

5-1961

Complete Issue 43(4)

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. (1961). Complete Issue 43(4). *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho*, 43(4), 53-70.

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.

DONALD O. OLSON

the gavel

volume 43

number 4

of
delta
sigma
rho



may

1961

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**

Second-class Postage Paid at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 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 \$25.00 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; Marvin Esch, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan; Mel Moorhouse, Wichita University, Wichita, Kansas; Herbert James, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

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 Freely, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio.

THE GAVEL

of

DELTA SIGMA RHO

VOLUME 43

MAY, 1961

NUMBER 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Fine Art of Being Ignored	53
President's Page by <i>Herold T. Ross</i>	54
Practical Experience in Human Relations for Debaters by <i>Donald W. Klopff</i>	55
A Postscript to The History of Debating in the American Colleges by <i>David Potter</i>	57
A New Look at The Debate Brief by <i>William A. Behl</i>	60
Total Forensics Programming at Washington State University by <i>Gerald M. Phillips</i>	62
Ohio Wesleyan Debate History by <i>W. Roy Diem</i>	64
The Art of Persuading <i>Whom?</i> by <i>Joseph A. Wigley</i>	67
Secretary's Report	69
Index to Volume 43	70

The Fine Art of Being Ignored

Another school year is drawing to a close.

And with that fact comes the annual "soul-searching" deluge of articles about what is wrong and right with American education.

As usual, your editor gets a little bitter about this time of year. Mostly because the thought of being ignored is just more than man should have to take. They can love us or hate us, but how horrible to have them pretend we don't exist.

This yearly battle, between the "hard-noses" as represented by Rickover and Bestor and the "Deweyites" as represented by our entrenched public school officials, is a fight worth enjoying. But to really enjoy a fight, one must take sides, even become a participant. And somehow I get the feeling that neither side is overly eager to have the

support of the countries' debaters and debate coaches.

The recent controversy has been marked by this conspicuous absence. The "let's get tough school" has never bothered to mention forensics as one of the toughest disciplines in any school curriculum (secondary or college). By omission they have made it plain debate just isn't one of the finer things in life. Loosely speaking, they have lumped it into the general category of "frill" subjects. What really hurts is the fact we haven't been mentioned by name (at least in the articles I have read). The acceptable subjects are listed, the most objectionable of the so called "soft" subjects are damned, and the rest of us are labeled by implication.

Of course, the brave warriors on the other

(Continued on Page 59)

President's Page . . .

The Faculty Sponsor

HEROLD T. ROSS

A new chapter sponsor recently raised two questions: What are my responsibilities? What are my duties? There are doubtless other sponsors who have the same questions but have not taken the time to ask them. This is an answer to the issues raised.

The chapter sponsor is the key link in the chain of communication between the national officers and the local chapters on the various college campuses. This in no way disparages the cooperative and generally effective work of chapter officers. Their period of activity as active members of Delta Sigma Rho on any campus is necessarily limited to two years and they hold office generally for one year. They really have little opportunity to establish effective communication with the national office. The chapter sponsor, for the most part, serves for a number of years, he has an established mail address to which letters, reports and *Gavels* may be sent and he is able to contact members in the chapter. For this reason, the national president seeks to establish chapter contact each fall with the chapter sponsor. In return, he asks a short form response which will establish the communications link for the year.

Obviously then, the first duty of a sponsor is to send in his chapter reply, giving the national officers any information which they need to know about the local situation.

What duties and responsibilities follow? The sponsor should, of course, establish the chapter each fall by contact with the members. If the local chapter has a program or sponsors a tournament, plans should be made. The sponsor, with the actives, should next encourage students who are academically in the upper third of their classes to come out for debate and to qualify for membership. There is no thought here that the chapter will in any way interfere in the activities of the forensic director; the chapter should recruit and encourage participa-

tion so as to augment and stimulate cooperation in the debate and oratorical programs. Then the sponsor and chapter members should set a date near the end of the season to consider students who are eligible and to elect them to membership. Since it is always more impressive if new members receive their certificates and keys at the time of initiation, elections should be held at least a month before the initiation in order to give the national secretary and the jewelers time to make out the certificates and engrave the keys. The sponsor should assume responsibility for an impressive initiation ceremony.

Delta Sigma Rho is not only a national forensic society but it is a national *honor* society. This distinction should be established on the campus and in the thinking of students, faculty and administration. There are so many recognition societies and clubs on the average campus that it is often necessary to consider the best way in which to establish prestige of the chapter on a campus. On several campuses, for example, members elected to honor societies have their names printed on honors day programs or they are read on such occasions. On another campus the annual forensic banquet brings to the campus state and national leaders who were elected to Delta Sigma Rho in their college days. There are many other ways by which the society may be given a place of prominence on the campus.

Finally, the sponsor should keep the records and rituals of the society in his care, especially during the summer vacations. Valuable material has been lost on occasions when a summer mishap destroyed it or a key student failed to return to the campus.

The duties and responsibilities of a sponsor are not heavy but they are exceedingly important—so much so that the future of the society lies in their hands.

Practical Experience In Human Relations For Debaters

DONALD W. KLOPF

Assistant Professor of Speech
University of Hawaii, Honolulu

Victory in debate usually results from complete preparation—preparation which gives the advocate thorough knowledge of the subject. Such preparation requires more than individual analysis and research; it requires extensive cooperation between squad members and coaches in analyzing the proposition, assembling bibliographies, gathering evidence, organizing cases, and formulating team strategy.

Cooperation of this sort promotes rational thinking, practical judgment, and wider understanding. But it requires a sympathetic appreciation among the squad members of each others feelings and attitudes. Too often, however, in their deliberation, the members are unwilling or unable to cooperate in this manner. Unless they have had prior training in discussion techniques, chaos may result from this inability to work together. The casually interested may be lost before his interest ripens; friction occasionally develops between the more serious debaters.

Usually the coaches find it impractical to devote time and energy to teaching discussion methods even though those principles dealing especially with group unity are useful. However, insight into human relations difficulties encountered in debate preparation can be gained quickly through the Incident Process, a form of the case study.¹ As a training device, it helps the participants learn how to solve social problems by working on situations analagous to those actually found in debate preparation.

The Incident Process gradually evolved from the case study. When a group meets to analyze a case, they are confronted with the product of someone else's thinking. The

situation outlined in the case bears little resemblance to that found by an individual who is suddenly confronted by an actual difficulty because the case gives all the facts. In a true life situation, some precipitating event or challenge to authority which requires the need for a decision confronts individuals. The whole case does not suddenly unravel itself. So the Incident Process came into being.

