

11-1961

Complete Issue 44(1)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/gavel>



Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Delta Sigma Rho. (1961). Complete Issue 44(1). *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho*, 44(1), 1-16.

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

R.L. Scott

the gavel

volume 44 number 1

**of
delta
sigma
rho**



november

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, Department of Speech
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, Department of Speech, 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.

Member, Association of College Honor Societies.

THE GAVEL

of

DELTA SIGMA RHO

VOLUME 44

NOVEMBER, 1961

NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

President's Page: A Year of Achievement by <i>Herold Ross</i>	2
Delta Sigma Rho Chapter Activities	3
Is it Persuasion or Argumentation? by <i>Anita Taylor</i>	5
New Members of Delta Sigma Rho	7
Debate: Vital in the Educational Program by <i>Richard D. Henderson</i>	9
A Study of Case Construction in Tournament Debates by <i>Kim Giffin</i> and <i>Kenneth Megill</i>	11

Caught in a Publish or Perish World?

SORRY WE CAN'T HELP YOU.

But if you would like to contribute something
worthwhile to the Gavel—we'll consider it!

President's Page...

A Year of Achievement

BY HEROLD ROSS

A year of achievement is the natural and normal expectation for 1961-1962. It is a happy characteristic of college life that each fall we begin over with our activities as well as with our studies and look forward to opportunities of improving our past records. As a consequence, those who direct and those who participate in forensic activities are now busy with plans which it is hoped will bring success along with individual development and growth.

Delta Sigma Rho, as a forensic honor society, looks forward both to its society achievements as well as to those of its eighty chapters. Foremost in planning is the 10th Congress scheduled for April 12-14th in the Student Union on the campus of Indiana University. Those who attended the last Congress there will agree, I am sure, that this is an ideal location for our national meeting. Committees are being formed and plans will be announced in the next issue of the *Gavel*. In the meantime, every chapter should begin planning for this most important Congress, making due allowance in the annual budgets to care for the expense.

Equally important with the Congress will be the General Council meeting where most important decisions will need to be made. Every chapter will want to have a representative present to participate in the business of the society. One matter will undoubtedly be of paramount importance. Last spring members of Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha met in an exploratory meeting in Louisville to see whether both organizations might profit with closer cooperation. In the

course of these discussions a review was made of the findings of a joint committee which had been formed by the two societies to explore the possibility of a merger into one very strong society which would be recognized in all parts of the country as the highest forensic honor in America. Three years ago, these discussions were dropped and a rather complete and detailed plan for the merged society was laid on the table.

At the Louisville meeting it became evident that a number of members in both societies are still interested in the proposal. Naturally both Tau Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Rho are well established and have large active and alumni memberships. Both have publications which have a distinguished record and are widely recognized. Both societies have cherished customs and traditions. The conferees at Louisville were well aware of all of these considerations. It was their conclusion that areas of cooperation should be further explored and a meeting was planned in New York after Christmas.

The approval of the General Council will be needed for any suggestions or proposals which may grow out of these discussions. Consequently, each chapter will want to have a voice in the discussions and a vote on any proposals presented for consideration. This can best be achieved by having a representative at Bloomington when the General Council meets. In the meantime, chapters and sponsors with ideas should communicate them to me so that your national officers will know your wishes on all matters looking to the future of our society.

Delta Sigma Rho Chapter Activities

DELTA SIGMA RHO ANNUAL REPORT

	I	II	III	IV	V
Amherst	4	3	6	2	4
Bates	3	5	2	2	10
Beloit	0	1	0	0	0
Creighton	8	2	7	5	6
DePauw	11	4	8	2	6
Grinnell	8	3	8	6	6
St. U. of Iowa	7	12	4	1	8
Kansas St.	7	7	8	4	5
Loyola	8	2	20	4	5
Mich. St.	7	4	3	2	4
Missouri	6	6	9	0	0
No. Carolina	3	2	6	30	10
Oberlin	5	5	7	0	0
Oregon St.	10	20	10	6	4
Penn. State	3	0	5	2	3
Stanford	9	3	5	3	6
Texas Tech.	17	2	17	4	10
Virginia	5	1	3	1	3
Washington and Jefferson	6	1	4	2	4
Wash. State	6	4	12	4	8
Wooster	9	0	9	1	12

I—Number of student members of chapter on campus.

II—Number of members (from faculty and community) associated with chapter.

III—Number of persons initiated since September 1, 1959.

IV—Number of chapter meetings held during year.

V—Average number attending.

AMHERST

Delta Sigma Rho is viewed as an honor society (like Phi Beta Kappa) here. We do conduct a tournament but we have no other function. We are considering sponsoring a debate lecture series next year.

BATES

The Bates chapter functions as an honorary fraternity like Phi Beta Kappa. With so few members, it is limited in its activities. Its members are usually the leaders in the Debate Council, the active forensic body. On Honors Day, DSR shares with PBK the limelight as elections are announced.

BELOIT

The Beloit College Chapter of DSR has no members, therefore no activities. However, this does not mean that forensics has been

forgotten on the Beloit College campus. Beloit College has recently joined the Associated Colleges of the Mid-West Forensics Association. This group was formed to help with the forensic programs on its member colleges. Through its program implemented on this campus, new interest in forensic activities has grown on the campus. We are now preparing people for debate within the association; we are planning an all-association meeting patterned after the DSR meeting that is coming up. Public speaking, debate, discussion and oral interp are all receiving attention with a new interest and hope arising on the campus.

With this program, we hope to build a corps of qualified students for the ranks of DSR in the very near future. New interest, new leadership, new hope are building anew and we hope a vital forensic program on the campus.

CREIGHTON

The Creighton Chapter of Delta Sigma Rho started the year by holding a party to welcome our new moderator Fr. McAuliffe. The party was held at the home of Tim Rouse.

The third week of school we sponsored an all-school mixer to raise money for the debate club. The dance was a success and we made \$150.00 profit.

Before the end of the first semester we had a breakfast at the Blackstone Hotel. At this meeting we nominated Jerome Crooms, Mary Reres, John Gleason, Pat Green and Roberta Eckerman for membership in Delta Sigma Rho.

At the semester, Miss Mary Blomstrom took a leave of absence to work on her Master's at Denver University. This cut our on-campus membership to three.

With the initiation of the above five on May 6, 1961 our membership now stands at eight undergraduate and two graduate members associated with the chapter.

KANSAS STATE

This chapter regards itself primarily as an honorary organization and does not undertake a significant amount of activity. It tries to limit itself to the dignified and purposeful promotion of prestige for forensic activities on the Kansas State campus. Since our members are often leaders in other campus activities, we feel better able to accomplish our purposes through individual rather than organized efforts.

LOYOLA

The activities of the chapter during its first year of existence were basically two. One involved the whole process of planning and acting which finally culminated in the first formal initiation of new members by the chapter this last March 12th, an event which, because of the publicity effort given it, did much to draw attention to the chapter on campus. The process was more complicated and time consuming than had been first anticipated, but in spite of the lack of foresight much knowledge was gained which, because it was embodied in a written report, should facilitate an expeditious execution of this process in future years. In several instances the experience gained resulted in rules of procedure being formulated by the president, several of which were accepted into the chapter's bylaws.

The other activity might be described as basic organization. It included such specific actions as the formulation of a proposed constitution, its critical examination and amendment by the membership, and its final passage in amended form; the ordering of a chapter seal to be affixed to all chapter correspondence sent, and the preparation of a chapter record book in which the constitution, bylaws, minutes, attendance records, financial and other reports, correspondence sent and received, alumni records and much other important information will be permanently kept.

