

Complete Issue 4(4)

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



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

Recommended Citation

(1967). Complete Issue 4(4). *Speaker & Gavel*, 4(4), 81-134.

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 *Speaker & Gavel* by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

et al.: Complete Issue 4(4)

DONALD O. OLSON

speaker and gavel



volume 4, number 4

may, 1967

SPEAKER and GAVEL

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS
By ALLEN PRESS, INC.

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 order. 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-Tau Kappa Alpha."

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.** Individual key orders add 50c.



The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of *SPEAKER* and *GAVEL*. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive *SPEAKER* and *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 *SPEAKER* and *GAVEL* may subscribe at the following rates: \$1.50 per year for the standard subscription; \$5.00 per year for those who wish to sustain the work of *SPEAKER* and *GAVEL*; and \$25.00 for a lifetime subscription.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: LEROY T. LAASE, University of Nebraska
Vice President: JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California
Secretary: NICHOLAS M. CRIPE, Butler University
Treasurer: KENNETH G. HANCE, Michigan State University
Trustee: E. C. BUEHLER, University of Kansas
Historian: HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: JOHN A. LYNCH, St. Anselm's College; RAYMOND S. BEARD, New York State University at Cortland; GEORGE F. HENIGAN, George Washington University; JOSEPH C. WEATHERBY, Duke University; THEODORE J. WALWIK, Butler University; REX WIER, University of Texas; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; JOHN R. WENBURG, University of South Dakota; GEORGE ADAMSON, University of Utah; ROBERT GRIFFIN, University of Nevada.

Members at Large: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico; ANNABEL HAGOOD, University of Alabama; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University.

ACHS Representative: H. L. EWBANK, JR., Purdue University.

Representative on SAA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: AUSTIN J. FREELEY, John Carroll University.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: WAYNE BROCKRIEDE, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

Associate Editors: ROBERT L. SCOTT, University of Minnesota; DONALD L. TORRENCE, Knox College; ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 4	May, 1967	Number 4
Letters to the Editor		81
The President's Page— <i>Leroy T. Laase</i>		82
The Nature of Language: A Question of Ethics in Debating-Both-Sides— <i>Angela C. Crampton</i>		88
CURRENT CRITICISM: The Powell Affair— <i>Peter E. Kane</i>		93
Speaker of the Year and Distinguished Alumni Citations		100
NEWS FROM THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE		
The National Conference Staff		118
Results of Four-Man Debate		105
Results of Two-Man Debate		110
Results of Persuasive Speaking		115
Results of Extemporaneous Speaking		116
Minutes of the Student Congress		119
Minutes of the National Council Meetings		127
Region Eight Holds Tournament		126
Chapters and Sponsors		131

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

One of our debaters in research on the current topic uncovered the following statement made by General Maxwell D. Taylor in his book *The Uncertain Trumpet*. The frequency with which General Taylor is quoted on the current topic makes the statement especially interesting.

"I was asked recently what in my past experience had been most helpful to me as Chief of Staff. Was it attendance at the Command and Staff College and the Army War College? Was it service alongside General Marshall at the time of Pearl Harbor? Was it command of the 101st Airborne Division in Europe in World War II or of the Eighth Army in Korea? I never hesitated in replying, 'My most valuable preparation was membership in the Northeast High School Society of Debate in my pre-West Point days in Kansas City.' The subsequent chapters will show the reader why."

Very truly yours,
Michael C. McGee
Debate Coach, Cornell University

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

LEROY T. LAASE*

We are met here in the fourth annual Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha National Conference. We are especially indebted to George Ziegelmüller and his colleagues of Wayne State University for local arrangements. Hosting a conference of this kind is a big job, requiring many hours of careful advanced planning and filled with emergencies and last-minute requests. The smooth operation of this conference from here on out will depend largely on the cooperation of faculty and students. To Wayne State University, George Ziegelmüller, Austin Freeley, and every member of their committees who share responsibilities for this conference, we express our sincere gratitude and deep appreciation.

Dr. Wayne (Tex) Eubank, during his three-year term of office, reported annually on this occasion to the membership of the Society on "The State of the Union." In the first years of the merger of Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha, this was an appropriate title for the President's message. During the four years which have elapsed since the union of the two societies, a new student generation, who have known only the new united society, has come along. The two former organizations have now, in fact, become one. I speak to you now, therefore, under the title of "The State of the Society."

I shall organize my remarks under three captions: (1) the health of the Society; (2) the honors of the Society; and (3) the mission of the Society.

