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The President’s Page in this issue will be devoted to transitional matters. Your outgoing president, Wayne C. Eubank, affectionately known to us as “Tex,” has served DSR–TKA in an able and distinguished manner. He has taken the society, from the time of the merger of two independent societies, each with illustrious histories and proud traditions, through three critical years while the new society, combining the strengths and prestige of both, became fused into a unified, dynamic force in the collegiate forensic world. Whereas the problems which faced him three years ago were primarily those of union, the problems facing your new president are essentially those of transition. Whereas the immediate task when he became president was one of resolving the problems implicit in merger, the focus at this time can be on building on the sound foundation which, under his leadership, has been established. Your new president accepts the responsibilities of furthering the growth and development of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha.

At the beginning of any new administration, the first task is to select the necessary appointive officers and committees. The growth, development, and welfare of the society is contingent on a team effort by your national officers, regional governors, and committee members. It also depends on the cooperation of the chapter sponsors and the society membership. At the outset, therefore, I solicit the full cooperation and support of all members of the team responsible for the functioning and welfare of the Society. Without this cooperation and support, we cannot succeed. With it, we can move smoothly and steadily forward in furthering the goals of DSR–TKA.

By the nature of our Constitution, changes in the composition of the National Council and the committees, except for filling vacancies, occur simultaneously at three-year intervals. A major consideration by your new president in selecting appointees was to insure enough carryover in experienced members to provide continuity in the functioning of the committees, while naming some new members with new ideas and energy. While at the National Conference at Reno, I conferred with the then-incumbent officers, with other members of the National Council, with several Regional Governors, and with numerous Chapter Sponsors. I sought suggestions for the various appointive positions. Some consideration was given to geographic distribution. Very little consideration was given to whether the appointee came from a former Delta Sigma Rho or Tau Kappa Alpha chapter. We have in fact become one society, and the primary consideration should be to appoint people who are professionally most competent for the task involved. An analysis after the committees were complete, however, reflects as one might expect a judicious representation from both DSR and TKA schools. The willingness of the appointee to serve was ascertained. The list of new appointive officers and committee members, as submitted to and approved by the National Council, appears elsewhere in this issue. (See the front cover and page 29.) I believe the affairs of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha are in responsible, efficient, and competent hands.

One of the most important tasks was the selection of a new editor for the Speaker and Gavel. Charles Goetzinger had served the society well...
as editor, but he expressed a desire to be relieved. After soliciting suggestions from many persons, then discussing the possible choices with members of the Council, and after checking the availability and interest of several of those who were suggested, the National Council has approved the nomination of Dr. Wayne Brockriede, University of Colorado. In a major change from former policy, the new editor has been provided at his request three associate editors, each with a distinct and major responsibility in the preparation of each issue of the *Speaker and Gavel*. Through the sharing of labors and the pooling of resources, the *Speaker and Gavel* can become even a better journal. In the final analysis, no editor can provide a better journal than the material made available by the membership permits. I urge you to cooperate with the editors in the transmission of chapter news and by the submission of feature articles for consideration. (A more comprehensive description of the editorial policies and an introduction of the associate editors appear below.)

There are many other subjects I might well discuss in the President’s Page. Some of the more pressing concerns relate to building the Society’s membership and strengthening weak and inactive chapters. These and other topics I shall reserve for subsequent issues of the President’s Page. I will close by wishing every chapter and every member of the Society the very best in achievement during the year ahead.
The May, 1966, issue of *Speaker and Gavel* completed the first three years of this journal's history under the able editorship of Professor Charles Goetzinger. With this issue, a new editorial staff begins a three-year term. We want to produce the best journal which Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha can sustain. In this first issue, we want to discuss our editorial policies and procedures and to solicit your patience, your criticism, and especially your essays and news.

One of the functions of a journal of this sort is to stimulate its members intellectually. In each issue we shall print the best essays we have received. Although we confess a bias in favor of articles which look at argumentation and debate from theoretical and philosophical perspectives, we welcome also those manuscripts which take a more practical turn. Furthermore, we are interested in getting materials written by students and alumni, as well as those written by faculty members.

Professor Robert L. Scott is the Associate Editor whose primary function is to help me read, evaluate, and edit manuscripts. Writers may submit manuscripts either to my office (see address on front cover) or to Professor Scott, Department of Speech, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 55455. Please send us an original and one carbon copy of a double-spaced typewritten essay. Follow the MLA Style Sheet (rev. ed.) in preparing the manuscript. (Copies of this style sheet may be obtained at your library or by sending 50 cents to the Treasurer of the Modern Language Association of America, 4 Washington Place, New York, N. Y. 10003.)

With this issue our journal begins a new series of articles which present criticisms of contemporary speaking and debating. Until some reader suggests a more imaginative title for the series, we shall call it "Current Criticism." This series grows out of several convictions: that criticism has a special function when completed soon after the discourse; that contemporary criticism provides materials and insights which help the later more thorough, scholarly critic; that people who participate in and judge scores of intercollegiate debates annually have skills which equip them well to judge speaking and debating in the real world; and that teachers and students should generally be more concerned with what happens in the real world.

Professor Donald L. Torrence is the Associate Editor in charge of "Current Criticism." Anyone interested in participating in this venture should correspond with him and send him manuscripts. His address: Department of Speech, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois 61401. The series will last only as long as we have good criticisms to print. Those of you who have voiced a concern about contemporary criticism in convention corridors can now act your concern in *Speaker and Gavel*.

A second major function of this journal is what might be termed the "house organ" function. *Speaker and Gavel* should serve as a communication channel between officers and members and as a clearing house of information about the national organization and its chapters. In this issue, *Speaker and Gavel* contains messages from the president and the editor, lists the officers and committees, announces the next annual national conference, reports news notes from the chapters, presents the minutes of the meetings...
of the student executive committee and the student assembly, prints a letter to the editor, names the initiates of 1965–1966, and lists the chapters and sponsors. This kind of material will typify our attempts to fulfill the house organ function of Speaker and Gavel.

Professor Robert O. Weiss is the Associate Editor in charge of materials of this sort. When your chapter engages in a new or interesting venture, please send him a note. If Speaker and Gavel lists the wrong faculty sponsor for your chapter, send him a note. When your committee wants to communicate with the membership of DSR–TKA, send him a note. His address is Department of Speech, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 46135.

I am pleased with my staff of associate editors. Their importance to the publication is evident throughout this issue. Much of the writing for this first issue is theirs. We mean to work hard together so that Speaker and Gavel is as good as your manuscripts and other materials can make it, but it can be a good journal only if you members send us manuscripts and other materials of high quality.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

I have just received my May, 1966, copy of the Speaker and Gavel. I was disappointed to note that on p. 107 you have placed the University of Utah as the 3rd place team in 2-man debate at the DSR–TKA National Tournament. This is incorrect.

There were two teams technically tied for third, the second team being myself and Gerry Philipsen from the University of Denver. If one team is to be designated as the third place team, then it is, in all probability, the University of Denver due to the fact that we obtained better speaker points and a better over-all win-loss record than the gentlemen from Utah (our record being 8-1, theirs being 7-2).