In short the achievement of the chapter in its first year of existence has been the laying of the necessary foundation upon which it can build with confidence in future years.

NORTH CAROLINA

Up to this year debating activities at the University of North Carolina have been under the auspices of a debating team under the student government. The highlight of the year for the debating team was the installation of a Delta Sigma Rho chapter by national president, Herold Ross, on April 14, 1961. After the installation a banquet was held for the entire team with members of the UNC English Department and Dr. and Mrs. Ross as guests. Dr. Ross gave a short and amusing history of Delta Sigma Rho. Those installed were: Earl Mancill Baker, president; Daniel McMullen Armstrong, secretary; John Hulan Killian and Osborne Bennett Hardison, Jr., member-at-large. Professor Donald K. Springen, a Delta Sigma Rho initiate from Iowa, is sponsor of the chapter and director of the debate team.

President Baker and Secretary Armstrong have formed a powerful team this year—they went undefeated in tournaments at N.Y.U. (Bronx Division) and N.Y.U. (Washington

Square College). Other tournaments where the team has competed include the University of Virginia, the University of South Carolina, the University of Maryland, and Howard University. The Delta Sigma Rho chapter has sponsored a home-and-home debate with Amherst, debates with North Carolina A & T and Kenyon College, and a novice debate with Davidson College.

The chapter is sending letters to incoming freshmen with debate experience and hopes for a good response and active organization next year.

OBERLIN

Thirty-two out of a total membership of forty-two members of the Forensic Union participated in three or more intercollegiate debates or discussions during the 1960-61 season. Seventeen members engaged in six or more intercollegiate events. Forensic Union members were in 105 intercollegiate debates, 22 discussions, and 27 off-campus audience debates and discussions before civic, social, and educational groups. On January 13-14 Oberlin served as host for the Northeast Ohio Debate Conference Legislative Assembly. In February at the Men's State Tournament at Capital University, Oberlin tied for first place. Oberlin sent Mary Turzillo and Bliss Cartwright to the National Delta Sigma Rho Tournament at the University of Colorado. Mr. Cartwright received a certificate of distinction. On Sunday, May 28, the Forensic Union sponsored the annual Strawberry Breakfast where prizes were awarded and the new members of Delta Sigma Rho were given their certificates and keys.

OHIO STATE

Coached by Richard D. Rieke, Harland Randolph, and Allen Jones, Ohio State debaters competed in 220 rounds of debate and won 144 for a 65% win record. Debaters won 14 speakers awards. In national competition, Dale Williams and Allen Rule won a trophy or speakers awards at every tournament they attended. Among the highlights of the year were a second-place trophy at the University of Kentucky, a third-place plaque at Purdue, a first-place trophy in the Championship Division at Illinois Normal, a runner-up trophy and the top two speaking awards at Harvard, a runner-up trophy at the Owen L. Coon tournament at Northwestern, a tie for first place in the Ohio Men's Championship tournament, certificates for second-best affirmative team at the University of Maryland, and trophies for runner-up and best four-man team at Georgetown. Rule and

(Continued on page 16)

Is It Persuasion or Argumentation?

BY ANITA TAYLOR¹

What would be your opinion of the following comments? "I am a flying instructor. I have never flown a jet, nor have I taught jet pilots; but I think that a jet race could be defined as competition in the art of flying."

Would you agree that the comments are quite inaccurate? It seems to me there is the same inaccuracy to be noted when Professor Joseph A. Wigley writes in the *Gavel* of May, 1961, that he is one who has "never engaged in debate either as a participant or as coach," and then proceeds, completely upon his own authority, to define debate as "formal competition in the art of persuasion." Based upon this definition, of which I shall soon show the inaccuracy, is an interesting article in which he contends that neither an ordinary audience nor a debate coach is the ideal judge of academic debates. Rather, he argues, it should be the expert in the subject area being debated, because

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?

In this essay, I shall attempt to answer this question. Furthermore, I shall endeavor to demonstrate that not only is this definition of debate inaccurate, but also that this is a naive conception of persuasion. I am writing this rejoinder because I, too, am a teacher of speech who is often called upon to judge debates. Moreover, I am a teacher of argumentation and debate, a student of debate, and a student of persuasion. I, too, am disturbed by much that may be noted in the current scene of academic debate. And one of the things which disturbs me is this belief that every teacher of speech is "per se" qualified to judge debates.

Before one can argue, a debater is taught, there must be clear understanding of the terms being discussed. So what are the meanings of these words I shall be using?

Let us first distinguish between debate and persuasion so we can see why one cannot be defined in terms of the other.

The speaker who wishes to persuade "is making a calculated effort to change the psychological orientation of his listeners."² "He is making a conscious attempt to modify thought and action by manipulating the motives of men toward pre-determined ends."³ These two definitions have in common the point that the end sought by the persuader is a change in human behavior, whether that change be mental assent, psychological acceptance, or any other position along a continuum which ends in securing action. However, in their orientation toward the teaching of persuasion to the aspiring student, they seem to imply that all persuasion is gained through conscious efforts of the persuader.

Let us seek further to define persuasion more completely so that we may include the times when one's psychological orientation is changed by another in ways which are not "calculated," or "conscious." According to *Webster's New International Dictionary*, persuasion is "an act of influencing the mind by arguments or reasons offered, or by anything that moves the mind or passions, or inclines the will to a determination." Stating this definition specifically in terms of the speaker it can be said that "the persuader is directing his discourse because it is his purpose to win belief or stimulate action, and he employs all the factors which determine human behavior to do this."⁴

Now let us understand what is meant by this much maligned term, debate. "Debate consists of arguments for and against a given proposition,"⁵ and an argument may be defined as a "conclusion and evidence from

² Robert T. Oliver, *The Psychology of Persuasive Speech*, p. 7.

³ Wayne C. Minnick, *The Art of Persuasion*, pp. 33-34.

⁴ Austin J. Freeley, *Argumentation and Debate, Rational Decision Making*, p. 2.

⁵ Winston L. Brembeck and William S. Howell, *Persuasion, A Means of Social Control*, p. 22.

¹ Mrs. Taylor is a debate coach at Kansas State University.

which the conclusion is drawn."⁶ It is not difficult to recognize, therefore, how debate can be confused with persuasion. To avoid doing so we must be careful to remember two things. First, debate consists of arguments "for and against" and this alone constitutes a special form of persuasion. Second, there are many forms of debate. There are political, legal, legislative, administrative, social, and academic debates. Because of these differences Professor Wigley is quite accurate to point out the error of analogies between sports and debate. We will be equally in error if we forget that each kind of debate has its own distinct characteristics and forms of arguments.

It is academic debate with which we are concerned and it is ". . . The paramount goal of academic debate . . . to train the student in the tools of argumentation, to train him how to construct logical arguments and to detect weaknesses or lapses from logical standards in the arguments of others."⁷ Argumentation—a term usually omitted completely by non-participants when they discuss the nature of debate—may be defined as "the art and science of using primarily logical appeals to secure decisions."⁸

So now let us note that academic debate emphasizes only one aspect of persuasion, and therefore, it is apparent that one oversimplifies if he defines debate as persuasion. It is the mistaken identification of academic debate with the other forms, principally with political debate, which gives rise to this common misunderstanding that "debate may be defined as competition in the art of persuasion."

