	ISSUE #1			ISSUE #2			ISSUE #3			ISSUE #4			TOTAL		
	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%
Business	3	4.2	13.1	1	.4	2.0	8	23.3	58.3	10	20.8	52	22	48.7	37.0
President	1	1.3	4.1	1	1.7	8.5	1	1.3	2.3	1	1.8	4.5	4	6.1	4.6
Forensics	2	3.1	9.7	2	2.5	12.5	2	3.5	8.8	0	0	0	6	9.1	6.9
Oratory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen. Speech	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.6	6.5	0	0	0	1	2.6	2
Debate	5	13.2	41.2	2	7	37.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	20.7	15.7
Discussion	0	0	0	1	5.1	25.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.1	3.9
Alumni	1	1	3.1	0	0	0	3	6.1	15.2	0	0	0	4	7.1	5.4
Features	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7.2	18	2	7.2	5.5

Pictures	1	.3	.9	2	1.7	85.5	2	.9	2.3	12	8.1	20.3	17	11.0	8.5
Book Reviews	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chapter News	3	7.6	23.7	1	.3	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7.9	6
Letters	1	.6	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.6	.5
Miscellaneous	0	.7	2.2	0	.8	4.0	0	2.2	5.5	0	2.1	5.2	0	5.9	4.5
Totals	17	32		10	20		17	40		25	40		69	132	

THE GAVEL—Volume 39

	ISSUE #1			ISSUE #2			ISSUE #3			ISSUE #4			TOTAL		
	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%
Business	2	1	4.2	5	5.1	15.8	3	1	4.2	8	4.6	18.4	18	11.7	10.5
President	1	1	4.2	0	0	0	1	1.7	6.9	1	2	8.0	3	4.7	4.2
Forensics	2	4.5	18.9	2	6.9	21.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11.4	10.3
Oratory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	6.8	1	1.7	1.5
Gen. Speech	2	4.2	17.6	1	2.1	6.5	2	9.4	38.5	0	0	0	5	15.7	14.1
Debate	1	3	12.6	7	14	43.9	1	1.2	4.9	3	4.1	16.4	12	22.3	20.1
Discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	11.9	0	0	0	1	2.9	2.6
Alumni	2	2.5	10.2	1	1.8	5.6	1	7.1	29.1	1	.6	2.4	5	12.0	10.8
Features	3	2.7	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2.7	2.4
Pictures	1	.2	.8	2	.7	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.9	.1
Book Reviews	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chapter News	1	3.7	15.5	1	1.4	4.4	0	0	0	2	9	36.0	4	14.1	12.7
Letters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	1.2	5.0	0	0	0	0	.8	3.3	0	3.0	12.0	0	5.0	.1
Totals	15	24		19	32		9	24		16	25		59	105	

THE GAVEL—Volume 40

	ISSUE #1			ISSUE #2			ISSUE #3			ISSUE #4			TOTAL		
	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%	#	P	%
Business	3	1.7	10.5	4	3.1	19.4	5	8.5	35.4				12	13.3	23.8
President	1	1.6	9.9	1	1	6.2	1	.5	2.1				3	3.1	5.6
Forensics	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7.6	31.6				3	7.6	13.6
Oratory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0
Gen. Speech	0	0	0	1	6.7	41.9	1	3.1	12.9				2	9.8	17.5
Debate	3	5.4	33.5	1	1.5	9.4	2	3.3	13.7				6	10.2	18.2
Discussion	1	2.1	13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	2.1	3.8
Alumni	1	1.9	11.8	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	1.9	3.4
Features	0	0	0	2	2.7	16.9	0	0	0				2	2.7	4.8
Pictures	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4	1.7				1	.4	.7
Book Reviews	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0
Chapter News	1	3.0	18.6	1	.4	2.5	0	0	0				2	3.4	6.1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				0	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	.3	1.9	0	.6	3.8	0	.6	2.5				0	1.5	2.7
Totals	10	16		10	16		13	24					33	56	

UNPUBLISHED
AT TIME OF REPORT

(Continued on Page 16)

Delta Sigma Rho Tournament

May 7 - 8 - 9, 1959

Cleveland, Ohio

(John Carroll U. — Host)

Events will include — Debate, Discussion, Extemp and Oratory
(full details will be available by January 15, 1959)**Be Sure and Make Plans to Attend**

Direct Clash Debate as a Teaching Procedure

BY J. GARBER DRUSHEL^o

The use of a single proposition throughout the year draws criticism to debate programs from their best friends. The complaint is confounded with considerable justification when the season consists of migrations from one tournament to another, all of a single type, the standard or formal debate. Each evil has its alternative. More than one proposition could be used during the year. However, the reluctance with which this suggestion is received, except for the visiting British, leaves little hope for a change. A second improvement is possible when students have available throughout the year a variety of types of debates. Fortunately, more cross-question meets, with variations in details, are now scheduled than formerly. Direct clash, and the other available types, are scheduled only infrequently.

It is the purpose of this article to discuss direct clash debate, especially with emphasis upon its training procedures, and to suggest certain values it brings to the participants. These observations are based upon ten years' experience with an annual tournament on the College of Wooster (Ohio) campus where this type was featured, and upon use in the classroom.¹ It is believed to be the oldest—indeed, perhaps now the only!—such meet in the country.