"Incidents" are brief, simple statements which present challenges of some type. For example:

"Rah Rah U Debate Team" Incident

Five members of the Rah Rah University debate team met at a special organizational meeting to discuss plans for a forthcoming tournament. During the course of the meeting Arthur Andrews, a member of the team, insisted that the team members adopt his particular affirmative case. Bob Blair, another member, stood up and said: "You're all pig-headed. My ideas would have settled this whole problem, but you ignored them. I guess I'd better not participate in this tournament."²

Such an "incident" highlights the necessity for identifying the basic problems involved in order to gain insight into the behavior of Andrews and Blair. These problems will become apparent only when all the facts are known. Then solutions can be proposed.

In a short training session the coach can show his debaters the need for cooperation by having them analyze an "incident" similar to the "Rah Rah U" one. These five analytical steps are followed:

1. Beginning work on an incident. Each debater silently reads the incident. As he

¹ Much of the material on the Incident Process contained in the article comes from the manual *The Incident Process* (Washington: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1955) by Paul and Faith Pigors.

² The "Rah Rah U" incident case was prepared by Kenneth Sereno of the Speech Department, University of Hawaii, for the University's 1959 Debate Workshop

does so, his situation is much like that of a person in real life—he suddenly is confronted with an actual difficulty. In real life, he usually would attempt to find some solution to the difficulty. In the discussion situation, his concern would be similar but he would be impressed with the need to secure more facts before considering a solution. The statement of the incident is always so bare that hardly any member would be tempted to jump to conclusions. It is apparent that the next task is to get more facts.

2. Uncovering the facts of the case. Since there is no opportunity for direct access to informational sources in a discussion group, the coach acts as a fact resource person. He knows the complete details of the case. Questions concerning the facts of the case are answered by him. His replies pertain only to the facts; they are not inferences which he has drawn from the facts nor are they decisions which he has made about the facts. For example, the coach, questioned about the facts of the "Rah Rah U" incident, would give, without trying to speculate about it, this information: Arthur Andrews, the debate captain, called four other debaters to a meeting to plan team strategy the day prior to their departure for Kazoo University's tournament. Although he knew several months before that four debaters could go, he neglected to ask anyone. Consequently, he could get only four inexperienced students who had not debated together previously. This lack of planning typifies Arthur's leadership. Yet he enjoys directing people, assigning them tasks, and doing their thinking for them. He likes to dictate the direction of discussion. Bob Blair, on the other hand, makes a practice of analyzing arguments. He gives special attention to all errors in reasoning, and thus blocks progress by the group. He does not discriminate between ideas that should be tested carefully and those that should be accepted or rejected without absolute proof. He also becomes angry when his ideas are refuted.

The three other debaters present similar personal problems. Cathy Cornell is insecure and very sensitive to criticism. She does not contribute much to the group. Don Duff finds his suggestions completely ignored. He

recently started to debate and even though his ideas are usually sound, the group looks upon him as a newcomer and tends to isolate him from their deliberations. Eve Elgin agrees with everyone about almost anything. When she speaks, her remarks are generally very long, and though they are agreeable to everyone, the others lose interest due to the excessive length of her contributions.

The meeting had gone on for an hour and a half with little accomplished before the incident occurred. Much of the time Andrews and Blair bickered and argued about technicalities. Elgin took sides with each in turn. Duff spoke often but usually was ignored. Cornell said little.

As the debaters ask questions of the coach in an attempt to uncover these details, possibly some key questions may be overlooked and, therefore, certain vital information will not be available to the group. An unrealistic decision may be made, as in real life, because all the facts were not obtained. In a later step in the analysis, this problem, if it arises, can be dealt with.

This step likely will require about one-half of the discussion period. Collecting facts takes considerable time. It provides distinct advantages, however: (a) the process is so easy that the entire group can immediately experience the satisfaction of contributing to the total group effort and self-consciousness tends to be dispelled; (b) members get experience in interviewing while securing facts; and (c) participants gain experience in weighing the nature of evidence to determine its importance to the case.

Before moving on to the next step, a summary is needed. All the facts are assembled in order to picture the entire case.

3. Determining what constitutes the central issues. Here the problem is to decide what are the main points at issue. Very likely several difficulties caused the incident. In this step the group agrees to the most relevant and important of these problems. The "Rah Rah U" case presents problems primarily concerned with the development of group unity. Cooperation is hindered by Andrew's authoritarian personality and executive complex, by Blair's emotional antagonism.

(Continued on Page 65)

A Postscript to The History of Debating In The American Colleges

DAVID POTTER

Sometimes, when those of us in debate tire of the criticism tossed so energetically in our direction, we seek refuge in the glories of our past. How reassuring it is to discover that ages before most of the popular faculties existed, we were important members of the academic coterie. What satisfaction there is in noting the imprint of famed literary and debating societies on prized collections of 18th century literature, a satisfaction enhanced by the knowledge that long before there was an English department to accuse us of being "Mickey Mouse," students of our discipline were actually defying college edict to explore important contemporary literature and the world of current affairs. What balm to our pride as "outsiders" invade our domain of forensics and leadership training to learn from the records of the student societies that debaters were experimenting with various methods of oral communication and offering practical training in leadership, all this many decades before the birth of special colleges of education and statistically minded departments parading under the aegis of "communication." And what relief it is to hide from the caustic charges of some political scientists ("Debate's main contribution to modern society is the formulation of Richard Nixon's political and ethical integrity" or "Debate as it exists in today's political assemblies is but specious and usually ghost written window dressing.") behind the pages of old newspapers featuring victorious debaters in picture and headline.

But relief of this sort is of short duration and we learn little while our heads are buried in past glories. Far better that we expose ourselves to attack with the possibility of vulnerability but with the possibility, also, of learning.

With this point of view in mind, let us examine briefly the development of collegiate debating in America during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries (the 20th deserves a paper of its own!). And as we examine (all

too briefly) the major forms of debate that existed, expanded, declined, or died during this period, we might also measure the accuracy of one of the most persistent and still pertinent criticisms of debate practice; namely, that during most of its existence in America, debate has been a stultifying and impractical technique, far out of tune with contemporary educational objectives and with reality.

When Harvard, the first of our colonial colleges, was founded, it stressed twice-weekly disputations for all the members of its three undergraduate classes. These early debate exercises, as we learn from contemporary descriptions and examples, were very similar to the medieval Latin Syllogistic Disputations once so important in arming the cleric and scholar for a defense of his beliefs and for attack on the "prejudices" of his opponents. Couched in Latin (once the language of scholars) and formulated in the syllogistic mode (once an acknowledged method of inquiry and academic proof) the syllogistics also demonstrated the academic proficiency so admired in men of the cloth and wearers of the gown. But as the centuries passed, the format of academic debating remained constant. Meanwhile, the needs of students, the interests of audiences, and the nature of topics of vital concern to all colonials were remolded by the onrush of events and issues. Thus, less than a century after the inauguration of the syllogistics in the English colonies, students at Harvard rebelled against forced participation in the exercise. And as President Wadsworth discovered to his chagrin in the 1720's, stiff fines seldom overcome student opposition. Nevertheless, and here our critics have a point in their favor, the overseers refused to yield to the onslaught of a new age and the syllogistics remained at Harvard and other tradition-minded colleges until the early years of our Republic.

