The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho

Volume 43
Issue 1 *November 1960*

Article 1

11-1960

Complete Issue 43(1)

the gavel

volume 43 number 1

of
delta
sigma
rho

november
1960

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, Bureau of Continuation Education, Colorado University, Boulder, Colorado

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 between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of THE GAVEL. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive THE GAVEL for 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, Virginia.

Vice Presidents: Eugene Chenoweth, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Bob Griffin, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada; Leroy Laase, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska; Bob Newman, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Paul Boase, 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, Bureau of Continuation Education, Colorado University, Boulder, Colorado.

Associate Editors: Halbert E. Gulley, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois; Clayton Schug, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania; Paul Carmack, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Austin Freeley, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio; Robert A. Lang, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

THE GAVEL

of

DELTA SIGMA RHO

VOLUME 43 NOVEMBER, 1960 NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attention Chapter Sponsors:

In an attempt to gather more information about what goes on in *your* chapter, the GAVEL is attempting something new.

Each year in an attempt to present to the membership this local information, long forms have been sent out. The success has varied from year to year.

Now it is time to try something new.

What we would like is this:

Each chapter sponsor will please send us one, single-spaced, typewritten page giving these things:

1. A brief report on the forensic program of the school for the past year.

2. A brief report on the Delta Sigma Rho Chapter activities for the past year.

3. A brief report of honors won by chapter members.

4. A brief report on alumni activities.

This report should be mailed to

Charles Goetzinger, Editor, GAVEL
352 Chemistry Bldg.
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Only those reports which are in the hands of the Editor by December 1, 1960, will be included in the January, 1961, issue of the GAVEL.

So remember, if you want your chapter included, send the report to the Editor by December 1, 1960.

President's Page...

Laboratory in Persuasion

BY HEROLD ROSS

A political commentator recently wrote that thousands of voters would attend the speeches of Senator Jack Kennedy because they would be curious about him and would want to see him in person. On the other hand, wrote the commentator, most people in the United States are fairly familiar with Vice President Nixon. This is an interesting comment and may be true. It is always good sport to speculate about political crowds and to attempt to evaluate the effect of a particular speaker or speech in the campaign.

This is not the first time that crowds have wanted to see and hear the candidates. This was certainly true in the case of William Jennings Bryan whose reputation for oratory brought huge audiences together. Yet Bryan was well aware that results could not always be gauged by the size of the crowd. "When Cicero spoke," Bryan once said, "thousands came to hear him and when he had finished they left saying 'Ah, I have heard Cicero!' Likewise, people also came to hear Demosthenes, but when they left they said, 'Let's go out and lick Philip.'" Bryan continued by saying, "Thousands come to hear me speak and go away saying, 'Ah, I've heard William Jennings Bryan,' but they later vote for McKinley."

The fall campaign will once again provide students of persuasion with many excellent examples of public speaking. It will be interesting to see if election results can be traced to the things which were said. In particular, an evaluation should be made of the debates projected over television. This project was supported by the General Council of Delta Sigma Rho under the active leadership of Dr. Austin Freeley. The Lincoln-Douglas debates have long been studied by speech students as models in political argument. The projection of this type of debating before nation-wide audiences numbering in the millions will revive an interest in direct verbal clash and may prove a medium of enormous public import in influencing public opinion.

Thus the public forum becomes a laboratory for the practice of persuasion and academic debaters can and will learn much by a study of the speeches and the results which can be traced to them.

Students of persuasion may also study the demagogic speeches Khrushchev and Fidel Castro as modern day examples of emotionally charged Philippics. While it is often difficult to understand why audiences are influenced by these speeches, it is desirable to analyze and understand the people and the situations in which such utterances can arouse immediate response. While it may be distasteful to spend time on rabble-rousers, they are too dangerous in the modern world to be disregarded. The same type of inflamed oratory by Mussolini and Hitler brought Italy and Germany into World War II. Rattling rockets is as dangerous now as rattling swords was in the late 1930's.

The principles of persuasion are probably as old as Aristotle but they are much alive in the immediate present. Not only our own national forum but the world platform is the laboratory which college students may study now. Only by understanding the principles and techniques of persuasion can we as citizens of the United States learn to evaluate all that is said in national and world debate and to formulate the answers which are so urgently needed.

A Study of the Use of Key Issues in Tournament Debates

BY KIM GIFFIN AND KENNETH MEGILL*

Debaters and their coaches have frequently hypothesized about a "turning point" in debates. Occasionally it has been suggested that the handling of one or another key issue is related to such a "turning point." Such speculation was the basis for the present study.

More specifically, the purposes of this investigation were to determine (1) which, if any, of the "stock" issues were given important consideration by better-than-average tournament debaters and (2) which, if any, "stock" issue was given the greatest consideration and (3) if one "stock" issue did become most important, at what point in the debates did this usually occur.

The term "issue" as used in this study denotes one of a number of fundamental questions, the answers to which determine the acceptability or unacceptability of the proposition being debated.[1] The term "stock" refers to one of a number of key issues which are crucial to a class of propositions.[2]

Textbook writers do not entirely agree in terminology or treatment of "stock" issues; however, they generally agree that the following issues are important for propositions of policy which suggest a change in a more or less necessarily continuing system (such as national defense):[3]

1. Is there a need to adopt the proposal?
2. Will the proposal meet the need indicated?
3. Can the proposal be put into effect in a practical way?
4. Will serious disadvantages result if the proposal is adopted?
5. Will some other proposal meet the need presented?

The problem of identification of crucial issues is of utmost importance to a debater as he searches for information and organizes his materials preparatory to debate. The data collected in this study indicate the relative importance of various issues generally employed by experienced debaters; it also indicates at what point in a debate each issue usually achieves significance. Such information should be of interest to those who teach argumentation or direct debate programs.

Considerable attention has been given by textbook writers on debate to the problem of identification of key issues. However, for the most part this treatment has been quite theoretical, even somewhat speculative. A search through the literature on debate shows no report of an experimental study concerning this problem. Descriptive or analytical studies have been made concerning argumentative issues, but these have either been concerned with analysis of the issues of a political campaign[4] or the analysis of the issues in a specific proposition by a single speaker.[5] Such studies are tangential to the one here reported; however, the relationship is an analogous one at best.

---

* Kim Giffin (Ph. D., Iowa, 1950) is Head of the Speech Division and Director of Debate, Department of Speech and Drama, University of Kansas.
Kenneth Megill is a Carnegie Corporation Undergraduate Research Assistant at the University of Kansas.

[1] See Baird, A. Craig, *Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950, p. 63.

[2] Cf. McBurney, James H., *et al.*, *Argumentation and Debate*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1951, p. 38.

[3] See, for example, Potter, David (Ed.), *Argumentation and Debate*, New York, The Dryden Press, 1954, pp. 31–38; Baird, *op. cit.*, pp. 63–71; McBurney, *op. cit.*, pp, 36–42.

[4] See, for example, Oliver, Robert T., "The Speech that Established Roosevelt's Reputation," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. XXXI (1945), p. 275; also, Crocker, Lionel, "Henry Ward Beecher and the English Press of 1863," *Speech Monographs*, Vol. VI (1939), pp. 32–40.

