

5-1963

## Complete Issue 45(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. (1963). Complete Issue 45(4). *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho*, 45(4), 57-76.

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 45**

**number 4**

**of  
delta  
sigma  
rho**



**may  
1963**

# 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.

**Vice Presidents:** Clayton Schug, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania; Patrick Marsh, Wyoming University, Laramie, Wyoming; Thomas Murray, Wisconsin University, Madison, Wisconsin; Leroy Laase, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska; 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 45

MAY, 1963

NUMBER 4

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| President's Page . . . . .  | 57 |
| "The Time Has Come the Walrus Said . . ." . . . . .   | 58 |
| Auld Lange Syne . . . . .   | 59 |
| What Delta Sigma Rho Has Done for Me by <i>E. C. Buehler</i> . . . . .                            | 59 |
| We Salute Delta Sigma Rho by <i>Eugene C. Chenoweth</i> . . . . .                                 | 61 |
| Delta Sigma Rho Merger by <i>Lillian Wagner</i> . . . . .   | 64 |
| The Future of Controversy on the Campus by <i>T. B. Fest</i> . . . . .                            | 65 |
| For the Gavel by <i>Leroy T. Laase</i> . . . . .  | 67 |
| D.S.R. Tournament . . . . .   | 68 |
| Past Pride and Future Promise Thoughts<br>from 1906 to 2020, by <i>Rupert Cortright</i> . . . . . | 70 |
| "The Old Order Changeth . . ." by <i>Brooks Quimby</i> . . . . .                                  | 71 |
| Rhetorical Education and Liberal Education by <i>Kenneth Hance</i> . . . . .                      | 73 |
| Forty-four Years—Auld Lange Syne by <i>Earl W. Wells</i> . . . . .                                | 74 |
| Merger by <i>Patrick O. Marsh</i> . . . . .   | 76 |

## The President's Page...

As five short and happy years as your president draw to a close and my last deadline for the President's Page is close at hand, I wish, first of all, to express my very deep gratitude to all who have contributed so cheerfully and so effectively to the achievements of our society. The officers, the committee chairmen, the sponsors and the members, both active and alumni, have demonstrated a loyalty to Delta Sigma Rho which has made progress inevitable. New and valuable chapters have been added, the older chapters have been vigorous and active, our financial structure has been strengthened, and our national meetings have contributed to the forensic growth of our undergraduate members. The climactic achievement of the past five years, of course, is the movement to merge Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha into one great honor society in forensics.

Each week the reports of the planning committees bring the new society more clearly into focus. The careful preparation

now being made insures the success of the merger. For the chapters, an important questionnaire will soon be in your hands so that you can indicate the type of national meeting you would prefer for 1964. It is the thought of the planning committee that any type of event which will be adequately supported by the chapters should be included and the various events so arranged that maximum participation can be achieved. Such a national meeting can be scheduled only if you make your own wishes known. Therefore, study the questionnaire carefully and return it promptly.

Now is also the time to put all chapter records and documents in good order. Above all, arrangements should be made to insure that your chapter in the fall will receive the first communications from Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. The establishment of communications with the new national office is absolutely necessary both for your chapter and for the new society.

Although Delta Sigma Rho has had sev-

eral historians it has never had an Archivist and has never established a true Archives. Tau Kappa Alpha is now furnishing an Archives Room in the handsome new library being built on the campus of Butler University where this society was founded. It is quite possible that Delta Sigma Rho will be invited to place in this room its files and historical documents. If this invitation is extended, we should be ready. Any chapter or alumnus, therefore, possessing materials of historic value which might be permanently preserved in an archives room, should make this fact known. At the moment, several issues of the *Gavel* are missing from the files available. What do you have which you are willing to contribute?

I should like to close my final communication to you, not on matters of the past but on a note of happy anticipation for the future. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is being designed to meet the forensic problems of the future. With your loyal cooperation it can and will meet the challenge of a complex and ever changing new era in American higher education.

#### EVENTS OF MERGER

Sunday, August 18th at 7:00

The Joint Meeting of Tau Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Rho

Tuesday, August 20th at 7:00

The National Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha

#### "The Time Has Come The Walrus Said . . ."

In the eight years since I first became connected with the *Gavel*, many things have happened. Some good—some bad. But things have never been dull.

An editor serves a very unique function in any honor society. He actually becomes the guardian of a very valuable piece of property designed to keep the members informed on one hand and to be academically respectable in terms of articles printed on the other. It is a tough course to follow. The *Gavel*, unlike so many honor society publications that come across my desk, has never been just a vehicle for society news.

There have been times when as editor, I have wondered if I could find enough quality material (even in our modern publish or perish world) to fill a particular issue. But always the contributors seemed to come through just in time. The students, faculty and alumni of Delta Sigma Rho have always been an eager, critical and contributive group. With this going for him, no editor could ever do a really bad job. Admittedly, I have had my good issues and my not so good ones. And the difficulty has generally rested with me and not with the society or the contributors.

The philosophy which has been the guiding one during my term as editor has been a fairly simple one. When you represent a society that deals in ideas, controversy and argument—how can the official publication do otherwise? To my knowledge no article submitted for publication to the *Gavel* has ever been turned down because it contained ideas that may have been unpopular.

There have been disagreements voiced with articles that have been published. The disagreement was always with the ideas and never with the fact that it was published.

So now we come to the end of the road. The *Gavel* as we have known it will be no more after this issue. Henceforth it will be part of a hyphenated name representing both segments of the new merger. By the time the next issue reaches you a new editor will have taken over. As of now, there is a four-man committee planning the first issue of the new publication. If everything goes according to schedule, Volume I, Issue I, will be a collector's item. The hope is to make it into a commemorative edition worth saving.

The best way I know to express my feelings is by borrowing a phrase from our English cousins, "The King is dead—long live the King."

Charles Goetzinger  
Editor, *Gavel*



---

## Auld Lange Syne

(Editor's note: No final issue would look right without a few backward looks and some fond remembrances. The *Gavel* is no exception. A number of people were asked—on very short notice—to write short articles upon this momentous occasion. The officers of the organization naturally were included in those asked as well as a number of people

who were arbitrarily selected by the editor. The answers that were received by the deadline you will find in the following pages. They make interesting reading for young and old alike. If the contributors wonder what happened to part of their articles—blame me. If it isn't in this issue—blame me.)

---

## What Delta Sigma Rho Has Done For Me

E. C. BUEHLER

This is a demand performance. When I received the letter from our editor, Charles Goetzinger, asking if I would be willing to contribute something for the final edition of the *Gavel*, I considered this a call which could not in good conscience be ignored, even though I was given a deadline of seven days hence. I gladly accept the invitation. I see this as my last chance to be identified with the one and only publication which did so much for the common welfare of our Society for more than a half century.

Fortunately, this is not an occasion which calls for a glowing tribute in behalf of a publication which has outworn its usefulness. We are not about to say a kind word for a sinking ship or an organization about to fold up or take bankruptcy. On the contrary, never has the Society been stronger financially or more able to support a strong publication. The *Gavel*, like the bride to be, is having her last fling before taking on a new name and joining into a partnership forming a new home.

Since I am soon to round out my professional career as an active classroom speech teacher and director of forensics I find myself in a mood to reflect about what Delta

Sigma Rho and my experience in forensics has done for me. It is all right that you younger readers should ask what you can do for the Society, but, after more than forty years of active service as a speech teacher and thirty years of activity in Delta Sigma Rho, I am more inclined to count my blessings than enumerate challenges.