Direct clash debate features two separate periods: the analysis speeches, and the series of clashes. Each of these presents distinct opportunities to the debater—and to the judge.

The analysis period (by now you should have read Crocker's rules!) is one of the important assets to the direct clash form. It enables the teams to draw the lines of disagreement very clearly. The only goal here is to determine the main issues, and not to engage in substantive argument on these issues. The period is not the place for the blockbuster points, but for the agreement on potential targets.

Note that the definitions come in the first six-minute analysis speech for the affirmative. If the negative chooses to differ on

basic definitions they must do so in their first speech. Thus, before basic argument is begun, the definitions are mutually agreed upon. If agreement cannot be reached, the judge may request that the first clash in argument be on definitions. However, a clash on definitions is as unfruitful here as it is when formal debaters haggle for eight speeches on shades of meaning. Yet sometimes it must be done.

A major purpose of the analysis period is to provide a time when the teams can reach an agreement upon the important points of difference, the main issues of the debate.² Not infrequently areas of agreement also develop, which at the outset are removed as potential bases for argument. Issues must be more specifically stated than the stock divisions of, "There is a need for a change," etc. Four or five question (issues) may be proposed by each team, even though only three will be debated. If the affirmative issues, including their exact wording, are acceptable to the negative, they need not suggest additional areas for clash. On the other hand there may be important differences between the two teams as to where the basic areas of clash lie. Therefore, the negative often presents additional questions for issues, or at least wordings which give a different emphasis.

Evidence serves a different function in analysis than in argument. Here the use of supporting material has as its objective the establishment of the importance of the issue, its vitality as a phase of the proposition. Hence the only evidence used in the analysis period lends weight to the contention that the issues proposed by one side are crucial, important, and necessary to a significant clash between the teams. Some mistakenly infer that there is no evidence in the analysis period. Not so, but it serves a different purpose than in substantive argument. (See paragraph *infra* on the function of the judge in relation to the analysis period.)

The plan of action proposed by the affirmative must come in the analysis period. The emphasis is upon clarity. Any substi-

^oProf. Drushal is Faculty Advisor of the Wooster chapter.

tute to be proposed by the negative must likewise come in their first analysis speech. It is understood that if the negative does not present an alternate plan here, it will not do so throughout the debate, making its stand at some other battlement. Thus at the end of the analysis period the basic position of both teams should be clear.

Certain mistakes made in the analysis period by new debaters should be noted here. Often the teams try to present only stock issues, not limiting the areas of potential clash. Because of the narrow time limits in clash speeches, main issues, normally less inclusive than stock issues, must be clear and specific. Beginners sometimes want to get on with the contest, and therefore try to start basic argument in the analysis period. Plans of action are sometimes presented obscurely, even by the affirmative, or the negative omits any reference to a plan which they must use later. Most of these errors are easily corrected by a little practice in the method.

In considering the second phase or part of direct clash debate, it is apparent that the clashes present a different kind of challenge to the speaker. He must be incisive, direct to the point of the chosen issue, and careful in his constructive organization. In the later phases, the speeches tend to become rebuttals. In each speech after the opening presentation, each speaker has the direct responsibility to clash specifically with what the preceding speaker has argued.

Such a demand is hard on the wanderers, on the speakers whose circumlocutions unravel into purple periods. The speaker who is uninformed, or who does not want to tackle a difficult answer, cannot "pass the buck" by saying, "My colleague will develop that point." It is unwise in these clashes to use lengthy quotations. Abstracts of material, succinctly stated and identified, which form the logical base for any style of debate, are demanded here.

Each speech must clash directly with the one preceding it. A decision comes at the end of each clash series. However, the rules provide that the judge may stop a series before the scheduled five speeches, thus penalizing a weak rejoinder immediately with the loss of the clash.

Beginners have a tendency to miss the

point of the clash speeches. They fail to reply to the preceding speaker. Further, they often get involved in lengthy, complicated evidence, and then wonder why they have not had time to phrase their arguments and conclusions. They sometimes even fail to speak directly to the issue at hand (not unheard of in standard debate!). The most difficult procedure, yet the rhetorical device with the most persuasive values, demands that the speaker in a brief speech both clash with the opposition, and carry a constructive case forward. Admittedly difficult, yet the mastery of this *sine qua non* for superior clash debate will improve all speaking.

In direct clash debate the judge performs a continuing teaching function throughout. It involves more than writing won or lost on a small ballot, or a few checkmarks on a scale, or another meandering critique after sixty minutes of oratory.³ If the judge's view is influenced by the progress of the debate, the speakers come to know it, and to know the reason why.

One of the most important opportunities for the judge comes at the end of the analysis period when the issues are all out on the table. The judge then comes forward for his preliminary comment. He briefly reviews the speeches, and then explains which of the main issues are acceptable for the debate, which may be combined, which wording is acceptable, or which ones for a variety of reasons are not pertinent. The judge should not insert new issues of his own making, though they seem vital to him, or which his fancy suggests would make an interesting clash. He takes the potential brought to the debate by the participants, and skillfully evaluates their work as he delineates the issues. At the end of his succinct remarks, there should remain a minimum of three issues, though more may be retained, giving the debaters a wider selection.