[5] Two examples are illustrative: Arnold, Carroll C., "Invention in the Parliamentary Speaking of Benjamin Disraeli, 1842–1852," *Speech Monographs*, Vol. XIV (1947), pp. 66–74; and Richards, Gale L., "A Case Study in Deliberative Persuasion: John Marshall's Congressional Speech on Jonathan Robbins," *Speech Monographs*, Vol. XXI (1954), pp. 258–261.

TABLE I

Relative Importance In Debate of Each of the Stock Issues
(Averages of ratings given on a scale of 0–10)

Issue	Preliminary Rounds	Elimination Rounds	All Debates	Number of Replies*
"Need"	8.10	7.23	7.87	162
"Solution"	6.26	6.69	6.37	150
"Workability"	7.28	7.51	7.34	158
"Disadvantages"	5.90	5.00	5.78	143
"Counterplan"	0.46	2.36	0.65	125

* Averages were taken from questionnaire items appropriately marked; replies which ignored this question were not considered in obtaining these averages.

Procedures.

The basic data for this study were obtained by a questionnaire which was submitted to each judge for each debate during the 1959 University of Kansas Heart of America Debate Tournament.[6]

At this tournament in March, 1959, colleges and universities from representative parts of the entire United States were invited; schools were selected on the basis of their outstanding records in intercollegiate debate over the last five years. In attendance were thirty-two teams from twenty-two schools representing fifteen different states.

Each school was required to furnish a trained, qualified judge,[7] i.e., a staff member trained in debate and experienced in the preparation and training of student debaters. Prior to each debate each judge was given a questionnaire with instructions as follows:

TO THE JUDGE:

Debate coaches have frequently hypothesized about a "turning point" in a debate. We have frequently wondered if the handling of one or another key issue is related to such a "turning point." Although we recognize that any conclusions drawn must be qualified in terms of the particular debate topic employed, we still think that information of this type would be of interest to you and to us. You will be given a copy of the results of this study at a later time.

Will you please answer two questions concerning the debate you have just heard?

I. Which, if any, of the following "stock issues" became important in this debate? Rate, on a scale of 0 to 10, the relative importance of each of the following issues as they were handled in the debate just heard.

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ISSUE:

0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10
"Need Issue"—Is there a *need* to adopt the proposal?

0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10
"Solution Issue" — Will the proposal *meet the need* outlined by the affirmative?

0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10
"Workability Issue"—Can the proposal be put into effect in a *practical* way?

0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10
"Disadvantages Issue" — Will serious *disadvantages* result if the proposal is adopted?

0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10
"Counterplan Issue"—Will some *other proposal* (Counterplan) better meet the need?

II. If one of the above issues is rated *higher than any of the others*, at what point in the debate did it become apparent to you that this issue had become most important in this debate?

PLEASE CHECK THE ONE WHICH IS APPROPRIATE, IF ANY

..... 1st affirmative speech
..... 1st negative rebuttal

..... 1st negative speech
..... 1st affirmative rebuttal

..... 2nd affirmative speech
..... 2nd negative rebuttal

..... 2nd negative speech
..... 2nd affirmative rebuttal

(Continued on Page 10)

[6] For a description of this tournament, its objectives and manner of operation, see Giffin, Kim, and Will Linkugel, "The Heart of America Debate Tournament," *The Gavel*, Vol. 40, No. 4, May, 1958, pp. 73–74.

[7] See Giffin, Kim, "A Study of the Criteria Employed by Tournament Debate Judges," *Speech Monographs*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, March, 1959, pp. 69–71.

Have We Forgotten Quality?

BY BRUCE M. HASTON*

During the last few years our speech journals have featured many articles about competitive forensics. Many of these express dissatisfaction with some aspects of tournaments. As an undergraduate, I participated in forensics and felt discontent myself, and now after assisting in the direction of a large forensics program, I would like to formally cast my lot with those who criticize the competitive situation as it now exists.

There are many practices in forensics competition that warrant attack. One of these, and one most damaging to student morale, is the indiscriminate use of student judges. Because of this indiscriminate use, many of the tournaments have evolved into an emotional and physical "spectacular," in contrast with tournaments of earlier years which were small, well-organized, and provided keen intellectual competition by allowing the individual rounds to be evaluated by competent judges.

Better transportation and expanding enrollments bring more people to the tournaments. Some of the smaller colleges where many of the tournaments originated have not kept pace with the enrollment boom. Many of these schools have increased the scope of the tournament in order to provide for more students without having the facilities necessary to do an adequate job. In our immediate vicinity and in chronological order tournaments are sponsored by schools with enrollments of 300, 6000, 1400, 1100, 3800, 800 and 3000. Only two of these schools have facilities to accommodate the large number of entries, for the average tournament in this area draws twenty-five schools and around three hundred and fifty contestants. Not one of the tournaments limits entries, and so we have a tournament held at a school of eight hundred drawing over six-hundred participants from forty schools. Instead of building tournaments of quality in keeping with the physical limitation of the hosts, the tournaments have now become a contest featuring a quantitative scramble for the "sweepstakes" trophy. Students soon learn to adjust themselves to rounds conducted in lounges or sorority houses (or in one case, in broom closets)—but a tournament would not be "competitive" without judging, and it appears easier for the host's over-taxed facilities to provide rooms than it is to provide judges.

The problem of providing judges has been met by some schools by resorting to the extensive use of student judges. Many of these student judges have never taken a speech course, either in college or in high school, and they are recruited in a most peculiar fashion. One tournament director pays each sorority and fraternity $40 for providing a certain number of judges. Another school pays students up to $5 for judging one round. One student judge with whom I talked recently stated he had an athletic scholarship and had to judge two rounds a day "in order to do some work for the school." Another judge, I was told, suddenly entered the room fifteen minutes late wearing a basketball uniform and instructed the female contestants to "talk as fast as you can so I can get back to practice."

No matter how large or small the tournament, there is frequently an emergency and student judges must be used. It would probably be better to cancel rounds than drag untrained students off the streets to judge, particularly if they are to judge an event like debate where they lack a complete knowlege of the basic processes. In a recent tournament, two of our students went through six rounds of debate with student judges, only one of whom had taken a college speech class. In one round the debaters had to devote ten minutes in trying to explain to the student judge how a debate should be judged. They finally ended up judging the debate themselves! On one debate ballot a

* Department of Speech, Washington State University.

girl had placed the comment, "I don't like your hairdo," while another student judge told me he placed the comment "show more self-confidence" on every ballot because he thought it was an "intelligent comment." If we are perfectly candid with ourselves, we would have to admit that there are very few students who are adequately qualified to judge debate.

Oral interpretation is another area of abuse. Debate coaches know little or nothing about it, and few well-trained interp teachers are available to judge. One girl from another school, one of the best interpreters on the circuit and who has been in the finals of every tournament in which she entered, was recently given last place in two preliminary interp rounds by student judges but ranked first in the third round by a teacher of oral interp. When asked what had happened, the interp teacher said "students rarely distinguish emotional declamation from good oral interp."