While I am sure that this was not an intentional error in any sense, I did want to bring it to your attention. This is the best performance so far that the University of Denver has given at the National Tournament. We are proud of this accomplishment and since we will be returning next year, again as a debate team in the same division, we felt it was desirable to bring your attention to this situation. We feel that, if at all possible, a clarification to this effect should be noted in the next issue.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

William H. Bennett
In the pursuit of rationality, practitioners of the art of debate stress the need for valid evidence to support contentions offered in defense of a stand. And rightly so, for evidential support is the heart of rationality, and certainly rationality ought to be pursued. The context of rationality, however, should not obscure the real nature of the controversy in whose name it is invoked. The purpose of this essay is to argue that the need issue in a proposition of policy is a question of value. By viewing this stock issue as a question of value, the construction of both affirmative and negative cases becomes clearer and closer to the "real-life" issues of debatable propositions. Further, evaluation of debate is freed from the too-often-used dodge of demanding evidence to support every conceivable kind of statement, even if a statement is not supportable in any logical sense by direct evidential means.

A. J. Ayer in *Language, Truth and Logic* provides a cogent distinction between statements of fact and statements of value. Simply stated, a factual statement can be verified, at least theoretically if not actually, by observing the phenomena relevant to the assertion of the statement. A value statement, on the other hand, includes no direct assertion about the events of the universe; it asserts only that the speaker holds a feeling of approval/disapproval toward the events mentioned in the statement. Thus, it is not verifiable in the evidential sense. "John hit Bill" is a statement of fact; "John ought not to hit Bill" is a statement of value. The first may be supported by evidence, but the second has no evidence that can be invoked directly to gain its acceptance.

If Ayer's distinction is accepted, the stock need issue in a proposition of policy is clearly a question of value. "Is there a need for a change?" or stated indicatively for the affirmative, "The present situation is bad," involves a value judgment about the present situation. The affirmative need case must include two dimensions; it encompasses a two-fold burden: first, to show that the alleged circumstances do exist, and, second, to show that these circumstances are to be judged bad. The existence of circumstances is established by direct evidential support, but what of the value judgment? Direct evidential support does not do the job.

Let me illustrate the difference between the two dimensions and the problem it poses: I may go before the city council of my town and present evidence which supports the contention that the city fathers should adopt proposals to improve the lot of Negro citizens in our community. For example: 90% of all Negroes live in three distinct areas of the city, median income of Negro families is well below the median income of white families, the sickness rate among Negroes is higher than that of whites, etc. Here I have presented a "conclusive" need for a change. And the councilmen agree with all my factual statements, but their conclusion is, "So what?" In effect, they are, in this hypothetical example, disagreeing with the value dimension of my need case, "The situation is not bad." In order to move these men to action, I must not only show that a given set of circumstances...
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does exist, but I must get them to attach the value "badness" to these circumstances. Similarly, the members of the John Birch Society must not only prove evidentially that there are "left-leaning socialists" running the government, but they must also strive to gain acceptance of their value position that such a circumstance is bad.

Any negative opposition to an affirmative need case may statiate on either of the dimensions mentioned above: either that the situation is not as described by the affirmative (fact) or that the situation described is not bad (value).

Is this distinction an important one? Admittedly, college debaters seldom statiate on the value dimension of the need issue. This is probably so because most college debaters bring a similar set of values to these debates. The value position of the affirmative is usually implicit and seldom stated. Negatives with similar values unconsciously accept the implication. However, "real-life" ethical disputes frequently center upon this very value dimension. Teachers would be remiss if they did not point out this two-dimensional nature of need issues and if they did not teach their students how to treat questions of value. The demand for value statements to be directly supported by evidence is naive. If we do not know how to support value statements, we had better learn how it is done.

WITTENBERG HONORS KELLEY

Dr. G. Vernon Kelley retired as Director of Forensics after forty years service at Wittenberg University. In his honor, a Recognition Banquet was held on May 22, 1966, with Dr. Earl F. Morse, President-elect of the American Bar Association and a former debater under Dr. Kelley, as the principal speaker. Dr. Kelley also was saluted by the White House with a telegram congratulating him for his unusual length of service to one institution.

The local chapter of DSR–TKA honored Dr. Kelley with the establishment of the G. VERNON KELLEY ANNUAL DEBATE AWARD to be presented each year to the outstanding debater on campus on the basis of scholarship and competitive record.
ON THE MEANING OF "SHOULD"

ARTHUR HASTINGS*

What does "should" mean in a proposition of action or policy? To rephrase this question in a more illuminating form: What does it mean to say that a proposition of action is true? The descriptive statement "snow is white" is true because snow is white. The statement "two plus two equals four" is true by the definitions of the terms. The statement "she is the most beautiful girl in the world" is true, I suppose, when it is translated "I am in love with her."

To say that a proposition calling for action is true in any of those senses—sense verification, analyticity, or emotional meaning—is not satisfactory. In the proposition "the United Nations should set up a permanent police force," no sense data directly correspond to the meaning of "should," the sentence is not self-validating, and translation into emotional feelings leaves factual elements still to be dealt with.

What is common to all "should" propositions is the implicit presence of goals, and this gives a clue to answering the question of their meaning and verification. The reasons given in support of a policy or action can always be translated into the achievement or satisfaction of goals through that action. An action will solve a problem, provide benefits, make virtue triumphant, etc. The goal will be, as Freud observes, to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Initially, then, the proposition of action asserts that a policy will further some goal which one values. Arthur Kruger, in Modern Debate, phrases this meaning as "such-and-such a policy is the best of available means to a certain desired end."^1

This translation does not say what "should" means. It says what one usually does when he has to prove "should." What does one prove in that way? What processes are verbalized as attaining or furthering a goal? I suggest that the underlying behavioral process is what is usually called motivation. When a person is seeking a goal he is motivated. The specific ways he seeks pleasure and avoids pain are his motives. What "should" means in a proposition of action or policy is "given an understanding of the circumstances, someone will be motivated to . . . ." Our sample proposition means, "Given an understanding of the circumstances, the audience will want the United Nations to set up a permanent police force."

In advocacy the affirmative speaker or writer presents the facts of the situation (including hypothetical discussions of the policy) so they interact with the audience's motivations to create a desire for a United Nations police force. The negative advocate presents facts which diminish motivation or which deny the affirmative's view of the circumstances.

The role of motivation in controversy creates all sorts of problems, and they are not illusions. Many persons feel that motivation changes rational argumentation into subjective persuasion. Audiences have many different motives, and to decide policies for some of their reasons could be disastrous. Certainly this is true. To avoid such a problem our society has developed socially accepted motives. These are values which people have learned to

* Mr. Hastings is Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Public Address at Stanford University.
accept and respond to, at least in public. These range (for the general American culture) from the dignity of human life, to abiding by majority rule, to the virtue of hard work. These are the motives which rational argument appeals to, because these are the socially accepted motives one may act on. Listen to an advocate or debater giving reasons for adopting a policy. Translate his reasons into motives and they will almost always be the socially approved values held by the audience. The premises of the argument are based on the beliefs held by the audience.