Why do I argue that academic debate cannot be identified with political debate? Perhaps in years past when debaters addressed themselves to audiences there was a close relation. But as the university environment of 1900 is no longer with us, neither is the debate activity the same. As an instructor, I could not justify teaching a student to practice and compete in persuasive speaking when I know he is not going to be judged by

whether or not he persuades. And, of course, quite the contrary is true in today's academic debate situation. Only championship debates seem capable of drawing audiences, and these are spectators, not potential persuadees.

It would be a liberal estimate if I said five per cent of current academic debates are addressed to more than a judge and a time-keeper. And, quite definitely, a debate is not won or lost according to the judging of the "truth" or "falsity" of the proposition.

If we were attempting to teach persuasion such as is used in political or legal debating, we would be naive to address ourselves only to experts as Professor Wigley suggests. As he points out, when persuading in these forms of debate, "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." It is certainly unrealistic to contend that all customers, voters or juries are to be persuaded in the same manner as the "teacher of political science, economics, or history, or the newspaperman, or the well-informed layman." Indeed, it is difficult for me to understand how current academic debate activity, conducted as it must be, largely without audiences, could be justified if not viewed as competition in the art and science of argumentation. It would surely be naive to teach persuasion in this manner.

Even when viewed with its own distinct characteristics, academic debate has its shortcomings. I would be the last to contend it does not. Assuredly, it occasionally creates weaknesses in delivery. This I will argue is due to poor coaching, hardly poor judging. Let's not forget most debate coaches are also speech teachers. Most coaches will also grade a debater's performance in part according as the presentation is "orderly and agreeable," even though this is not their criterion for awarding a win or loss.

With regard to another specific charge against coaches as judges, I would challenge anyone to find many speech teachers who are better informed laymen concerning the debate topic than the coaches who have studied the topic with their students. Therefore, if a coach fails to penalize dishonesty

⁶ Arthur N. Kruger, *Modern Debate: Its Logic and Strategy*, p. 110.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸ *Freeley, op. cit.*, p. 2.

New Members of Delta Sigma Rho 1960-61

ALBION (10)

Virginia Ann Baldwin, 204 Park, Albion, Michigan
 Roy Wayne Boyer, 229 Ardmoor, Battle Creek, Michigan
 Dennis Otto Cawthorne, 254 Fourth Street, Manistee, Michigan
 Patrick Dennis Conner, 85 Latta, Battle Creek, Michigan
 Darlene Gay Emmert, 1209 East Oliver, Owosso, Michigan
 Harold Alan Haddon, 14439 Eddy Lake Road, Fenton, Michigan
 William Charles Lauderbach, 2422 Mershon, Saginaw, Michigan
 Harry James Montgomery, 685 West Van Buren, Battle Creek, Michigan
 Perry Buckman Smith, 6630 Cranberry Lake Road, Clarkston, Michigan
 Walter Aleksy Urlick, Route 3, Hart, Michigan

AMERICAN (10)

William Elliott Butler II, 2422 Eleventh Avenue East, Hibbing, Minnesota
 Clarkson Jeffrey Human, 1905 North Ode Street, Arlington, Virginia
 Darlene Mae Johnson, 2404 Second Avenue East, Hibbing, Minnesota
 Gary S. Judd, 726 East Fourth Street, Meridian, Idaho
 Donald Koenig, 2410½ Second Avenue West, Hibbing, Minnesota
 George P. Lamb, Jr., 2325 42nd Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
 George P. Lamb, Sr., 5063 Loughboro Road, Washington, D.C.
 George Britton Loos, 30 Champlain Avenue, Liberty, New York
 Barbara Ann Lowden, 3511 Shepherd Street, Chevy Chase 15, Maryland
 Steven Charles Walzer, 2121 82nd Street, Brooklyn, New York

BATES (1)

Grant Stephen Lewis, 82-37 212 Street, Jamaica 27, New York

BOSTON (2)

Donna Ruth Barnes, 14 East DeGraw Avenue, Teaneck, New Jersey
 S. Dale Hess, 966 West Main Street, Palmyra, Pennsylvania

BROWN (8)

Robert Joseph Carney, 168 Hall Street, Leominster, Massachusetts
 Charles Arthur Heckman, 3837 Grand Avenue, Western Springs, Illinois
 Ernest William Lampe, 4959 Colfax Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota
 Taylor Peter Pearson, 1507 Evergreen Street, West Bend, Wisconsin
 Gerald D. Rosen, 220 Wolcott Road, Chestnut Hill 67, Massachusetts
 Michael Saul Saper, 411 Sheridan Road, Wilmette, Illinois
 Robert Michael Shannon, 199 Cedar Lane, Cheshire, Connecticut
 Frank Ingvar Strom II, 245 Beverly Road, Douglaston, New York

CHICAGO (2)

Donald Allan Fox, 2516 Victory Drive, Cedar Falls, Iowa
 Gary Joseph Greenberg, 277 West End Avenue, New York 23, New York

COLORADO (10)

Edwin Philip Banks, 329 Cook Street, Denver 6, Colorado
 Russell F. Brasselero, 511 Bellevue, Pueblo, Colorado
 Donald Allen Coates, 3008 Sonoma Avenue, Santa Rosa, California
 Annette Lane Denton, 2355 South Gaylord, Denver, Colorado
 Edward Stephen Phillips, 733 Seventeenth Street, Boulder, Colorado

Robert William Schwab, 1102 Carteret, Pueblo, Colorado
 Franklin Joseph Sferra, 4530 Balsam Street, Wheat Ridge, Colorado
 Albert E. Smith, 415 Elm Street, Julesburg, Colorado
 Patty Lou Trent, 121 South Elm, Osborne, Kansas
 Sonja Elaine Warberg, Route 2, Box 107, Loveland, Colorado

CONNECTICUT (1)

Alan Herbert Hertzmark, 149 Cooke Street, Waterbury, Connecticut

CORNELL (5)

Philip Henry Loughlin III, Chappell Court, Mayfield, Kentucky
 Harold S. Nathan, 81 North Sixth East, Provo, Utah
 Robert Stanley Rivkin, 673 Pelton Avenue, Staten Island 10, New York
 Owen Jay Sloane, 1070 East New York Avenue, Brooklyn, New York
 James Walter Spindler, 113 Ardmore Drive, Middletown, Ohio

CREIGHTON (5)

Jerome R. Crooms, 2707 Maple Street, Omaha, Nebraska
 Roberta J. Eckerman, 3261 Martha Street, Omaha, Nebraska
 John M. Gleason, 905 North 49th Avenue, Omaha, Nebraska
 James Patrick Green, 1020 Turner Boulevard, Omaha, Nebraska
 Mary E. Reres, 707 West 22nd Avenue, Bellevue, Nebraska

DE PAUW (2)

John Thomas Elliff, 915 Washington Street, Pekin, Illinois
 Lee B. Ross, 3312 Marcus Drive, Nashville 11, Tennessee

GEORGE WASHINGTON (7)

David Ernest Aaronson, 1668 Tamarack Street, N.W., Washington 12, D.C.
 Robert Arthur Aleshire, 2341 Fairview Street, West Lawn, Reading, Pennsylvania
 Alvin Capp, 2006 G Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
 John Lawrence Diesem, 619 Harding Way, East Galion, Ohio
 Mollie Ann Harper, 440 Tenth Street, N.E., Washington 2, D.C.
 Stanley R. Remsburg, 507 North Summit, El Dorado, Kansas
 Carlyn Lorain Sundberg, 17 Harvey Lane, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey

GRINNELL (4)

Allen Spencer Boston, 710 Atlanta, Webster Groves, Missouri
 Larry Gene Hoffman, Box 35, West Grove, Iowa
 S. Joseph Nassif, 2316 Hillcrest Drive, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa
 John Moodie Williams, 305 West Thirteenth Street, Sterling, Illinois