Another experience with student judges came in the finals of senior extemp speaking where two coaches and a freshman girl were assigned to judge. After hearing the nine speakers and marking the ballots, the two coaches compared their ratings to see only a slight difference. However, when the girl's ballot was examined, the speakers whom the coaches had rated at the top she had rated near the bottom. Since each ballot carried equal weight, the difference was just enough to result in a tie for second place and give another school the sweepstakes trophy.

In one tournament it was amazing to see the large number of finalists from the host school. Preliminary rounds were judged by students. When the finals were judged by the coaches it was equally amazing to see that not one of the participants from the host school had placed in the first two positions. We might suspect that students not only lack a knowledge of speech but possibly are swayed by personal allegiance.

It may appear that I am placing a blanket condemnation on the use of student judges. This is not so. However, I feel that many of us have failed to use discrimination in the selection of student judges. When unqualified students are used to excess, particularly in senior division and debate, I feel that we are being unjust to our forensic participants.

Competitive forensics is a tension situation. Normally, there is much effort and practice involved in preparation for the tournaments. At best, tournament judging is fraught with problems. Being a debate coach does not confer competence and objective evaluation, and being human allows prejudice to somewhat affect decisions. There are many young competitors who leave forensics in disgust because of poor judging. To add incompetent student judges is the straw that breaks the backs of many debate squads. An eighteen-year-old freshman math major is not qualified to pass judgment on trained persuaders or interpreters—and our students fully know it.

There have been some tournaments that have tried to improve student judging. One school uses a whole class in oral interpretation to judge preliminary rounds with the interp teachers judging the finals. Another tournament will allow student judges to judge speakers in the junior division only when they are qualified by their speech background. A unique method used in one large and elite debate tournament is to allow each team to rate its opponents. The awards are given solely on this rating—neither students nor faculty are used as judges.

We are only deluding ourselves when we innocently look at the vast number of unqualified student judges and say "it can't be helped." It is morale shaking for our students to be continually subjected to this type of evaluation by persons knowing less about speech than they. Nothing dampers the appetite for intellectual competition quite so fast as a series of bad judges, especially when all concerned have devoted a large amount of time in tournament preparation. It seems that we must place some type of self-restraint upon ourselves when it comes to student judges or accept for a fact that quantity is more important than quality in the competitive tournament.

Tournament Audiences

BY ROBERT O. WEISS*

At the tournament sponsored by the DePauw chapter of Delta Sigma Rho this year, a worried coach came up to me and complained, "I'm supposed to judge a debate in room 206, but I can't. There's a class in there."

He was understandably surprised when I replied, "That's not a class. That's an AUDIENCE."

I am sure that many directors of debate confronted by the obvious convenience and advantage of tournament debating, yet concerned about the inadequate amount of "audience" debating they are able to arrange, have pondered the methods of bringing audiences into the tournament picture. Up to this point, however, we still find it worthy of remark whenever we find an audience listening to a debate at the tournaments we attend.

An analysis of the possible causes for the absence of listeners leads us to note that the tournaments are not often set up with the needs and convenience of the spectators in mind. Many of our most common practices actually discourage people from coming to these debates.

There are a number of factors in tournament management which seem to me to have implications toward helping audiences to attend and enjoy tournament debating. I would like to make three general suggestions concerning methods which might be considered in this regard, namely that (1) tournament scheduling must be relatively open and above board, (2) visitors need to be given information about how to attend a tournament, and (3) publicity has to be oriented toward the possible audience.

(1) *The tournament scheduling must be relatively open and above board.* The common practice of hiding team names and debate decisions during a tournament is inevitably a cause of wonderment to outsiders. Perhaps we should consider whether the secrecy is worth the bother.

Take the names of teams, for instance. Certainly we are bound to repel visitors when we ask them to attend a debate between "Affirmative Number 15" and "Negative Number 12." At the DePauw Delta Sigma Rho tournament we have regularly drawn up the schedule ahead of time and have made the names of the teams public. We don't use numbers at all. The very impartial secretary in the next office draws the schedule, and I have never had any complaints about it (to my face). This open scheduling makes it possible for anyone to find out what schools are going to meet and when they will meet. It does call for a certain amount of confidence that the teams entered will actually show up for the tournament, but on the whole it is as easy to rearrange names as numbers.

Furthermore, I cannot blame people for wanting to know how a debate "came out." This is part of the attractiveness of a competitive activity. I must admit that we have been fudging a little on this requirement at the DePauw tournament by keeping decisions secret in the first two rounds, but we do allow them to be revealed in the last two. Listeners like to hear these decisions in the later rounds and perhaps compare notes with the judges' evaluation. Any advantages which accrue from keeping decisions secret at a tournament should at least be weighed seriously against the disadvantages of making the debate less attractive for the audience.

(2) *Visitors need to be given information about how to attend a tournament.* Frankly, most people do not know how a debate tournament is set up. There are few analogous activities in which many contests are going on simultaneously. Therefore, it is not an easy experience for the uninitiated to come into a building to hear a debate and to be met either by closed doors and empty hallways during a round, or else by the buzz and confusion typical of a tourney "between rounds."

* DePauw University.

First of all, then, to remedy this, adequate personnel should be provided to tell people what is going on and how they can become spectators at an actual debate. At the very least, a prominently located information desk must be manned at all times during the tournament. A supplemental plan is to have a number of people available to "collar" the spectators who are fairly frequently found more or less lost in the building and tell them in a friendly fashion how to see the debates they want.

These guides should be prepared to answer a variety of questions. Interesting to note is the fact that a frequent question is "Which debate would be the best one to hear?" Another, of course, is "Where is DePauw debating?" (The answer is not always the same to both questions.) This type of question means that those at the desk must know something about the teams which are attending as well as about diplomacy. Other questions are ones which involve procedure and decorum, such as "Is it all right to go into a room while a debate is in progress?"

We have found it helpful to post the schedule prominently and to provide copies of it for visitors. We also, for local fans, have a blackboard installed on which we tell where DePauw teams are debating each round and who their opponents are.

(3) *There should be adequate publicity, oriented toward a potential audience.* Few tournament directors are completely unaware of the values of publicity, but this publicity is too seldom designed for the attraction of audiences.

To improve this situation, the usual channels of news should be utilized, of course, and they should be provided with as much information about names of teams, times of rounds, and such, as they will absorb.

Furthermore, there are many pockets of special interest which can be tapped. Girls with boy friends at one of the visiting schools, a delegation from a local church desiring to hear "their" church-related college, fraternity brothers of one of the debaters, are among those who show up, and are welcome, at the debates. Local alumni and other townspeople are often interested, if they only are told that a debate tournament is taking place. On our campus, word-of-mouth is actually about the best medium of information, and it is particularly appropriate for informing such groups about the tournament.

I don't want to neglect the time-honored method of requiring members of speech classes to attend debates, and I can't bring myself to complain when my colleagues make such requirements. (My own students "volunteer" to be chairmen and timekeepers.)

In summary, the three methods I have been describing are methods of tournament management which at least make it possible for audiences to be attracted to debate tournaments. I am not saying that we necessarily want audiences at all tournaments and I certainly do not feel that all meets should follow identical procedures or have identical goals. However, these methods do call for a good deal of re-evaluation of the purposes of the tournament and the extent to which we feel audiences are necessary or helpful in the debate situation. They also call for evaluation of the various mechanical devices we use to make tournaments run smoothly and fairly in light of the goals which we feel are important.