Revenge is not a publicly acceptable motive, so it would be surprising to find an advocate recommend capital punishment as a way of revenging ourselves on murderers, rapists, and kidnappers. When revenge is a motive, it is usually tempered, de-emphasized, and rationalized. Again, our foreign aid program is rarely justified because it is a way of buying friends (perhaps, in part, because it is not very successful in achieving this goal). Humane reasons are given. But certainly one of the actual reasons why the government believes it should give economic aid is to gain friends.

Nevertheless, nothing prevents an advocate from contending an audience should take an action for "evil" reasons. Criminals do it all the time, I suppose: "Say, Scarface, I think we should rob that bank." They are using "should" in exactly the same way it is used by the most ethical debater at West Point, and it means, "If you know what I know, you will want to rob that bank."

A Pandora's Box of motives within the meaning of "should" is really there, but since audiences believe that some motives are better than others, these are the motives one automatically appeals to when advocating a proposition of action. (These motives are called "rational.")

The way of determining the truth of a "should" proposition becomes clearer. Such a statement is true if, given the facts, values, and inferences of the situation, an audience is motivated to take the action. At least in theory, that is. One need not give post-speech tests to determine if the audience actually is motivated to take the action or adopt the policy, although such an action would constitute a behavioral test of the success of proving "should." Usually one judges if "should" has been proved by deciding if the speech has shown that the action is justified by acceptable motives, e.g., that the action will achieve certain goals better than alternative actions.

This definition may seem to omit the ethical consideration of "right reasons" or "rational reasons," but it does not. In saying that "should" means that an audience is motivated, the ethical judgment of what motives they respond to is their own responsibility. If they are "evil," they will respond to "evil" motives as right reasons which lead them to conclude they should act. If they are virtuous, they will be motivated to act when they are given virtuous reasons.

For effective persuasion, the speaker and the audience should have common motives, or should accept the same motives as good reasons. If they disagree on motives, then persuasion is impossible unless the advocate can persuade the audience to adopt his motives as a justification for action.

(Often accepted reasons for action become rationalizations for "base motives," and contemporary advertising is noteworthy for constantly remembering this formula. A person may give rational (i.e., socially acceptable) reasons for buying a particular brand of automobile—high trade-in value, five-year guarantee, reserve power for safety, roominess, etc. In
reality, he may be motivated to buy the car because it is sexy, powerful, and brings status. But in supporting a proposition of action to ourselves, most of us wish to feel we have higher goals than pure sex and power.)

Implicit in the discussion of motives is a definition of rational arguments which incorporate values approved by society. Emotional arguments, like emotional behavior, often are not irrational but rather include values or motives not approved by society. Rational and emotional appeals may be distinguished on the basis of social approval. Many arguments which are called emotional have a logical structure, but they contain value premises which are selfish, immoral, or otherwise socially rejected.

In evaluating persuasive discourse for “reasoning” and “emotion” at least four aspects must be distinguished: the logical structure (evidence, conclusion); the strength of the argument (testing the warrant, etc.); the implicit motives or values (importance and acceptability); and how strongly the motives are aroused.
CURRENT CRITICISM

Edited By Donald L. Torrence

With the essay below Speaker and Gavel begins what hopefully will become a regular series of brief critical essays on contemporary public speeches and debates. Such critical analysis ought to appear in print shortly after the event without the long wait for extensive research and development.

The editors of Speaker and Gavel are offering space in each issue for one such critical essay. All we ask is that the essay be a critical evaluation of a recent speech or debate presented by persons and on a topic with a general appeal to readers of this journal. Manuscripts should be short (three to ten typed pages) and should be submitted to Donald L. Torrence, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois 61401.

HUBERT HUMPHREY FACES THE "BLACK POWER" ISSUE

Robert L. Scott and Wayne Brockriede*

When Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey spoke to the 1,500 delegates of the NAACP convention in Los Angeles, July 6, 1966, he took a position on the major current issue confronting civil rights groups. Although the issue had not been drawn formally, it was nonetheless divisive. That issue was "Black Power."

At about the time Humphrey spoke, Stokely Carmichael said that he had heard the term used in one way and another since he was a child.1 The phrase did not become a public symbolic issue, however, until it was introduced, presumably by Carmichael, during the Mississippi March which followed the shooting of James Meredith. By June 26, when the march climaxed in Jackson, Miss., "Black Power" was echoing throughout the country.2

By agreeing to speak at the NAACP convention, the Vice President appeared to signal the approval of the executive branch of the federal government with the stiffening opposition of Roy Wilkins and the NAACP and Martin Luther King and the SCLC toward Floyd McKissick and CORE

* Mr. Scott is Professor of Speech at the University of Minnesota, and Mr. Brockriede is Professor of Speech at the University of Colorado.
and Stokely Carmichael and SNCC, opposition centering on the use of the Black Power phrase. Indeed, the day before the Humphrey speech, President Johnson told a news conference, "We are not interested in black power and we are not interested in white power. But we are interested in American democratic power, with a small 'd.'"

In speaking to the delegates in Los Angeles and, through reports of the speech, to the nation, Humphrey had three choices: not to mention or allude to Black Power in any way, to treat it positively, or to treat it negatively. One might argue that the first choice was closed: his very being on the program constituted a position and, further, not to treat the issue would fail grievously to meet the expectations of his immediate and larger audiences. Perhaps the President's statements at his press conference closed the second choice to the Vice President. At any rate, Humphrey made the third choice.

For the delegates at the NAACP convention and for those relatively few additional persons who read the complete speech as a message addressed to those delegates, the speech may well be judged a masterpiece of identification of the speaker and what he stands for with the audience and what it stands for.

The strategy of identification is apparent from the outset: "America is marching on the road to freedom. I am proud to be back among my friends of the NAACP who have led this march for 57 years." These words identify both speaker and audience with a dominant symbol of the civil rights movement, the march. The speaker recalled the long history of NAACP involvement in the civil rights march, and many listeners must have known the speaker's own dedication to the cause. They may have remembered the 1948 Democratic convention when Humphrey risked his political future in the fight for a strong civil rights plank in the platform. Humphrey may have aided the recollection with his words, "For we have marched . . . even when our band was small and our ranks thin and ragged . . . even when victory seemed a distant and unattainable goal." Throughout the first section of the speech, the "march" motif dominates: "There have been young marchers and old . . . Negro and white . . . rich and poor . . . but always marching with a common spirit—moved by a common hope—and striving for a common objective." The motif suggests gradual progress, hard work, sacrifice, and cooperation; and it identifies the speaker with his NAACP audience.

The second section of the speech develops Humphrey's argument that neither he nor his listeners are, or should be, satisfied with past accomplishments. Civil rights workers and social scientists commonly express the belief that some of the restlessness and frustration in Negro ghettos stems from the male Negro's feeling that he is cut off from a positive, masculine role in his family and his community, cut off in some instances by a lack of education, cut off in others by a lack of opportunity to use what he has. Humphrey seemed to recognize this problem in a significant passage:

---

4 *U. S., Congressional Record*, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., July 12, 1966, Appendix, p. A3609. Mr. Humphrey's speech was inserted into the *Record* by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington. All references to the Humphrey speech are to this printed version, pp. A3607–A3609.
A generation ago, it may have been enough for the Negro to ask for the right to enter a restaurant.