Delta Sigma Rho and all that it represents has played an important role in my professional destiny. I came to Kansas exactly forty years ago. The first two years I was in charge of Forensics at Washburn College, followed by thirty-eight years as Director of Forensics at the University of Kansas. During that span of time I had three major loves or interests: one, forensic activity, both intramural and intercollegiate; two, speech for business and industry; three, teaching problems for the beginning college speech course. Note that, chronologically, forensics came first, and it is here that the real internship of my profession took place.

During the first decade and a half, forensics provided a significant and important training ground for developing insights and perspectives useful in the overall discipline

which applies to speech education. Here my mind was put to a test. Horizons of knowledge unfolded before me and a professional conscience began to take shape. For a period of about fifteen years I was deeply involved during the summer months in editing and authoring debate handbooks for the high schools in some thirty states using the national debate topic. This was often a humiliating but challenging experience as I came face to face with the public issues of the late 20s and the 30s, issues which had wide social, political, economical, and international implications. Since colleges operated forensic programs without the benefit of a single common national debate topic, and since the debate tournament had not yet become a permanent fixture, college debate squads frequently worked up five or seven different questions in a single year. This provided another incentive to become knowledgeable about controversial issues germane to our national culture. During these early years, Delta Sigma Rho always provided a wholesome, constructive force for me and my students. The finest hour of the year was the annual Delta Sigma Rho Honors and Awards Banquet. These were the days when Delta Sigma Rho carried an impressive prestige image for both students and faculty. Any orator or debater who was a member of this Society held his head high and felt worthy of sitting down to eat at the same table with the Phi Beta Kappas, and no one asked who should sit to the right side of whom. We all felt the wearer of the Delta Sigma Rho key had a better chance to make *Who's Who* after graduation than the wearer of the Phi Beta Kappa key.

I firmly believed that I was rubbing elbows intimately and realistically with the intellectual aristocracy of the student body and that I was playing one of the most important and responsible roles on the entire faculty, for I was developing men and women who would be tomorrow's top leaders in government, law, economics, and education.

Now as I look across the years, I realize that my deep and extensive involvement in forensics and Delta Sigma Rho was a great source of strength. In fact, I am embarrass-

ingly pleased and happy as I reflect on how these early years crowned my service as an academic teacher of speech with dignity and honor. Now I realize, more than ever, how my role in forensics and Delta Sigma Rho provided for me in a large measure a respectable academic climate by which I could grow from one level of maturity to another. Here was a sustained motivation for my own continued self-education and professional growth.

There are more fringe benefits I could mention—there is the matter of travel. I saw much of the U.S.A. with my debaters. We traveled far and wide by train, bus, plane, and automobile, visiting many schools, forming lasting friendships among colleagues all over the nation. More important are the scores of deep and abiding friendships with my students which grew out of squad meetings and the many forensic experiences. Only in later years have I been able to appreciate how much I owe to forensics and Delta Sigma Rho for the greatest discovery a speech teacher can have. I see now that a coach cannot teach a boy debate or oratory, nor can a teacher teach a student how to make speeches. The best director of forensics uses the forensic program to teach people, and the best speech teacher uses the speech class to teach a person, the whole person. One of my beloved colleagues of the University, now departed, Professor U. G. Mitchell, Chairman of the Department of Mathematics, was widely heralded as an outstanding professor of mathematical science. For more than two decades he enjoyed the enviable reputation of being one of the most effective classroom teachers of the University. When friends and colleagues probed him for the secret of his success, he would reply, "But I don't teach math. No one can really teach math. We only use mathematics as a means by which we teach people." There you have it. The first law of the classroom must be, "Teach people." Teach the man and he will find a way to release his personal resources and bring order and direction to his energies. Delta Sigma Rho and forensics taught me this one important lesson, for which I am most grateful.



## We Salute Delta Sigma Rho

EUGENE C. CHENOWETH\*

The main purposes of a "swan song" issue of the *Gavel*, it seems, are (1) to make a survey assessment of the outstanding achievements of Delta Sigma Rho during the past fifty-seven years, (2) to discover causal factors contributing to these achievements, and the negative factors if any, (3) to visualize the enormity of the challenges ahead, and (4) to evaluate pertinent ideas so that Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha can revitalize past practices and revamp past policies for the purpose of developing a more practicable and dynamic speech education program, which will assist the students to meet the crucial challenges of the future.

### OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS

Perhaps, the most immediate achievement of Delta Sigma Rho was the reaffirmation in the minds of the eight founders, who met in Minneapolis in 1906 to organize an honorary fraternity, that they were dedicated to the proposition that a fundamental principle of education of youth is to gain proficiency in oral communication. Self-fortified with this significant reaffirmation, these men returned to their universities to launch a more aggressive program of curricular and extra-class instruction and training in oral expression.

The second substantial achievement of Delta Sigma Rho, it appears, was the development among college and university administrators of an awareness of the value of excellence in oral communication in the education of youth, and the implementation of this awareness by persuading the colleges and universities to provide opportunities (curricular and extra-class) for the students to receive instruction and training in public speaking.

As a result of these achievements, Delta Sigma Rho can lay claim to the fact that twenty thousand members are benefiting pro-

fessionally and materially by the instruction and experience in oral communication gained under the aegis of Delta Sigma Rho. Experience has shown that individuals with significant speech training usually stand head and shoulders above their colleagues who otherwise have similar education and opportunities.

This honorary society, furthermore, can claim notable fringe accomplishments. Among these is the speech training received by thousands of students who aspired to membership in Delta Sigma Rho but lacked sufficient maturation in oral expression and/or other specific qualities to meet membership requirements, but who later bloomed into very effective speakers. Also, no doubt many thousands of students, inspired by the speaking performance of Delta Sigma Rho members and aspirants, have been stimulated to initiate an effective program of speech education for themselves. Still further, the influence of college and university speech education, substantially due to the endeavors of Delta Sigma Rho, probably has encouraged many administrators and teachers in the secondary and elementary schools to institute speech training for youth and children at these levels of education.

Finally, it would be impossible to visualize and estimate all the positive contributions to society at large which have emanated, directly or indirectly, from the organization of Delta Sigma Rho since April 13, 1906.

### CONTRIBUTING CAUSAL FACTORS

The important causal factors contributing to the phenomenal achievements of Delta Sigma Rho are these:

First, Delta Sigma Rho has attracted ambitious, intelligent students to its portals to gain instruction and training in oral communication, which of course is the only purpose of Delta Sigma Rho. That twenty thousand members and many thousand aspirants and observers have given liberally of their time,

\* Is in charge of Discussion and Debate classes and History of British Public Address at Indiana University.



energy and intellect toward fulfilling the purpose of Delta Sigma Rho is sufficient proof of the lure of this institution for students of high caliber. The brilliant triumphs of thousands of successful alumni, furthermore, seem to indicate that they as students were drawn to Delta Sigma Rho by the promise of ultimate values gained through their efforts in the program of this honorary fraternity. That the majority of the applicants for membership in Delta Sigma Rho have no difficulty in meeting the academic scholarship requirements of the Association of College Honor Societies appears to be substantial proof that this fraternal honorary has attracted students of high caliber.