As noted above, if the differences in definitions have not been resolved by the debaters, or if the debaters have not come so close to it that a declaratory judgment by the judge will suffice, he may request that the first clash be upon definition of terms. The winner of this first clash, therefore, sets the definitions for the remainder of the

(Continued on Page 14)

What It Takes To Build A Good Forensic Program: The Urban University

BY RONALD F. REID¹

In a previous issue of *The Gavel*, Donald Olsen, in the first of a series of articles on "What it Takes to Build a Good Forensic Program," discussed the characteristics of a sound forensic program.² The present article concerns some of the obstacles to, and methods of, achieving these characteristics in one specific kind of school, the urban university.

I

The typical urban university is one in which most students reside, and are graduates of high schools, within the metropolitan area. Consequently, the university's forensic program is affected markedly by the work of the high schools. If forensics is a major activity on the secondary level, the university can hardly fail to profit. But if students never hear the words "debate" or "discussion" or "oratory" while in high school, they are unlikely to enter college eager to start filling their evidence boxes.

The fact that most students live at home gives the campus a peculiar character—peculiar in more than one sense of the word. Students spend considerable time commuting, sometimes as much as two or three hours a day. A large percentage of students work, both because jobs are readily available and because a substantial number of students are married. Many parents keep a watchful eye on Johnny and, though I suspect they disregard his reading ability, they are quite concerned that he be home at six o'clock "sharp" for dinner and be in bed by ten-thirty. Students find that after dinner it is easier to turn on the television set than to ride the street car eight miles to the campus. They find it easier to continue socializing with their neighborhood friends than to make new acquaintances on campus. In sort, most students regard the campus as nothing more than a kind of gigantic and impersonal classroom. They study, socialize, eat, sleep, and

work where they always have—at home. The slang phrase, "street car college," is not without meaning.

Participation in forensics inevitably suffers. Bright, eager students come to the director's office to inquire concerning the forensic program and, midway through the conference, ask—ever so innocently—whether their working afternoons and week-ends is an obstacle to participation. Or a discouraged freshman comes to report that his father has ordered him to discontinue all extracurricular activities. Or, worse yet, students give no thought to forensics, simply because of widespread campus lethargy.

Nor is obtaining audiences for public debates easy. If the stands are virtually empty for basketball and football games, it requires little imagination to visualize the emptiness of the auditorium when debates are held.

Furthermore, a host of little—but frustrating—problems arise. Evening meetings are impossible for some participants who live far from the campus. Some parents will, without any qualms of conscience, forbid their "child" to attend a tournament in which he has been entered for three weeks because of some important development at home—such as Aunt Jane's week-end visit.

These are some of the problems confronting the typical urban university's forensic program. Let us turn our attention to some of the methods of overcoming them.

II

An urban university should help promote high school forensics in the area. If forensics is weak, special attention should be given to institutes, both for students and teachers. The high school situation should be studied carefully so that the university can conduct events which best fulfill the needs of the schools. For example, if existing tournaments provide little opportunity for novices to participate, the university might conduct a novice contest.

The university can also help form and support vigorously a municipal high school

¹ Ronald F. Reid is Director of Forensics at Washington University, St. Louis.

² Donald O. Olson, "What it Takes to Build a Good Forensic Program," *The Gavel* XXXIX (May 1957), 89-90.

forensic association or a speech association with an interest in forensics. In St. Louis, for example, a metropolitan speech association was formed in 1955, and one officer was given the responsibility of finding hosts for tournaments and maintaining a proper balance of different kinds of interscholastic competition. There has been a substantial increase in the amount and quality of forensic activity since this innovation.

A sweepstakes tournament to designate a municipal high school champion may help stimulate interest not only within schools where forensics already exist but also in schools without forensic programs.

III

Creating campus interest in forensics is neither an easy nor a hopeless task. Participation can be encouraged in three general ways. (1) Emphasize competition in the early stages of building the program. Whether we like it or not, such tangible rewards as trophies and trips are often more attractive to students than intangible educational benefits. And headlines in the student newspaper can be a powerful stimulant to participation. Competition, of course, should not be the ultimate end; but it is a means of creating interest in forensics.

(2) Try to arouse the interest of the faculty. Admittedly, college professors are too busy to give much attention to forensics, but even a mildly interested faculty can recommend potentially good participants, encourage students to attend public debates, and, in general, stimulate student interest. Faculty members frequently enjoy participating on panels at debate institutes, judging at high school tournaments, and chairing public debates. Such methods of attracting interest might well be followed with a systematic plan of having debaters interview the faculty to obtain names of potential participants.

(3) As the forensic program begins to expand, it can be organized to permit specialization. Separate groups of students should be organized to work on the national debate proposition, the national discussion question, and one or two other debate or discussion topics. In addition, individual attention should be given to students pre-

paring speeches for individual events contests or for public presentation.

An individual student should be allowed—indeed, encouraged—to participate in more than one such group; but it is impractical not to permit specialization in a situation where participation is likely to be limited and where participants, because of family obligations or a variety of other reasons, can devote only limited time to forensics.

IV

Despite its many problems, the urban university has one obvious advantage: it is surrounded by a large general public, which is frequently not only willing, but happy, to serve as audience. On-campus intercollegiate debates can be publicized via the metropolitan newspapers and radio and television stations, frequently with considerable effect.