Finally, an aroused press entered the lists.

In 1787, the *Massachusetts Centinel* strongly urged the Harvard administration to abandon the increasingly "fulsome" exercise for more modern practices, assuring the academicians that "it would surely be more entertaining and instructive to discover this mode of reasoning in conferences and orations, than to view it in the disgraceful garb in which the schools have clothed it." Shortly afterwards, the ministers turned against their ancient practice and the Rev. John Clarke sounded its death knell when he concluded that in the syllogistics, "the art of reasoning has been degraded to the art of wrangling . . . [in which debaters] by availing themselves of technical terms, and syllogistic forms . . . have stopped the mouth of an adversary without convincing his understanding." Score again for our critics.

But the story is not completely one-sided even in the 18th century. Secular-minded colleges like Pennsylvania had more modern ideas from the very beginning. Indeed, change was in store for even such tradition-minded institutions as Harvard and Yale. At the former, for example, the administration voted to accept forensic disputation in English—in addition to the Latin Syllogistics—in 1757. At the latter, the vernacular was introduced in debate a decade earlier.

Unfortunately, a series of circumstances, the majority of which were not engendered by debate, conspired to weaken the curricular tenure of the forensics. But for almost a century this form of debate served to train college men in their acquisition of written skill in argumentation and in the use of emotional as well as logical proof. With the powerful assistance of the student organizations I shall treat in more detail later, tutors helped countless patriots as well as tories develop written styles of argumentation which reached their height at the time of the American Revolution and during the period of the Federalist papers.

The circumstances to which I alluded earlier began to manifest themselves toward the middle of the 19th century. Popular methods of communication challenged the hold of the forensic mode. Drastic faculty control over the topics for debate and equally strict faculty censorship over content con-

tributed to student opposition. Changes in the college curriculum and in the student body favored other course work. And, as the administrations at both Brown and Columbia openly admitted when they dropped the forensics from the college curriculum, student societies were already doing a better job of teaching forensic skills.

The administrators could have reached an equally justifiable conclusion almost a century earlier: While faculty and trustees alike demonstrated their dread of change or experimentation, groups of students held spirited meetings in private rooms, convenient taverns, and elaborate halls. There, amidst surroundings far more conducive to learning than the foreboding classrooms buildings, they engaged in parliamentary debate, reported on or read from contemporary and classical literature, delivered orations and dialogues—in English, tried their hands at dramatic productions, attempted to explore light as well as serious topics, and, from the beginning, stressed debate above all their exercises.

At first, the society debates were written and read or memorized, as were the forensics later introduced into the classroom. But, early in the history of the societies, undergraduates realized that developing skill in written disputation did not guarantee a transfer of learning to oral combat. In 1766 the Yale Fellowship Club experimented with a new form of academic debate they called extempore. In 1778 the brothers of Phi Beta Kappa at William and Mary inaugurated a similar exercise. By 1783 the new form of debate had replaced the written in two out of three assignments at the Linonian brotherhood in New Haven. By 1810 it was *the* format of the United Brothers at Brown. Gradually, at the other societies, the extempore merged with the forensic to form an almost standard type of debate (not dissimilar to that used by most teams today) which was featured in public exhibitions and during intersociety contests. For many private society contests, however, the extempore frequently turned into an impromptu affair—especially as the student organizations weakened in the later years of the 19th century.

Less flexible than the format of debating at the societies and more open to criticism was their system of judging debates. Following the ancient faculty habit of giving decisions according to the merits of the question, they carried over this practice to formal society debate well into the 19th century. As late as 1863, for example, the long-lived Linonians directed their president-critic to cast his decision according to the merits of the question *and* the quality of the argument presented by the disputants. Within a decade, however, the quality and delivery of the case was the determining factor and some societies like Princeton's Cliosophic in the 1870's brought the entire membership into the critical function, requiring that each decision as well as the original presentations be brought before the society for general comment and discussion—a practice followed by only the boldest of modern educators.

But the elements of change which influenced contemporary college curricula and American society did not bypass the literary and debate societies. During the middle of the 19th century and well into its final decades, the societies at many respected eastern and southern schools lost their hold on the student bodies or else disappeared completely while athletics, an expanded curriculum, special and social societies, and other media of entertainment and instruction siphoned off the energy necessary to maintain a rounded and vigorous program of debates and literary exercises.

Fortunately, for those of us who direct forensics or coach debate, a small core of ardent debaters remained in most of the schools where the societies were once the major cog in the students' extracurricular life. In the early 1880's, these "diehards" in several midwestern, southern, and eastern schools convinced their fellows of the desirability of debates with representatives from societies of other colleges. Momentarily, the extended motivation of rivalry awakened student and community interest. But these initiators of a new step in forensic progress lacked the status and public appeal of a Harvard or Yale. Probably unconscious of what others were doing outside their preparatory school and ivy league

circle, students from Cambridge and New Haven held their first intersociety debate in 1891. The attendant publicity breathed the life of intercollegiate contention into forensics—and magnified a host of problems, old and new. But that is a topic for another paper.

And for another paper is the task of suggesting how we might benefit, if at all, from past errors and omissions. Today I should like to conclude this postscript by raising two innocent questions for your consideration. 1. Is there any significance to the comparative strength of forensics during past centuries when under student or faculty control? 2. Is there any application to the present forensic situation of the old observation that as we resort to technical devices to silence our adversaries, we succeed only in building resentment through the bypassing of an appeal to understanding?

THE FINE ART . . .

(Continued from Page 53)

side are not much better. They have been telling debate coaches for years that we make the students work too hard, we stress competition far more than we should, and we are developing an elite corps of thinkers to the exclusion of the general student body. So, you couldn't really expect them to love us. But you might expect them to hold us up as an example of what hard work will lead to if one isn't careful. Frankly, I'd rather be a horrible example than ignored.

Somewhere in this country there must be an individual who is willing to include us in the fight. This man won't even have to tell us how nice we are. As far as I am concerned, I'd be willing to accept an article telling us why we have no place in modern education (and it wouldn't really matter which side of the controversy desired to take first crack at us).

This is a serious request. The editor would hope that someone could find it within his province to tell the members of Delta Sigma Rho exactly where debate and forensics stand in the present controversy. Any and all views will be accepted.