A second chief contributing factor to the extraordinary accomplishments of Delta Sigma Rho down through the years has been the personal devotion of *senior* faculty members not only to the administration of college and university forensic activities but also to the actual instruction of students for speech tournaments and the evaluation of speech performance of students in intercollegiate competition. This was especially true of the original initiators and sponsors of Delta Sigma Rho. (See "Delta Sigma Rho, 1906-1956, Golden Anniversary," pages 7 to 12.) More recent representatives of the best traditions of devotion of *senior* faculty members to the initial purpose of Delta Sigma Rho are A. Craig Baird, E. C. Buehler, Kenneth G. Hance and Brooks Quimby. This tradition of participation of *senior* faculty members has been more or less universally the case until recent years when there seems to have been a departure from this practice in some universities.

A third causal factor contributing to the outstanding recognition gained by this society has been the loyal support of college and university administrators to the objective of speech education for youth. Some administrators, in fact, are distinguished alumni of Delta Sigma Rho. President Virgil M. Hancher, the State University of Iowa, and Dean John W. Ashton, Vice-President and Dean of the Graduate School, Indiana University, are excellent representatives of ad-

ministrators who are loyal to Delta Sigma Rho.

#### NEGATIVE FACTORS

When I returned to my teaching duties last fall after nearly three years of enforced absence, I was surprised and disturbed to see the change in age of faculty personnel when I looked in on debate tournaments. Some of the older directors had been replaced by younger men, some of whom were merely eager, intelligent boys with little experience and slight education in the challenging field of instructing college youth in the science and art of oral argumentative discourse.

The policy of assigning inexperienced and inadequately educated young men the responsibility of teaching students to speak effectively and of judging them in intercollegiate competition discourages many capable students from participation in extra-class speech instruction in higher education. This is recognized as a serious problem by alert departmental chairmen and vigilant leaders in speech education in institutions of higher learning.

Sometimes these young inexperienced directors are employed by institutions because well-trained men with experience and maturity have shunned positions which include extra-class speech instruction duties. Their refusal to consider and accept these positions seems to be due to the fact that some institutions have adopted a policy of considering the faculty personnel in forensic positions not very significant. The administrators of these institutions have failed to recognize that the time-consuming work of the director of forensics is at least as important as the duties of the person who directs a play or a radio program, and should be given equal consideration in promotions and salary increments. In this connection it might be well to ponder the fact, that when national and world crises arise, the people of the nations look to those men educated and skilled in the effective use of oral argumentative discourse for leadership in resolving the perplexing problems. It should be noted, furthermore, that in the educational background of these powerful leaders in national and world affairs are patient, knowledgeable

men skilled in teaching youth the principles of logical and persuasive oral discourse.

Some universities which subscribed to the shortsighted policy of not recognizing the importance of the positions of those faculty members who give extra-class instruction in discussion and debate are reaping the undesirable results of their inequitable practice in that some of their very capable young recipients of the Ph.D. degree shy away from positions which include extra-class forensic responsibilities. This is due largely to the fact that these young men have seen faculty members, distinguished in the forensic education of students, treated inequitably and ignobly when promotions are made and salary increments are given to the members of the department of speech. This is being recognized in some universities as a serious problem.

#### PLUS FACTORS

If the Gestalt theory is valid, namely, that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, it is extremely fortunate that these two powerful fraternities are combining their forces into a whole, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, because these plus factors, whatever they may be, are desperately needed in these times of pressure in the speech education of youth for the day when they will launch forth to face future challenges.

#### CHALLENGES

In an era of high specialization in a world of social, economic and political turmoil, there is an urgent challenge for articulately capable leaders, fortified with a superior liberal arts education and imbued with enthusiasm for our democratic way of life, who, with a broad, knowledgeable perspective, can critically and effectively approach the solutions to serious national and world problems.

There are the challenges of solving unemployment problems caused by modern mechanization, of attempting to stabilize the production of agricultural foodstuffs, and of finding solutions to the problem of population explosion, especially among the "have not" nations.

There are also the challenges of deter-

mining whether the reduction of federal taxes will stimulate the national economy, of providing information for citizenry while maintaining discreet security against giving important information to our enemies, and of developing bombs so powerful and terrible that they could destroy us and make a shambles of civilization's progress.

#### REVITALIZE PRACTICES— REVAMP POLICIES

Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, therefore, must face up to the immensity of its challenges by revitalizing its resources to help educate new generations of students to employ imagination and extend their vision toward new horizons for answers to pressing questions, which status quo policies have failed to give.

Where else can we turn for capable leadership to answer these questions but to articulate youth with a liberal arts education? Inasmuch as a mind full of pertinent social, political and economic knowledge is largely useless unless it can be vocally expounded and logically applied to the analysis and solution of problems, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, therefore, might well enthusiastically and unapologetically invite youth to its forensic citadel, where these young people not only can enhance their liberal arts education but also can learn the art and science of orally expressing profound ideas simply, clearly and persuasively.

To stimulate greater student interest and effort, the society might consider experimenting with different forms of debate, such as cross-examination and courtroom style.

Students might be expected to participate more actively in Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha policy making at the local, regional and national levels.

To provide opportunities for larger numbers of students to participate more frequently and more actively at the regional and national conferences, some thought might be given to extending these conference programs to embrace the three branches of government—legislative, judicial and executive.

The society might draw up standards of



excellence of achievement in oratory, extemporaneous speaking, discussion and debate.

Faculty and students might be encouraged to participate in a research program in forensics and submit their research findings to the *Gavel-Speaker* for publication. To expand the prestige and reenforce the goal of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, consideration might be given to founding one or more research fellowships in forensics, and/or including individuals, corporations, foundations or government agencies to provide financial support for such research fellowships under the jurisdiction of the society.

It might be advisable to appoint a public relations committee to inform the public and college and university administrators about the goal, policies and achievements of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, and thereby

gain broader loyalty and greater cooperation from our friends, especially the administrators. In this way, for example, the administrators might become better acquainted with the problems involved in encouraging mature and experienced faculty members to devote at least some of their time and efforts to forensic instruction and administration.

\* \* \* \* \*

We salute the superior achievements of Delta Sigma Rho during the past fifty-seven years. These great successes, along with those of Tau Kappa Alpha, stimulate us to look forward to still more dynamic and aggressive programs of speech education under the sponsorship of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

---

## Delta Sigma Rho Merger

LILLIAN R. WAGNER

With the passing of Delta Sigma Rho as a unique entity, one of the things I shall miss personally is the association with Herold Ross, Kenneth Hance, Bill Buehler, and the others. And I shall miss those friendly, heated discussions at conference time, for Delta Sigma Rho had not only the "Young Turks" but the "Old Turks" as well! I remember sitting back in a meeting for a moment and thinking, "This is like siblings fighting to find the right solution to the problem!" No one could understand that there was real warmth and friendship underneath those spoken disagreements unless he himself had at one time been a member of a close-knit family life. I have noticed this same feeling among my students who were members of Delta Sigma Rho—the desire to find "the best solution," and the respect for others which encouraged vigorous and open discussion. Perhaps there was something about the spirit of this oldest forensic organization which encouraged that kind of atmosphere.

But what of the future? I believe that we will find the answer in the instructions left by the beloved Ralph Dennis in his last will and testament:

If, at the time of my death, I am still connected with the School of Speech of Northwestern University, it is my desire that nothing be done more than this. Let the last minutes of a regular assembly hour be used by a member of the faculty who shall say something like this: a man who believed in the kind of education offered by this school, who was proud of the product turned out by it, who worked with it for many years, is gone. It was his wish that no classes be closed, no ceremonies be held, no eulogies be spoken. He asks that we close ranks, march on.<sup>1</sup>

May the true spirit of Delta Sigma Rho and *The Gavel* march on!