But today the Negro American asks:

Is my life better? Are my children attending better schools? Do I hold a better job—or any job? Do I have a voice in the life of my city and my neighborhood? Am I a first class citizen—a man among men, in my own eyes and in the eyes of my family?

Until a man can truthfully answer “yes” to these questions, we should not expect him to consider the battle won or the struggle ended. And neither should we.

The long middle section of the speech is a catalog of past efforts by the federal government to alleviate conditions that irritate and frustrate, as well as a promise for more action in the future.

The short third section fulfills several functions. Humphrey called for a realistic and cooperative struggle to achieve civil rights for all Americans. He encouraged those of like mind to persevere. The primary function, however, is to support the NAACP leadership on its position on the Black Power issue. One day before the Humphrey speech, Roy Wilkins had taken a vigorous stand on the issue in his keynote address to the delegates:

No matter how endlessly they try to explain it, the term “black power” means antiwhite power. . . . It has to mean “going it alone.” It has to mean separatism.

Now, separatism, whether on the rarefied debate level of “black power” or on the wishful level of a Secessionist Freedom City in Watts, offers a disadvantaged minority little except a chance to shrivel and die. . . .

We of the NAACP will have none of this. We have fought it too long. It is the ranging of race against race on the irrelevant basis of skin color.®

The Vice President endorsed Wilkins with a parallel statement on the issue:

It seems to me fundamental that we cannot embrace the dogma of the oppressor—the notion that somehow a person’s skin color determines his worthiness or unworthiness.

Yes, racism is racism—and there is no room in America for racism of any color.

And we must reject calls for racism, whether they come from a throat that is white or one that is black.

We must strive to create a society in which the aims of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the civil rights movement can be achieved. And, always remember, we seek advance-ment . . . not apartheid.

This passage placed Humphrey personally, and by implication the Johnson administration, behind the NAACP and SCLC in their struggle over the Black Power issue with SNCC and CORE. Humphrey had agreed with

the majority of delegates who formed his immediate listening audience. Three days after the speech, the convention ended after having passed a resolution described as virtually seeking "to establish the NAACP as the paramount organization that could decide which of the other groups are in the interest of Negroes and of the country, and which are not." Viewed as an attempt to identify personally and substantively with the NAACP delegates, Humphrey's speech was probably highly successful. Humphrey had joined himself with the goals, values, and positions of the NAACP and its leader, Roy Wilkins.

But the critic has a "second speech occasion" to evaluate when he considers Humphrey's address on July 6. The speaker is Hubert Humphrey as he is revealed through the press and the broadcasting media. The audience is the national audience, especially those persons and groups which have a strong interest in the civil rights movement. The speech consists of excerpts which reporters conveyed to the national audience. With only a few exceptions, press and broadcasting reports limited the "speech" to all or parts of Humphrey's allusion to the Black Power issue in the passage quoted above.

The probable occurrence of the second occasion is predictable. Journalists would find newsworthy what a Vice President might say to a leading civil rights organization about an explosive controversy. Also predictable is the journalists' selection of the passage which relates to the Black Power issue in strikingly figurative language.

Humphrey's "second" speech, addressed through the press to the national audience, may be judged a failure. The rhetorical circumstances, in our judgment, made possible a great speech at a critical moment, but Mr. Humphrey's analysis of the "second" occasion gave him at best a mediocre speech.

The moment was critical because of the nature of Negro need and the nature of the Black Power symbolic issue. Legislative gains had not been transformed into substantial political or economic improvement for Negroes. Discontent was deep, especially in riot-torn and riot-threatened ghettos, and the feeling of powerlessness and frustration to effect significant change led to a sense of desperation. The legislative approach shared by Wilkins and King with the white liberals had become suspect.

Into this sense of need Stokely Carmichael and SNCC had introduced the ambiguous phrase Black Power, and Floyd McKissick and CORE had endorsed it in Baltimore. The phrase implied Black Power, but left open

---

6 Not all members of the NAACP oppose Black Power. One exception, for example, is the Rev. James Jones, a Negro member of the Los Angeles School Board. In a speech to the NAACP convention, after Wilkins' but before Humphrey's speech, Jones said: "An organization such as the NAACP should not be scared into a position of defense by the power structure with regard to the question of black power. [cheers] The NAACP must accept the challenge of defining black power and making it honorable and a factual part of the total power spectrum in America." Quoted in Nicholas von Hoffman, "Black Power Called Racism by Humphrey," Washington Post, July 7, 1966, p. A7.

7 Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, July 10, 1966, p. 4A.

8 Our treatment of Humphrey's address as "two speeches" raises an interesting issue in the criticism of contemporary public address. To what extent does the reporter function merely as a channel of communication and to what extent may he be regarded as a more active rhetorical agent, as a part of the source component in a communicative event?

whether the leadership was to be exclusively Negro or whether cooperation with white liberal forces was to be tolerated or sought. It further implied Black Power, but left open the specific goals and methods. The phrase threatened, but not clearly, not unequivocally. The black panther's message, "Move on over or we'll move on over you," may be seen as a counterpart to the white rooster and "white supremacy." But the range of power-seeking methods and the degree to which Black Power advocates might move from nonviolence through violent self-defense to the initiation of violent acts was yet to be determined.

Though ambiguous (and perhaps, in part, because ambiguous), the phrase developed a fascinating appeal for many Negroes. It spoke to their condition in a way that "freedom now" and nonviolent "we shall overcome" no longer did. Many Negroes agreed with Floyd McKissick's description of nonviolence as a "dying philosophy" that no longer can "be sold to the black people." Black Power developed a kind of rhetorical magical power, and the events of the Mississippi March and the CORE convention revealed many Negroes ready to follow its banner. Where the banner would lead was still negotiable, and the very ambiguity of Black Power implied an attitude mobility inviting to rhetoricians.

How well did Hubert H. Humphrey meet this challenge in his address to the national audience? The first section of the speech to the NAACP delegates failed in its address to the national audience by default. The national audience never heard the "march" motif by which Humphrey had so adroitly identified with his physically present audience. Perhaps the journalists viewed this part of the discourse as too ordinary and too predictable to merit reporting.

The second section, again, failed by default. Again, journalists did not report to the national audience Mr. Humphrey's catalog of positive federal achievements, nor did they cite his promises for future action. Humphrey here claimed, "The next phase of the battle will be less dramatic, and it will attract a small number of those interested in the simple issues and the easy victories. Yet this next phase—one of the nuts and bolts of employment opportunities—is vital." But Mr. Humphrey did not specify the methods. He only made repeated abstractions of the sort quoted above. To those who are impatient, such promises seem excuses. In short, journalists perhaps properly regarded this portion of the speech as not worth reporting. The Vice President did little to advance the thinking on what gains should be expected through a continuation of the march toward freedom without an exercise of Black Power.