HAWAII (7)

Richard Phelps Bartley, 2602 Kaaha Street, Apt. H, Honolulu, Hawaii
 Bernadeen Siu Yin Ho, 1805 Poki Street, Honolulu, Hawaii
 Cynthia M. H. Ho, 40 Ahi Place, Honolulu 17, Hawaii
 Patricia Kim, Box 574, Kaaawa, Oahu, Hawaii
 Hazel Hideko Mizokami, 3362 Kilauea Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii
 Doda Liang Tai, P. O. Box 329, Lenox Hill Station, New York 21, New York
 Liberato C. Viduya, Jr., 1916 University Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii

IDAHO (5)

Susan Kay Arms
 Vivian Bonita Dickamore
 James Collier Herndon
 Marvin Dwayne Heilesen, Route 3, Idaho Falls, Idaho
 Ronnie Boyd Rock, Route 1, Rexburg, Idaho

IOWA STATE (1)

John William Dalgetty, 1028 East State, Mason City, Iowa

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA (3)

James Forrest Fowler, 703 Plum Street, Atlantic, Iowa
Norman Stanley Oberstein, 7108 Reite, Des Moines 2, Iowa
Edward Allison Purdy, R. R. 1, Spirit Lake, Iowa

JOHN CARROLL (2)

Richard D. Henderson, 4725 Farwell, Lincolnwood, Illinois
Eugene L. Kramer, 325 Bell Street, Barberton, Ohio

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS (6)

Judith Lois Anderson, 613 First, Garden City, Kansas
Thomas David Beisecker, 2901 Moundview, Topeka, Kansas
Daniel Roger Crary, 5013 Yecker Street, Kansas City, Kansas
Louis A. Lawrence, Box 430, Great Bend, Kansas
Wilmer A. Linkugel, 1745 Massachusetts, Lawrence, Kansas
William Dean Salter, 1222 Parkwood, Garden City, Kansas

KANSAS STATE (7)

Deanna Kay Atkinson, East Central, Caldwell, Kansas
Gladys Kathleen Bryson, 1821 Leavenworth, Manhattan, Kansas
James Benwell Dean, 18 East 28th, Hutchinson, Kansas
Lawrence Andrew Dimmitt, Piper, Kansas
Arthur Jerome Groesbeck III, 1829 Anderson, Manhattan, Kansas
Linda Ruth Krueger, Box 133, Roosevelt, Utah
William C. Robinson, Jr., 2311 Anderson, Manhattan, Kansas

KING'S (5)

Edward Francis Hanlon, 188 South Franklin Street, Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania
Frank Girard Harrison, 74 West Northampton Street, Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania
John Edward O'Connor, 433 Chestnut Avenue, Kingston, Pennsylvania
Richard Henry Passon, 20 East First Street, Hazleton, Pennsylvania
Peter Joseph Smith, 119 North Dawes Avenue, Kingston, Pennsylvania

LOYOLA (7)

Frank Michael Covey, Jr., 1843 West Eddy Street, Chicago 13, Illinois
Mary Lee Agnes Cullen, 1306 Oak Avenue, Evanston, Illinois
Kenneth Peter Feit, 5345 North Linden, Chicago 30, Illinois
John Ralph Fernandez, 6560 North Winthrop Avenue, Chicago 26, Illinois
Robert Clinton Hartnett, 6525 North Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois
Andrew Joseph Leahy, 7547 South Hamilton Avenue, Chicago 20, Illinois
Timothy John Materer, 3113 North Major, Chicago, Illinois

MARQUETTE (3)

James Robert Ehrle, 7537 Kenwood Avenue, Wauwatosa 13, Wisconsin
Dennis Howard Gensch, 1515 North 59th Street, Milwaukee 8, Wisconsin
Richard George Kemmer, 1231 North 120th Street, Wauwatosa 13, Wisconsin

MICHIGAN (1)

Arthur Norman Plaxton, 920 Southdown Road, Birmingham, Michigan

MICHIGAN STATE (3)

William Vern Brewer, 1404 Sheridan Street, Lansing, Michigan
George Hamilton Foley, 321 Cavanaugh Road, Lansing, Michigan
Thomas E. Rasmusson, 1500 Clifton Avenue, Lansing, Michigan

MINNESOTA (6)

Andrea K. Goudie, 5374 Shoreview, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Gary Christian Kleinsmith, 713 Sixth South, New Ulm, Minnesota
LaNei E. Knitter, Stephen, Minnesota
Clara Marie Kurz, 1409 East First Street, Redfield, South Dakota
Howard John Vogel, 516 South State Street, New Ulm, Minnesota
Andre Joseph Zdrzil, 9603 Ann Lane, Hopkins, Minnesota

MISSOURI (1)

William H. Eaglstein, 1244 West 64th Terrace, Kansas City, Missouri

NEBRASKA (5)

Lloyd Erwin Goodson, Thompson, Nebraska
Gary Hill, 4041 Woods Boulevard, Lincoln 2, Nebraska
Suzanne Lee Moffitt, 4521 Lowell Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
Ellen Nore, 1545 "S," Lincoln, Nebraska
John Henry Wehr, 2734 Dudley, Lincoln, Nebraska

NORTH CAROLINA (3)

Daniel McMullen Armstrong, 106 Rogers Street, Rogersville, Tennessee
Earl Mancill Baker, 920 Spring Avenue, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania
Johnny Hulan Killian, Route 2, Waynesville, North Carolina

BERLIN (4)

Bliss Cornell Cartwright, 4416 Beecher Avenue, Dayton 20, Ohio
John Wells Kingdon, 640 Witter Street, Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin
Laurie Jean Oliver, 402 Glendenning Place, Waukegan, Illinois
Frank Ruff Parker III, 223 Canterbury Boulevard, Steubenville, Ohio

OHIO STATE (2)

Alejandro J. Casambre, Manaoag, Pangasinan, Philippines
John Harvey Saylor, 1950 Korbel Avenue, Columbus, Ohio

OHIO WESLEYAN (8)

Nancy Kaye Hudson, 921 East Gorgas Street, Louisville, Ohio
David Beach Hughes, 706 Sherwood Drive, Indianapolis, Indiana
Charles Bright Mills, 614 West Seventh Street, Marysville, Ohio
Robert Dietrich Nelson, 1166 Holgate, Maumee, Ohio
Norma Jean Osborne, Delaware-Warrensburg Road, Delaware, Ohio
Donald Allen Pierce, Jr., 27620 Terrence, Livonia, Michigan
Judith Eileen Strayer, R.F.D. 3, Marysville, Ohio
Lawrence Paul Woodrum, 25 Terrace Street, Bradford, Pennsylvania

OREGON STATE (8)

Beverly Jean Bower, 100 Prairie Road, Junction City, Oregon
Wallace Duane Cegavske, 1810 West Fifteenth Avenue, Albany, Oregon
Diane Mabel Dietrich, 1704 N.E. 56th, Portland, Oregon
Joan Lee Kallberg, Route 1, Box 587, Warren, Oregon
Herschel Lewis Mack, P. O. Box 168, Gold Hill, Oregon
Jan Marie Marquiss, 4020 Philomath Road, Corvallis, Oregon
Diehl Ingersoll Pyfer, 1575 King's Road, Corvallis, Oregon
Robert Wayne Russell, 540 North Ninth Street, Corvallis, Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA STATE (4)

Sheila Gay Cohen, 5076 Rosecrest Drive, Pittsburgh 1, Pennsylvania
Jacqueline Leavitt, 144-44 41st Avenue, Flushing, New York
William Harry Swisshelm, 223 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh 21, Pennsylvania
Judith Roslyn Weiss, R.F.D. 1, Box 436, Elizabeth, Pennsylvania

(Continued on page 15)

Debate: Vital in the Educational Program

BY RICHARD D. HENDERSON*

There is much evidence to indicate that responsible leaders in many areas have found experience in educational debate to be an important asset in their careers.¹ One group particularly well qualified to comment on the educational value of debate are our college presidents. In an effort to learn the views of college presidents on debate this writer undertook to make a survey of the chief executive officers of colleges having chapters of Delta Sigma Rho.