<sup>1</sup> Rarig, Frank M., "Ralph Dennis," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXIX, p. 237.

## The Future of Controversy on the Campus

THORREL B. FEST

April 13, 1963, marked the fifty-seventh year of Delta Sigma Rho's service in the cause of full and responsible discussion of public affairs. It is a record of which every member may be proud. Over 16,000 alumni are living examples of the value of excellence in forensic training. In every state and in many foreign lands, these men and women are respected leaders in the political, commercial, religious, educational and cultural life. Reports of their achievements on the occasion of the Golden Anniversary Commemoration provide dramatic proof of the contributions they make to human welfare. Each year their number is increased as student members from 86 chapters join the alumni ranks. Comprising a select group, these graduates constitute one of our nation's essential resources. Against this imposing background of achievement, what may be said of our future as an amalgamated society, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha?

Fully conscious of our tradition, I have long been persuaded that merger of these two major forensic honor societies was essential. Change and growth are the order in our educational system and through merger we have responded appropriately. Our primary purpose to encourage sincere and effective public speaking is shared by TKA. Together we can insure that our goal is more widely understood and honored. Welded into a single powerful unit, DSR-TKA can speak with increased authority in support of policies and programs that include quality teaching so long a hallmark of our activities. Of equal importance is the potential for increasing the vitality of student discourse by fostering constructive controversy on the campus.

The heart of controversy is ideas, and ideas are at once the most intriguing and the most frightening matters with which man must contend. They emerge unexpectedly. They defy control. They will not be suppressed. Respecting no boundaries, they conquer where force fails. Human history is in

part a record of man's efforts to generate and use ideas confidently rather than cower in fear of them. We believe that in the freedom of the mind and in the accompanying freedom of speech lies the best hope of free men. Such is the method that separated church and state, paved the way for scientific inquiry, produced our Constitution and turned social consciousness into statutory foundations for contemporary industrial society. In acknowledging that education should facilitate development of the individual personality, we recognize the primary role of communication in effective social interaction. Thus it has been the function of DSR to encourage men and women to deal with significant controversial issues comfortably and effectively.

It is well to note here that as a society we have practiced at home the philosophy which we spread abroad. Within our organization significant innovations and advances have been the products of extensive and sometimes dramatic debate. Thirty-two years ago the University of Wisconsin chapter opened the debate that established excellence as the sole criterion for membership. The congress concept was later adopted as a format for student-oriented national meetings. Much discussion preceded our official recognition of modern forensic forms as qualifying students for membership. Plans for our Fiftieth Anniversary were reviewed and modified many times, and the merger now so happily accomplished was an agenda item for several years. All these and other changes were conceived and perfected in a spirit of good will and DSR and its program were stronger as a result.

In passing from one organizational structure to another, DSR members may well recall this tradition and emphasize the importance of continuing to talk intelligently and skillfully about vexing and controversial issues. Societies of men are built on talk. Societies of free men cannot survive without



it. When deliberations fail, social disintegration enters and expediency triumphs over the common good. Reasonable men agree that force is no longer an acceptable response to social and political problems. The alternative to talking our way out of our troubles is to blast ourselves into oblivion. Whatever the limitations of committees, councils, conferences and assemblies, their faults lie not so much in the concept of debate as in its abuse. In a society based on law, we must accept the fact that freedom of speech entails obligations as well as rights.

Taken by itself, freedom of debate is not enough. It is the substance of the talk, the problems posed and the policies considered that reflects the quality of the controversy and the health of the society. Debate divorced from reality and potential social change is sterile. It must of necessity focus on form for the content has been eroded and reduced to inconsequentials. The nature of the talk affects not only those who utter the words but those who listen as well. It necessitates a confrontation of both issues and persons, for involved is not only the right and the obligation to speak but also the duty to listen. Somehow we must illuminate those issues in our society that are most controversial, for they must be dealt with frankly and democratically if we are to continue to govern ourselves.

It is here that colleges and universities have a special responsibility and opportunity. One of their major functions must be to teach the techniques of controversy and to reward those who excel in objective application of these complex and difficult principles. We have achieved some capacity for this in the scientific field. Unfortunately we have far to go in other areas, for as Associate Justice William O. Douglas remarks, "Our prejudices are rooted in folklore!" As a part of the educational process, a forensic honor society is committed to the battle to free men's minds. The injunction, "Thou shalt not," has been invoked innumerable times in efforts to control the thoughts and actions of men. Kings have feared treason and theologians have claimed divine right to stamp out heresy. One of the principal charges against Socrates

(an educator by the way) was impiety. He denied the existence of government-approved gods. How frequently have the curious, the questioner, the dissenter saved us (despite our reluctance) from ignorance and error? Such persons are always in short supply. We develop too few of them, and those who do arise are often ill-used. Not many years ago dissenters lost liberty and even life while breaking the bubble of popular dogma. We have come far from the belief in the divine right of kings and the burning of witches. We have, however, witnessed the exercise of political, economic and police power in as ruthless a manner as many a dictator employed and listened in silence to pronouncements from both board room and pulpit as though an oracle had spoken. There remains much challenge to discussion so long as we are confronted with loyalty oaths, proscribed book lists, denial of civil rights, authoritarian education, population explosion and the like. In the age-old struggle between social change and the status quo, colleges and universities, and particularly forensic programs, must provide the climate in which new approaches may be examined and established principles reaffirmed. If such thought and action comes not from the college student and professor, where shall we find a better source?

I submit that the DSR tradition may be best preserved and enhanced in meeting through our new society, DSR-TKA, the need to develop a focus for constructive controversy on the campus. This will involve something more than "keeping the forensic program going and winning the tournament." It implies an active involvement in vital and sometimes unpopular issues. It means testing the ideas in the heat of public debate and tempering the antagonists as well. This will not be easy for there are pervasive and powerful forces of apathy and repression with which we must contend. Our affluence submerges us in creature comforts which dull our sensitivity and motivations. A materialistic and anti-intellectual culture prefers economic status to social or public service. Life is so complex and organized that response seems more important than evaluation of activity. Conformity provides a refuge

from insecurity. The standardization of technology finds its counterpart in the packaging of mass communications and entertainment. Many persons have reached the point where they not only tolerate but welcome inquiries into men's beliefs.

Moving against such trends will require both intellectual and moral courage. The campus is not exempt from the influences we oppose. Clearly we shall require material

resources which need not be detailed here. Most important, however, are the resources each individual possesses, the personal belief in the importance of full discussion and a commitment to act in its support. Thus will our tradition be vitalized for student and citizen alike. The fostering of constructive controversy is consistent with the heritage of Delta Sigma Rho.

---

## For the Gavel

LEROY T. LAASE

We are approaching a memorable occasion in the history of Delta Sigma Rho. Our merger with Tau Kappa Alpha will bring together two societies with the same purposes serving similar colleges and universities in the United States. In this merger, we have preserved the traditions of both organizations. With it, we have created a united organization substantially stronger and greater than either society could ever have been alone.

Bringing together the chapters of the former two organizations into one society will permit a materially strengthened program of society-sponsored forensic activity, both at national and at regional levels. Nationally, plans are under way for annual meetings that will continue the traditional forensic activities of both societies. At the regional level, there will now be sufficient chapters in the respective regions to permit the holding of an effective regional forensic progression and/or tournament, should they so desire.

Administratively, the two societies should give their membership more and better services at proportionately lower costs. Obviously, the maintenance of one national office instead of two to serve the same membership should make the provision of these services available at a lower per capita rate. One of the biggest advantages accruing to the membership from a united administrative effort should be in the Society's journal, *Gavel-Speaker*. By combining the resources of the two editorial staffs and journal con-

tributors, this journal should become a professional publication of much higher quality.