The third section, which journalists channeled to the national audience, failed by employing a negative divisive strategy. In a few well-turned sentences, Mr. Humphrey said "me, too," to Mr. Wilkins' prior rejection of Black Power, and placed the administration behind the NAACP. By implication, the essence of the Humphrey message was that Black Power adherents are racists, an accusation certain to alienate such people and tending to force a decision from those who were wondering what attitude to adopt toward the ambiguous phrase, a decision as likely to go toward Black Power as away from it. Not only would a divisive strategy encourage

10 Quoted in ibid., p. 32.
11 New York Times, July 8, 1966, p. 16, reports that CORE's Floyd McKissick was "visibly angry when asked to comment on remarks made by Mr. Humphrey."
a further splitting of the civil rights movement into two factions, but it would leave the militant faction in full possession of the symbol and in full control of determining its meaning.

"Yet we still think that there tends to be a panicky overreaction to the slogan 'black power,'" a Christian Science Monitor editorial said two days after Humphrey's speech. Perhaps the editorial writer could have used the Vice President's speech as a basis for restructuring the response to the term had Humphrey chosen to have spoken differently.

Instead of a strategy of division, saying in effect, "There's the line, cross it at your peril," the Vice President's strategy could have been toward unification. Mr. Humphrey was in a unique position to help heal a breach which two days after the speech Martin Luther King said threatened to split the civil rights movement permanently. Furthermore, he had the opportunity to take the first step toward de-fusing the explosive Black Power phrase.

Did the Vice President really have a good opportunity to unify the movement and to de-fuse the phrase? "No matter how endlessly they try to explain it, the term 'black power' means antiwhite power," Wilkins had said in his keynote address. But that "they" are "endlessly" explaining it indicates that the meaning of the concept is in the process of being worked out. "It is necessary for Negroes to have power," Martin Luther King said in Chicago the day Humphrey spoke in Los Angeles, "We've got to have political power. I don't use the phrase 'black power' because it gives the wrong impression. . . . We do not want to substitute one tyranny for another." Could Mr. Humphrey have helped make Black Power mean political and economic power for Negroes? Certainly the administration stands for increasing Negroes' political and economic power in certain specified ways. Could he have suggested ways in which Negroes might participate more vigorously in achieving certain other specified goals so that power could be used by the blacks as well as for them? Could he have encouraged civil rights leaders to use the term in less menacing ways?

The person most closely identified with the phrase, Stokely Carmichael, has indicated that the term is open to a pacific interpretation. In his interview with the press the day after Humphrey spoke, he responded to the question, "Roy Wilkins . . . has said no matter how you say it, it means antiwhite. What's your view?" by replying, "Well, I've never used that word and I don't see why the rallying cry of black power would mean that." Mr. Carmichael compared the impulse behind Black Power with the banding together of workers in labor unions to make their demands felt. Here is an analogy that a man like Hubert Humphrey should have been able to see and to exploit.

---

14 Minneapolis Star, July 7, 1966, p. 2A.
15 Martin Luther King recognized this aspect of Black Power: "[If it is] . . . an appeal to racial pride, an appeal to the Negro not to be ashamed of being black, and the transfer of the powerlessness of the Negro into positive, constructive power . . . then I agree with it" (quoted in Christian Science Monitor, July 11, 1966, p. 3).
16 Minneapolis Star, July 7, 1966, p. 1A.
17 James Jones also suggests the value of defining Black Power (see fn. 7). Had the statement of Jones been made by someone as visible as Humphrey, it might have packed a greater rhetorical wallop.
For the Vice President to have identified himself with a pacific interpretation of Black Power would have recognized the need of Negroes for power exercised in their behalf and also their need to do some of the exercising. It could have aided tendencies toward cooperation and unification of civil rights groups. The strategy is perhaps not an obvious one, nor is it one easily made effective. Given the rhetorical climate in which Mr. Humphrey worked, however, such a choice could have made possible a truly great speech. The choice he made allowed him to identify skillfully with the NAACP and Roy Wilkins. Even assuming the wisdom of rejecting Black Power, however, such a choice allowed the Vice President only to echo Roy Wilkins' keynote address. Given his office and his ability, this much is too little to expect from Hubert Humphrey.
Tournament debating now dominates the intercollegiate forensic scene, a fact demonstrated overwhelmingly by the evidence of DSR–TKA chapter reports plus simple first-hand observation. Thirty of the reporting chapters indicated that they sponsored one or more such tournaments, and some schools apparently had little activity other than tournament debates.

The summary of the 1965–1966 tournament results compiled by Jack Howe for the American Forensic Association provides a massive description of the extent of this activity. Howe lists the results of 179 tournaments and estimates that the results of perhaps as many as a hundred others eluded him.

The largest tournament reported attracted entries from 93 schools (at Georgetown University), while the largest from the point of view of the number of participants reported approximately 900 (at Bradley University). The DSR–TKA National Conference at the University of Nevada was among the “top ten” in both categories, although several sizable tournaments were among the elusive unreported hundred. At the opposite end of the scale, the Wooster Direct-Clash Tourney (4 entries) and the Friendly Five at Butler (5 entries) were among the tiny tournament gems with which we are acquainted, demonstrating that challenging debating need not depend upon size.

Howe notes that four of the tournaments attracting the largest number of schools were in Illinois, and seven of the eleven were east of the Mississippi; but attendance figures indicate that three of the eleven largest were in California and that nine of the eleven were west of the Mississippi.

Of the 179 tournaments reported, 115 were strictly confined to debate, 57 had debate plus one or more individual events, and seven did not include debate. Events added to debate, in order of their popularity, included oratory, extemporaneous speaking, interpretation, after-dinner speaking, impromptu speaking, discussion, expository speaking, persuasive speaking, radio speaking, and others mentioned only once.

Of the 179 tournaments, eighteen were for novices only and an additional thirty-seven included a novice division.

Howe provided several other conclusions. Tournaments in 1965–1966 largely emphasized debate to the exclusion of individual events. Among individual events, extemporaneous appeared to be slipping slightly and interpretation gaining ground. Discussion and after-dinner speaking, once highly popular, have almost ceased to exist as tournament events. Impromptu speaking is strictly a regional event, almost unknown outside the west. Separate debate divisions for women have almost disappeared, too. Of the thirteen tournaments in which the separation remains, six were in the south and six were in the west.
NEWS NOTES FROM THE CHAPTERS

ROBERT O. WEISS

A perusal of chapter reports reveals a number of creative ventures and achievements during 1965–1966.

Chapter sponsorship of events, of course, is tremendously variable. Some schools which initiate many members are proud that the organization is “strictly honorary,” whereas other chapters sponsor tournaments and other events and yet have few if any undergraduate members.

Several chapters sponsored intramural speech events. George Washington had an intramural forensics program including five events for men and five events for women. There were 125 participants, and trophies and certificates were presented to winners. Washington and Lee sponsored debate tournaments for its freshmen. Wittenberg sponsored an intramural public speaking contest. Chapters at Mankato State College and the University of Colorado sponsored the college oratory contests. Hanover College forensics activities included a weekly student-faculty discussion called “Hanover Forum” on the local radio station. Memphis State University maintained its Student-Faculty Forum.

Ten chapters reported sponsorship of debates with British universities’ teams. Eastern Kentucky had two British debates and the chapter held receptions honoring the visiting debaters. Pittsburgh held its tenth annual exchange with the University of West Indies, Jamaica.