A New Look at The Debate Brief

WILLIAM A. BEHL
Brooklyn College

It is a generally accepted principle in the teaching profession that it is wise to make a continuous evaluation of what we are doing in the name of education. Socrates spoke well when he said that "the life which is unexamined is not worth living." It is doubtful that we in the field of speech do a sufficient amount of reflection on the method and the content of our speech curricula. Certainly this observation is appropriate in some areas of speech. I have special reference to the interpretation and the use of the brief as a tool in teaching and coaching argumentation and debate. For many years there has been considerable confusion concerning its meaning and its use in the argumentation class. In a recent survey, I discovered that approximately half of those who answered a questionnaire believed that a brief was a survey of all the pertinent material on one side of a proposition; the other half considered it as a report of the arguments and evidence on both sides. In the same investigation, I found that about one-fifth of the instructors did not use the brief at all. The results of this inquiry tend to indicate that the purpose and the value of the debate brief should be re-examined.

Let us look at some of the definitions as set forth in selected texts on argumentation and debate. Some writers interpret the brief to mean something less than an outline of the oral argument; others consider it more than that. One author says that a brief is an "outline guide" and that "the whole brief is not much larger than a single division of the finished forensic."¹ On the other hand, others define it as "a full and finished arrangement in logical order of the evidence and argument on a given side of a case. It is not a preliminary outline on which to build a speech or essay."² Still another author defines it as "a storehouse of informa-

tion, including a complete analysis of a given proposition and all the representative arguments and evidence on a given side of a orally accepted interpretation of the debate brief.

resolution."³ Other authors make a very clear distinction between a brief and a case outline: "A brief is a logical outline which organizes and records all the available material on one side of a proposition. It is not intended to serve as a case outline or a speaker's outline; it is strictly a preparatory outline."⁴ There is still another definition of a brief: "It is a complete written survey of all available material that is pertinent to a given problem."⁵ This type of brief is a complete survey of the data for and against all the significant solutions to a problem. It is obviously a preparatory investigation from which the individual may develop argumentative or expository speeches. I believe that the latter definition should be the general one.

Just what would be the nature of this kind of brief? Would it differ from the traditional brief form? Would it differ in substance? The general format would not be changed because every brief should have an introduction, body, and conclusion, but there would be some changes in the substance of these main divisions. An important addition to the introduction would be the statement of criteria by which any solution to a problem must be measured. What should be accomplished by the solution to the problem? Will the resolution under consideration measure up to the desired goals? Suppose that students are debating the proposition, that capital punishment should be abolished. There must be agreement among the advocates concerning the objectives of a penal code before a debate can take place. If the affirmative maintain

¹ William T. Foster, *Argumentation and Debating* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927), p. 208.

² J. M. O'Neill, Craven Laycock, and Robert L. Scales, *Argumentation and Debate* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 208.

³ A. Craig Baird, *Argumentation, Discussion and Debate* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 79.

⁴ J. H. McBurney, J. M. O'Neill, and Glen Mills, *Argumentation and Debate* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), p. 173.

⁵ William A. Behl, *Discussion and Debate* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1953), p. 116.

that a penal code should deter crime, and the negative hold that it should not, the debate would not be concerned with the retention or abolition of capital punishment but with the aims of the penal code. It should be obvious that there must be an understanding and an agreement with regard to the ultimate aims of a general policy before debate can take place on a specific resolution.

What changes in the body of the brief will be necessary to make it consonant with the interpretation of the brief as suggested here. This brief should consist of three parts: An explanation of the suggested solutions to the problem; the arguments and evidence in support of each plan; and, the lines of reasoning and data against each solution. These solutions, of course, are measured in terms of the criteria set forth in the introduction of the brief. Let us assume that students are debating the proposition, that the United States should cease to give direct economic aid to foreign countries. The real problem is concerned with the kind of relationship we desire with foreign countries. The arguments for and against the solutions to the problem, including the cessation of direct economic aid, must be evaluated in terms of the aims and objectives of our intercourse with foreign countries. The conclusion of the brief should be a summary of the main parts of the investigation.

What is the value of this type of brief for the student of argumentation and debate? First of all, the preparation of a document of this character gives the student a comprehensive view of the proposition. If training in debate is to be defended educationally, it should provide an opportunity for the student to see the proposition in its complete economic, political, and social setting; it should not be a sophistic exercise which trains the individual to see but one side of a proposition. It is difficult to comprehend how the preparation of a brief on one side of a resolution can really prepare the student to see the proposition in relation to the larger problem of which it is a segment. One of the most common criticisms of college forensic activity is that the stu-

dents do not demonstrate a real grasp of the problem involved in the proposition. This is not the fault of the student; it is the result of improper training by the supervisor. If all teachers of debate would require students to prepare full and comprehensive briefs, this objection would be reduced to a minimum. What is more important, the student would be trained to understand the whole problem before attempting to defend any particular proposition.

The discovery of the criteria or the objectives by which any solution must be measured is a second distinct advantage of this type of brief. Too frequently the student looks for arguments for or against a proposition with little or no reference to whether or not they are relevant to the aims. In many debates, the controversy centers around the aims or objectives of a general policy and not the resolution itself. This can make for an interesting debate but it is not a direct and intelligent discussion of the proposition.

A final advantage of this type of brief which is a complete survey of the pertinent information on a given problem is that it contains all the weaknesses of the several solutions. This should be a distinct asset not only in the preparation of the constructive case but also in planning points for refutation.

To summarize, I agree with those who hold that a brief should be a complete survey of both sides of a proposition because such preparation gives the student a comprehensive insight into the total problem; it sets forth the criteria for the evaluation of the various solutions; and, it enables the student to see the problem as a whole before attempting to defend any particular resolution. In short, the preparation of a brief can be a real and valuable educational experience instead of a sophistic practice where individuals try to discover arguments to support preconceived prejudices and predilections. It is probable that support from related departments and college administrators would be intensified if students were encouraged to prepare this comprehensive brief before participating in class debates or intercollegiate contests.

Total Forensics Programming at Washington State University

GERALD M. PHILLIPS
Washington State

All of us in the field of speech know that "forensic" as applied to a program conducted as an activity by a department of speech must have something to do with debate. By usage, the meaning of this word has been restricted to competitive activities in which groups of schools debate each other at a central location for two or three days on the same topic. Proponents of this sort of activity contend that this is a great convenience, since you get a "maximum of participation" for a "minimum of dollars." There is no thought implied here about the role of forensics in a modern speech program—and simply "logging rounds" makes little sense, even if it costs little money. The meaning of the word "forensic" must be extended if speech activities are to play a role in a modern speech curriculum, even if it means doing violence to Aristotle's original definition.