There are other reasons why I think that the merger of the two societies is for the best interests of the membership in both organizations. It merges two national honor societies of distinction into a single honor society distinctive for the field of forensics. The new society should be a much more effective voice speaking for forensics in our colleges and universities, for the role of discussion, debate and speeches of advocacy in a democratic society, and for the cause of free speech in America.

The two societies have a glorious past of which they may be justly proud, but they have an even more promising future ahead. It is to this future that the member institutions, not as two cooperating societies, but as the chapters of a single society, should address ourselves.

For a number of years it has been my privilege to serve as a national officer of Delta Sigma Rho. It has been particularly satisfying to have played a small part in the union with Tau Kappa Alpha. I have many personal and professional friends in Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. To the officers elected to assume the leadership responsibilities of the new society, and to the membership which compose the united brotherhood, I extend my best wishes for the fulfillment of a dream that has become a reality.



## D.S.R. TOURNAMENT ---



The top picture shows the head table at the banquet. From the left is Professor Herold Ross, National President; Paul Carmack, National Secretary; William Sattler, Chairman, Department of Speech at The University of Michigan; Kenneth Andersen, Tournament Director; Roger W. Hynes, Vice President for Academic Affairs at The University of Michigan; Mrs. N. Edd Miller; N. Edd Miller, Chapter Sponsor, at The University of Michigan.

Second picture shows a debate in progress during the tournament. Sandra Allison of Knox College, who received an Award of Distinction is shown holding forth. Listening to her are the negative team composed of Ed Thomas of John Carroll and Ann Wuletich of Indiana.

The third picture is simply a general shot of the banquet.

# APRIL, 1963 MICHIGAN U.



The fourth picture shows the winners with Special Distinction. Left to right and in back are Harlan McGhan of Michigan State and Robert Buxner of Washington U. in St. Louis; in front are Dennis Smith of Wichita, Linda Hillyer of Nebraska and Nick Karatinos of Wooster. Absent was George Rieke of Oberlin.

The fifth picture shows the winners with Distinction. In back and left to right are David Crossman of DePauw, Stephen Schwab of Washington, Dennis O'Connell of Wisconsin. In front are Robert Glenn of Wichita, Larry Bradshaw of Wichita, Sandra Allison of Knox and Jim Kendis of Western Reserve. Absent were John Elliff of DePauw, Richard Lempert of Oberlin, Keith Williamson of Wichita and Kathie Bayles of Nebraska.



## Past Pride and Future Promise Thoughts from 1906 to 2020

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT

This spring Delta Sigma Rho has completed 57 years as a society honoring college men and women for outstanding achievement on the intercollegiate public speaking platform. We who wear its key with pride would do well to reflect a few moments upon the accomplishments of intercollegiate forensics in this long half century.

It is 71 years since the first intercollegiate debate when Yale went to meet Harvard at Cambridge. The Interstate Oratorical Association has held its ninetieth contest this May. Numbered among its first and second place winners well before the birth of Delta Sigma Rho were Albert J. Beveridge, E. A. Bancroft, Robert M. LaFollette, future presidents of Wabash, Pomona, Wooster, Beloit, Pacific, Winona State Normal and New York City colleges, a Bishop of the Methodist Church, a Governor of Illinois and distinguished lawyers, judges, congressmen, educators and preachers. Yet the arts of debate and oratory are as old as man as a communicative being. Think how wonderful it would have been in ancient Athens, 23 centuries before Delta Sigma Rho chose a Greek name, to have had as a partner in a cross-question debate that lad by the name of Socrates who dealt a wicked and ignorance-revealing question. Such a debater, think you not, would "mow them down" even in April, 1963, at West Point! Incidentally, such orators as Demosthenes and the Roman Cicero would provide worthy competition, no doubt, for the Interstate champion orators of 1963.

The forerunners of modern debate are to be found not only in ancient Greece and Rome but in the public disputations as Scholasticism swept into the universities in the Middle Ages. Professor Pelligrini, of the University of Washington, has observed (*Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Feb., 1942) that in the span between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries "there probably was more

debate than in any other period in the history of Western Civilization." Perhaps this first century of Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha will overshadow that record with intercollegiate debate teams on hundreds of college campuses and high school debate leagues in 41 of the 50 states of the United States in 1963.

It was not until the rise of parliamentary government in Britain, however, that debate came into its modern period of use as the indispensable accompaniment of the democratic process. The formation of the Oxford and Cambridge Unions led to intercollegiate debate in Britain patterned after legislative debate. In the United States all early intercollegiate debate was to follow the model of the courtroom.

International intercollegiate debating began in 1921 when a team from Bates College (Maine) went to England to debate an Oxford team. The coach of that Bates team was A. Craig Baird (D. S. R., At-Large). The first British team came to the United States from Oxford in 1925. This writer was one of the many college debaters in this country privileged to engage that team.

I first came to know of Delta Sigma Rho just forty years ago. Mine was the high privilege of four years of intercollegiate debate experience under the coaching of the late Henry Lee Ewbank: not only a member of Delta Sigma Rho and of Phi Beta Kappa (from Ohio Wesleyan) but later to join the line of distinguished presidents of Delta Sigma Rho. To his influence and his inspirational teaching I, along with many others from Albion College in the era of the '20s (Kenneth Bartlett, Claude Kantner, Lyman Judson, Sherman Lawton, and the late Paul E. Lull—to mention but a few), owe my choice of professional career.

As the bright moments of our memories are picked out from along the years of Delta

Sigma Rho we think perhaps most vividly of all those men and women who unselfishly and with great patience and ingenuity inspired and helped others to improve their art of oral expression and communication. Truly, to borrow the phrase-making assistance of Henry Ward Beecher: They will never die for they live on in that most positive of immortalities, the hearts and minds and words of those they have influenced.

The feeling of gratefulness to Delta Sigma Rho by students and alumni would require more than the pages of this final issue of the *Gavel* for full expression. Central to such tributes is the basic thought expressed by Dr. David D. Henry (Delta Sigma Rho, Penn. State), President of the University of Illinois, as he describes his undergraduate debating as "the most important single educational experience in my career" (*Detroit Free Press*, March 16, 1952).

Now Delta Sigma Rho, joining hands—and hearts and minds—with Tau Kappa Alpha, faces into an issue-packed future. We who now take increased pride in our expanded heritage may do well to reflect a few moments upon our greatedened opportunities. As we have gloried in a backward glance across the 57 years of our heritage (since April 13, 1906) are our imaginations sufficiently daring to look ahead 57 years? Who dares imagine what inspired seekers of the new key (now with a doubled tradition) may achieve? Whose dream can envision what the devoted eloquence of future wearers of the new key may have accomplished

by that year 2020, which is as far away into the promising future as is the founding year 1906 far away through the hallowed years of tradition.

This writer has lived all but one of those years of Delta Sigma Rho's illustrious history. My memories are firsthand of many great teachers, even greater students and surpassing alumni who *are*, in considerable part, what Delta Sigma Rho *is* and whose abiding influence will ever be entwined in what Delta Sigma Rho *may yet become*.

May it not be well to ask a few questions about the forensic future? Will debate and oratory coaches remember always their first responsibility to promote the art of effective public speaking which alone can give to truth its deserved dynamic? Will those who guide the next half century remember that experimentation and creative ingenuity have enriched this tradition which is ours and have continuing duties to perform? New occasions, new times and new challenges call upon on-going resourcefulness to adapt debate, discussion, oratory and extemporaneous speaking to the future.