Eight schools conducted high school debate tournaments or clinics. Virginia Polytechnic Institute reports the appearance of their debaters at area high schools. Murray State College presented 45 high school assembly programs with a listening audience of over 16,000.

Our assumption that debaters spend all their extra time running the campus political machine is not confirmed by the chapter reports. However, at Washington and Lee, David Marchese was vice president of the student body. Michigan State debater Andrew Kramer was chosen the outstanding senior at that university.

Morgan State College held a debate on the desirability of social control based on the book The 480. Hanover had intramural debates on the topic, “Resolved, that the U. S. should increase trade with Eastern Europe.” DePauw and Wabash conducted a split-team debate for the Indiana College Public Relations Association on the topic, “Resolved, that public relations is the blight on the ivy.”

George Washington has established the DSR–TKA Trophy to be presented to the outstanding novice debater. The 1966 recipient was Leonard Giannessi.

News of chapter activities and other forensic news not included in chapter reports may be submitted at any time to Robert O. Weiss, Speech Department, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 46135.
President Larry Woods of Emory University called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. at the University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada.

Mr. Woods announced that he had appointed four councilmen and an acting secretary since those elected to those posts had been unable to attend the conference. Vice Presidents Snow of Vermont and Gale of Alabama were in attendance.

The procedure for the election of student officers was the first order of business. For the office of President, there would be three minute nominating speeches, introductions by the candidates themselves, a three minute speech by the candidate, after which each candidate would entertain three minutes of questions from the floor. For First and Second Vice Presidents, Secretary and Treasurer, there would be nominations three minutes in length, followed by personal introductions from the candidates. For the councilmen, there would be nominations without speeches, followed by personal introductions.

Mr. Woods then reported to those present some of the results of the December meeting of the National Council in New York. At that time, one hundred dollars was allocated for use by the Student Committee and the National Student Speaker of the Year Award was approved.

A study committee formed at the 1965 Conference reported the results of a questionnaire survey undertaken to determine the general student opinion about retaining the Student Congress as a Conference event. More than 60% responded in favor of the event.

Mr. Snow of Vermont, First Vice President, then gave a summary of action taken concerning the National Student Speaker of the Year Award for 1966. For the award, only fifteen entries were submitted. The Student Committee decided that in the future, nominees were to be accepted on an open, rather than a regional, basis. The motion was passed that "recognized national competition" be changed to "recognized intercollegiate competition" in the award. The Committee also passed a motion that applications be sent which list specific questions and that no information not specifically requested be submitted.

After discussion, the Committee passed a motion that up to five persons be designated as distinguished speakers of DSR–TKA. This award would supersede the National Student Speaker of the Year Award.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Gloria Smith, National Student Secretary
bly. Motion passed unanimously. The motion was then passed to allow in the future one vote to each chapter represented at the student officer elections. In case of a tie, individual votes will be the criterion.

Mr. Woods urged that those elected to offices for 1967 and any others willing to do so write a Constitution for the organization.

Discussion ensued on the difficulty in getting publicity in Speaker and Gavel. The motion was passed to make the Second Vice President responsible for making a report in each issue of Speaker and Gavel concerning each region. One report should include notification that early nominations for student officers will be made at the Conference.

It was moved that the Student Executive Committee recommend to the National Council that the portion of the initiation ritual dealing with the history of the organization be edited and that the number of initiating officials be increased. Motion passed.

The motion was made that the Student Executive Committee recommend to the National Council that membership cards be issued to all active members of DSR–TKA. Motion passed.

Dr. Eubank presented his views concerning the National Student Speaker of the Year Award and asked the Committee to think carefully about any action to be taken.

The motion was passed that the nominations for Student Officers be made at a meeting on the first day of the Conference and that a list of nominations be published and distributed. Nominations would also be accepted from the floor at the election meeting. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Gloria Smith, National Student Secretary

MINUTES OF THE DSR–TKA STUDENT ASSEMBLY
April 12, 1966

President Woods called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Miss Smith of South Carolina, Acting Secretary, read the minutes of the 1965 Conference. They were approved as read.

Mr. Woods announced the names of the appointed officers. He also announced the results of the survey conducted in 1966 which revealed the general desire to retain the Congress event as a part of the Conference.

It was also announced that the National Student Speaker of the Year Award was approved by the National Council in December, 1965.

Several motions then came before the Assembly for its consideration. Mr. Kenner of U. S. C. explained the motion that in the National Student Speaker of the Year Award, “recognized intercollegiate competition” should replace the phrase “recognized national competition.” Motion passed unanimously.

The next motion to be considered was that the National Student Speaker of the Year Award be changed to recognize up to five persons as Distinguished Speakers of DSR–TKA. After discussion, motion defeated.

Mr. Gale as Second Vice President reported that the new Second Vice President should get a list of schools in each region and have this list published in Speaker and Gavel. In each succeeding issue, regional news will be published.
Two recommendations from the Student Committee to the National Council were announced: first, a desire for changes in the initiation ritual and, second, a request that membership cards be issued to all active members of DSR-TKA.

The Assembly then passed a motion that each DSR-TKA chapter shall be limited to one vote in future student officer elections. In case of a tie, individual votes shall be the criterion.

Results of the student election:

President: Ric Flam of the University of Southern California defeated Marty Weisman of Ohio Wesleyan University.
First Vice President: Bob Shields of Wichita defeated Lee Burnham of the University of Utah and Jim Demot of Brigham Young.
Second Vice President: Ken Newton of Michigan State defeated Alvin Entin of American University.
Secretary: Gloria Smith of the University of South Carolina, unopposed.
Treasurer: Nancy Tschetter of South Dakota defeated Judy Wolfe of Brigham Young.
Councilmen at Large: Bob Smith of Wichita, Bill Boice of Emory, Al Entin of American University, and Greg Mowe of Oregon were elected.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Gloria Smith, National Student Secretary
NEW MEMBERS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO–TAU KAPPA ALPHA

1965–1966

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
James Addison Harris, Jr.

ALBION COLLEGE
Michael Carlos Halbig
John Bentley Mason
John Alan Watts

ALMA COLLEGE
Paul Edward Jensen

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
Charles Gary Bogart
Alvin Ernest Entin
Gary Kim Harris
Frances Carol Sabel
Jack Harlan Yocum (at large)

AUBURN UNIVERSITY
John Thomas Schell, III
William Paul Shealy, Jr.