Fifty-six executive officers responded to the survey; fifty-four recommended debate as a valuable experience for students.

Even more interesting is to note how many of the presidents actually participated in debate when they attended secondary school and college. Thirty-four of the fifty-six presidents engaged in debate while in high school; twenty-nine participated in debate while in college. Only twelve did not take part in any type of debate program. Of the forty-four who did participate in debate, thirty-eight considered it to be of great personal value. Six considered debate to be of only limited personal value. It may be significant to note that five of these six participated in debate in high school only. There may have been then, as there sometimes is today, a marked difference between debating in high school and debating in college. Thus, if they had participated in debate in college they might well have found debate to be of more than limited value.

As a part of the survey the chief executive officers of the Delta Sigma Rho colleges were invited to comment on the value of debate, some of their replies follows:

H. WALTER SEEFENS, Executive Dean, University of Idaho,

One of the most practical things we must do in life is present our views in a concise and clear fashion. Debate trains one in this field. . . Improves one's ability to speak effectively.

RICHARD A. HARVILL, President, University of Arizona,

Debating is a very fine experience. . . .

MILLARD E. GLADFELTER, President, Temple University,

One of the most valuable experiences as an undergraduate.

CARL M. REINERT, S.J., President, Creighton University,

There is a direct correlation between learning and the faculty to communicate.

F. D. MURPHY, Chancellor, University of Kansas,

The capacity to express oneself is of immeasurable value, no matter what field one takes up as a life work.

HUGH E. DUNN, S. J., President, John Carroll University,

One of the best laboratories for the development of an important communication skill.

C. J. ARMSTRONG, President, University of Nevada,

The ability to communicate effectively, but formally and extemporaneously, is a great asset in any activity. Effective communication is fast becoming a lost art, yet it is vital to all progress.

WILLIAM P. TOLLEY, Chancellor, Syracuse University,

Of all the extracurricular interests I had, debating was the most rewarding.

DAVID L. LOCKMILLER, President, Ohio Wesleyan University,

Very helpful to me in the practice of law, as a teacher, and a college president. This is most helpful for anyone who meets or who would serve the public. There is no other training which quite duplicates the valuable experience of debate.

JAMES L. MORRILL, President, University of Minnesota,

The ability to organize thought cogently and intelligibly for either oral or written pres-

*Richard D. Henderson is currently a Snow Scholar at New York University Law School. He is a member of Delta Sigma Rho and was a four-year debater at John Carroll University. This article is based on a paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Dr. Austin J. Freeley's course "Argumentation and Debate" at John Carroll University.

¹ See, for example, Austin J. Freeley, "An Anthology of Commentary on Debate," *The Gavel*, Vol. 41, No. 3, March, 1959, pp. 43-45.

entations is greatly assisted, I feel sure, by participation in debate.

GEORGE W. STARCHER, President, University of North Dakota,

We need a revival of interest in speech and debate.

ETHAN SHEPLY, Chancellor, Washington University,

The ability to think quickly and logically and to express one's thoughts clearly and convincingly is a valuable asset.

RUSSELL J. HUMBERT, President, DePauw University,

An experience in clear thinking and genuine competition.

EDWARD H. LITCHFIELD, President, University of Pittsburgh,

I consider debating as a valuable and useful instrument in the educative process. It is more than just a matter of being able to marshal one's arguments, to present them forcefully, or to outdo your opponents. By its very nature debating will clarify one's expression and, hopefully, one's thinking. Participating in debating will make the student soon realize that if he is to engage the public's attention he will have to be quite sure, not only of his facts, but the truthfulness of his interpretation of those facts and the manner in which he presents them. Conversation is an art and public speaking is a skill not often found in America today; debating can make a great contribution in restoring to them the refinement, the grace, and the clarity that characterize the learned man in any society.

PERSUASION . . .

(Continued from page 6)

and instead rewards skillful manipulation of mechanics—as Professor Wigley seems to fear he will, and unfortunately as sometimes occurs—it remains to be shown whether this is due to poor moral character or to the fact that he happens to be a debate coach. Even a beginning debater learns that one does not condemn correlation as causation.

One last point I should like to make concerns the often expressed belief that every teacher of speech, or expert in the subject area being discussed, is naturally qualified to judge debates. Of course, at times a "reason-

able and thoughtful" expert or well-informed layman (although we might raise a question as to what is well-informed) can serve as a useful debate judge. My objections are twofold.

First, each expert and well-informed layman is not free from strong bias which inhibits his perception of certain arguments. I know many reasonable, thoughtful, and well-informed doctors whose medical opinions I highly respect. Still, I would not invite them to judge a debate on the national debate topic of this past year which concerned adoption of compulsory national health insurance. A friend of mine is a "reasonable, thoughtful," and highly intelligent corporation executive; but I would not invite him to judge debates on the "right to work" legislation. Walter Ruether would hardly be selected to judge debates on the 1961-62 national topic.

Have I made my point that even reasonable, thoughtful, intelligent, and well-informed people have prejudices? A great knowledge of psychology is not necessary for one to be aware that one's biases will predetermine the way he perceives arguments, the way he evaluates arguments, and the acceptance of statements as true or not true.

My second disagreement is that every speech teacher is not well-informed in the subject area being debated. If he is, and I know some who are, the speech teacher often makes a good debate judge. If he isn't, and I know many who are not, he is likely to fail to notice lapses from honesty, from valid reasoning, or other errors of argumentation. Because he may not know either the principles of argumentation or the intricacies of the subject, he naturally relies on that which he does know, and the contestants are rated more strongly on their agreeable presentation than they should be.

Let us indeed concentrate our energies on isolating and solving the problems which currently beset the academic debate program. But let us not seek to solve them with hastily conceived remedies.

NEEDED!
ARTICLES!

A Study of Case Construction in Tournament Debates

BY KIM GIFFIN AND KENNETH MEGILL*

The process of constructing a case is one of the most important elements in effective debating. The manner in which superior debaters construct their cases is of interest to both debaters and coaches. This study attempts to describe the type of cases which average and above-average debaters have used.

The term "case" is defined by Ewbank and Auer as a "series of statements . . . which logically lead to the desired conclusion."¹ The case is usually composed of statements which answer certain "stock issues" which determine the acceptability or unacceptability of the proposition being debated.²

The "stock issues" which are used most frequently can in general be classified under the following headings:

1. Is there a *need* to adopt the proposal?
2. Can the proposal be put into effect in a practical way, i.e., is it *workable*?
3. Will serious *disadvantages* result if the proposal is adopted?