Actually, tournament debating is the sole element of a forensics program in most schools in the United States. Some pay lip service to extended programming, by scheduling one or two public debates, or booking the visiting Oxford team, but this is not truly extended programming, and it does not tend to increase student participation. Studies made at W.S.U. of the 1958-59 debate season covering more than 200 active debate schools indicate that the more active the school in tournament competition, the fewer the total number of participants involved in the program (with a few notable exceptions of course). It has been the experience of the writer that concentration exclusively on competitive debate also limits personnel qualitatively—for there does appear to be a "personality type" that is magnetically attracted to competitive debate—and I am not entirely sure that I like the type. Probably the biggest problem faced by a competitive program is justifying it to one's colleagues in other academic areas, for, if we contend that

debate ". . . teaches critical thinking," they may answer that the same assertion is made of geometry, and that neither debate nor geometry has offered definitive proof. If we say it "teaches subject matter," they may point to innumerable courses on campus that also purport to do that, and inquire whether debate can do it any better; and if we say it teaches people to "think quickly on their feet," their logical question is, "what is the carry-over from response to a formal debate tournament to 'life' and how do you measure it." Rather than attempt to justify tournament debating on these counts, let us concede some lowest terms, i.e., that it does provide experience in preparation and speaking to a relatively large number of people under a considerable amount of pressure, and because of this it is worth retaining as *part* of a total speech activities program.

A broad forensics program must sweep across as much of the field of speech as possible. In order to appeal to the greatest number of students (we presume this to be desirable since, if the benefits are great, they are worth spreading widely) and to provide the diversified training that a speech major must have on the undergraduate level. There are altogether too many of us active in the field that received "specialists" training on the undergraduate level as "debaters" or "actors" who now have a great deal of difficulty cooperating with directors of "rival" speech activities. But this need not be. Total programming tends to resist this idea of fragmentation, and allows specialization on the graduate level, where it belongs, while producing a sound major—at home in the theatre or at the tournament, not to speak of spreading the benefits of participation in speech activities farther beyond the borders of the department.

This institution, Washington State University, is committed to total programming. We do not give it lip service in the form of

an occasional public program. Competitive activity is a *small* part of our program. While our program is far from ideal, it represents, I think, a maximum in diversification that can be expected after three years. The program operates like this:

1. Competitive activities of a traditional nature continue. We participate in five intercollegiate tournaments each year, preferably those with individual events. Debaters are introduced to other forms of competition, and persons skilled in oratory or interpretation are acquainted with debate. We do not regard individual events as "extra" but as ends in themselves, equal with competitive debate, and we have no qualms about training individual events experts as intensely as we might train competitive debaters.

2. In addition to regular tournaments, we participate in a number of special competitive events. For example, each year, Portland State College sponsors a "Town Meeting Tournament" which features symposium activity in front of audiences with the speakers rated by the audience, and prizes awarded. The subject is something other than the national college question. Humboldt State sponsors a "pentathlon of individual events," each individual must participate in five events, and the events are changed each year. Here, too, whatever topic is debated is different from the national college question. We regularly attend student congresses as they are available, and are currently looking forward to the 1961 DSR meeting at Boulder. Tape recorded debates with distant schools and a match with the touring overseas team rounds out this phase of the program.

3. We sponsor tournaments when we can. At the present time we sponsor, regularly, one college tournament which attracts 25 schools and 250 competitors, a small regional high school tournament, and the official state high school tournament. When the opportunity arises, we offer our facilities to other tournaments. Persons who plan to teach speech or coach debate are thus afforded an opportunity for practical training in tournament mechanics.

4. Community service and extension is

provided in the form of touring debate clinics, which present demonstration debates to the high schools, and then meet with high school debaters to answer their questions and help them with their cases. Each year we invite some distant school to tour the state with us—and to do local programs as well. Our guests have included The University of Florida, Western Reserve University, University of Hawaii, Bates College, Montana State College and University of British Columbia. Northwestern is tentatively slated to be our guest next year. We pay an honorarium and cover expenses for the visiting school, and we break even by charging a small fee to schools who take the program. In addition to this, the regular speakers' bureau provides programs for campus and local audiences.

5. Perhaps the most distinctive feature of our "total program" is our liaison with other speech activities. Each year our forensics group sponsors a tour of the state's high schools by the Readers' Theatre, a group of oral interpreters who do a one hour reading of a classic for assembly programs. This has been tremendously popular. We have put on programs in more than 75 communities over the past two years, and interest among the students is very high. It should be noted, parenthetically, that more than half of our successful tournament competitors have been recruited from the ranks of interpreters who originally tried out for Readers' Theatre. In addition to this program, we sponsor a weekly radio program on our campus station, dealing with current issues. Sometimes a celebrity is interviewed, and sometimes we use a simple panel or symposium format. Also, for the first time, this year forensics is sponsoring a state-wide tour of a three-act play. The play has been booked by 16 communities over a ten-day tour. It is interesting to note that at least half the players are also varsity debaters.

The advantages of such total programming are obvious. In the first place, there is no conflict between drama and debate for personnel. It is simply presumed that whatever qualified personnel is available will be utilized as fully as possible in a diversity of

(Continued on Page 65)

Ohio Wesleyan Debate History

W. ROY DIEM

Emeritus Professor of Speech
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio

Intercollegiate debate at Ohio Wesleyan University began with the organization at Delaware on January 2, 1897, of the Ohio Intercollegiate Debating League.¹ The League was a very close affair, involving only four colleges—Ohio Wesleyan, Ohio State, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, and Oberlin College. The representatives of the colleges were: Ohio Wesleyan, Prof. Robert I. Fulton (the moving spirit), and Prof. John H. Grove; Adelbert, Prof. O. F. Emerson; Ohio State, Dr. Barrows; Oberlin, Prof. W. W. Cressy.

Annual contests were to be held as follows: in 1897, Adelbert vs. Oberlin, and Ohio Wesleyan vs. Ohio State. In 1898, Oberlin vs. Ohio State; Ohio Wesleyan vs. Adelbert. In 1899, Ohio State vs. Adelbert; Oberlin vs. Ohio Wesleyan. In following years, the same schedule would occur in rotation.

Kenyon College sent a representative to the meeting and sought membership, but was denied, owing to the difficulty of making a schedule with five members in the League. Later a separate arrangement was set up with Kenyon.

The rules provided that the debates should involve three speakers and an alternate on each team. Each speaker would have fifteen minutes; the affirmative side would be given a five minute rebuttal speech to conclude the debate.

Any student who was carrying ten hours of college work would be eligible for the debates.

Debates were to occur on the last Friday of February and the first Friday of March of each year.

The home team would propose the question to be used and the visiting team would have the choice of sides.

A charge for admission to the debates was to be made. Provision was to be made for a treasury of \$1,000.00, with a constant

surplus of \$250.00. Proceeds from door receipts would go to the treasury.