I cannot make any claims that the methods I have suggested have drawn large crowds to the debates at the DePauw Delta Sigma Rho tournament. If there is any exhortation in what I have been saying, it has been aimed as much at myself as anyone. However, the methods I have described briefly here are methods which we are using, and which I believe move in the direction of a desirable goal for many of our tournaments, the re-introduction of audiences to intercollegiate debating.

WANTED—Controversy

Apply—Gavel Editor,

Colorado U.

Biennial Delta Sigma Rho Forensics Conference on National Issues

[Editor's Note: At Indiana this spring a committee report was approved which changed the Biennial D.S.R. Forensics Conference. Because many of those instrumental in securing this conference were not present the report is printed below. Any comments, both ways, will be welcomed by the Editor.]

In the belief that

1. Delta Sigma Rho should provide competition recognizing individual excellence through nonconventional forms of forensics experience, and
2. Delta Sigma Rho should provide for emphasis on individual participation, as opposed to school representation, within the program,

We therefore propose:

1. To capitalize upon the fact that this conference will meet in the early days of newly elected national Congresses and, on occasion, new administrations at a time when the legislative program has been presented but not determined.
2. That the Delta Sigma Rho program committee select at least two and not more than four major subject matter areas for consideration by the delegates (e.g., in this year the areas might well have been farm legislation, national security, civil rights, and labor).
3. That these issues shall be analyzed and acted upon as follows:
   a. Not later than February 1 the program committee shall announce the subject matter areas.
   b. In advance of the conference each delegate shall prepare on two of the areas and designate his first and second choices in his advance registration approximately one month before the conference.
   c. The program committee shall assign delegates to appropriate committees on the arrival of the delegates at the conference with consideration for the delegates' preferences and balance in the several committees.
   d. Members of each subject matter area, divided into groups of eight, will participate in the following steps:
      1) Each delegate shall make a 5-minute expository talk analyzing the nature and extent of the problem and defining the issues. These speeches will be evaluated by two faculty critics, one of whom shall stay with the group through subsequent phases of the conference and one of whom will be a floating critic.
      2) Each group of eight will have a round-table discussion further to explore the problem to the point of identifying, but not arguing the merits of, possible solutions. This discussion will be judged as in 1) above.
      3) Each delegate shall make a 5-minute speech of advocacy on the solution of his choice. Following his speech he shall be questioned for three minutes by other delegates in his group. This session shall be judged as in 1) above.
      4) At this time, and to conclude the business for Thursday of the conference, the faculty critic judges for each of the subject matter areas will assemble and a) formulate a debate proposition for the area and b) designate 2-speaker teams for the debates for Friday. Proper care shall be exercised to ascertain that each 2-speaker team is composed of delegates from different schools and that each delegate is assigned to the affirmative or negative in accordance with the views he has expressed in 1), 2), and 3) above.

5) There shall be two rounds of debate on Friday morning. The debates shall be judged by a single faculty judge who shall indicate the winning and losing team and individual ratings for the several debaters.
6) A set of caucuses will be held on Friday afternoon of affirmatives on each resolution and negatives on each resolution to enable those delegates to arrange their strategy for the parliamentary debates.
7) A parliamentary debate of one and one-half hours shall be held on subject matter area I with all delegates to the conference attending. The resolution for debate shall be that used in the debates of Friday morning. Two leading affirmative and negative speakers shall begin the debate with 5-minute speeches. These speakers shall be determined on the basis of their cumulative score in their subject matter area for their participation in 1), 2), 3), and 5) above. After the four leading speakers have spoken, the debate shall be thrown open to all conference delegates. The debate shall be chaired by a faculty member.
8) Immediately after 7) a second parliamentary debate shall be held on subject matter area II.
9) Friday night of the conference shall be reserved for the conference banquet, Delta Sigma Rho initiation, and social hours.
10) Starting at 8:30 on Saturday a parliamentary debate shall be held on subject matter area III.
11) Starting at 10:00 a.m. on Saturday a parliamentary debate shall be held on subject matter area IV.
12) After lunch an awards session shall be held at which the top 10 percent of all delegates shall be recognized for special distinction without regard for rank and the next 15 percent of all delegates shall be recognized for distinction without regard for rank. This ranking will be determined through over-all cumulative evaluations by the several judges.

The above format provides for a program in which four subject matter areas are considered. In the event that fewer issues are discussed, additional time may be allotted to individual or parliamentary debate.

KEY ISSUES . . .

(Continued from Page 4)

Results.

Tabulation of the data collected indicates that each of the stock issues studied was found to be important. The "need" issue was rated highest in relative importance (7.87) on a scale of 0–10) with "workability" a very close second (7.34); "solution" and "disadvantages" were third and fourth and were rated almost as high (6.37 and 5.78). The "counterplan" issue was found to have slight importance in these debates (see Table I).

It is of some interest to note a slight difference in importance for each issue between the group of preliminary (partial round robin) rounds and the elimination rounds. This slight increase in importance was in favor of the "solution" and "workability" issues at the expense of "need" and "disadvantages."

As a further check on the data presented above, a tabulation was made of the percent of the debates in which the judge indicated that one stock issue became the most important; this was done for each stock issue (see Table II).

TABLE II

Percent of Debates In Which the Judge Indicated Which Single Stock Issue Was the "Most Important" (N = 123)[*]

Issue	Preliminary Rounds	Elimination Rounds	All Debates
"Need"	46.9	36.1	44.7
"Solution"	14.9	17.2	15.5
"Workability"	23.3	31.0	25.2
"Disadvantages"	14.9	13.7	14.6
"Counterplan"	0.0	0.0	0.0

[*] Of the total of 168 replies, 123 indicated that *one* issue was "most important" in the debate; only these replies are considered in this table.

TABLE III

Points In Debates At Which It Became Apparent to the Judge That One Stock Issue Had Become Important

Given in percent of judges indicating that one stock issue had become most important during the selected period of speaking by one debater. (N = 123)*

Speech	Need	Solution	Workability	Disadvantages	Counterplan	Total
1st Aff. Constructive	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	2.4
1st Neg. Constructive	12.2	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.0	17.0
2nd Aff. Constructive	5.7	2.4	4.1	1.6	0.0	13.8
2nd Neg. Constructive	12.2	7.3	9.8	5.7	0.0	35.0
1st Neg. Rebuttal	7.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0	9.7
1st Aff. Rebuttal	0.8	0.0	4.9	0.8	0.0	6.5
2nd Neg. Rebuttal	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	9.6
2nd Aff. Rebuttal	2.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Not answered	0.8	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.4

* Of the total of 168 replies, 123 indicated that *one* issue became "most important" in the debate; only these replies were considered in this table.

Again, "need" was first, "workability" second, "solution" third and the "disadvantages" issue fourth. In this set of dimensions the difference in relative importance of the various stock issues is more pronounced; however, the order of importance is the same as in Table I, giving some indication of the reliability of that data.

The question of a "turning point" in a debate is one of the most interesting ones posed for this study. In order to make this concept more meaningful, a tabulation was made of the distribution of the percent of judges indicating that one stock issue had become most important during one of the debaters' speeches (see Table III).