In general, the health of the Society is excellent. We number 198 chapters; have more than 20,000 members; and have 89 colleges and about 450 in attendance at this conference. This is our largest conference ever. Our finances are in good shape, thanks to wise investment of our capital funds by the Board of Trustees under the direction of National Trustee E. C. Buehler; the annual royalty income from the sale of the Society's textbook on debate, published under the capable editorship of our Vice President James McBath; the annual income from charter and initiation fees; the wise budgeting of your national council; and the careful disbursement of funds by National Treasurer Kenneth Hance.

Our journal, *Speaker and Gavel*, which combined the resources of the two former publications, has brought about savings in publication costs. Under the able editorship of Wayne Brockriede and his editorial staff, the quality of the publication has been raised with the introduction of a new feature, "Current Criticism." This innovation promises to make the journal a scholarly publication that is more than a mere house organ and a group of articles about forensics. We hope you like the new cover design of the March issue. The May issue will be filled with material that grows out of this conference. The quality of future issues will depend much on the extent and calibre of articles which you may submit to the editors for their consideration. We encourage faculty and students alike to submit research reports and scholarly essays of the nature appropriate for *Speaker and Gavel*.

* The "President's Page" in this issue is an address delivered by Dr. Laase at the DSR-TKA National Conference, Detroit, March 30, 1967.

The time has come, if your chapter has not already done so, for the election and initiation of new members. The health of our society is vitally tied up with its active membership. Tonight 78 of the potential new members for this year were initiated with a revised ritual designed to make its pageantry more impressive and its message more meaningful. If you have suggestions for the further refinement of the ritual, please send them to Dr. Herold Ross, Chairman of the Ritual Review Committee.

My biggest concern for the health of the Society is some thirty-three relatively weak and inactive chapters. Twenty-seven chapters have initiated no new members in the last year; six others have initiated only one. At present, once a charter is granted, we have only one applicable criterion for assessing the strength and activity of a chapter, namely, "the initiation of at least two new members during the last three years." This is not an adequate index. It doesn't identify chapters which are "sick" before they are "dead." Consequently, your Chapter Standards Committee, under the chairmanship of Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., has been asked to develop more adequate guidelines for assessing chapter strength. Conceivably, these guidelines might include such criteria as attendance at regional and/or national meetings; filing the annual chapter reports and otherwise handling chapter business and correspondence with the national officers; the maintenance of an active forensics program supported by at least a minimal budget; and the initiation of new members. This year, the regional governors have been striving to stimulate weak and relatively inactive chapters. Taking preventative measures to salvage weak chapters is much easier than reactivating totally inactive chapters. But failing in these precautionary efforts to save weak chapters, the health of the Society will be better for striking them from the active chapter rolls. To take their places are strong institutions with good forensics programs that would like to have chapters in Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. Several applications for charters are under consideration at this time. Some of these colleges are present as invited guests at this conference.

While on the subject of new chapters, I want to say a word about our sister fraternity, Pi Kappa Delta. In recent years, a large state university in the Southwest withdrew from our Society to obtain a chapter in Pi Kappa Delta. Conversely, I have received two inquiries from universities who say they have withdrawn from Pi Kappa Delta in order to apply for a chapter in Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. The officers of the two societies understand that, for reasons which may or may not seem justified, such requests for transfer from one Society to the other will from time to time arise. The two organizations have entered into a "gentleman's agreement" for handling such inquiries. The agreement, signed by the presidents of the two societies, includes the following two salient provisions: (1) Officers of both societies are enjoined from soliciting or encouraging chapter applications from institutions holding chapters of the other. (2) Applications for affiliation with either society will be accepted only after one calendar year has elapsed following written declaration of resignation by the appropriate administrative office of the society in which they previously were chartered. If contacts are made with you about transferring from one organization to the other, please abide by the spirit of this agreement, just as your officers must honor the commitments in that agreement. Encouraging a school to transfer from one society to the other is not conducive to good will between the two societies. In the interest of

promoting good will, your President, while enroute to this conference, stopped at Wisconsin State University in Whitewater, Wisconsin, where Pi Kappa Delta is meeting in its biennial convention, and at their opening session extended to them the greeting of this Society and our best wishes for a successful convention. In a similar expression of good will, Miss Georgia Bowman, National President of Pi Kappa Delta, will visit us here on Saturday and bring the official greeting and best wishes of Pi Kappa Delta to this Society.