A fourth "stock issue" is generally recognized: "Is there an alternative proposal which better meets the alleged need?" This issue is less frequently found in tournament debating.³

The problem of proper case construction is treated by nearly all textbook writers on debate. This treatment tends to be theoretical, and a search of the literature finds no study reported of the actual techniques of case construction which are employed by the average and above-average debaters. Proposals for methods of constructing cases have

been made in articles which have appeared over the past 35 years, but, again, these have been confined largely to suggestions for case construction and do not report how cases have been constructed.⁴

In 1954 Kruger objected to most textbook treatments of case analysis as being "fragmentary, unrealistic, and oftentimes misleading."⁵ However, he then continued to expand upon traditional treatments of the construction of debate cases and did not refer to what he calls "real debate situations." None of the articles which have come to our attention has attempted to describe actual practices in use.

This study is intended to provide information concerning the methods of case construction which are being used in tournament debating. The value of this sort of study is shown by the suggestions of textbook writers in regard to case construction. Ewbank and Auer advise, "the student learns to build strong cases by practice in building them and by observing work of skilled debaters."⁶ This study is an attempt to systematize such information and to make it more readily available to debaters and debate coaches.

Procedures. The basic data for this study were obtained by a questionnaire which was submitted to each judge for each debate during the 1960 University of Kansas Heart of America Debate Tournament.⁷

At this tournament in March, 1960, colleges and universities from representative parts of the United States were invited; schools were selected on the basis of their

*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 Ewbank, Henry Lee and Auer, J. Jeffrey, *Discussion and Debate*, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1951, p. 405.

² See Baird, A. Craig, *Argumentation, Discussion and Debate*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950, p. 63.

³ See Giffin, Kim and Megill, Kenneth, "Stock Issues in Tournament Debates," *Central States Speech Journal*, Vol. XII (1961), No. 2.

⁴ See, for example, Graham, Gladys Murphy, "The Natural Procedure in Argument," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, Vol. XI (1925), pp. 319-337; Brooks, George E., "A Revised Method of Case Analysis," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. XXVII (1941), pp. 46-51; Lambertson, F. W., "Plan and Counter-Plan in a Question of Policy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. XXIX (1943), pp. 48-52.

⁵ Kruger, Arthur N., "Logic and Strategy in Developing the Debate Case," *The Speech Teacher*, Vol. III (1954), pp. 89-106.

⁶ Ewbank and Auer, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

⁷ For a description of this tournament, its objectives and manner of operation, see Giffin, Kim, and Linkugel, Will, "The Heart of America Debate Tournament," *The Gavel*, Vol. 40, No. 4, May, 1958, pp. 73-74.

outstanding records in intercollegiate debate over the last five years. In attendance were 32 teams from 21 schools representing 14 different states.⁸

Each school was required to furnish a trained, qualified judge,⁹ 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:

Case-construction is viewed by coaches and debaters as an important part of debating. There is evidence to indicate that the debaters attending the Heart of America Tournament are "above-average." We are interested in obtaining a composite picture of the techniques of case-construction employed by such debaters.

To help us obtain such a picture, will you please answer the following questions on the basis of the debate you have just observed?

ON THE NEED ISSUE:

1. Was a *need* identified as a clear and present danger? (Check one.) ___ yes, clearly; ___to a limited degree; ___ not at all.

2. Was a *need* identified in the form of a possible positive advantage to be acquired through the adoption of the proposal? (Check one.) ___yes, clearly; ___to a limited degree; ___ not at all.

3. Was the *need* developed in any other way? If so, please explain briefly: _____

ON THE WORKABILITY ISSUE:

1. Was *workability* argued by the affirmative as a separate and discrete block of argumentation in the debate? (Please check one.) ___yes, clearly; ___to a limited degree; ___ not at all.

2. If *workability* was not handled by the affirmative as a separate and discrete block,

to what extent did it play an "incidental" role in the debate? ___in a large number of places; ___in a few places; ___not at all.

3. Was *proposal won't work* (or "won't meet the alleged need") argued by the negative as a separate and discrete block of argumentation? (Please check one.) ___yes, clearly; ___to a limited degree; ___not at all.

4. If *proposal won't work* was not argued by the negative as a separate and discrete block of argumentation, to what extent did such negative argumentation play an "incidental" role in the debate? (Please check one.) ___in a large number of places; ___in a few places; ___not at all.

5. How many identifiable sub-contentions (or supporting reasons) were presented on *workability* by the affirmative? _____. By the negative? _____.

ON THE DISADVANTAGES OR DANGERS ISSUE:

1. To what extent were *disadvantages* or *dangers* argued by the negative as a well-defined block of structured argumentation? (Please check one.) ___very clearly; ___to a limited degree; ___not at all.

2. How many *disadvantages* or *dangers* did the negative team clearly identify? _____.

3. How many were supported by evidence? _____.

4. How many were supported by deductive reasoning? _____.

5. How many were supported by both evidence and deductive reasoning? _____.

Results. Tabulation of the judges' responses to the questionnaire showed that the three chief stock issues were all used in a majority of the debates. In the affirmative cases the need issue was clearly identified much more often than the workability issue. In only 18.4% of the debates did affirmative teams fail to identify the need issue as a clear and present danger, and in only 11.9% of the debates was the need issue omitted as an argument in the form of a possible positive advantage in the adoption of the proposal. Workability was clearly used by the affirmative teams as a separate argument in approximately one-fourth of the debates (23.6%). (See Table I.)

With respect to negative cases, it was clear that the disadvantages inherent in the affirma-

⁸ Schools in attendance were Augustana College (Illinois), Baylor University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Kansas State Teachers College at Emporia, Marquette University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northwestern University, Pacific Lutheran College, San Diego State College, Southwest Missouri State College, St. Olaf College, Stanford University, University of Florida, University of Houston, University of Kansas, University of Kansas City, University of Miami, University of Oklahoma, University of Southern California, and The United States Military Academy.

⁹ See Giffin, Kim, "A Study of the Criteria Employed by Tournament Debate Judges," *Speech Monographs*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, March, 1959, pp. 69-71.

TABLE I
*Employment by Affirmative Teams of Identifiable Arguments
 Which Were Related to Selected Stock Issues*
 (The degree to which such arguments were identifiable is
 given in per cent of the number of replies received.)

Argument	Clearly Identifi- fiable	Identifiable to a Limited Degree	Not Identi- fiable	Number of Replies
Need argued as a "clear and present danger"	44.9	36.7	18.4	147
Need argued as a "possible positive advantage"	43.7	44.47	11.9	135
Workability argued as a separate contention	23.6	55.4	21.0	148
Workability argued incidentally but not as a separate contention	13.9	72.2	13.9	79

TABLE II
*Employment by Negative Teams of Identifiable Arguments
 Which Were Related to Selected Stock Issues*
 (The degree to which such arguments were identifiable is
 given in per cent of the number of replies received.)

Argument	Clearly Identifi- fiable	Identifiable to a Limited Degree	Not Identi- fiable	Number of Replies
Workability argued as a separate contention	45.6	53.0	11.4	149
Workability argued incidentally	10.0	78.0	12.0	50
Disadvantages argued as a separate contention	70.0	24.7	5.3	150

ative proposal were the most important elements in the construction of negative cases and were clearly identifiable 70% of the time. It is also interesting to note that the disadvantages were stressed much more by the negative than the advantages were stressed by the affirmative. Workability also played a much more important role in negative cases than it did in those of affirmative teams. (See Table II.)

The data also revealed that the negative used a larger number of sub-contentions on the workability issue than were used by affirmative teams. About one-third of the affirmative teams did not identify any sub-contentions on the workability issue; about one-half identified only one or two. On the other hand, the negative teams identified as many as 12 sub-contentions on workability and in only 12% of the debates failed to identify any sub-contentions. (See Table III.)