Since the data presented previously indicates that "need" was generally the most important issue, it is of interest to note that there were two places in the debates studied in which this fact most frequently became apparent to the judges; those were the two negative constructive speeches.

When "workability" became the most important issue in a debate, it usually occurred in the second negative constructive speech; this speech was also the one in which it usually became apparent to the judges that either the "solution" or "disadvantages" issues had become the most important one in a debate.

No issue became the most important one in a debate as frequently during the rebuttal speeches as they did in constructive speeches. In those debates in which the most important issue had not become clearly apparent until rebuttals, the "workability" issue in the first affirmative rebuttal speech was clearly in the lead; however, a significant number of debates had the most important issue identified during the second negative rebuttal speech. These latter cases were evenly distributed over these four issues: "need," "solution," "workability," and "disadvantages."

The second negative constructive was the single speech in the debates during which it most frequently became apparent that one issue had become the most important one; in about one-third of those cases it was the "need" issue. The second most important single speech in this respect was the first negative constructive, and in two-thirds of of these cases it was the "need" issue which became the most important one.

It is most interesting to note that in two-thirds of the debates in which one single issue became most important this factor became apparent to the judge during the *constructive* speeches; less than one-third of the time did a judge have to wait until rebuttals to realize which issue (if only one) was going to be the most important one in a debate.

It is also very interesting to note the preponderance of times (about three to one) that one of the negative speakers was able to determine for the judge which issue (or issues) was most important.

Conclusions.

The main limitation of this study is that only one proposition was employed in the debates studied: "Resolved, that the further development of nuclear weapons should be prohibited by international agreement."

If we may conclude that this proposition is fairly representative of those in college debate tournaments, then from the data presented in the study we may derive these generalizations:

1. Four stock issues are ordinarily important in above-average college tournament debates; they are:
   a. "Need"—is there a *need* to adopt the proposal?
   b. "Solution"—will the proposal *meet* the need outlined by the affirmative team?
   c. "Workability"—can the proposal be put into effect in a *practical* way?
   d. "Disadvantages" — will serious *disadvantages* result if the proposal is adopted?
2. Of highest relative importance in college tournament debates meeting the conditions of this study is the "need" issue; of *only slightly less* importance are the "workability" (practicality), "solution" (meeting the alleged need), and "disadvantages" issues.
3. College tournament debaters, when meeting above-average competition, can expect the judge to have become aware that a certain issue has become the most important one in the debate *before* rebuttals have commenced; on the basis of this study such could be predicted in about two debates out of three.
4. Among debaters who are above average, the negative constructive speakers (either first or second, and in about an even number of cases) may be expected to determine for the judge that the "need" issue has become the most important one in the debate.
5. In about ten to fifteen percent of such debates either "workability" or "solution" or "disadvantages" may be expected to become the most important issue; in such cases this fact usually becomes apparent to the judge in the rebuttal speech of the first affirmative or the first negative, more probably in that of the first negative.

It would be interesting to study this problem further with another debate proposition. Did the general political climate regarding nuclear weapons and nuclear cease-fire color these results by making some special demands upon the debaters?

Throughout the study it seemed that the negative teams more than the affirmative had made more of an impression upon the judges concerning the relative importance of various issues. Is this facet of argumentation one which advocates must expect to encounter? To what extent did the nature of the specific topic debated influence this tendency or trend?

Further research on the treatment of issues in argumentation and debating would seem to be interesting and warranted.

New Members of Delta Sigma Rho, 1959-60

ALBION (1)

Charles Wilson Hayden, 2518 Teel Avenue, Lansing, Michigan

ALLEGHENY (2)

Herbert Lincoln Dyer, 525 Howe Avenue, Erie, Pennsylvania
James Robert Toole, 56 Lakeview Park, Rochester, New York

AMHERST (5)

Jack Le Roy Easterling
Bert W. Rein
Keith S. Rosenn
Mark L. Stiglitz
Fred L. Wallace

ARIZONA (4)

Norman J. Liechty, Jr., 313 W. District, Tucson, Arizona
Edward A. Morgan, Jr., 524 W. Harmont Drive, Phoenix, Arizona
Alfred J. Olsen, 504 Arizona Ave., Buckeye, Arizona
John H. Schatteles, 2309 E. 7th Street, Tucson, Arizona

BATES (2)

Neil J. Newman, 15 Mt. Hood Road, Brighton, Massachusetts
Marjorie C. Sanborn, 12A Jewett Street, Laconia, New Hampshire

BROOKLYN (3)

Marguerite R. Goodman, 3108 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn 10, New York
Louis D. Krone, 101 Lenox Road, Brooklyn, New York
Stephen Robb, 2170 Brigham Street, Brooklyn, New York

BROWN (3)

Henry R. Austin, 248 Hutchinson Boulevard, Mt. Vernon, New York
Joseph B. Juhasz, 88-11 34th Avenue, Jackson Heights, New York
Kevin V. O'Leary, 22 Bartlett Avenue, Arlington, Massachusetts

CHICAGO (2)

William R. Hawkins, 919 East 6th Street, Davenport, Iowa
Elizabeth A. Truninger, 504 East 6th Street, Muscatine, Iowa

COLGATE (3)

Charles L. Corbin, 67 High Street, Laconia, New Hampshire
Jonathan M. Landers, 1311 Avenue "L," Brooklyn, New York
Joseph J. Medved, 60 Old Plank Lane, Chagrin Falls, Ohio

COLORADO (3)

Jerome C. Davies, 213 South Sherwood, Ft. Collins, Colorado
Warren L. McElvain, 1025 North Fifth, Grand Junction, Colorado
Martha Ann Showers, 605 Essex Road, Kenilworth, Illinois

CREIGHTON (2)

James Brady, 4032 Burt, Omaha, Nebraska
Timothy J. Rouse, 1015 Beverly Drive, Omaha, Nebraska

DEPAUW (6)

Lynda S. Bayliff, 155 North Washington, Delaware, Ohio
Jerry Wm. Frost, 711 Berkeley Drive, Marion, Indiana
George R. Geier, Jr., 6801 Old State Rd., Evansville 10, Indiana
David L. Landsittel, 455 W. Central Avenue, Delaware, Ohio
Virginia E. Peterson, R.R. 1, Box 24, Delphi, Indiana
John H. Smith, 310 S. Race, Urbana, Illinois

GRINNELL (2)

Dixie L. Harrington, Lamoni, Iowa
Cameron B. Hendershot, 3612 Ingersoll, Des Moines, Iowa

HARVARD (1)

Gregory M. Harvey, 43 Mills Street, Morristown, New Jersey

HAWAII (2)

Kay K. Fujii, 2834 Varsity Circle 1, Honolulu, Hawaii
Sylvia D. Kang, 3011 Holei Street, Honolulu, Hawaii

IDAHO (6)

Niels R. Andersen, 635 W. Cherry Lane, Meridian, Idaho
Gordon R. Chester, 2268 Gekeler, Boise, Idaho
Stephen H. Keutzer, 195 Willoughby Avenue, Brooklyn 5, New York
Darrell K. Merrill, 306 Peasley Street, Boise, Idaho
Warren R. Martin, 123 Florence, Grangeville, Idaho
Jess Walters, 1011 Bear Avenue, Idaho Falls, Idaho