Service clubs, church groups, and high schools constitute a vast potential audience for a speaker's bureau. A reputation for good programs, a few topics of current interest, and a minimal amount of publicity will enable a forensic squad to have as many speaking engagements as it wants.

The urban university, then, in spite of many obstacles, can build a good forensic program, one which contains a balance between competitive and non-competitive elements, tournament and audience performances, and a variety of topics and speech forms.

A Correction

In the May issue, Miss Barbara Lee (Boston U.) was mistakenly elected to Who's Who and Senior Class President. These offices went to Mr. Jerome Packer, also of Boston U.

(Page 75)

A Local Forensics Conference—Some Advantages

BY DALE E. WOLGAMUTH^o

Within an hour's driving time of the nation's capitol are located several colleges and universities active in intercollegiate forensics. These include Georgetown University, George Washington University, The United States Naval Academy, The American University, Howard University, Johns Hopkins University, The University of Maryland, Loyola University of Baltimore, Morgan State University, Mount St. Mary's College, and Notre Dame College of Maryland.

This group of schools makes up an unusual, though not unique, area. Too far north for easy access to competitors in the South; too far south for easy access to competitors in the North; and too far east for easy access to competitors in the Midwest, this area finds itself, in a sense, on the periphery of the geographical locations of major tournaments. This is not to say, of course, that no major tournaments are held nearby. Georgetown University holds its annual Cherry Blossom Tournament; Johns Hopkins University annually sponsors a two-man tournament; and the University of Maryland inaugurated its Capital Hill Tournament last year. Nor is it to say that it is not feasible for schools in the area to travel occasionally to New York, New England, Virginia, the Carolinas, and points in the near Midwest. However, it is to say that such traveling makes the cost of attending major tournaments high and limits severely the number of tournaments in which a modestly financed debate group can participate. It limits a novice program to one or two tournaments a year with local contract debates in between. There are other obvious difficulties which arise in a situation such as this, but suffice it to say that these were among the disadvantages most acutely felt.

Prior to September of 1957, these institutions operated their forensic programs more or less independent of one another. At that time, the author, together with M. M. Anapol of the University of Maryland, suggested the organization of a local conference to sponsor intercollegiate debates and associ-

ated forensics activities in the Maryland-Washington area. The idea met with enthusiastic response and thus the conference was born.

Though the Maryland-Washington Forensics Conference is neither unique nor original the experience of its organization and its developing program may be of value in other geographical areas where similar collegiate "clusters" exist which have not been so organized. It is with this thought in mind that the following details of our experience are presented.

After our initial "feeler" correspondence we scheduled an early season warm-up tournament and invited all schools potentially interested in a conference to attend. Here an organization meeting was held among the attending forensics directors. With the consensus that the proposed organization could serve a useful purpose and fill certain gaps in the local forensics programs, we scheduled another warm-up tournament, appointed officers pro-tem, and put a constitutional committee to work. By mid-year we had a draft of a constitution. It was revised and adopted in late April of 1958. This, then, sketches the steps in our organization.

Likely to be of more interest are the following events—the products of a local conference:

Two weeks apart, early in November we held warm-up tournaments. We found these useful early in the season and though decisions were rendered, emphasis was placed on the criticism and development of the embryonic cases offered. Competition in both novice and varsity classes was scheduled. At the end of the Spring semester, late in April, a novice championship tournament was sponsored by the Conference. This gave us an inexpensive but important incentive for our novice debaters.

This year we will repeat the events of last year's program but we will add an individual events tournament, another novice tournament, and a two-man tournament to ready our top debaters for more effective West Point district competition. All events

^oProf. Wolgamuth is Director of Forensics at American University.

are hosted by members on a rotating basis.

The advantages we have been able to see in the program thus far are:

(1) Emphasis on training without undue emphasis on winning decisions.

(2) More competition at lower cost. (To the well-known financial advantages of tournament events is added the economy of short distances.)

(3) Traveling convenience. (The longest trip any conference member ever has to make takes but one hour.)

(4) Additional competition for novice debaters.

(5) Closer cooperation for mutual benefit among schools in the area.

(6) Early season, informal, constructive competition.

(7) Stimulation of interest in forensics in the area. (Several institutions which previously had no forensics programs have asked for membership in the conference.)

Though it is not the desire of conference members to have the conference dominate forensics competition, there seems to be room for expansion of conference activities. For instance, it has been suggested that the conference sponsor an annual high school festival that may eventually include Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia. Also, since Maryland and D. C. have no state speech association, the forensics conference may provide a forum for discussion of problems in speech education in general. Presently the conference publishes a dittoed newsletter. Public events at member institutions, coming conference events, new faces, etc. get conference-wide publicity. This could be the beginning of a modest, but more complete pamphlet publication. Of course, if none of these possibilities become facts, the benefits for the program as it now exists are substantial.

In particular instances, it may be desirable to limit the scope and degree of activity of a conference. Certainly, in our case the conference was designed to meet our circumstances. It would defeat its purpose if it became so demanding in scope and activities that the membership had to pre-occupy itself with serving the conference. But with an awareness of the possibility of over-

expansion, it shouldn't be difficult to recognize that point at which a conference ceases to fill gaps in a forensics program and begins to duplicate established and successful avenues of training and competition. Some careful monitoring of activities may be needed but our belief is that the conference can be effectively controlled.