An executive committee would supervise selection of judges and the making of arrangements for the debates. "Three judges and an alternate are to be selected forty days before the contest. Protests against judges are to be in twenty days preceding the contests, and each college may have but one judge removed." It was specified that no person having any connection with either college in a debate would be eligible to judge.

The first debate to be held under the terms of the constitution was held at Ohio State University on May 7, 1897.² The question was stated, "Resolved, That a uniform restrictive tax should be laid on all immigrants into the United States." Ohio State University, represented by William B. Guitteau, Quinton R. Lane, and Arthur C. Nutt, upheld the affirmative side. Ohio Wesleyan's speakers on the negative were Webster H. Powell, Charles W. Spicer, and Charles Fulkerson. Guitteau had the affirmative rebuttal speech.

The three judges were Rev. John B. Helwig, D.D., Urbana; Judge O. W. H. Wright, of Logan; and Frank Thomas, M.D., Marion. The decision was unanimous for the negative.

A delegation of 200 students and faculty members went with the debaters to Columbus, riding in a special train on the Hocking Valley R. R. to the Union Station in Columbus, and by trolley thence to Ohio State University. Among the 200 were many ladies from Monnett Hall. They were chaperoned by several faculty members who made it their concern, not to keep the boys and girls apart, but to keep them together. In the cheering section to support the Wesleyan debaters were the Ladies' Glee Club

² The Ohio Wesleyan Transcript, May 1 and May 8, 1897.

¹ The College Transcript, Jan. 24, 1897, p. 1.

(Continued on Page 66)

PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE . . .

(Continued from Page 56)

onism and logic maneuverings, by Cornell's fear, Duff's isolation, and Elgin's orations. The central issue is how to get these five to work together.

The process of determining central issues has distinct advantages: (a) members obtain experience in identifying key issues and weighing evidence; (b) genuine discussion usually begins and the debaters start to work toward a common goal; (c) as they discuss, they develop social and intellectual skills like tolerance, recognition of the validity of difference, clear thinking, objectivity, capacity to understand and clarify the thoughts of others.

4. Finding solutions to the problems. The group suggests solutions to the central issues. A number may be suggested, and securing more than one possible solution to any one problem is desirable. The group members gain greater insight by being exposed to numerous solutions. Also, in this step the coach calls to the attention of the group any vital facts not revealed in the second step. If the new evidence changes the picture, the group can revise its decisions.

5. Reflecting on the case situation and generalizing to similar problems. In this final step, the debaters are asked to broaden their view and to consider what needs to be done in actual events. Before doing this the group should evaluate the incident on which they have been working. They think about prevention of future incidents, about general principles, and about what they have learned from this incident. They reflect for a few moments on the probable outcome of the case. In the "Rah Rah U" case, for example, they may consider whether or not the debaters would participate in the tournament and what would happen if they did. Then, finally, they should attempt to generalize to other situations by testing general ideas which seem valid in the case they worked on and applying these to other social interaction difficulties in debate preparation with which they are familiar.

Debaters who have followed these five steps of the Incident Process have learned

to respect the feelings and attitudes of their fellow team members. They liked the use of the Incident Process because they learned by doing. The skills and attitudes called for in working on a debate incident are the same as those needed by debaters in actual deliberation between team members. In one short session, a group of debaters can learn the necessity for cooperation in order to help themselves attain victory in debate.

TOTAL FORENSICS . . .

(Continued from Page 63)

activities. Scheduling, then, becomes simple. Debate tournaments are not scheduled to conflict with plays, and vice versa. The whole department can be mobilized to help with tournaments, with coaching, with producing the play, whatever is necessary. The variety in the program has the effect of drawing persons from other subject matter fields to participate in department activities. In the 1959-60 season, over 100 persons here participated in forensic activities (plus an equal number in drama). Half of them were speech majors; the other half represented virtually every subject matter area and class-standing (including 9 graduate students) on our campus. No one need be turned away for there is activity for all. The participants in the program debated nearly 350 competitive rounds of debate, and appeared in front of more than 30,000 people—and the radio program had a weekly listening audience of 40,000. It appears that nothing has been sacrificed, and much gained.

Of course, we have not been winning many trophies lately, but a discussion of the worth of trophies is not germane here. At least, winning them is neither an expressed nor implied goal of our program. Experience and broad training *is*—and the sacrifice of "hardware" to a diversified program is well worth it.

As to cost, total programming can be operated with a moderate budget. Our student government starts us with a basic allotment of \$2,800. To this we add some \$2,100 in fees for programs, ranging from \$15.00 for a debate clinic or Readers The-

atre program, to \$40.00 for the three-act play. The fees are not prohibitive and enable us to nearly break even on our state-wide service, so that the original budget can be used to support competitive activities. Our General Extension Service helps by providing publicity and mailing, and the Speech Department provides letterheads, envelopes, secretarial help, phone, etc. The secret lies in cooperation. There are three, sometimes four, graduate assistants involved in the program. Two other staff members give the program considerable time, and a staff member at the radio station supervises broadcasting. Assistance is solicited and received from other subject matter areas, including Business Research, Computer Center, Agricultural Extension, etc. None of

the faculty personnel (except the director) receive load credit for their activity. It is done willingly because of the obvious advantages of the program.

May we recommend that you try total programming at your school.

OHIO WESLEYAN . . .

(Continued from Page 64)

and a male quartet. The Wesleyan yell, which in earlier years of Ohio Wesleyan, had cheered on the orators in many a hotly contested oratorical competition, became an integral part of the debate tradition, occasionally to the surprise of debaters from other states, where yells were reserved for athletic contests.

IDEAS AND CONTROVERSY ARE THE
LIFE BLOOD OF A DEMOCRACY!



So — as the official publication of a forensic honor society,
The Gavel should express ideas and controversy.



If you have ideas or controversy, the editor would like to
publish them. Acceptable articles are always in demand, and *The Gavel* will always feel a duty to
protect your right of expression.

The Art of Persuading *Whom?*

JOSEPH A. WIGLEY

Assistant Professor of Speech

Washington State Univ., Pullman, Washington

I am writing as a speech teacher who is frequently called on to judge debates, but who has never engaged in debate either as participant or as coach. I am writing because I have been disturbed by such statements as "Debates should ideally be judged by experienced debate coaches."

Debate is formal competition in the art of persuasion. Persuasion has, obviously, three basic elements: the persuader, the one persuaded, and the area of knowledge within which the former attempts to modify the beliefs of the latter. Let us turn our attention to the second element, the person persuaded, with special regard to his knowledge of (a) the area of social problems in which the debate is laid, and (b) the special techniques of debate.

Statements about debating often involve analogies with athletic contests. I should like to use an analogy that seems to me much more valid. An automobile salesman is a kind of persuader, and his skill is fairly easy to measure. The best salesman is the one who, other things being reasonably equal, sells the most cars. If two men are selling the same make of car in comparable regions, the better salesman is the one with the higher sales volume. Of course if both are assigned to low-income areas, and one is selling a popular-priced and the other a luxury car, their sales are not comparable. But this is a difference any sales manager would readily recognize.