ILLINOIS (13)

Ralph D. Beal, 5203 South Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois
Ronald E. Boyer, 1101 West Oregon, Urbana, Illinois
Janet A. Dubisky, 4602 S. California, Chicago, Illinois
James B. Ellern, 25 Shireford Lane, Ferguson 35, Missouri
Barbara F. Gaul, 7028 N. Mendota Avenue, Chicago, Illinois
Charles N. Goldstein, 5232 West Van Buren, Chicago 44, Illinois
John E. Hill, 78 Beardsley, Champaign, Illinois
Paul R. Lederer, 2943 Chase Avenue, Chicago, Illinois
Arnold E. Perl, 1222 Sherwin Avenue, Chicago 26, Illinois
Joseph L. Podolsky, 5043 North Troy Street, Chicago, Illinois
Irwin N.M.I. Rosen, 4304 N. Francisco Avenue, Chicago 18, Illinois
Norman M. Sobiesk, 2718 W. Roesmont, Chicago, Illinois
Ilmar Waldner, P.O. Box 177, Greenview, Illinois

INDIANA (6)

Sue Ann Baker, 909 South 20 Street, New Castle, Indiana
Vedder J. Brocker, 10940 Beechwood Drive, Indianapolis, Indiana
Lynda A. Beltz, 215 First Street, Findlay, Ohio
John P. Geberin, 253 E. Riverside, Peru, Indiana

Thomas G. Morgan, 2900 Garfield,
Terre Haute, Indiana
Robert V. O'Neal, Box 229,
Hagerstown, Indiana

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY (8)

Dan M. Bechter, 610 West 1st Avenue,
Indianola, Iowa
George A. Forsyth, 4315 Northwest Drive,
Des Moines, Iowa
Max L. Gross, Fayette, Iowa
John R. Hansen, 225 3rd,
Manning, Iowa
Sharon M. Langford, 2105 South 91st,
Omaha, Nebraska
Marilyn K. Miller, R.R.,
Lewis, Iowa
Susan K. Timm, Rt. 4, Muscatine, Iowa
Richard W. Wilkie, 1117 Wilson,
Ames, Iowa

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA (4)

John F. Niemeyer, 604 North Main,
Elkader, Iowa
James E. Roever, 528 Plum Street,
Reedsburg, Wisconsin
Ronald M. Stump, 728 Fulton Street,
Keokuk, Iowa
Todd G. Willy, 315 NW 4th Street,
Madison, South Dakota

IOWA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE (5)

Patricia A. Cookinham, R.R. 3,
Estherville, Iowa
Richard R. Olmsted, 1011 South 23rd,
Fort Dodge, Iowa
Audrey J. Perryman, 3038 Melrose Avenue,
Sioux City, Iowa
Marvin R. Scott, Anita, Iowa
John L. Baker

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS (7)

Leland D. Cole, Route 2,
Great Bend, Kansas
Harry W. Craig, Jr., 932 Kentucky,
Lawrence, Kansas
Gary E. Dilley, 318 W. 13th,
Emporia, Kansas
William K. Flynn, 6904 Leavenworth Road,
Bethel, Kansas
William D. Haught, 825 Third,
Alamosa, Colorado
David N. Rockhold, 1409 East Third,
Winfield, Kansas
Sonnie K. Youle, 701 S. Washington,
Wellington, Kansas

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY (4)

Carl J. Austermiller, 1224 Fremont,
Manhattan, Kansas
Virginia J. Baxter, 323 Elm,
Russell, Kansas
Mary E. Richardson, 207 North Buffalo,
Stafford, Kansas
J. Joanne Russell, 202 N. Campus Courts,
Manhattan, Kansas

LOYOLA (12)

Philip J. Augustine, 3537 S. Union,
Chicago, Illinois
Leroy F. Blommaert, 9031 Knox Avenue,
Skokie, Illinois
Richard Wm. Bock, 4816 West Grace Street,
Chicago 41, Illinois
Barry J. Cullinan, 5902 W. Roosevelt Road,
Chicago 50, Illinois
Charles T. Dienes, 4813 N. Lincoln Avenue,
Chicago, Illinois
Kathleen E. Dwyer, 4418 West Congress,
Chicago 24, Illinois
William M. Hegan, 7203 N. Hamilton,
Chicago, Illinois
Alan C. Jorgensen, 4100 West 24th Pl.,
Chicago, Illinois
Elaine G. Koprowski, 8343 Muskegon,
Chicago, Illinois
Patricia B. Kubistal, 5111 N. Oakley Avenue,
Chicago, Illinois
Maurice J. McCarthy, 2745 N. Oak Park Ave.,
Chicago, Illinois
John Charles Plotzke, 2153 N. Seminary Ave.,
Chicago, Illinois

MARQUETTE (5)

Michael J. Ash, 4130 West Martin Drive,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Julie A. Haislmaier, 3410 Wright Avenue,
Racine, Wisconsin
John Wm. Hellman, 1530 Church Street,
Wauwatosa 13, Wisconsin
Jerome H. Kringel, 2727 N. Lefeber Avenue,
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin
Gerald W. Sazama, 2124 S. 31st,
Milwaukee 15, Wisconsin

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN (3)

Albert E. Fowerbaugh, 17700 Riverside Dr.,
Lakewood, Ohio
Alan E. O'Day, R.R. 2,
Quincy, Michigan
Richard O. Parmelee, Jr., Hotel Ventura,
Ashland, Kentucky

MICHIGAN STATE (3)

Barry D. Boughton, 3018 Rolfe Road,
Lansing, Michigan
Charles E. Herbert, 1224 Downer,
Lansing, Michigan
Ralph O. Wilbur, 912 Townsend,
Lansing, Michigan

MISSOURI (2)

Paul T. Bryson, 11700 Winner Road,
Independence, Missouri
Robert H. Osborn, R.R. 2, North,
Effingham, Illinois

NEBRASKA (1)

Ernest E. Hinest, 3303 S. 28th,
Lincoln, Nebraska

NEVADA (4)

Virgil A. Bucchianeri, 802 Thompson,
Carson City, Nevada
Richard W. Madsen, 775 Airport Rd., No. 4,
Reno, Nevada
F. DeArmond Sharp, 2217 Beverly Way,
Las Vegas, Nevada
Daniel B. A. Sobrio, 195 Booth Street,
Reno, Nevada

NORTH CAROLINA (2)

John T. McMillan
Henry C. Simpson, Jr.