The essence of our experience, then, has been that in areas where the location of schools active in debate make it physically possible, much can be gained from the organization of a local forensics conference. As long as the conference complements the goals and the programs of member schools, the scope of the conference can be broadened constructively to allied areas.

We Need Your Help

The Gavel can always use:

1. Articles (1,000-1,500 words)
2. Chapter Notes and News Items
3. Pictures
4. Letters to the Editor

So start writing. It doesn't matter if you are undergraduate, graduate, faculty or just interested—all that counts is that you have something to say of importance.

Deadline for January issue

DECEMBER 3

Words Are Deeds

BY JAMES ROBBINS*

A debate student remarked quite airily during practice, "Oh what difference does your use of words make—how you say it—as long as your argument is sound and as long as you have evidence to back it up!" This is alarming. Are words not important? Are they merely incidental to the issue?

There is such a multiplicity of words in our modern everyday world that normally we pay little attention to them or attach much significance to them. A lecture is a byword for dullness. A speech is associated with boredom. Just words. Someone is just talking! It has been calculated that if we spend but one hour out of twenty-four engaged in talking, a ridiculously modest estimate, that we would use some three million words a year. Think of a teacher in a classroom or a lecturer in a university, the minister in his sermons and public addresses—and the total begins to approach an astronomical figure. Add to this the words that bombard us from the radio, from TV, from the printed page. Millions and millions of words tumbling about us, and therefore we conclude that words are cheap.

Of course, at certain times we become aware of the vital meaning of words—hours of crisis, moments of decision, periods of testing—words suddenly become weighted with significance! There do come times when words determine the direction of the future. Who would minimize the value of words in an interview with the director of admissions of a college or with a prospective employer? Who would dare ignore words uttered in the hour of death? But on the average we would estimate that words are cheap. There is such a superabundance of them pouring in and gushing out of us that we are apathetic to their impact. So, talk is common and who would assume that we are held responsible for what we say? After all it's not what we say, it's what we do that matters. Deeds, not words, are the important things in this life. Deeds are the things by which we will be remembered.

Words are like butterflies on a summer day. They flit by and catch our attention for a moment; but as quickly as they come, they are gone and soon to be forgotten.

Yet can we brush aside so easily what we say? Should words be delegated to such a lowly place in our life? Consider their force in American industry. Sales and advertising men are not so quick to pronounce words as unimportant. They keep pouring out a steady stream of words on radio and TV commercials and in newspapers and magazine advertisements. These words mean the difference between red and black ink at the end of the year. Words spell action. They send us out to buy the soap that makes a bath "so rewarding—so refreshing—so inviting—that you linger . . . linger . . . linger." They impel us to choose the cigarette of the "man who thinks for himself" and to pick the cereal that is "just a little bit better." They pound into our thinking, words—and we transfer those words into acts. These men know that words are deeds. Business in America lives or dies by the effectiveness of words.

And so do nations. Hitler's burning, hate-filled words roused a nation to war. Churchill's full-blooded words rallied England to heroic sacrifice. Patrick Henry's immortal words filled the colonists with determination. Roosevelt's words at his fireside chats brought stability to our own nation. Truman's barnstorming words elected him when the "experts" had marked him off as a has-been. Communist propaganda breeds and nourishes suspicion and resentment against the free world. Men speak and the destiny of a nation is determined.

This is true in our personal lives, too. We make a vow; we utter a single word and commit our lives to a choice. We speak a word thoughtlessly or in anger and subtly damage a relationship; we speak of it as a "slap in the face"—and so it is—as surely as if it were accompanied by the action. Can we ever say of a man's words that they are "just talk?" Psychologists know full well the therapy in "talking it out" or the effect of "talking in" an adverse emotion. Words

*Mr. Robbins is Assistant Director of Forensics at Kansas State College.

are powerful agents in aiding or frustrating our own attitudes. Rudyard Kipling spoke of them as "the most powerful drug used by mankind."

Speech is conduct, closely related to moral behaviour. It is the epitome of all that a person has been, is, and may become. When you and I were given the faculty of speech, it was set down squarely at the center of our relationships with one another. Were it not for speech each of us would dwell apart from his fellows; society would cease to function. For example, in a social gathering there are two people who are set apart from the others by a personal handicap; one is blind; the other is deaf. Of the blind person, we would undoubtedly think, "What a pity!" Of the deaf we are likely to feel, "What a nuisance!" Darkness frightens us more than silence. Yet is the loss of hearing only a nuisance? Blindness cuts a man off from things and what people look like. Deafness blots out the eager excitement of a child's question, the soothing voice of a mother, the gentle quiver of the aged, the rising inflection of anger or the lowered tone of fear. Being deaf cuts a man off from people who reveal what they are by what they say. A blind man in a room filled with conversation is a part of it; we may even forget that he is blind. But the deaf man is alone; he might as well be a hundred miles away.

Perhaps we ought to reconsider before we assume that it is only what we do that matters, before we discount the value of the spoken word. Who would underestimate the influence of Jesus of Nazareth? The centuries have not dimmed the force of his personality. Yet he left not a note, not a scrap, not one written letter—only his words flung to the winds and into the ears of his listeners. Words—backed up by his life to be sure—but his life without the words would have been quite meaningless. The strange authority of his teaching which has captured the minds of men ever since is found in what he said. For what he said is the indispensable clue to what he was.