Since the disadvantages issue was the one most used by the negative teams, it is of interest to investigate how the disadvantage issue was employed. Table IV shows that most teams who advanced the disadvantage argu-

ment identified three disadvantages and supported them both by evidence and deductive reasoning. However, we should also note the wide range in the number of disadvantages identified by negative teams and note that as the number used by a team increased, a smaller proportion was supported by deductive reasoning. (See Table IV.)

Conclusions. The main limitation of this study is that only one debate topic was used during the course of the study. However, if we may conclude that this topic is fairly representative of those used in college debate tournaments, we can draw the following generalizations concerning the methods used in constructing cases by average or above-average debaters:

- Three stock issues are ordinarily used during the course of the debate:
 - Is there a *need* to adopt the proposal?
 - Can the proposal be put into effect in a practical way, i.e., is it *workable*?
 - Will serious *disadvantages* result if the proposal is adopted?
- In about 80% of such debate cases the need to adopt the proposal is identified by

the affirmative. In over half of such cases the need is developed in the form of "a clear and present danger."

3. In about one-fourth of such debate cases workability of the proposal is clearly used as a separate contention by the affirmative, and in nearly one-half of such cases the workability of the proposal is clearly identified as a separate issue by the negative. Both the negative and affirmative identify to a limited degree the workability argument as a separate argument in nearly four-fifths of such debate cases.

4. Most affirmative teams identify two or fewer sub-contentions on the workability issue, while most negative teams identify from one to three sub-contentions on this

issue; from this fact can be deduced a greater importance of the workability argument to the negative teams.

5. Most negative teams identify from two to four disadvantages during the course of the debate and support nearly all of the disadvantages identified, if no more than four, by both evidence and deductive reasoning.

This study has given some definite indication of the type of case construction which is being used by average and above-average debaters on at least one topic. It would be interesting and of some merit to investigate another topic and another group of debaters to determine if the conclusions reached in this study have general validity. Further research on the problem of case construction would seem to be warranted.

TABLE III
Employment by Affirmative and Negative Teams of Identifiable Sub-contentions on Workability
(Expressed in per cent of replies received; N = 132 for affirmative teams and 125 for negative teams.)

Number of Sub-contentions	Affirmative Teams	Negative Teams
0	34.1	12.0
1	24.2	20.8
2	22.0	25.6
3	18.2	23.2
4	1.5	5.6
5	0.0	8.0
6	0.0	3.2
7	0.0	1.6
(or more)		

TABLE IV
Employment by Negative Teams of Identifiable Sub-contentions on Disadvantages and Methods Used to Support Them
(Expressed as per cent of replies received; N = 142.)

Number of Sub-contentions	Teams with Identifiable Sub-contentions	Teams Which Supported Sub-contentions with Evidence	Teams Which Supported Sub-contentions with Deductive Reasoning	Teams Which Supported Sub-contentions with Both Evidence and Deductive Reasoning
0	6.3	17.5	10.2	16.9
1	9.9	19.0	19.0	16.9
2	30.3	29.2	35.0	34.6
3	28.2	20.4	23.4	20.0
4	10.6	7.3	7.3	6.9
5	7.7	5.7	4.4	4.6
6	3.5	0.0	0.7	0.0
7	3.5	1.4	0.0	0.0
(or more)				

NEW MEMBERS . . .

(Continued from page 8)

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA (1)

James Jay Brown, 7803 Brookpark Road, Cleveland 29, Ohio

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH (6)

Toby Berkman, 3312 Parkview Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
 Judith R. Fingeret, 2307 Beechwood Boulevard, Pittsburgh 17, Pennsylvania
 Patricia Ann Gulas, Box 36, Bradenville, Pennsylvania
 Willis Edward Higgins, 216 Goldsmith Road, Pittsburgh 37, Pennsylvania
 Raymond Krotec, 3333 Evergreen, Pittsburgh 37, Pennsylvania
 David Jacob Mishelevich, 6346 Caton Street, Pittsburgh 17, Pennsylvania

SAN FRANCISCO STATE (13)

Vern Winchester Carpenter, Jr., 1700 El Camino Real, South San Francisco, California
 Lloyd Earle Crisp, 419 Del Mar Avenue, Pacifica, California
 Steve Wall Covington, 1455 Pacific Street, Redlands, California
 Philip Andre Fisher, 546 Sixteenth Avenue, San Francisco, California
 Sherrard Gray, 739 Harvard Avenue, Claremont, California
 Jerry Richard Herman, 402 San Francisco Boulevard, San Anselmo, California
 Charlie Junior, 1171 Capitol, San Francisco, California
 Henry McGuckin, 1545 Sunnydale Avenue, San Francisco, California
 Neil Thomas Laughlin, 718 44th Avenue, San Francisco 21, California
 Sylvia Medina Palmira, 1225 Vicente, Apt. 2, San Francisco, California
 James Aloysius O'Sullivan, Jr., 5686 Oak Grove, Oakland, California
 David Kent Randolph, 15 Gaviota Way, San Francisco, California
 Howard Irving Streifford, Jr., 2900 Neal Avenue, San Jose, California

STANFORD (2)

Robert Edward Driscoll III, 632 Ridgeroad, Lead, South Dakota
 Robert Nelson Saylor, 3015 West 67th Street, Kansas City, Kansas

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT FREDONIA (1)

Arlene Muller, 107 South Burrows Street, State College, Pennsylvania

SYRACUSE (5)

David Smith Binsse, Star Route, Chatham, New York
 Lowell Philip Colvin, 2 Kenwood Road, Auburn, New York
 Richard L. LaVarney, 44 Bradford Street, Auburn, New York
 Christopher John Lucas, 47 Oakgrove Drive, Williamsville 21, New York
 William Carl Sittig, 630 Baltimore Boulevard, Westminster, Maryland

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL (9)

William Robert Collier, Route 1, Idalou, Texas
 Margaret Jane Crockett, 3604 Colgate, Dallas, Texas
 John Stanley Gibson, Jr., 2516 62nd Street, Lubbock, Texas
 Genie Marie Joyner, 2217 47th, Lubbock, Texas
 Jimmy Kay Norman, Box 391, Memphis, Texas
 Jan Lee Pfluger, Box K, Eden, Texas
 Cecelia Kay Porter, 114 South Main, Jacksboro, Texas
 Don William Stewart, 1008 53rd Street, Lubbock, Texas
 Lonnie Howard Wheeler, Jr., 906 East Reppto, Brownfield, Texas

VIRGINIA (2)

Joseph John Murrie, 120 South 17th Street, La Crosse, Wisconsin
 Neal Edler Sheldon, 1068 North Montana Street, Arlington, Virginia

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (1)

Alvin Rabushka, 8604 Red Bud Avenue, Richmond Heights 17, Missouri

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON (2)

James Ronald Caruso, 360 Elm Street, Canonsburg, Pennsylvania
 Daniel McClure Criswell, 5320 Ellsworth Avenue, Pittsburgh 32, Pennsylvania

WASHINGTON STATE (7)

David Jean Curry, 1232 S.W. Jefferson Street, Portland, Oregon
 Arthur George Eckman, 5954 N.E. 37th, Portland, Oregon
 Theodore Saxton Hopf, Route 4, Box 267, Yakima, Washington
 Richard Byron Howard, W. 1409 11th Avenue, Spokane, Washington
 Raymond R. Jones, 1504 Monroe Street, Pullman, Washington
 Vivian Lynne Nossom, Box 452, Bainbridge, Washington
 Charles Weber Weedon, Route 1, Box 453, Yakima, Washington

WAYNE STATE (6)