NORTH DAKOTA (2)

Robert A. Bergquist,
Adams, North Dakota
Scott P. Pearson, 1114 Chestnut Street,
Grand Forks, N. Dakota

OBERLIN (3)

Susan S. Kelly, Hillbrook Estate,
Chagrin Falls, Ohio
Benjamin Sevitch, 516 Hedgerow Lane,
Oreland, Pennsylvania
Mary A. Turzillo, 2078 Glengary Road,
Akron 13, Ohio

OHIO STATE (22)

Sarah J. Benson, 168½ Merriman Road, Akron 3, Ohio
Allen B. Bogarad, Wittenberg College
Loren D. Crane, 191 W. 9th Avenue, Columbus 1, Ohio
Donald F. Faules, 1416 11th Street, Greeley, Colorado
James W. Gibson, 173 Elwood Avenue, Marysville, Ohio
Thomas D. Gindlesberger, Wooster Road, Millersburg, Ohio
Edward L. Hammerman, 201 Hornwood Drive, Dayton 5, Ohio
Arla Chatfield, MacArthur, Ohio
Ned W. Hashbarger, RFD 4, Leipsic, Ohio
James R. Jeffery, 1818 Wellesley, Toledo, Ohio
Ruth B. Lewis, 1350 Highland Street, Columbus, Ohio
Edward L. McGlone, 400 Tuscarawas, Newark, Ohio
Basil F. Medvitz, 55-16 Street, Barberton, Ohio
Diane L. D. Powell, 7995 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio
Regina M. Rieke, 116 Broadmeadows Boulevard, Columbus 14, Ohio
Marlyn R. Sandhaus, 1058 Larchdale Drive, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania
Gilbert E. Shepard, 261 E. 13th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio
James A. Shipp, 1056 Afton Road, Columbus, Ohio
Harriet L. Wain, 1106 Briarwood Road, Mansfield, Ohio
Richard H. Walker, 3050 Oakridge Road, Columbus 21, Ohio
James L. Walters, 1661 Guilford Road, Columbus, Ohio
Dale E. Williams, 607 E. 9th Street, Port Clinton, Ohio

OHIO WESLEYAN (6)

Robert R. Crosby
William A. Kyler
David A. Lockmiller
Robert A. Richardson
Blake H. Schubert
Cheryl A. Smith

OREGON STATE (3)

Margo R. Fellman, 2434 Grand Avenue, Billings, Montana
Harriett S. Palmer, 1816 S.E. 51, Portland, Oregon
Thomas O. Schooley, 17720 Dixie Highway, Homewood, Illinois

PENNSYLVANIA STATE (5)

Vernon D. Barger, Curllsville, Pennsylvania
Peter J. Galie, 209 Harry Street, Conshohocken, Pennsylvania
Mary A. Ganter, 7200 Baptist Road, Bethel Park, Pennsylvania
Lurene M. Jochem, 127 Center Street, Pompton Lakes, New Jersey
Joan C. Kemp, 45 Stanford Place, Glen Ridge, New Jersey

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURG (3)

Leonard J. Bucki, 1 Halket Street, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania
Sherman D. Fogel, 624-18th Street, NW, Canton, Ohio
Fadell J. Hallal, 501 Spring Street, Brownsville, Pennsylvania

POMONA (1)

Joseph P. Myers, 3401 Toni Drive, West Covina, California

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (1)

Alan I. Widiss, 5672 Marburn Avenue, Los Angeles, California

STANFORD (6)

Gloria B. Bianchi, 13871 River Ranch Circle, Saratoga, California
Robert K. Best, 1605 Argonne Drive, Stockton 3, California
Daniel J. Kremer, 6505 Olympic Drive, Everett, Washington
O. Wood Moyle, III, 1412 Yale Avenue, Salt Lake City 5, Utah
John M. Rolls, Jr., 280 Casitas Avenue, San Francisco, California
Michael A. Willemsen, 795 Roble Avenue, Menlo Park, California

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT FREDONIA (5)

William D. Coss, 92 North Main Street, Portville, New York
James G. Dobie, 197 57th Street, Niagara Falls, New York
Linda J. Nagel, Box 82, Panama, New York
Alda Pendell
Roy Wollo, 9 Bryce Avenue, Glen Cove, New York

SYRACUSE (4)

Barbara A. Emmons, 118 Oakland Street, Syracuse, New York
James F. Hale, 512 Bradford Parkway, Syracuse, New York
Brenda S. Jonas, 530 East Grand Street, New York, New York
Giselle C. Nemeth, 123 Kensington Drive, Utica, New York

TEMPLE (7)

Sandra P. Chanin, 4401 Rhawn Street, Philadelphia 36, Pennsylvania
Patricia A. Connell, 1510 Grove Avenue, Noble, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania
Arthur De Leo, 6133 Castor Avenue, Philadelphia 49, Pennsylvania
Harlene E. Lit, 7345 Woodcrest, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
James M. Malloy, 139 Rochell Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Reeca Smith, 2296 Bryn Maur, Philadelphia 31, Pennsylvania
Laurence O. Spector, 5119 Springfield Ave., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

TEXAS (3)

Almalee Cartee, 6619 Granada Boulevard, Coral Gables, Florida
Robert C. Falls, 4002½ Avenue F, Austin, Texas
James F. Hofheinz, 2400 Yorktown Drive, Houston, Texas

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE (10)

Mayme M. Allen, 1400 Rosewood Avenue, Odessa, Texas
Saundra F. Clark, 1724 Loma Linda, Vernon, Texas
Cameron M. Cunningham, 4906-21 Street, Lubbock, Texas
Suzanne Dale, 6542 Lindyann Lane, Houston, Texas
Mary H. Fairly, 502 East Randall, Beeville, Texas

Alice A. Fursman, 10106 Inwod, Dallas, Texas
Franz L. Helbig, 6319 Mimosa Lane, Dallas 30, Texas
Robert G. Kinney, 401 Phillips Court, Arlington, Texas
Gail Q. Pfluger, Box K, Eden, Texas
Donald L. Zimmerman, 107 Beach Street, Hereford, Texas

TULANE (7)

Donald I. Bierman, 2120 S.W. 15 Street, Miami, Florida
Clyde E. Buzzard II, Route 2, Neosho, Missouri
Jerome I. Chapman, 7021 Walmsley Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana
Alan T. Cramer, 5315 Braeburn Drive, Bellaire 101, Texas
Richard F. Cromer, 2305 S.W. 16th Terr., Miami, Florida
Arthur C. Hastings, 507 West Sherman, Neosho, Missouri
Harlan A. Schmidt, R.F.D. 1, Spirit Lake, Iowa

VIRGINIA (1)

Richard G. Clemens, Williamson School, Media, Pennsylvania

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON (2)

Peter S. Chamberlain, 301 N. 7th Street, Indiana, Pennsylvania
William T. Shulick, R.F.D. 1, Box 152, Blairsville, Pennsylvania

WASHINGTON STATE (9)

Richard S. Culp, 14601 E. Valley Way, Spokane 67, Washington
Diana J. Gibson, 10828 S.E. 18th, Bellevue, Washington
Theodore G. Grove, Sunnyhill Trailers, Pullman, Washington
Susan J. Harris, 615 7th Street, S.E., Puyallup, Washington
Bruce M. Haston, Box 325, Oakesdale, Washington
Neva A. Houston, Box 397, Benton City, Washington
James E. Loss, 3537 W. Matthews Drive, Bremerton, Washington
Marguerite R. Martini, 2809 S. 150th, Seattle, Washington
Jim R. Rockey, Box 323, Omak, Washington

WAYNE STATE (8)