BATES COLLEGE
Susan Curtis Francis
Alan Michael Lewis
Charlotte Ann Singer

BEREA COLLEGE
Thomas Edward Bedwell
James Glenn Branscome
Betty Jean Hall
Sylvia Rebecca Smith

BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN
Angelan Beatrice Berry
Sheila Elizabeth Bishop
Marilyn Elizabeth McGough
Omer Lee Reed
Nancy Gena Terrel

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
David Allan Baker
Barbara May Beckerman
Jay Matthew Finkelman

BUTLER UNIVERSITY
Bonnie Joy Kaplan
Donald Arthur Wall

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY
Thomas Richard Clink
Frederick Ernest Hasecke
David Eugene Schaffter

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
James Russell Gordley
Avis Charlotte Vidal

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
Robert George Finney
Jimmie Lee Seal
Timothy Joseph Shay

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
John Karl Anderson (at large)
Walter Thompson Cox
William Thomas Ramsey
( at large)
Jack Kenny Williams

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Cheryl Ann Card
Ronald Marshall Childress
Richard Norman Gottfried
Richard Robert Ranta
Mary Louise Ruhl

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
John William Coffey
Charles Joseph Coleman
Mary Pat Devaney
Carolyn Jean Fooks
Mary Cheryl Gleason
John Edward Glode
Charles Evans Hester
John Francis Mira
Thomas Stephen Schmidt
Dennis Roger Smith
Larry Raymond Taylor

C. W. POST COLLEGE
Joel Charles Ehrlich

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
William Harold Bennett
Steven Bruce Hunt
Gerry Frank Philipsen
DEPAUW UNIVERSITY
Gail Arden Franklin
Richard H. Hudelson
Robert Srader Hulett
John Edward Peterson
Deborah Ann Schade
Tip A. Bruce Scott

HAMILTON COLLEGE
Steven Gottlieb
William S. Newell
Lawson Schohnicoft
Michael Richard Zedek

HAMPTON INSTITUTE
Jack Carson, Jr.
Gilbert S. Derr (at large)
Jacob B. Miller (at large)
Dennis L. Montgomery

HAMPDEN SYDENEY COLLEGE
John William Goethe

HANOVER COLLEGE
Wesley Louis Franzmeier
Catherine Jane Westfall

HARPUR COLLEGE
Margaret Jeanne Divet
Louis Gurman
Steven G. Kellman
David M. Lorton
Eugene Vasilew (at large)
Stephen Glenn Young

HOWARD UNIVERSITY
Cloister Bryant Current

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
Kenneth Duane Ayers
Steven Barrett Perkins

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
John F. Van Vactor

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
(Iowa City)
John Waite Bowers

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY (Ames)
Gary Fristedt Barton
James Glenn Berns
Loren Kent Miller
Wendell Eugene Primus
Kathryn Elizabeth Williams

STATE COLLEGE OF IOWA
(Cedar Falls)
Paul James Boysen
Terry Jo Knapp
John Anthony Morrissey
Frank Warren Pechacek
Patricia Schultz
T. Ella Strother
Elizabeth Mae Voss
Bonnie Jean Young

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
Hilary T. Hornung

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Robert Harold Campbell
James F. Klumpp
Susan Elizabeth McCarty
James LeRoy McNish
William Roth Sampson
Phyllis Anita Schofer
John Randall Schultz
Robert Barrett Ward
William Henry Ward
Nancy Gayle Wood

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Vincent Stephen DiSalvo
Sheryl Beth Etling
Paul Robert Firling
Janice Darlene Kepley
Jack Victor Lewis

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Charles Steven Duncan
Charles Edward Hastie
Rodney F. Page
Sheryl Glenn Snyder
Robert Andrew Valentine

KING’S COLLEGE
Mark James Caman
William John McCarthy

KNOX COLLEGE
William Robert Kowinski
Jacqueline Marie Piraino

LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
Bruce Carithers
Judy Duncan
William E. Files
James A. Finley
James K. Leach
James Williams

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE
AT LONG BEACH
Carolyn Sue Bosnian
Eugene Francis Covelli
Robert Allen Jackson
Gary D. Keele

Annjennette Sophie McFarlin
Penny Ethelyn Thomas

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Ben Colin Freasier

LOYOLA COLLEGE (Maryland)
James Patrick Dougherty, Jr.
Richard Carl Fleming
William Francis Moeller

MANCHESTER COLLEGE
Ronald Lee Aungst (at large)
Silas Edward Carroll, III
Carol Lee Carter
Susan Martha Keim
Janet Ann Kurtz
Mary Jo Willingham
Connie Sue Zehring

MANKATA STATE COLLEGE
Sheryl Lynne Osborne
Robert Allen Ridley
Beverly Lynn Wacker

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
Gerald Sullivan Frank
Kathleen Mary Hall
John Frederick Kreul
William Daniel Semlak
James Michael Weiss

MERCER UNIVERSITY
David Eugene Hudson
Emily Joan Wortman

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
Richard E. Friedman
Philip M. Gerson
Larry H. Mans
Daniel J. O’Connor
Hilda Yu-Hsiang Shen
Louis J. Sperling
Betsy Clare Vollette

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Gary L. Evans

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Richard Close Brautigam
Phillip Henry Carr
William M. Fulkerson (at large)
Cynthia Dee Goldstein
Susan Ruth Harris
Kathleen Louise Hastedt
Evelyn Jean Knott
Dan Pyle Millar (at large)  
Stephen Elliott Morgan  
Kenneth Craft Newton  
Famela Gail Shaw  
Ronald Eugene Smith  
Thomas George Trott  
James F. Weaver (at large)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
Barry John Kirchmeier  
William Jay Overmoe

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA  
Gilbert Jamieson Clark (at large)  
Carol-Lynn Greenfield  
Channing Julius Hartelius  
Donna Marie Pentz

MOREHOUSE COLLEGE  
Samuel Allen Andrews  
Jon Michael Griffith  
H. Washington Pope  
Roderick Lawrence Robinson  
Everett Newton Smith

MORAGN STATE COLLEGE  
Delores Helease Camison  
Harold Bruce Chinn (at large)  
Judith Michele Mudd

MURRAY STATE COLLEGE  
Margaret Ruth Crider  
Kenneth William Hauptli  
Ed Franklin Jeffrey  
Michael Allen Nims  
John O. Pasco

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA  
Terry Frederick Hall  
Alan Lee Larson  
Lynn Randall Prier  
Richard La Vern Sherman

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA  
John Peter Echenerria  
James Emerson  
Robert Erickson  
Sheila Marie Locke  
Steven Morris  
Kenneth Frederick Muller  
Max Steinheimer  
Rita Wilkinson

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO  
Dawn Therese Adrian  
Timothy Alan Browning  
Olivia Suzanna Gallegos  
Robert Lewis Halle  
Arlee Wayne Johnson  
Lynna Lee Joseph  
John Bennett Pound

NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS  
Troy T. Baker  
Gerald L. Bryan  
Arthur B. Trujillo

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY  
(Philadelphia)  
Barry Howard Cohen  
David George Leahy (at large)  
Juan U. Ortiz  
Charles Barry Wilson (at large)  
Stephen Theodore Zabrenski

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA  
Barton D. Beglo

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY  
Robert Hal Chandler  
Michael Louis Denger  
Fred T. Plog, III

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME  
Eugene W. Beeler  
Stephen Blaha  
John Robert McMenamin  
James Bryant McTigue  
Gary Robert Morrow  
James Leslie Sauter

OBERLIN COLLEGE  
Sally Christine Cornwell  
Edward William Jacobson, Jr.  
Richard Peter Lasko  
James Franklin Reiter  
Elizabeth Kilbourne Tracy