Will forensic programs in our colleges and universities receive in the future, as they richly have in the early years, the direction of great and dedicated minds inspiring and directing the discovery of the available means and arts of persuasion?

Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha as individual honor societies now are history. Long live Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha "now and forever one and inseparable!"

## "The Old Order Changeth ..."

BROOKS QUIMBY

"The Old Order changeth, and gives way to the New." All hail the new order of combined Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha. For many years a vice president of DSR and an honorary member of TKA, I am pleased with the amalgamation for a bigger and stronger national honorary forensic fraternity. But before we abandon the old, we

might well look at its achievements and those who brought them about. My active participation in DSR has been almost continuous since I was a charter member at Bates, the first and only freshman there to be admitted (probably in defiance of the regulations!); and so our editor has invited me to reminisce—a last opportunity.



Like many others at our 50th anniversary in 1956, I heard Horace G. Smith (Northwestern) tell of that historic meeting on April 13, 1906, when he met with Thomas Trueblood (Michigan), J. Q. Adams (Illinois), J. Ray Files (Iowa), Fernand French (Nebraska), Max Loeb (Wisconsin), Eugene McDermott (Minnesota) and Francis Wiley (Illinois) to set up the first national forensic society. To those founders should be added Henry Gordon (Iowa) and some others who corresponded to set up the meeting.

The founders and early leaders of the society insisted on a principle to which the organization has steadfastly adhered throughout its entire history—that there be no honorary members. Every member of Delta Sigma Rho has been certified as an actual participant in some form of intercollegiate forensics. This meant that two of the founders could never become members, McDermott and Adams. However, the latter as a former national president of Tau Kappa Alpha now posthumously will be a member of the new organization.

Another important meeting took place in 1938 when, largely due to the championship of the idea by Milton Dickens, then of Syracuse, the National Congress of Delta Sigma Rho was accepted and initiated in 1939. We have left it to Tau Kappa Alpha to develop to its present status the big debate tourney with its competitive aspects, and have sponsored a different contribution to the actual forensic needs of the day.

There are many other significant dates and meetings in our history, such as the time when the Bates Chapter took the lead in taking out of the constitution any restrictions against race or color. But most of our developments do not center around any particular time or person, though a few outstanding names might well be recalled.

I remember well Stanley Houck, who had the longest term as president of the national body (1931–37). DSR was his chief interest in life. He visited all the chapters, arriving in Maine in midwinter without an overcoat—a protection he scorned to use. He and his successor, H. L. Ewbank, Sr., did much to build the present image of the society. Later

presidents such as E. C. Buehler, Thorrel Fest and Herold Ross have done much to bring about this present merger and to adjust the society to the times.

Kenneth Hance has not only had the longest term as secretary-treasurer, but also as editor of *The Gavel*. I think my own greatest contribution to DSR was my nomination of Kenneth to his first national office! There have been many who performed faithfully the duties of those offices which have made this a stable group. The office of trustee has been an important one. From 1926 to 1949 Gilbert L. Hall through his wise investments built up a large endowment. Through his efforts and those of his successor, E. C. Buehler, we have come to the marriage with Tau Kappa Alpha with so large a dowry!

There is one group of men so numerous that I cannot name them all, but they have formed the backbone of the organization—the chapter sponsors. In spite of the fact that I have been a chapter sponsor since 1927 continuously and bow in longevity only to Earl Wells who was a sponsor when Oregon State was Oregon Agricultural College, I still want to pay a tribute to others who may have served less in years but not necessarily less in devotion and effectiveness. Find a strong chapter and you find a strong sponsor behind it. As I have just read over the lists in some old copies of *The Gavel*, I see the names of so many who have given so much—our thanks to them all.

Those of you who have a copy of our Golden Anniversary booklet will find there the names of the nineteen members who were selected as those who have made the greatest contributions to the world. But there are many more in the halls of Congress, the state capitals, the universities, the laboratories, the welfare organizations, the professions, business, and especially on the bench and in the bar, who have made splendid achievements. May we take some small credit for their success as due in some part to the training they received in intercollegiate forensics under the stimulation of Delta Sigma Rho. May our merged society help many more students in their preparation for outstanding careers.

## Rhetorical Education and Liberal Education

KENNETH G. HANCE

This opportunity to prepare a statement for the last issue of the *Gavel* of Delta Sigma Rho is much appreciated, especially because it provides the opportunity to express a conviction concerning the basic contribution of forensics. It is my thesis that the kind of rhetorical education provided through a good forensics program and an equally good curricular program makes a substantial contribution in terms of a *liberal education* as well as in terms of a specialized training for prospective lawyers, preachers, and other "professional communicators."

Realizing that definitions of terms are important at the outset of any discussion, I would suggest the following two: (1) "Rhetorical Education" is that discipline which is concerned with the principles or theories of communication; (2) "Liberal Education"—to quote Cardinal John Henry Newman—is "the education which gives a man a clear, conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to get right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophistical, and to discard what is irrelevant." (It is important to note that this conception of a "liberal education" includes more than association with, or exposure to, even a large body of material or knowledge. Rather, it implies a mastery of this material that is the product of, or is correlated with, processes of *analysis*, *synthesis*, and *testing*—processes which are not always, or necessarily, inherent in the material itself or which necessarily are the result of contact with this material.)

With these definitions before us, we may well ask two important questions: (1) What does a study of rhetoric (participation in forensics) contribute to a person within the context of making knowledge meaningful and usable to him without regard to his problem of communicating with other persons? (2)

What does such a study contribute within the context of making knowledge functional and meaningful in one's attempts to communicate with his fellowmen?

Within the first context, rhetorical instruction (participation in forensics) provides important resources of *analysis*. It provides means of getting "at the heart of material," of perceiving relations of association and of causation—of "disentangling a skein of thought." In addition, this instruction provides resources of *synthesis*. One writer has said, "In our liberal arts colleges it is rhetoric alone, as the culminating art of the arts of language, which is equipped to teach the student how to order his knowledge, to order his thoughts in speech and writing. Perhaps I should have said *organize*." Specifically, I see these resources of synthesis in rhetorical doctrines and practices regarding overall patterns of organization (time, space, problem-solution, cause-effect, association, etc.) and in the principles regarding relations of facts and opinions, on the one hand, and inferences, on the other. Third, this instruction provides important *tests* of evidence and reasoning. It enables us to "see things as they are" by presenting principles concerning the nature and validity of the materials of the "phenomenal world" (evidence) which are used as the raw materials of reasoning. In addition, it enables us to detect "what is sophistical" by presenting principles concerning the nature and validity of the reasoning process. In short, rhetorical education provides the resources for testing what we *find* in the world and, also, what reasoning we do when we work with these materials. Thus it may be said that the person who is schooled in the principles and methods of rhetoric brings an interest, an insight, a discernment, and skills which are assets for scholarships in general.

Within the second context (communication with others), rhetoric appears to provide at least five important resources. (1) It pro-



vides a warning concerning the need for analysis of persons and circumstances involved in the communicative process; and it also provides means of conducting this analysis. (2) It provides resources concerning analysis and synthesis, also selection and rejection, of materials for communication in the light of this audience analysis and in the light of the material itself. (3) It provides resources concerning the "several pathways to the mind" in the form of principles pertaining to the modes of development or of persuasion, and also the ethical, logical, and emotional processes of communication. (4) It provides resources concerning the problem of *style* in communication (language). (5) It provides resources concerning the problems of the oral and the visible factors in communication.