What we say is the measure of what is going on inside of us. Thought in its essence is talking to ourselves. And the word spoken aloud reveals our thinking. Sharp, clear thoughts are expressed in exact words. Lazy

thinking is manifest in abstract terms. Brigrance calls words "the garments of the mind." They are our mental clothing—in good or bad taste—they reveal the kind of people we are. Certain words mark the uncouth and illiterate. Our choice of words, particularly the one chosen at random, unveils our attitudes, discloses our deeper feelings, unmasks our true motives, reveals our basic character. It is not the carefully chosen, deliberately spoken word but the idle word that indicates indifference or malice, knowledge or ignorance. We are known by our words. The words that rush out of the mouths of all of us are tremendous instruments. The things we say in that last hasty rebuttal, when we are somewhat off-guard, when we do not stop to think—these are the words that give us away. They are the windows of our minds and our personality. They undergird or undermine the reasonableness of our logic, the depth of our convictions.

Sound argument, strong evidence—these will not be discounted. But words themselves can not be minimized. They are not cheap, nor commonplace. Perhaps we should remember the truth that was stated by Joseph Conrad when he said, "He who wants to persuade should put his trust not in the right argument, but in the right word. . . . Give me the right word and the right accent, and I will move the world." Then when we recall the words of the old master, Socrates, "Such as thy words are . . . will be thy deeds; and such as thy deeds will be thy life," we must conclude that words are deeds.

Remember —

Paul Carmack is now Secretary of D.S.R., so direct all correspondence—*EXCEPT* editorial material—to Paul at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Suggestions For Judging Debates

DONALD O. OLSON (N)^o

There have been many complicated point systems set up for judging debates. Many times research studies are conducted to set up a more objective criteria. Many of these systems make the judge a glorified bookkeeper and force him to spend so much time bookkeeping that he cannot listen to the debate. Many ballots, on the other hand, are so simplified, that they do not explain what one should look for in judging a debate.

There are also many misconceptions held by critics as to their duties and the duties of each team. Some judges believe that the negative must present a plan to solve the problem. Some judges spend their time refuting in their own minds the arguments of the side that they oppose. Some judges vote for the negative when they have never touched the specific case of the affirmative. Some judges vote for the affirmative when they only show a need for a change and do not show how the debate proposition will solve that need. It is to correct some of these misconceptions that this paper has been written. This is merely a partial list of suggestions that one might consider in judging a debate.

Actually, you are trying to decide who did the better debating and not necessarily who won the debate. Sometimes the two terms or ideas are synonymous. Many times though it is very difficult to tell who won the argument as such.

The debate is between the two teams and not you and each team. You are not to sit there and refute in your own mind the arguments of each team. Let the opponents do the refuting. Any reasonable argument should stand until it is refuted by the opposition. Any unethical practices should be penalized.

You might ask yourself— which team would I rather have for my own on the basis of the following?

1. Analysis of the question as evidenced by case.

- A. Is the affirmative definition of terms fair?
- B. Are they debating the spirit of the question?
- C. Do they have a well-organized case?
- D. Does the affirmative show how their plan will meet the need?
- E. Direct refutation can be a negative constructive stand and you should evaluate it by its clarity and as to whether the arguments stand up.
- F. The negative may, but it need not present a counter-plan.

2. Evidence

- A. Do they have any?
- B. Is the evidence reliable?
- C. Is the evidence out of context— penalize a team that uses such evidence.
- D. Is the evidence falsified? A team that deliberately falsifies evidence should be voted against.

3. Refutation and rebuttal

- A. Is it well organized?
- B. Are the teams handling major arguments or merely minor details?
- C. Has the negative established a clash with the affirmative? This is a must. The negative must attack the specific case of the affirmative.
- D. Has the affirmative answered the negative arguments before the last rebuttal. It is unfair for the affirmative to leave arguments until the last rebuttal that should have been handled earlier.
- E. No new arguments should be allowed in the rebuttal. Any argument that is used should have a relationship to arguments that have been presented in the constructive speeches.

4. Delivery

These are a few of the factors one should consider. I hope that this paper will clear up some of the misconceptions that exist, and will be of help to debate judges.

^o Donald Olson is sponsor of our chapter at the University of Nebraska.

DIRECT CLASH

(Continued from Page 6)

debate. Judges over the years have not been eager to request this procedure, but in some instances it has been the only way to obtain a working set of definitions.

The judge must also decide in any given clash series whether it is to go the full five speeches or to be stopped earlier. Obviously the more speeches given, the more experience there will be for the debaters. Yet judges have not hesitated to stop clashes when a speaker has evaded, failed to clash, or replied very poorly. Little value derives from continuing obviously poor debating. Therefore, beginning at the end of the second speech, the judge must notify the group after each speech whether or not the clash is to continue. In the event that it must be stopped, the decision for that clash goes to the side represented by the next to the last speaker, the last speech being the inferior reply that resulted in the end of the series.

At the end of the clash, regardless of length, the judge gives a decision, and a brief statement of his reasons for it. If the clash series has been stopped before five speeches it will be apparent at once which side has won the clash. In any event, the decision comes while what has been said is fresh in the minds of the debaters—and in the judge's mind. It often gives the student the opportunity to apply immediately any advice given.