Now suppose that the car the two men are selling has both genuine points of merit and "sucker-bait" features. We discover that the leading salesman has achieved his success by misleading customers into believing the car will provide impossible economy of operation, for example. He specializes in victimizing individuals who cannot actually afford to operate this car; while the second-place salesman is too scrupulous to take advantage of buyers' ignorance.

In order to avoid rewarding dishonesty, we test the two salesmen in a way that makes chicanery unprofitable. We restrict them to selling to independent automobile mechanics, whose knowledge of the facts about cars makes them difficult to hoodwink. We have made the competition relatively ethical, because now it will require honest persuasive skill rather than tricks to succeed.

There is still a third way the two salesmen could be tested. We could arrange for them to give their sales talks to some veteran sales managers. These sales managers are of course not potential buyers, for they invariably drive cars assigned to them by their employers; but they have given and heard many sales talks, and hired and fired many salesmen.

These three situations are, it seems to me, comparable to situations in debate judging. In the first instance we have the straight "audience shift" in which persuasion by any means, fair or foul, is rewarded. In the third we have the type of debate judging often requested: judging by debate coaches only. Judging comparable to the testing of car salesmen on knowledgeable mechanics would be that by persons well educated in political science, economics, current events, or whatever field of knowledge provides the area of the debate. This is the type of debate judging for which I am arguing.

Judging by debate coaches can easily become thoroughly artificial. A debate coach, like a sales manager, can become enamored of techniques which he remembers as having succeeded for him at some time in the misty past. If the salesmen were measured only by their success in convincing sales managers, without ever going out to sell cars to actual buyers, you would have a situation something like that which apparently exists in many debate tournaments today.

Yet the alternative of the straight audience shift has its dangers too. The pretty girl who

capitalizes on a tight sweater, and the pseudo-bashful boy who wrings the heart-strings of middle-aged women in the audience, may be accurately compared to the car salesman who convinces a widow on relief that she can't afford not to own a car.

Between the two extremes of the sucker and the sales manager, the gullible public and the debate coach, is the expert judge. He knows cars, or international affairs, as the case may be. He doesn't give a hang about sales or debate techniques. If you want to sell him you must present facts in an orderly, intelligible fashion. Indeed, he has already heard most of the facts: he knows about compression and axle ratios, about the Security Council veto and what happened in the Suez crisis.

In a debate I judged recently my vote went to the affirmative, who presented a lucid, logical argument, simple in conception, backed with undeniable facts. The negative team spoke so much more rapidly that they must have presented twice as many statements, of which five were, to my positive knowledge, false. Although I was the official judge, members of the audience, experienced debaters, were also asked to give a verdict. With only one or two exceptions they voted for the negative, which, with their rapid patter and embarrassing vehemence, conformed more nearly to the audience concept of "skilled debaters." "They had the techniques," one member of the audience said afterwards.

In this instance I feel confident that a lay audience would have voted as I did. The high-pressure delivery and unwarranted intensity of the negative would, I am sure, have alienated the "man on the street." Yet I can easily imagine a situation in which an unscrupulous team, using heavily emotional appeals, could have taken the verdict of this hypothetical lay audience from either of the teams I heard. But they could not have done so if judged by political scientists, or by any judges in possession of the general facts of the situation involved.

On the one hand teachers of speech, including debate coaches, must recognize their ethical obligations not to encourage sophistry. On the other hand, they must recognize that

the art of persuasion is not confined to persuading other rhetoricians. We address ourselves not to the other salesmen, but to customers; not to other politicians, but to voters; not to other attorneys, but to juries. Debate which develops the skill of persuading only debate coaches is surely an activity in a vacuum.

Earlier I mentioned certain false analogies about debate. It is often regarded as a sport comparable to basketball or pole-vaulting. But obviously the basketball either goes through the hoop or it does not; the cross-bar is either 14 feet from the ground or 14 feet two inches. These are objective, measurable things. Nothing in rhetoric is susceptible to objective measurement—by definition. Rhetoric, including debate, operates in the area of probabilities. But the probabilities are *backed* by facts. The layman is too likely to be ignorant of the facts, as were, for example, the people of Germany who were persuaded by Hitler. The debate coach, on the other hand, is likely to be so impressed by whether the pole vaulter—to mix the analogy—takes off from the proper foot, that he disregards how high the cross-bar was.

If you are persuaded, you are persuaded. It doesn't matter, essentially, how it was accomplished. The real question is: *who* are you? Are you so ignorant of the facts surrounding the question that you will vote for the debater with the greatest show of confidence or the sweetest smile? Or is the question debated one you have previously given a good deal of consideration?

Let's recognize the possibility that the ideal judge is neither the neutral debate coach nor the mass audience, but the expert in the subject area. Depending upon the specific question, this is likely to be the teacher of political science, economics, or history, or the newspaperman, or the *well-informed* layman. His judging instructions should be to award the decision to the team which most influenced his opinions in the area of the subject. If he is a reasonable and thoughtful individual he will be influenced not only by the quantity of facts but by their honest, orderly and agreeable presentation. What more than this should debating be?

SECRETARY'S REPORT

APRIL 1961

Gavel Subscriptions:

Yearly	86	University of North Carolina	3
Libraries and Organizations	12	Brown University	4
Sponsor	18	Fredonia Teachers College	1
Lifetime	77	University of Wichita	3
1958-59 Members	78	Iowa State University	1
1959-60 Members	132	American University	4
Chapter Libraries	85	Colgate University	1
Chapter Sponsors (4cc)	340	University of Michigan	1
		University of Nebraska	3
		University of Pennsylvania	1
TOTAL	828	Stanford University	2
		Washington University	1
New Members from September, 1960, through April, 1961:		College of Wooster	5
University of Hawaii	4	University of Wyoming	4
Oregon State College	5		
Bates College	1	TOTAL NEW MEMBERS*	54
Loyola University	7		
Grinnell College	3		

* EDITOR'S NOTE: The bulk of D.S.R. chapters initiate between April and June. Therefore the total is not a true picture of the entire year.

INDEX TO VOLUME 43

SOCIETY BUSINESS

- Annual Reports—Delta Sigma Rho, March, p. 44.
 Attention Chapter Sponsors, November, p. 1.
 Biennial Delta Sigma Rho Forensic Conference on National Issues, November, p. 9.
 Delta Sigma Rho—Amherst College Chapter 1959 (picture), January, p. 27.
 Delta Sigma Rho Forensic Tournament, March, p. 42.
 Golden Anniversary of Delta Sigma Rho: May 13, 1960, January, p. 28.
 Golden Anniversary of Delta Sigma Rho—Ohio State University (picture), January, p. 29.
 Installation of the Loyola (Chicago) University Chapter (picture), January, p. 32.
 New Members of Delta Sigma Rho, November, p. 13.
 Secretary's Report, May, p. 69.