Danny Duane Angel, 22674 Karam Court, Warren, Michigan
 Seymour Henry Dussman, 17144 Indiana Avenue, Detroit 21, Michigan
 Daniel John O'Neill, 13439 Keystone, Detroit 12, Michigan
 Richard Dana Rourke, 12928 Pembroke, Detroit 35, Michigan
 Dorothy Mary Vandewalle, 1118 Harvard Road, Grosse Pointe, Park, Michigan
 Arthur Ronald Voisin, 14339 Fenton, Detroit 39, Michigan

WEST VIRGINIA (3)

Arthur Ashley Jones, 401 Central Avenue, Spencer, West Virginia
 Jeanie Diane Brown, 601 Hall Street, Charleston, West Virginia
 John Joseph McLinden, Jr., 1008 Indiana Avenue, Fairmont, West Virginia

WESTERN RESERVE (6)

Joseph Martin Budin, 1693 Belmar Road, Cleveland Heights 18, Ohio
 David Jack Elk, 14354 Washington Boulevard, University Heights 18, Ohio
 Norman Lee Faber, 1994 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York
 Cesare David Fazio, 883 East 143rd Street, Cleveland 10, Ohio
 Charles Haskell Goldstein, 1721 Chapman Road, East Cleveland 12, Ohio
 Alan Jerome Polansky, 305 Iowa Avenue, Lorain, Ohio

WICHITA (3)

Paul Huldreich Humann, 2401 West Fourteenth, Wichita, Kansas
 Marceil Elaine Welsh, 2606 East Douglas, Apt. 15, Wichita, Kansas
 Patti Roe Woolsey, 141 South Chautauqua, Wichita, Kansas

WISCONSIN (4)

Kathryn Jane Dornbrook, 5919 North Kent Avenue, Milwaukee 17, Wisconsin
 Frederick William Haberman, 5760 Bittersweet Place, Madison, Wisconsin
 Dennis Michael O'Connell, 6122 Colfax Lane, Minneapolis, Minnesota
 Roger Raymond Stauter, Grantsburg, Wisconsin

WOOSTER (5)

Larry Temple Caldwell, 820 South Fifth Avenue West, Newton, Iowa
 Carlisle Henry Dick, 2615 East Manchester, Tucson, Arizona
 Stephen David Gekeler, 219 Curryer Road, Middletown, Ohio
 Patricia Joan Raucci, R.F.D. 4, Box 307, Wooster, Ohio
 Carl Victor Weygandt, 17208 Edgewater Drive, Lakewood, Ohio

WYOMING (4)

Stanley Wayne Cooper, Box 133, Sturgis, South Dakota
 Richard Bert Lane, 2101 Cheyenne Place, Cheyenne, Wyoming

Mary Eloise Jones, 706 Gerald Place, Laramie, Wyoming
 Patrick Otis Marsh, 662 North Eleventh, Laramie, Wyoming

YALE (2)

Peter Robin Freed, 1216 South Hawthorne Road, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
 John Edget Koehler, 3223 South Moore, Olympia, Washington

MEMBERS AT-LARGE (8)

James Robert East, 350 Buckingham Way, Apt. 104, San Francisco 27, California
 Jack Hall Lamb, Box 392, Storrs, Connecticut
 Harold Maurice Livingston, 126 North 21st Street, Corvallis, Oregon
 Ralph Willard Peterson, 2430 Grant Street, Corvallis, Oregon
 E. Gene Ritter, 2H University Terrace, Columbia, Missouri
 Robert Gerald Smith, 32 Montgomery Street, Hamilton, New York
 Ernest C. Thompson, Jr., 54 Egmont Street, Brookline, Massachusetts
 Milton Albert Valentine, 454 Pine Street, Boulder, Colorado

TOTAL 247 Members, 53 Chapters

CHAPTERS . . .

(Continued from page 4)

Williams were one of five teams from four Midwestern states to qualify for the West Point Championship Tournament. Allen Rule, in his last year of debating, won nine speakers awards, including best speaker at Harvard and top affirmative speaker at Georgetown.

The Forensic Society, in cooperation with campus radio station WOIO also broadcast weekly debates on controversial issues.

OREGON STATE

The chapter began its activities this year by sponsoring the annual Forensic Mix in which any students interested in speech were invited to attend. At this time, the forensic activities for the coming year were explained and films were shown from the previous year.

Three times this year, Delta Sigma Rho sponsored the annual Extemp Contests for beginning speech students.

A new event was begun this spring—a Novice Tournament—in which any student who had never previously entered in collegiate competition could enter any one of the events: debate, extemp, interp, impromptu, and oratory.

Delta Sigma Rho held two initiations this year, gaining ten new members. Four other business meetings were held.

PENN STATE

We at Penn State are proud of what we believe is a varied, well-rounded, and extensive forensic program based on a sound educational philosophy. Our forensic activities run, annually, into the hundreds; however, we have few, if any, chapter activities. We believe that Delta Sigma Rho exists for the sake of forensics and not vice versa. Delta Sigma Rho at Penn State is not a promotional organization. It is an honor society "that truly honors!" It is the Phi Beta Kappa of

the forensic field. It honors each year the cream of our forensic crop—nothing more, nothing less! And that's exactly what we believe it should do. We think Delta Sigma Rho is doing all right at Penn State—and we're mighty proud, not only of the national society, but also of our own members and our own chapter.

STANFORD

The Stanford chapter of Delta Sigma Rho works closely with the Stanford Speech Association. While membership in the latter organization is open to all who participate in forensics (about 60), only two or three a year are invited to be members of DSR. As a result, DSR membership is considered by some to be second to none, and by others second only to Phi Beta Kappa. As a further result, the organization's activities are not centered in the sponsoring of parties, tournaments, jamborees, and the like, but rather, the organization exists as an honorary group whose members exert an influence that helps to determine the character of the entire forensic program. In short, Stanford DSR members are the leaders of the university's forensic activities.

TEXAS TECH

Members of the chapter and other forensic students participated in the YOUNG AMERICA SPEAKS television debate series sponsored by the Sinclair Oil Company and thereby earned \$2,500.00 for the Speech Scholarship fund. Nine new members have been initiated this year of whom six will be back in college in September. Chapter President is Cam Cunningham and Chapter Secretary is Sandra Clark.

VIRGINIA

Except for annual initiation of new members, the Virginia Chapter is not active. Last year two of the men did attend the DSR Congress at Indiana University, but that was the only activity of the year other than initiation.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON

The chapter activities are limited because of sparse membership. A spring banquet is held annually in conjunction with the college debating society. Annual Delta Sigma Rho initiation ceremonies take place on the same day, just prior to the dinner.

WASHINGTON STATE

The WSU chapter of DSR is rapidly increasing its responsibilities for the operation of the whole forensics program. Effective in the fall of 1961, a student board of five members will act to assist in planning events and selecting personnel, and eventually, full management of the forensics program will be vested in Delta Sigma Rho.

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	R. Victor Harnack	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. Freely	Cleveland, Ohio
K	Kansas	1910	Dr. Wilmer Linkugel	Lawrence, Kansas
KA	Kansas State	1951		Manhattan, Kansas
KI	Kings College	1961	Robert E. Connelley	Scranton, Pa.
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. McBath	Los Angeles, Calif.
SF	San Francisco State	1961	James East	San Francisco, 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. McLeod	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	Pullman, 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

Paul A. Carmack, Secretary
Department of Speech
154 North Oval Drive
Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Return Postage Guaranteed

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



**DELTA SIGMA RHO
CONGRESS
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
April 12-13-14, 1962**