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
(Columbus)  
John Howard Dupree  
Steven Keller  
Linda Ann Kotheimer  
Harold Lewis Lawson  
Michael Lloyd Manley  
Edward Allen Smith, Jr.  
Michael Peter Stinziano  
William Hunt Woods

OHIO UNIVERSITY (Athens)  
Sally Frances Smith
OHIO WESLEYAN
G. Jack Donson
James Philip McKee

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Jo Ann Johnson
William Howard Lawrence
Gregory Robert Mowe

PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
Gordon W. Bolton
Virginia Ann Stretcher
Monica Louise Wolf

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Rudolf Edward Anders
Donald Walter Kiefer

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Edward D. Munn, II
Stanley Frank Ratner
Rebecca Adeline Walker

QUEENS COLLEGE
Robert Michael Batscha
Ralph Dingmann Nurnberger
Donald Jay Tobias
Marvin Jon Weinroth

RANDOLPH MACON COLLEGE
John Clyde Mayer

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Mark Dennis Gould
Steven Howard Musen

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
William Harmon Money

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
Raymond Aaron Bragar
Gerald A. Greenberger
David Michael Wolf

SAINT CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY
John E. Fredell
William Robert McCleary
David R. McFarland
Kathleen Anne Polvi
Michael R. Sieben
Michael A. Sorenson

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
Robert Barry Nicholas

SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE
David Franklin Allen
Dorothy Marie Dryden

Richard Marvin Einstoss
Michael Robb Elliott
Edward Thomas Taylor
Helen Anne Wagley

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SANTA BARBARA
Kathleen Natalie Corey
David Malcolm Hunsaker
Sharon Kaplan Leff
Stanley Oliver Orrock
Craig Ralph Smith
Michael Dale Talley

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Parks McLendon Cibie, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA
Jane Ann Hyldahl
Byron George Lee
Elizabeth Jean Meyer
Nancy Ann Tschetter

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
Ralph Abraham Brown
Frederick M. Flam

SPRING HILL COLLEGE
Anthony Marion Dean
Jesse M. Gonzalez
Ramon Grant Hannah
John Phillip Hansen
Richard Sander Lynch
Donald Lester Parker
Timothy James Sweeney
Norma Laurendine Wittman

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
Harriet E. Tucker

TEXAS TECHNICAL COLLEGE
David Ross Bradley
Carl Douglas Moore

URSINUS COLLEGE
John Robert Almond

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
(Salt Lake City)
Jay Frederick Bodine
Blaine Lynn Carlton
Craig Cook
John Scott Horman
Kay Frank Israel
Grant Smith Kesler
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Chapter Name, Address</th>
<th>Faculty Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>New York (Univ. Hts.), New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>George B. Sargent II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>New York (Wash. Sq.), New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>Harold R. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.</td>
<td>John S. Penn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.</td>
<td>Thomas B. McClain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.</td>
<td>Leonard Sommer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio</td>
<td>Ruth Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Occidental, Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>Franklin Modisett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Ohio, Athens, Ohio</td>
<td>Ted J. Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Harold Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio</td>
<td>Ed Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.</td>
<td>Paul Borefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>Oregon, Eugene, Ore.</td>
<td>W. Scott Nobles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Oregon State, Corvallis, Ore.</td>
<td>Ralph W. Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pacific, Forest Grove, Ore.</td>
<td>Albert C. Hingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, Philadelphia</td>
<td>Clayton H. Schug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State, University Park, Pa.</td>
<td>Robert Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>Hans Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Pomona, Claremont, Calif.</td>
<td>John Monson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Purdue, Lafayette, Ind.</td>
<td>James Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.</td>
<td>John A. Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Randolph-Macon, Ashland, Va.</td>
<td>Edgar E. MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.</td>
<td>Lee R. Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Richmond, Richmond, Va.</td>
<td>Bert E. Bradley, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Roanoke, Salem, Va.</td>
<td>William R. Coulter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y.</td>
<td>Joseph Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Rockford, Rockford, Ill.</td>
<td>Jeanette Anderson Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>Rutgers, New Brunswick, N. J.</td>
<td>James Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>St. Anselm's, Manchester, N. H.</td>
<td>John DeBross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>St. Cloud State, St. Cloud, Minn.</td>
<td>William R. McCleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>St. Lawrence, Canton, N. Y.</td>
<td>Robert N. Manning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>St. Mary's, San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>James Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.</td>
<td>Orlando G. Baca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.</td>
<td>Merrill G. Christophersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.</td>
<td>Harold W. Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>John DeBross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>Southern Methodist, Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>Harold Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, Mo.</td>
<td>Holt Spicer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.</td>
<td>Kenneth E. Mosier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y.</td>
<td>Richard H. Wilkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>State Univ. of N. Y., Harpur College, Binghamton</td>
<td>Peter Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y.</td>
<td>Paul R. McKee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>Ralph Towne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Robert L. Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Texas, Austin, Texas</td>
<td>J. Rex Wier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Texas Technological, Lubbock, Texas</td>
<td>P. Merville Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Tufts, Medford, Mass.</td>
<td>Trevor Melia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Tulane, New Orleans, La.</td>
<td>Alex B. Lacey, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.</td>
<td>George A. Adamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>Rex E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Utah State, Logan, Utah</td>
<td>Randall M. Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Robert Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Vermont, Burlington, Vt.</td>
<td>John Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.</td>
<td>E. A. Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, Va.</td>
<td>Joseph O'Rourke, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Wabash, Crawfordsville, Ind.</td>
<td>Franklin R. Shirley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, N. C.</td>
<td>Herbert E. Metz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Washington, St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>Peter Kane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Chapter Name, Address</th>
<th>Faculty Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Washington, Seattle, Wash.</td>
<td>David Strouther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>Washington and Jefferson, Wash.</td>
<td>Robert J. Brindley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Washington State, Pullman, Wash.</td>
<td>Arthur B. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Wayne State, Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>George W. Ziegelmueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Waynesburg, Waynesburg, Pa.</td>
<td>A. M. Mintier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ</td>
<td>Weber State, Ogden, Utah</td>
<td>Robert Mukai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td>Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.</td>
<td>Bruce Markgraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Western Kentucky State, Bowling Green, Ky.</td>
<td>Randall Capps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, Mich.</td>
<td>Charles R. Helgesen,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deldee Herman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WN</td>
<td>Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Clair Henderlider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>Westminster, New Wilmington, Pa.</td>
<td>Walter E. Scheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.</td>
<td>William L. Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ</td>
<td>Whittier, Whittier, Calif.</td>
<td>George Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>Wichita State, Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>Mel Moorhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Willamette, Salem, Ore.</td>
<td>Howard W. Runkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.</td>
<td>Donald L. McConkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WU</td>
<td>Williams, Williamstown, Mass.</td>
<td>George G. Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.</td>
<td>Winston L. Brembeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>Raymond H. Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WX</td>
<td>Wittenberg, Springfield, Ohio</td>
<td>G. Vernon Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Wooster, Wooster, Ohio</td>
<td>Harry Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZ</td>
<td>Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.</td>
<td>Patrick Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XA</td>
<td>Xavier, Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Rev. Vincent C. Horrigan, S.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Yale, New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>Rollin G. Osterweis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YB</td>
<td>Yeshiva, New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>David Fleisher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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