It is this feature of direct clash debate that does more than any other to keep debaters alert, and on the subject. To digress for two minutes loses the day!

As in other forms of debate the infallible (*sic*) judge has supreme authority, but in direct clash he exercises it as the debate progresses, sharing with his audience his reasoning which has developed as a reaction to the speaking. Much profit can come from the instruction given by the judges after the analysis period, and after the ends of the clashes.

Certain objections are raised against this type of debate. The first one usually mentioned grows out of the length of the speeches. Due to their brevity, the speaker does not have an opportunity to develop a well-rounded public address. Of course this cannot be gainsaid, and, if formal oratory is

the sole object of debate, then direct clash falls far short. It is just not designed for that type of training. Secondly, some believe it gives the judge too much discretion, or, as some put it, too much power. Again this cannot be denied. Does not all decision debating depend upon a qualified, well-trained judge? It then must be decided whether it is better to have the benefit of his teaching during the debate, or to experience the short, sharp, shock at the end. It is insisted by some that evidence is improperly used, that arguments are fragmentary at best, and that the series of speeches does not utilize all of the pertinent material on the issues. These faults may be present in varying degrees, but have judges discovered these to be characteristic only of direct clash? As in other types, the thoroughness of instruction and care in preparation prevent such weaknesses.

There are certain important advantages to this style of debate. Although these values do not override completely the objections, nor force this method as the sole pattern of forensic endeavor, they may suggest a wider use of direct clash. These six points seem significant:

1. Direct clash provides excellent training in the selection of the main issues growing out of a proposition, and adherence to these during speaking. Certainly this is one of the major functions of debate as a teaching device, and in this one area, direct clash is perhaps more effective than all other forms or types, for the teams pay an immediate penalty for deviation.

2. It provides training in extempore analyzing and speaking. The preparation for debate is obviously general. Only the first speeches can even approach the "canned" state. Naturally this is true in superior debate of any kind, as all emphasize extemporaneous adaptation, but in direct clash you are forthwith withdrawn from the fray if you cannot extemporize promptly.

3. It provides excellent training in incisive, cogent speaking. There is no time for anything else. "Stemwind" and the clash is lost before you can move from the shadow of the Parthenon to Bunker Hill monument.

4. It provides training in the acceptance of the burden of proof, a procedure which

(Continued on Page 16)

The Case For Two Propositions

BY RICHARD GREGG^o

A new debate season is upon us, and all around the country students are digging into musty library stacks and poring over current publications in search of material for the intercollegiate question.

At the present time the facts to be mastered concerning nuclear weapons and agreements thereto look so portentous that one would scarcely wish to consider another proposition. Nevertheless, I want to take a stand in favor of two national topics instead of one.

In the first place, if there were two questions I think that the boredom and lethargy that is so prevalent the second half of the season would vanish. At the start of every season there is always a great deal of enthusiasm among debaters. The topic is new, the contentions which must be refuted are new, and the statistics and authorities are new. The intellectual stimulation that pervades the first few tournaments is tremendous because no one is exactly sure what his opponent will spring on him during a round of argumentation.

But after four or five tournaments, the lines of attack become repetitious. As the year progresses and the aura of freshness becomes lost, a debater may find that he can get by without really listening to all of his opponent's speech. He can get to the place where he grabs two or three key words, recognizes that they stand for such and such an argument and doesn't bother to listen to the proof presented. As a matter of fact, he may not really need to prepare a rebuttal because he has already refuted this particular point so many times that he can do it without thinking.

Coinciding with this mental lapse there can come a tendency to become loose in case presentation. The debater may realize that if his opponents are subjected to the usual barrage of verbiage they will recognize the point he is trying to make. In fact, they will establish his case in their own minds without his completely stating it, thus saving him a good deal of trouble. And so,

in many instances, the debates may become downright sloppy. Care is no longer taken to make certain that a line of argument is established clearly, simply because it does not have to be. By the end of the season, some of us don't care whether we ever hear or say another word about the proposition; some would rather not.

Certainly another deterrent to provocative thinking is the fact that the judges also become conditioned. The usual rule is to have coaches act as judges. They have helped their own charges prepare for the tournaments, and then have listened to the same arguments for countless rounds of actual debating. It can get to the point where contestants count not only on their opponents to presuppose their contentions for them, but the judges as well. I do not mean to discredit those who act as critics. I simply say that they have become so accustomed to listening to familiar arguments that their discerning ears and minds grow numb. In this situation it is no problem for a debater to put across a half-hearted attempt.

And finally, the topic itself can become outmoded by keeping it under discussion too long. This danger is certainly not as prevalent as the others because many problems stay with us for a prolonged period of time. But it can happen.

Take this year's proposition, for example. On October 31 the heads of state have proposed a meeting to discuss the possibilities of an international agreement to ban the further development of nuclear weapons. If they reach a definite solution—if such an agreement is reached—the controversy is over. True, we can still argue whether or not it was a wise decision. But the fact remains that our national government will have already decided our proposition for us. And what is more, the entire complexion of the debates will have changed, because the burden of proof will have shifted to the negative.