If it may be said that some discipline other than rhetoric contains the resources for preparing materials for communication and for carrying on this process, the answer may well be: Yes, some other label *may* be used to name the discipline or the process, but it must have the attributes which we have assigned to

rhetoric (and which have for 2,000 years been associated with rhetoric). In any event, we are not as much concerned with the labels (even though they are useful) as we are with the recognition of the need for this discipline and this process, together with the application of this discipline in a liberal education.

To restate my thesis, I believe that rhetorical education (properly conceived) makes invaluable contributions to a liberal education—in fact, is the very core of a liberal education as Isocrates contended in the Fourth Century B. C. I believe that forensics (which is but one means of implementing rhetorical education) can make these same invaluable contributions to the person who would be "liberally educated" as well as professionally trained in some specialized branch of communication. I believe, furthermore, that in seeking to promote the finest kind of forensics during the 57 years of its life, Delta Sigma Rho has been engaged in an important enterprise associated with a "liberal education" in the best sense of the term. For this, we shall always be grateful.

## Forty-four Years --- Auld Lange Syne

EARL W. WELLS

The date of this final issue of *The Gavel* happens to coincide with the date of my retirement as chairman of the Department of Speech of the Oregon State University, where, for the past forty-two years, I have devoted some of my time to the coaching of forensics—chiefly oratory.

From the time of my initiation into Delta Sigma Rho by the State University of Iowa (one of the eight founding chapters) in 1919, I have enjoyed a close association with the organization. I was honored with the presidency of my own chapter; and three years later I helped Stanley B. Houck to install the chapter at Oregon State.

As I look back on the past forty-four years, I ask: What has been the influence of Delta Sigma Rho in my life?

In the first place, I feel that being a member of Delta Sigma Rho has meant more to me than membership in any other fraternal organization. Wherever I have gone, my Delta Sigma Rho key has gone too. The key I have now—my second, as I had the misfortune to lose the first—no longer bears any engraving on the back and the letters  $\Delta\Sigma\rho$  on the front are barely discernable because of constant handling.

Once a year, at least, and often several times, since being a member of Delta Sigma Rho, I have witnessed or participated in the initiation ceremony. How many scores of young men and women have I watched lay down the talismanic ribbon to form the double isosceles triangle! The words of the ritual (whether they be from the old script

or the post-World War II version) have never grown stale with me. In these times of fallen idols, of shattered beliefs, and continual doubting and questioning, the words still have meaning and vitality to me.

Secondly, I feel that Delta Sigma Rho has brought me into close contact with the finest sort of people. All over the United States today are people—young and old—carrying the Delta Sigma Rho emblem, whom I am proud to know, people who have distinguished themselves in one profession or another, people whom I shall always remember with admiration and affection.

Thirdly, I feel that Delta Sigma Rho has provided me with a testament of faith, represented by "the five-pointed star which is emblazoned upon every Delta Sigma Rho key, signifying that as the star makes bright the path of men . . . so the clear light of service should ever shine from your life. . . . The five prongs of the star represent the five sources of power in oratory, without which there can be no ultimate success in the use of this key to power: thought, conviction, self-control, truth, courage." No nobler code could challenge any man!

Finally, I feel that Delta Sigma Rho, over the years, has provided me with a labor of love.

For about thirty-five years, I have been a chapter sponsor. For fifteen years, I was a national vice president—two terms in the late twenties and early thirties and one in the fifties. I once served for several years as national chairman of Memberships-at-Large. For a number of years, I was national chairman of Alumni Relations, during which time I made an extensive survey of Alumni Relations and wrote an article for *The Gavel* based on my findings. A few years ago, I

organized the Western Regional Delta Sigma Rho Congress. More recently, I served for several years as chairman of the Committee on Credentials for New Chapters. As a national vice president, I was charged with making chapter visitations in the far western area. On one occasion, I had the very pleasant assignment of installing a chapter at the University of Washington—one of our most recent chapters on the Pacific Coast.

But of all the national projects with which I was identified, that which gave me the greatest satisfaction and thrill was the memorable Golden Jubilee Convention and Congress at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago in 1956. I was a member of the general Jubilee Committee, headed by Professor Buehler, who, in my opinion, did a tremendous job. My chief contribution was superintending the mass initiation of some thirty to forty candidates—who were addressed in person by Burt Brown Barker, a graduate of Chicago University and now a resident of Portland, Oregon, one of the three living founders of Delta Sigma Rho. Outstanding, too, was the banquet program, with Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, as the main speaker.

Although located in the far, far west, I was fortunate in being able to attend many of the national conventions and came to know most all of our national presidents, beginning with Stanley B. Houck. Working with these wonderful and devoted men—Houck, Ewbank, Woodward, Buehler, Fest and Ross—was a real enjoyment.

Now comes the merger about which Houck first talked as far back as 1929. For years I have entertained doubt. But at last, Delta Sigma Rho is dead—long live Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.



## Merger

PATRICK O. MARSH

The outworn bit of consolation to the bride's mother that has become almost ritualistic in American wedding rites, that "you aren't losing your daughter, but rather you are gaining a son," seems only partially appropriate as we are on the threshold of our own merger. I say "only partially appropriate" because we are in no need for consolation. Our only need at this moment of merger is to pause for a moment and to reflect with pride upon the accomplishments our forensic fraternity has stockpiled since its 1906 beginning. Perhaps during our pensive pause, we should also review the wisdom of our decision to unite with Tau Kappa Alpha.

The admission of Delta Sigma Rho to the Association of College Honor Societies in 1955 is sufficient testimony of its scholarship standards, its academic worthiness, and its forensic distinction. But Delta Sigma Rho has been more than an organization which recognizes and rewards college students for their scholarship and forensic prowess; it has been more than a standard-setter for forensic activities; it has promoted creative forensic ventures which have brought credit both to the organization and to those who have participated in those ventures. I refer particularly to its refinement of the student congress concept and to its most promising progressive tournament concept which was introduced at the University of Colorado in 1961. Further testimony of the worthiness of our program can be heard from some of our nation's most outstanding leaders in law, in statesmanship, in education—indeed, in any profession you

care to name, you will find somewhere among its leaders a DSR key.

The list of our successes could continue, but in the era of scholarship's geometric progression—in the era when our total accumulation of knowledge doubles every few years—we can afford only a moment to look backward. The future lies ahead, and the future of our merged organizations will not be a static one any more than the society in which we thrive and which we serve can be a static one. Surely our decision to combine our efforts is indicative of our flexibility, and flexibility in a dynamic world is an essential of livelihood and a promise of success.

I am amazed when I consider the number of similarities between Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha: the reputation, the size, the wealth, and the goals of each are so similar that only a "split decision" could be given if an attempt were made to determine which is superior to the other. By uniting, our common interests and purposes as well as our influences shall become double; our representation throughout the country shall become much more complete since our areas of concentration tend to complement each other. We can now pursue our common objectives with renewed strength and enthusiasm.

Through this marriage we have all gained in many ways, and we have lost nothing, for the traditions both organizations have developed are not to be discarded, but rather they shall serve as a prefabrication of a foundation for the greatest forensic fraternity ever.

### THIRTY

To Ken Anderson of Michigan—congratulations on a tournament well done. I just wish we had more space for coverage.

For those of you who enjoy the yearly index—my apology. Somehow I feel this swan song would look better without it.