More involvement at the Chapter level in the government of the Society is also needed for the health of the Society. Under our present organizational structure, although the chapters are asked to suggest nominees, the National Council elects the officers. The current provisions, which carry over from the former DSR and TKA constitutions, go back to a time before the annual spring conferences became a fixed part of both organizations' activities. Now that an annual spring conference is held, at which a meeting of chapter sponsors is scheduled, the National Council could nominate officers at its midyear meeting at the SAA convention, and the chapter representatives could elect the officers at the spring conference. Furthermore, chapter sponsors could be empowered to amend the Constitution and Bylaws. This procedure would increase chapter involvement and provide greater incentive for chapter interest and activity, thus making the government of the Society more responsible and representative. To this end, I am asking a committee to study the matter and, if this proposal seems to them as advisable as it seems to me, to propose the necessary constitutional amendments to implement the change.

So much for matters related to the health of the Society. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is truly a National Honor Society. It is the only national forensic society to hold the distinction of being a member of the Association of College Honor Societies. This recognition is possible because our membership criterion requires not only that a student participate at a high level of excellence in at least two years of forensic activity, but also that such a person rank scholastically in the upper 35% of his college class. Membership in Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is indeed an honor.

But the honors of the Society are not limited to membership alone. Distinguished Alumni Awards were presented this evening. Alumni who have gained distinction in their professions and have earned a reputation as "effective, intelligent, and responsible speakers" are cited for their accomplishments. We have just such recognition in the awards given tonight. Rupert Cortright, whom I have known throughout most of my professional career and who served on the joint committee which explored merger, is indeed a distinguished teacher. Theodore (Ted) Sorensen, Special Counsel to the late President Kennedy, is indeed a distinguished practitioner. What could be more appropriate than that these two awards should go this year to a distinguished teacher and a distinguished practitioner of the art of persuasion?

The highest honor of the Society awarded each year is the Speaker of the Year Award. This award goes to an individual, without reference to whether he is a member of the Society, whose speaking during the year exemplifies the "effective, intelligent, and responsible speech" for which Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha stands. The Speaker of the Year Committee has made its selection. The identity of the recipient will be revealed tomorrow night. The Committee, headed by James Golden, has

done its work well. The honoree represents another "first" among a group of eighteen distinguished recipients of this award.

Another award which carries the honors of the Society, more recent in its origin, less pretentious in its import, but highly significant to the student membership, is the Student Speaker of the Year Award. To solve problems inherent in current procedures for selecting award recipients, I have asked the joint faculty-student selection committee to review current procedures and see if they can devise a more satisfactory method of granting this award in the future. The award is perhaps the most significant honor any student member of DSR-TKA can earn. Our procedures in selection must make it so.

I have one more suggestion relating to the honors of the Society. Some students drop out of forensics as soon as they have earned the coveted membership. On the other hand, some chapter sponsors believe that membership is the Phi Beta Kappa of the forensic world and should be awarded only to seniors. Perhaps we might elect members in their sophomore year and provide still greater honors to which they could aspire, such as membership "with special distinction." Presumably, such an honor might be reserved for seniors with three or more years of forensic participation at a high level of excellence, or for attaining certain levels of achievement at the national conference. Detailed specifications for such recognition would need to be worked out carefully. I am asking the National Student Council to consider the principle of establishing a new honor of "membership with special distinction." If the Student Council endorses the idea, I will appoint an appropriate committee to draft a specific proposal to be presented to the National Council for their consideration and action.

From these matters related to the honors of the Society, let us now turn to our final consideration—the mission of the Society. Forensic training is one of the most valuable liberal education experiences which a student may have. Through participation in forensics, he develops research competence in the social sciences, disciplines himself in critical thinking, and develops effectiveness in the extempore command of language in the oral situation. In discussion, debate, and persuasive speaking, students gain experience, insight, and proficiency essential to problem-solving in a democracy. At community, state, and national levels, problems emerge; discussion ensues to determine the nature, causes, and seriousness of the problem; possible solutions are evaluated; eventually a proposed course of action emerges, such as a piece of legislation or a bond issue; after argument, ultimately a decision is made to accept or reject the proposal. Forensic training is clearly education for effective participation as a citizen in a democratic society.

The educational mission of our Society is clearly stated in Article II of the National Constitution of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha:

This Society is organized and operated exclusively for educational purposes. These purposes are: (1) to promote interest in, and to award suitable recognition for, excellence in forensics and original speaking; and (2) to foster a respect for, and an appreciation of, freedom of speech as a vital element of democracy.

These purposes are unmistakably clear and vitally important.

We sometimes seem in danger of forgetting that this Society exists "ex-

clusively for educational purposes.” Although we give lip service to the philosophy that discussion and debate are both tools in a democracy, we have virtually allowed discussion to drop out of our forensics programs. We rationalize that discussion is not suited to competition rather than trying to find ways to make it a useable forensic experience.