Now I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not advocate arguing two propositions simultaneously. What I am proposing is

^oRichard Gregg is a senior at the University of Wichita. He is president of the University Debaters and the Wichita chapter of Delta Sigma Rho.

that there be one national question for the first semester and another one for the second. The topic for the second semester would not need to be, in fact, probably should not be, decided before December.

If such a policy were adopted, a debater would be challenged during the second half of the season just as he normally is at the beginning. The intellectual eagerness in anticipation of new arguments to be presented would be prevalent throughout the year. Case presentations would remain at a superior level, research would be carried out continuously and no one, judges or debaters, would be tempted to sleep on the job. In addition, topics of extreme timeliness would almost be assured.

I, for one, stand ready to support two national propositions during one season as a permanent policy.

DIRECT CLASH

(Continued from Page 14)

has values in other types of persuasive speaking. When the negative introduces a clash, they learn some of this lesson.

5. The burden of clash, the responsibility for the pointed, immediate refutation, comes in a unique way in this type of debate. In cross-question there is some of this same emphasis, though in a different perspective.

6. As suggested above, perhaps the outstanding advantage is that it trains speakers in the techniques of answering an opponent, and, at the same time, carrying a case forward.

¹ See Lionel Crocker, *Argumentation and Debate* (New York, 1944), pp. 217-219, for a definition of direct clash debate, and the rules usually followed. In the Wooster tournaments, three changes are made in these rules: (1) Each clash goes a maximum of five speeches instead of seven; (2) the debate goes only three clashes, instead of five, though it must go all three; (3) no single clash, but the total number of clashes won determines the winner of the debate. Further, though not an ironclad rule, judges are discouraged from directing which specific issues shall be initiated by which side, and in what order.

² In the Wooster tournament each speaker is allowed a "time out" either during his first six-minute speech, or immediately thereafter, to write his issues on the blackboard. All participants, including the judge, may more easily scrutinize them. Further, any changes suggested by the opposition or the judge may be placed before the group with equal clarity.

³ Dr. Paul Carmack, Ohio State University, has devised an acceptable scoring sheet type ballot for direct clash debate. It is designed to serve as a kind of record of the judge's decisions, and is not intended to replace the oral decisions made during the progress of the debate.

GAVEL SUMMARY (Continued from Page 4)
THE GAVEL—Summary

	VOLUME 36		VOLUME 37		VOLUME 38		VOLUME 39		VOLUME 40		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Business	13	12.2	14	28.9	22	48.7	18	11.7	12	13.3	79	114.8
President	4	5.3	3	4.9	4	6.1	3	4.7	3	3.1	17	24.1
Forensics	3	9.5	3	5.6	6	9.1	4	11.4	3	7.6	19	43.2
Oratory	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	0	0	2	3.0
Gen. Speech	2	1.6	5	3.1	1	2.6	5	15.7	2	9.8	15	34.8
Debate	5	11.9	9	25.9	7	20.7	12	22.3	6	10.2	39	81.0
Discussion	6	20.3	0	0	1	5.1	1	2.9	1	2.1	9	30.4
Alumni	6	3.2	0	0	4	7.1	5	12.0	1	1.9	16	24.2
Features	1	.2	3	5.3	2	7.2	3	2.7	2	2.7	11	18.1
Pictures	5	1.7	5	2.0	17	11.0	3	.9	0	.4	31	26.0
Book Reviews	2	1.3	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.9
Chapter News	9	34.6	3	14.0	4	7.9	4	14.1	2	3.4	22	74.0
Letters	0	0	4	8.3	1	.6	0	0	0	0	5	8.9
Miscellaneous	0	.9	0	1.4	1	5.9	0	5.0	0	1.5	0	14.7
Totals	57	104	50	100	69	132	59	105	33	56	268	497

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.
CONN	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	Herald 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	1010	Paul A. Carmack	Columbus, Ohio
OB	Oberlin	1936	Paul Boas	Oberlin, Ohio
OK	Oklahoma	1913	Roger E. Nebergall	Norman, Okla.
OR	Oregon	1926	Herman Cohen	Eugene, Oregon
ORS	Oregon State	1922	Earl W. Wells	Corvallis, Oregon
OW	Ohio Wesleyan	1907	Ed Robinson	Delaware, Ohio
P	Pennsylvania	1909	J. Harold Flannery	Philadelphia, Pa.
PO	Pomona	1928	Howard Martin	Claremont, Calif.
PR	Princeton	1911	Clarence S. Angell	Princeton, N.J.
PS	Pennsylvania State	1917	Clayton H. Schug	University Park, Pa.
PT	Pittsburgh	1920	Bob Newman	Pittsburgh, Pa.
R	Rockford	1933	Mildred F. Berry	Rockford, Ill.
SC	Southern California	1915	James H. McBath	Los Angeles, Calif.
ST	Stanford	1911	Leland Chapin	Stanford, Calif.
SW	Swarthmore	1911	E. L. Hunt	Swarthmore, Penn.
S	Syracuse	1910	J. Edward McEvoy	Syracuse, N.Y.
Y	Temple	1950	Gordon F. Hastettler	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. Cartright	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
Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Return Postage Guaranteed

Entered as
Second-class matter
at
Lawrence, Kansas



May 7 - 8 - 9, 1959

Delta Sigma Rho Tournament

Cleveland, Ohio

John Carroll University — Host

Keep This Date in Mind