DEBATE AND DISCUSSION

- Debate and Discussion—A Holistic Approach, **Remo P. Fausti**, March, p. 49.
 Have We Forgotten Quality?, **Bruce M. Haston**, November, p. 5.
 The Law in Debate: III—Hearsay Evidence, **Robert W. Smith**, January, p. 23.
 A New Look at the Debate Brief, **William A. Behl**, May, p. 60.
 The Nixon-Kennedy Debates and the Freeley Committee, **Raymond K. Tucker**, March, p. 47.
 Ohio Wesleyan Debate History, **W. Roy Diem**, May, p. 64.
 A Postscript to the History of Debating in the American Colleges, **David Potter**, May, p. 57.
 Practical Experience in Human Relations for Debaters, **Donald W. Klopf**, May, p. 55.
 Resolved: That Debaters Should Learn to Listen, **Robert G. Smith**, March, p. 35.
 Study of the Use of Key Issues in Tournament Debates, **Kim Giffin and Kenneth Megill**, November, p. 3.
 Total Forensics Programming at Washington State University, **Gerald M. Phillips**, May, p. 62.
 Tournament Audiences, **Robert O. Weiss**, November, p. 7.

GENERAL

- Aram's Defense, **Nels Juleus**, March, p. 38.
 An Evaluation of "Group Action," **Kim Giffin and Brad Lashbrook**, January, p. 30.
 Incidence and Characteristics . . . for Speech Majors, **Walter W. Stevens**, January, p. 25.
 Streamlining the Speakers' Bureau, **William S. Barber**, January, p. 18.

SPECIAL

- The Fine Art of Being Ignored, May, p. 53.
 Henry Lee Ewbank, **A. T. Weaver**, March, p. 51.
 Laboratory in Persuasion, **Herold T. Ross**, November, p. 2.
 Letters to the Editor, March, p. 33.
 Letter to the Editor, **Lawrence D. Posner**, January, p. 17.
 President's Page, **Herold T. Ross**, March, p. 37; May, p. 54.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Barber**, William S., **Streamlining the Speakers' Bureau**, January, p. 18.
Behl, William A., **A New Look at the Debate Brief**, May, p. 60.
Diem, W. Roy, **Ohio Wesleyan Debate History**, May, p. 64.
Fausti, Remo P., **Debate and Discussion—A Holistic Approach**, March, p. 49.
Giffin, Kim and Brad Lashbrook, **An Evaluation of "Group Action,"** January, p. 30.
 ——— and Kenneth Megill, **Study of the Use of Key Issues in Tournament Debates**, November, p. 3.
Haston, Bruce M., **Have We Forgotten Quality?**, November, p. 5.
Juleus, Nels, **Aram's Defense**, March, p. 38.
Klopf, Donald W., **Practical Experience in Human Relations for Debaters**, May, p. 55.
Phillips, Gerald M., **Total Forensics Programming at Washington State University**, May, p. 62.
Posner, Lawrence, **Letter to the Editor**, January, p. 17.
Potter, David, **A Postscript to the History of Debating in the American Colleges**, May, p. 57.
Ross, Herold, **Laboratory in Persuasion**, November, p. 2.
 ——— **President's Page**, March, p. 37.
 ——— **President's Page**, May, p. 54.
Smith, Robert G., **Resolved: That Debaters Should Learn to Listen**, March, p. 35.
Smith, Robert W., **The Law in Debate: III**, January, p. 23.
Stevens, Walter W., **Incidence and Characteristics . . . for Speech Majors**, January, p. 25.
Tucker, Raymond K., **The Nixon-Kennedy Debates and the Freeley Committee**, March, p. 47.
Weaver, A. T., **Henry Lee Ewbank**, March, p. 51.
Weiss, Robert O., **Tournament Audiences**, November, p. 7.

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	Delta Sigma Rho Advisor	Chicago, Ill.
CLR	Colorado	1910	Thorrel B. Fest	Boulder, Colo.
COL	Colgate	1910	Robert G. Smith	Hamilton, N.Y.
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, Mass.
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, Ill.
LU	Lehigh University	1960	H. Barrett Davis	Bethlehem, Penn.
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, Mich.
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	Robert Brisbane	Atlanta, Ga.
MU	Mundelein	1949	Sister Mary Irene, B.V.M.	Chicago, Ill.
N	Nebraska	1906	Don Olson	Lincoln, Nebr.
NC	University of North Carolina	1960	Donald K. Springen	Chapel Hill, N. C.
NEV	Nevada	1948	Robert S. Griffin	Reno, Nevada
ND	North Dakota	1911	John S. Penn	Grand Forks, N. D.
NO	Northwestern	1906	Frank D. Nelson	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, Ore.
ORS	Oregon State	1922	Earl W. Wells	Corvallis, Ore.
OW	Ohio Wesleyan	1907	Ed Robinson	Delaware, Ohio
P	Pennsylvania	1909	G. W. Thumm	Philadelphia, Penn.
PO	Pomona	1928	Howard Martin	Claremont, Calif.
PS	Pennsylvania State	1917	Clayton H. Schug	University Park, Penn.
PT	Pittsburgh	1920	Bob Newman	Pittsburgh, Penn.
R	Rockford	1933	Mildred F. Berry	Rockford, Ill.
SC	Southern California	1915	James H. McBeth	Los Angeles, Calif.
ST	Stanford	1911	Jon M. Ericson	Palo Alto, Calif.
SY	Syracuse	1910	J. Edward McEvoy	Syracuse, N. Y.
TE	Temple	1950	Delta Sigma Rho Advisor	Philadelphia, Penn.
T	Texas	1909	Martin Todaro	Austin, Texas
TT	Texas Tech	1953	P. Merville Larson	Lubbock, Texas
TU	Tulane University	1960	Dr. E. A. Rogge	New Orleans, La.
UNYF	University of New York at Fredonia	1960	Alan L. McLead	Fredonia, N. Y.
VA	Virginia	1908	Robert Smith	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		Middleton, 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	L. W. Kuhl	Cleveland, Ohio
WSU	Washington State University	1960	Gerald M. Phillips	Pulman, Wash.
WVA	West Virginia	1923	F. A. Neyhart	Morgantown, W. Va.
WYO	Wyoming	1917	Patrick Marsh	Laramie, Wyo.
Y	Yale	1909	Rollin G. Osterweis	New Haven, Conn.

DELTA SIGMA RHO

THE ALLEN PRESS
Lawrence, Kansas

Return Postage Guaranteed

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