Near the close of World War II, Northwestern University played host to an invitational forensics meet on the subject “What shall be done with Germany and Japan after the War?” which incidentally was the question of the hour and totally unrelated to that year’s debate proposition. Each school entered four students. Two rounds of discussion permitted exploration of the problem in Round I and an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of possible courses of action in Round II. Quality ratings were assigned to each participant in each round by a critic judge. Then the students were assigned to groups of six for a round of persuasive speeches in which each student presented his or her idea of the best solution to the problem. Again quality ratings, supplemented by rank-order placement, were given by each of two judges. Faculty directors then formulated a proposition for debate on the next day. Directors assigned two of their participants to the affirmative and two to the negative, then went to a party at our host’s home, while the students prepared their cases for the next day’s debates. After five rounds of debate, superior debate teams and superior speakers were announced. Coming as it did at the end of a forensics season, without the assistance of forensic directors, the conference was truly an assessment of the students’ abilities to apply what they had learned in forensics to a new question in a new situation which combined discussion and debate on a new question.

For several years, Delta Sigma Rho sponsored an event with a similar format on a new question, differing primarily in that speakers after the rounds of discussion and persuasive speaking, drew colleagues for debate from other schools and were given their awards solely on the basis of their individual ratings. Students who participated were enthusiastic about their experience in combining discussion and debate on a new question.

You will recognize these as variations of the Forensic Progression. In the popular vote to determine which events should be included in our national conference, the Forensic Progression did not gain enough votes to warrant inclusion. I am not trying to make a case for the inclusion of the Forensic Progression in our conference program. I am concerned, however, that after a full season of debating, only 37 students accepted the challenge of a fresh and different type of forensic experience in the National Student Congress, an experience that combines discussion and debate in a natural setting. One can perhaps understand why schools qualifying for participation in the American Forensic Association-sponsored national tournament might want to enter two-man debate; but why should not more chapters be represented by more individuals who, not going to the AFA tournament, are entered in the National Student Congress, where they would profit much from this new type of forensic experience? Chapters from a long distance can enter a single representative who may also participate in extemporaneous or persuasive speaking.

The National Student Congress is on trial. Either more interest and participation in it must develop, or it will die as an event in our national conference. Surely, providing our students with new and different types

of forensic experience, especially at the end of the season, has educational merit. Has your chapter tried participation in the National Student Congress? Let's not let the Student Congress die without giving it a fair trial. Talk with the students who are participating in the Congress here. Assess their enthusiasm. (Editor's Note: See Congress Resolution #2 on p. 124 of this issue.) In our next national conference, which is to be held in Washington, D. C., let's make our National Student Congress an event that will inspire our students and command national attention.

The mission of our Society is to promote interest in and to award suitable recognition for excellence in forensics and original speaking; and to foster a respect for and an appreciation of freedom of speech as a vital element of a democracy. That statement of purpose does not limit the mission of our Society to promote interest in debate alone, but to encourage a broad forensic experience. Can we justify to educators limiting our forensics program to tournament debating when students might also profit from other kinds of forensic experience? Can we justify to administrators spending almost all of our forensic budget on two or four students in preparation for the remote possibility of achieving a national championship? Can we justify spending an entire season in tournament debating before a judge and an otherwise empty room without giving those students experience in discussion before live audiences? Can we justify debating a single question all year when students might learn more from some experience with a second or even more questions?

I am not opposed to competitive debating. During the first ten years of my experience as a forensic director, I was as aggressive a campaigner in competitive debate as any coach of that time. My debate teams and speakers won a number of national honors. But more than a minimum number of students participated. At the very time I was actively involved in competitive forensics, in 1937, I was pleading for a variety of forensic experiences and for the involvement of as large a number of students as could profit from the experience and as we could handle. I am pleading for *sanity* in the forensics programs of our DSR-TKA chapters. I am asking that we guard jealously the kind of public image which fellow educators and administrators have of us. *I am not criticizing the things you are doing; I am criticizing what many of you are not doing.* I ask you to provide examples of educationally sound forensics programs. The Chapters of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha should be leaders, not followers, in forensic trends.

This is the end of my message, but I hope that it may not end the impact of what I have said tonight. I have reported to you on the health of the Society—let's try to improve it. I have considered the honors of the Society—let's try to upgrade them. I have discussed the mission of the Society—let's work on it. Not all of you will agree with everything I have said, but I hope you will respect me for saying what I believe. I can only hope that I may have stimulated your thinking about the state of the Society, and that some action will be taken by individual members, by chapter sponsors, by the Student Council, and by the National Council to build an even better and stronger Society.

THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE: A QUESTION OF ETHICS IN DEBATING-BOTH-SIDES

ANGELA C. CRAMPTON*

The controversy over a student's arguing both sides of a question in tournament debating is certainly not a new one. This practice has been labeled a corrupt educational tool, a shallow game, a truncated skill; it has been accused of fostering sophistry; it has been designated unethical. Defenders of the practice have contended that debating-both-sides offers training in critical thinking, develops man's capacity for logical analysis, serves as preparation for future decision-making, and is entirely ethical or is amoral.

The following discussion is not meant to review the previous attacks and defenses of the debating-both-sides issue. The purpose of this paper is to consider the ethics of debating-both-sides through an examination of the nature of language in relation to individual commitment, personal value judgments, and responsibility for the spoken word.

If the ideas on debate and language presented here are valid, an alteration in forensic instruction, as well as a reinterpretation of the ethics of debate, is warranted.

An examination of the uses and effects of language, and its ramifications for the ethics of debating-both-sides, requires definitions. First of all, debating-both-sides is that high school or college activity in which speakers publicly argue both sides of a policy question in a competitive atmosphere, the culmination of which is the declaration of a winner by a critic judge. Second, ethics refers to those standards of responsible speech implied by classical and contemporary rhetoricians. Karl Wallace specifies four such standards: (1) the speaker's duty of search and inquiry, (2) his allegiance to accuracy and fairness, (3) his individual expression of motive in speaking, and (4) his toleration of dissent.¹ And lastly, language is that medium of communication, which, unlike a numerical system, uses symbols in a personal, emotional, and connotative, as well as denotative, manner.

From classical times to the present, rhetoricians have been concerned with debate, ethics, and language. The rhetorician of today, however, has been criticized for researching and treating each of these areas as separate entities, isolated from one another. He has been accused of failing to assimilate this material into a unified, working concept for his discipline. Many texts in debate, for example, delegate a final chapter to a brief discussion of "ethics"—i.e., warnings against slander, plagiarizing, etc.; most texts in the field do not discuss the subject at all. And as for language, at least one prominent individual, I. A. Richards, charges that for the most part contemporary rhetoricians and their theories disregard the workings of words in discourse. Richards contends that language is a reflection of its user; that dictionary meanings are a guide, rather than an absolute confirmation, of the speaker's intent; that word meanings are nearly worthless out of context. The contention that today's rhetoricians ignore

* Mrs. Crampton is a graduate student at California State College, Los Angeles.

¹ "An Ethical Basis of Communication," *Speech Teacher*, IV (Jan., 1955), 6-9.

such aspects of language is a serious one; Richards' ideas on language are worth relating to the issue of debating-both-sides.

Richards asserts that word meanings are peculiar because "they do so mind their companions."² He denies the "Doctrine of Usage," the idea that a word has a specific meaning of its own, "independent of . . . the use and purpose for which it is uttered," and contends that meanings change from context to context. The stability of a word's definition depends upon the constancy of the contexts, not something to be assumed, he says, "but always something to be explained." Debating-both-sides, however, seems to uphold the "Doctrine of Usage" by asking students to use words as objective symbols, disregarding not only their contexts, but their effects and implications as well.³ The debater is taught to defend one side of an issue at 9:00 a.m. and demolish that same argument at 10:00 a.m. He is told that debate is an exchange of logical faculties, and that personal feeling has no place in such an exchange. He is taught that words are a means of expressing "reason," not of expressing himself.

Richards, of course, does not disregard the role of logic in thought, decision-making, and rhetoric. According to Richards, the function of logic is "to control both the emotional and conceptual elements in the process [of abstraction] in a way that ensures the proper, realistic, and balanced whole meaning of an event."⁴ Any such abstraction is mental activity having both external and internal contexts when expressed. Debating-both-sides tends to ignore the above ideas by attributing to "logic" the dubious quality of "objective purity."

Finally, according to Richards, speech may be viewed from four vantage points: Sense, Feeling, Tone, and Intention. By Sense, he means the direction of our words in relation to the expectations of the listeners. By Feeling, he means the speaker's attitude toward the subject he is discussing; Richards insists that a person "uses language to *express* these feelings." The speaker arranging his language in response to his audience is the aspect of Tone. And by Intention, Richards means one's purpose in speaking, asserting that it may modify one's speech, that it "controls the plot in the largest sense of the word."⁵ The modern debate coach, however, often appears to regard such aspects of language as unnecessary frills. The debater is advised to ignore such subtleties, and is trained to construct a logical argument with only slight consideration for Sense, Feeling, Tone, or Intention. But because these aspects of language are always at work in communication, this training will necessarily fall short of its goal.