Donald J. Boyd, 31135 Ryan Road, Warren, Michigan
Seymour A. Goss, 24221 Gardner, Oak Park, Michigan
Leon Hardiman, 16547 Linwood, Detroit 21, Michigan
Frederick E. Ioanou, 20151 Bramford, Detroit 34, Michigan
Ronald R. Kangas, 11660 Coyle, Detroit 27, Michigan
Dolores P. Kopek, 3086 Jacob, Hamtramck, Michigan
Paul L. Nine, 8786 Homer, Detroit 9, Michigan
Stephen A. Weiswasser, 17567 Appoline, Detroit 35, Michigan

WICHITA (2)

John E. Elder, 827 S. Green, Wichita, Kansas
Judith L. Wallace, Rt. 2, Box 208 A, Bartlesville, Oklahoma

WISCONSIN (2)

Barbara J. Bigger, 2465 E. Badger Road, Madison, Wisconsin
Cam B. Kornman, 108 Bellaire Drive, New Orleans, Louisiana

WYOMING (2)

Holly H. Patrick, Jr., Yoder, Wyoming
Harold F. Ward, 3332 Dunn Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyoming

YALE (3)

John W. Hetherington, 96-12 70th Avenue, Forest Hills, New York
Lance M. Liebman, 220 W. Campbell Street, Frankfort, Kentucky
Mark Wm. Zacher, 32 Otsego Road, Worcester, Massachusetts

AT LARGE (15)

Clarence L. Brammer, Box 104, Martinsdale, Montana
Keith Brooks, 4238 Shrewsbury Road, Columbus, Ohio
Donald B. Clark, 1623 Wilson Avenue, Columbia, Missouri
Stewart J. Crandell, 2004 Indiana, Pullman, Washington
Gov. Michael DiSalle, Governor's Mansion, Columbus, Ohio
Jon M. Ericson, Department of Speech, Stanford University, Stanford, California
Novice Fawcett, 220 West 12th St., President's House, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio
William F. Fratcher, Tate Hall, Columbia, Missouri
George Lewis, 452 Kroehler Drive, Hilliard, Ohio
Paul R. McKee, 2420 North Poplar, Wichita, Kansas
Loren D. Reid, 200 East Brandon Road, Columbia, Missouri
Charles R. Row, Department of Speech, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
Donald J. Stinson, 820 North Michigan, Chicago 11, Illinois
Joseph A. Wigley, 309 Howard Street, Pullman, Washington
O. J. Wilson, President's Office, Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio

TOTAL 259

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	Dale E. Wolgamuth	Washington, D.C.
AR	Arizona	1922	G. F. Sparks	Tucson, Ariz.
B	Bates	1915	Brooks Quimby	Lewiston, Maine
BE	Beloit	1909	Carl G. Balson	Beloit, Wisc.
BK	Brooklyn	1940	William Behl	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	Mrs. Shirley Miller	Chicago, Illinois
CLR	Colorado	1910	Thorrel B. Fest	Boulder, Colo.
COL	Colgate	1910	Robert V. Smith	Hamilton, New York
CON	Connecticut	1952	Charles McNames	Storrs, Conn.
COR	Cornell	1911	H. A. Wichelns	Ithaca, N.Y.
CR	Creighton	1934	Harold J. McAuliffe, S.J.	Omaha, Nebr.
D	Dartmouth	1910	Herbert L. James	Hanover, N.H.
DP	DePauw	1915	Robert O. Weiss	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	Harry P. Kerr	Cambridge, Massachusetts
HW	Hawaii	1947	Orland S. Lefforge	Honolulu, Hawaii
I	Idaho	1926	A. E. Whitehead	Moscow, Idaho
ILL	Illinois	1906	King Broadrick	Urbana, Ill.
IN	Indiana	1951	E. C. Chenoweth	Bloomington, Ind.
ISC	Iowa State	1909	R. W. Wilke	Ames, Iowa
IT	Iowa State Teachers	1913	Lillian Wagner	Cedar Falls, Iowa
IU	Iowa	1906	Orville Hitchcock	Iowa City, Iowa
JCU	John Carroll	1958	Austin J. Freeley	Cleveland, Ohio
K	Kansas	1910	Dr. Wilmer Linkugel	Lawrence, Kansas
KA	Kansas State	1951		Manhattan, Kansas
KX	Knox	1911	Donald L. Torrence	Galesburg, Ill.
L	Loyola University	1960	Donald J. Stinson	Chicago, Illinois
LU	Lehigh University	1960	H. Barrett Davis	Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
MQ	Marquette	1930	Joseph B. Laine	Milwaukee, Wisc.
M	Michigan	1906	N. Edd Miller	Ann Arbor, Mich.
MSU	Michigan State	1958	Dr. Murray Hewgill	East Lansing, Michigan
MN	Minnesota	1906	Robert Scott	Minneapolis, Minn.
MO	Missouri	1909	Robert Friedman	Columbia, Mo.
MM	Mount Mercy	1954	Thomas A. Hopkins	Pittsburgh, Penn.
MR	Morehouse	1959	A. Russell Brooks	Atlanta, Ga.
MU	Mundelein	1949	Sister Mary Irene, B.V.M.	Chicago, Ill.
N	Nebraska	1906	Don Olson	Lincoln, Nebraska
NC	University of North Carolina	1960	Donald K. Springen	Chapel Hill, N. Carolina
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 Boase	Oberlin, Ohio
OK	Oklahoma	1913	Roger E. Nebergall	Norman, Okla.
OR	Oregon	1926	W. Scott Nobles	Eugene, Oregon
ORS	Oregon State	1922	Earl W. Wells	Corvallis, Oregon
OW	Ohio Wesleyan	1907	Ed Robinson	Delaware, Ohio
P	Pennsylvania	1909	G. W. Thumm	Philadelphia, Pa.
PO	Pomona	1928	Howard Martin	Claremont, Calif.
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.
SY	Syracuse	1910	J. Edward McEvoy	Syracuse, N.Y.
TE	Temple	1950	Amelia Hoover	Philadelphia, Pa.
T	Texas	1909	Martin Todaro	Austin, Texas
TT	Texas Tech	1953	James E. Brennan	Lubbock, Texas
TU	Tulane University	1960	Dr. E. A. Rogge	New Orleans, Louisiana
UNYF	University of New York at Fredonia	1960	Alan L. McLeod	Fredonia, New York
VA	Virginia	1908	Robert Jeffrey	Charlottesville, Va.
W	Washington	1922		St. Louis, Mo.
WA	University of Washington	1954	Laura Crowell	Seattle, Wash.
WAY	Wayne	1937	Rupert L. Cortright	Detroit, Mich.
WES	Wesleyan	1910		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
WSU	Washington State University	1960	Gerald M. Phillips	Pullman, Washington
WVA	West Virginia	1923	F. A. Neyhart	Morgantown, West Va.
WYO	Wyoming	1917	Patrick Marsh	Laramie, Wyoming
Y	Yale	1909	Rollin G. Osterweis	New Haven, Conn.

DELTA SIGMA RHO
205 Derby Hall
Department of Speech
Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Return Postage Guaranteed

Second Class Postage Paid
at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.

DELTA SIGMA RHO

NATIONAL FORENSIC TOURNAMENT

University of Colorado—Boulder, Colorado

April 27-28-29, 1961

More details in January Issue

Full details in March Issue