# Delta Sigma Rho . . . Chapter Directory

| Code | Chapter Name             | Date Founded | Faculty Sponsor        | Address               |
|------|--------------------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| A    | Albion                   | 1911         | Charles Hampton        | Albion, Mich.         |
| AL   | Allegheny                | 1913         | Nels Juleus            | Meadville, Pa.        |
| AM   | Amherst                  | 1913         | R. R. Allen            | Amherst, Mass.        |
| AMER | American                 | 1932         | Jerome B. Polisky      | Washington, D. C.     |
| B    | Bates                    | 1915         | Brooks Quimby          | Lewiston, Maine       |
| BE   | Beloit                   | 1909         | Carl G. Balson         | Beloit, Wis.          |
| BK   | Brooklyn                 | 1940         | C. E. Parkhurst        | Brooklyn, N. Y.       |
| BR   | Brown                    | 1909         | David F. Unumb         | Providence, R. I.     |
| BU   | Boston                   | 1935         | Ernest Thompson        | Boston, Mass.         |
| CA   | Carleton                 | 1911         | Ada M. Harrison        | Northfield, Minn.     |
| CH   | Chicago                  | 1906         |                        | Chicago, Ill.         |
| CLR  | Colorado                 | 1910         | R. Victor Harnack      | Boulder, Colo.        |
| COL  | Colgate                  | 1910         | Robert C. Smith        | Hamilton, N. Y.       |
| CON  | Connecticut              | 1952         | John W. Vlandis        | Storrs, Conn.         |
| COR  | Cornell                  | 1911         | John F. Wilson         | Ithaca, N. Y.         |
| CR   | Creighton                | 1934         | Mrs. J. L. Schneller   | Omaha, Neb.           |
| D    | Dartmouth                | 1910         | Herbert L. James       | Hanover, N. H.        |
| DP   | DePauw                   | 1915         | Robert O. Weiss        | Greencastle, Ind.     |
| EL   | Elmira                   | 1931         | Dr. Kenneth W. Pauli   | Elmira, N. Y.         |
| GR   | Grinnell                 | 1951         | William Vanderpool     | Grinnell, Iowa        |
| GW   | George Washington        | 1908         | George F. Henigan, Jr. | Washington, D.C.      |
| H    | Hamilton                 | 1922         | J. Franklin Hunt       | Clinton, N. Y.        |
| HR   | Harvard                  | 1909         | Harry P. Kerr          | Cambridge, Mass.      |
| HW   | Hawaii                   | 1947         | Orland S. Leforge      | Honolulu, Hawaii      |
| I    | Idaho                    | 1926         | A. E. Whitehead        | Moscow, Idaho         |
| ILL  | Illinois                 | 1906         | Ted J. Barnes          | Urbana, Ill.          |
| IN   | Indiana                  | 1951         | E. C. Chenoweth        | Bloomington, Ind.     |
| ISC  | Iowa State               | 1909         | R. W. Wilkie           | Ames, Iowa            |
| IT   | Iowa State Teachers      | 1913         | Lillian Wagner         | Cedar Falls, Iowa     |
| IU   | Iowa                     | 1906         | Todd Willy             | Iowa City, Iowa       |
| JCU  | John Carroll             | 1958         | Austin J. Freeley      | Cleveland, Ohio       |
| K    | Kansas                   | 1910         | Wilmer Linkugel        | Lawrence, Kansas      |
| KA   | Kansas State             | 1951         | Mrs. W. M. Taylor      | Manhattan, Kansas     |
| KC   | Kings                    | 1961         | Robert E. Connelly     | Wilkes-Barre, Pa.     |
| KX   | Knox                     | 1911         | Donald L. Torrence     | Galesburg, Ill.       |
| L    | Loyola                   | 1960         | Donald J. Stinson      | Chicago, Ill.         |
| LU   | Lehigh                   | 1960         | H. Barrett Davis       | Bethlehem, Pa.        |
| MQ   | Marquette                | 1930         | Joseph B. Laine        | Milwaukee, Wisc.      |
| M    | Michigan                 | 1906         | N. Edd Miller          | Ann Arbor, Mich.      |
| MSU  | Michigan State           | 1958         | 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, Pa.       |
| MR   | Morehouse                | 1959         | Robert Brisbane        | Atlanta, Ga.          |
| MU   | Mundelein                | 1949         | Sister Mary Antonia    | Chicago, Ill.         |
| N    | Nebraska                 | 1906         | Dan Olson              | Lincoln, Nebr.        |
| NEV  | Nevada                   | 1948         | Robert S. Griffin      | Reno, Nevada          |
| NC   | North Carolina           | 1960         | Donald K. Springen     | Chapel Hill, N. C.    |
| 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         | Wayne Brackriede       | 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         | Malthon M. Anapol      | Philadelphia, Pa.     |
| PO   | Pomona                   | 1928         | Josette L. Maxwell     | Claremont, Calif.     |
| PS   | Pennsylvania State       | 1917         | Clayton H. Schug       | University Park, Pa.  |
| PT   | Pittsburgh               | 1920         | Bob Newman             | Pittsburgh, Pa.       |
| R    | Rockford                 | 1933         | Mildred F. Berry       | Rockford, Ill.        |
| SF   | San Francisco State      | 1961         | Henry E. McGuckin, Jr. | San Francisco, Calif. |
| SC   | Southern California      | 1915         | James H. McBeth        | Los Angeles, Calif.   |
| ST   | Stanford                 | 1911         | Jan M. Ericson         | Palo Alto, Calif.     |
| SY   | Syracuse                 | 1910         | J. Edward McEvoy       | Syracuse, N. Y.       |
| TE   | Temple                   | 1950         | Ralph Towne            | Philadelphia, Pa.     |
| T    | Texas                    | 1909         | Martin Todaro          | Austin, Texas         |
| TT   | Texas Tech.              | 1953         | P. Merville Larson     | Lubbock, Texas        |
| TU   | Tulane                   | 1960         | E. A. Rogge            | New Orleans, La.      |
| UNYF | U. of N.Y. (Fredonia)    | 1960         | Alan L. McLeod         | Fredonia, N. Y.       |
| VA   | Virginia                 | 1908         | John Graham            | Charlottesville, Va.  |
| W    | Washington Univ.         | 1922         | Earnest Brandenburg    | St. Louis, Mo.        |
| WSU  | Washington State         | 1960         | Gerald M. Phillips     | Pullman, Wash.        |
| WA   | University of Wash.      | 1954         | David Strother         | Seattle, Wash.        |
| WAY  | Wayne State              | 1937         | Rupert L. Cortright    | Detroit, Mich.        |
| WES  | Wesleyan                 | 1910         | Dr. Bruce Markgraf     | Middletown, Conn.     |
| WICH | Wichita                  | 1941         | Mel Moorhouse          | Wichita, Kansas       |
| WIS  | Wisconsin                | 1906         | Winston L. Brembeck    | Madison, Wisc.        |
| UWM  | Wisconsin-Milwaukee      | 1962         | Goodwin F. Berquist    | Wilwaukee, Wisc.      |
| WJ   | Washington and Jefferson | 1917         | James Marshall         | Washington, Pa.       |
| WM   | Williams                 | 1910         | George R. Connelly     | Williamstown, Mass.   |
| WO   | Wooster                  | 1922         | J. Garber Drushal      | Wooster, Ohio         |
| WR   | Western Reserve          | 1911         | Warren Guthrie         | Cleveland, Ohio       |
| WVA  | West Virginia            | 1923         | Douglas Stallard       | 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.