Debating-both-sides has attempted to make itself an activity dedicated to objective reasoning, to "pure" logic. And if such an activity were possible, no controversy over its ethics would have developed. The controversy

² *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 10.

³ See Austin J. Freeley, *Argumentation and Debate* (San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1961); James H. McBath (ed.), *Argumentation and Debate* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963); Don Geiger, "The Humanistic Direction of Debate," *Speech Teacher*, XIV (March, 1965), 101-106; and Russel R. Windes, Jr., "Competitive Debating: The Speech Program, the Individual, and Society," *Speech Teacher*, IX (March, 1960), 99-108.

⁴ Cited in Daniel J. Fogarty, *Roots for a New Rhetoric* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959), p. 35.

⁵ *Practical Criticism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1954), pp. 180, 181, 192, 183, 207.

arises when one considers that debating-both-sides is an activity that involves human minds, minds that cannot divorce their values, opinions, and attitudes from their language. In effect, subjectivity cannot be divorced from oral expression.

Subjective judgments are not merely an adjunct of rhetoric. Karl Wallace asserts that the "basic materials of discourse [including debate] are ethical and moral values and information pertinent to these."⁶ Value judgments are not based on rationality alone; the debater cannot escape such assessments. The affirmative argues the evils of the status quo; the negative argues the evils of the proposed change. According to Wallace, the debater's explanation of the evils of a situation "cannot avoid value judgments, and even his facts that support explanation function in a context of values." The oral expression of a "fact" is preceded by the speaker's interpretation of that fact's meaning. Interpretation is determined by the speaker's subjective judgments.

The wording of the debate proposition itself demands a decision that is based on values. In effect, propositions of policy are judgments expressed in words that allege or deny that a certain course of action *should* be taken. These judgments demand personal interpretations which are, intentionally or not, subjective. Recognizing the inherent subjectivity of words, E. C. Buehler charges that "debaters and their coaches become so engrossed in the cold, mechanical skills of debating, that they often neglect the subtleties of persuasion that indirectly envelop the activity."⁷ Therefore, tournament debate in general, and debating-both-sides in particular, in recognizing the subjectivity of language and the subtleties of persuasion, would do well to keep in mind Kenneth Burke's definition of man: "Man is not just a rational animal. He is a symbol-using animal; because his use of symbols is what makes him specifically different from other animals."⁸

The attempt to use words without regard for the speaker, and devoid of persuasive elements, not only turns debate into a game, it also ignores the "whole" man—man as both a rational and emotional being. In the process of arriving at a "reasoned" decision, man is subject to the influence of his own persuasion; he mentally debates the pros and cons of a subject, eliminating alternatives, until he makes a final choice. Choice implies action; action implies commitment. The primary concern here is the effect of language on the debater, on his own choice of words, and on those of his colleagues and opponents. Language is not a passive instrument. Richard Weaver cites the *Phaedrus* to distinguish the goals of language. According to Plato, words are used to gain three distinct ends: to move for good, to move for evil, or not to move at all.⁹ Hermann Stelzner deposits the language of tournament debate into Plato's final category, because it attempts to avoid as much as possible any ethical or emotional terminology, any personal entanglement with the subject matter involved.¹⁰ But is this possible? I think not. As Weaver states,

⁶ "Substance of Rhetoric: Good Reasons," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLIX (Oct., 1963), 240.

⁷ "The Role of Opinion as Related to Persuasion and Contest Debate," *Southern Speech Journal*, XXV (Fall, 1959), 25.

⁸ *A Rhetoric of Motives* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 146.

⁹ *Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1953), p. 6.

¹⁰ "Tournament Debate: Emasculated Rhetoric," *Southern Speech Journal*, XXVII (Fall, 1961), 38.

"While you are doing something with it [language], it is doing something to you, or with your intent."¹¹ This is exemplified in any situation that arises when decision-making is imperative. You tell yourself, "Yes, I do support the President's stand in Vietnam," or "No, I won't spend the money for those outrageous theatre prices." This process of talking ourselves into or out of a course of action occurs on both the mental and vocal levels of self-communication, and cannot be ignored. L. S. Vygotsky states, "The meaning of a word represents such a close amalgam of thought and language, that it is hard to tell whether it is a phenomenon of speech or a phenomenon of thought."¹²

If these premises that language is by nature persuasive, and that choice of words reflects the user, are accepted, what are the implications for debating-both-sides? What are the implications for personal commitment and responsibility for the spoken word? The most obvious implication is that debating-both-sides denies both the nature of language and the nature of man. Language cannot be used in a purely denotative, definitive, or logical sense; every word, every sentence, carries with it the personal interpretation of, and significance for, its speaker. Man cannot detach his values, attitudes, and opinions—his emotional being from his communication.

Many debate coaches hold that tournament debate does not constitute a public commitment, that the question of responsibility for the spoken word is irrelevant.¹³ Whether the tournament is labeled "public" or not, however, the activity is designed to express arguments for and against a given proposition publicly, i.e., in the presence of at least four other persons not in the confines of a classroom. Must not the debate coaches seriously consider Weaver's statement that "any utterance is a major responsibility"? Must not the debate coaches seriously consider the ethical stand they are taking when they ask students to argue against their convictions? Instructors in forensics often complain about the lack of interest in tournament debate by faculty, students, and community, but the tournament as a playground for debaters does not have much appeal; the tournament as an activity designed to expose all sides of an important problem by those who are committed to their arguments has much to offer.

Several conclusions derived from the preceding discussion seem warranted.

Most importantly, I believe, asking students to debate both sides of a proposition regardless of commitment (and commitment must be taken to mean the student's values, opinions, and general outlook) in tournament debate is aiming for impossible as well as questionable goals. For what is really being asked is that the student step outside himself and "deliver the facts" in much the same way as a computer. Perhaps unfortunately, man simply cannot use language in that manner. Probably the closest one can get to arriving at an "objective" definition of a word is to look it up out of context in a dictionary. As soon as words are strung together to form a sentence, that sentence stimulates connotative as well as denotative meanings. The words man uses and the way he uses them is dictated by

¹¹ Weaver, p. 116.

¹² *Thought and Language* (Cambridge, Mass.: M. I. T. Press, 1962), p. 120.

¹³ See Douglas Ehninger, "Debate about Debating," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLIV (April, 1958), 128-36; and Donald K. Smith, "Debating Both Sides," *Speech Teacher*, VI (Nov., 1957), 336.

personal choice, and personal choice is dominated by individual commitment. To assert that language can be used without reference to individual commitment is to assume the presence of an ability that the human animal does not possess.

Another question continues to be raised—who assumes responsibility for public statements in tournament debate? Many debate coaches seem to ignore this question, deeming it irrelevant; debaters tend to think it an unnecessary consideration. But the implications of any ethical code of responsible speech demand that this question be answered.

Further study of the debate-both-sides practice, its goals, uses, and effects is needed before unequivocally determining its ethical status. In respect to the material presented here, however, debating-both-sides is inadequate as an educational tool and unethical as a rhetorical practice: the former because it disregards the value factors inherent in language and fails to consider the “whole” man and a “whole” rhetoric; the latter because it does not recognize the forces and effects of personal commitment and does not realize the speaker’s responsibility.

CURRENT CRITICISM

Edited by DONALD L. TORRENCE

THE POWELL AFFAIR

PETER E. KANE*

One of the more interesting legislative debates in recent years took place on the floor of the United States House of Representatives on the afternoon of March 1, 1967. The question debated that afternoon was that of the seating of Representative Adam Clayton Powell, eleven-term Negro Congressman from Harlem. The following will examine the context in which the debate took place and then the debate itself.

One of the most important but unspoken problems to face the Ninetieth Congress is the marked decline of public confidence in the legislative branch of the Federal government. Public opinion surveys clearly show increasing doubts about the competence and integrity of Congress. The origins of these doubts are twofold. First, the archaic procedures used by Congress are not adequate to meet the demands placed upon a national legislature in the mid-twentieth century. Second, the abuse of personal power by individuals and groups of Congressmen has tarnished the reputation of the entire legislature.¹ On the Senate side of the hill the problem has been confronted in the extended debate on legislative reorganization. On the House side the problem was personified in Adam Clayton Powell.

Representative Powell was first elected to Congress by his Harlem constituency in 1944. Over the years he served without any particular distinction until the inexorable passage of time and the rules of seniority brought him to the chair of the House Education and Labor Committee. Under his chairmanship this committee brought to the floor of the House many of the major pieces of legislation upon which President Johnson's "Great Society" is based.

Like many other Congressmen, Representative Powell used his position to further his own as well as the public's welfare. Traditionally Congress has ignored the fairly common practices of "investigation" trips to popular resorts and relatives on Congressional payrolls. Such practices were in effect viewed as normal perquisites of the office. In addition any moral wrongdoing was either just ignored or actually covered up as Congressmen protected fellow members of the club. This latter posture is probably no better illustrated than in the House reaction last year to published comments about Representative L. Mendel Rivers' drinking problem. Rivers' appearance on the House floor following this disclosure was greeted with a standing ovation.²

The essential difference between the Powell case and that of other Congressmen is one of publicity. Other representatives convicted on more serious charges have continued their Congressional careers with little notice.³ Unlike his colleagues, Powell was never particularly circumspect

* Mr. Kane is Director of Forensics and Instructor of Speech at Harpur College.

¹ Theodore Sorensen, "Reforming Congress," *Saturday Review*, XLIX (July 16, 1966), 22.

² "Vote for Non-Leadership," *Time*, LXXVII (June 24, 1966), 24.

³ "No Home in the House," *Time*, LXXXIX (March 10, 1967), 20.

about his activities. The hiring of beauty queen Corinne Huff as an Administrative Assistant for his committee staff and the many trips he took with her were widely publicized. His real problems began, however, with his loss of a libel suit to one of his Harlem constituents. In a major strategic error Powell refused to pay the judgment against him. Continued adjudication of this dispute not only increased the judgment fourfold and resulted in contempt citations, but also attracted even greater public attention to himself and his activities.⁴ Powell's legal problems eventually reached the point where he was unable to enter his home state because of outstanding warrants for his arrest.

The Powell situation was complicated by his race. Although he is only in small part of Negro origin and could probably "pass" as white, Powell has identified himself as a Negro and is identified in the public mind as a Negro. His position in Congress made him the most politically powerful Negro in the country. As such he became the symbol of success and "Black Power" for many.

Following his 1966 re-election in which he won 74% of the vote cast without ever appearing in his Congressional district, a subcommittee of the House Administration Committee began an investigation of Powell's activities. The hearings under committee chairman Wayne L. Hays, Ohio Democrat, revealed questionable expenditures of travel funds and that Powell's wife, listed by her maiden name as Administrative Assistant on his Congressional staff, had been living in Puerto Rico, had done no work, and had not received her pay checks although someone had signed and cashed them.⁵

One of the fundamental issues involved in the Powell case arose during this hearing. In response to a request to cooperate, Representative Powell stated that he would do so providing the committee expand its investigation to include other representatives and House committees. In rejecting these conditions for cooperation, the subcommittee lent weight to the charge that the House was out to get Powell rather than eliminate questionable practices.⁶

The formal recognition of Representative Powell's activities led to demands that the House take action against him. On January 3 the House Administration Committee issued a twelve-point report of their findings.⁷ On the basis of these findings Representative Lionell Van Deerlin, California Democrat, stated that he would challenge Powell's right to be sworn when the Ninetieth Congress convened.⁸ The House Democratic Party leadership suggested alternative punishment. The party caucus might strip Powell of his seniority rights and chairmanship as it had Representatives John Bell Williams of Mississippi and Albert W. Watson of South Carolina who had supported Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential election.⁹ In response Powell issued a statement in which he charged that

⁴ *The New York Times* for 1965 ran more than sixty separate articles on Powell's legal problems.

⁵ "Adam & Yvette," *Time*, LXXXIX (Feb. 24, 1967), 18.

⁶ "Powell Actions," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, XXIV (Dec. 23, 1966), 3068.

⁷ *The New York Times*, January 4, 1967, p. 1.

⁸ "Unseating Powell," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, XXIV (Jan. 13, 1967), 26.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

his critics were "motivated by the desire to politically castrate one of America's most powerful Negroes."¹⁰ With this charge Representative Powell made explicit the racial dimension of the case.

The Democratic caucus on January 9 voted to replace Representative Powell as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee but took no action on his seniority.¹¹ The hope that this step would head off any further disciplinary action was not realized. The following day Powell was asked to stand aside while the rest of the House took the oath of office. Representative Van Deerlin was prevented from moving that Powell be barred by the motion introduced by Representative Morris K. Udall, Arizona Democrat, which would postpone the seating of Representative Powell for 60 days so that a select committee could investigate and make recommendations to the House. The Udall motion was passed by a 363 to 65 roll call vote. The 65 representatives opposing the resolution and supporting the seating of Powell were all Democrats.¹²

On February 8 Representative Powell appeared before the nine-member committee selected by House Speaker John W. McCormack, Massachusetts Democrat. Powell's lawyers introduced a series of motions challenging the right of the committee to examine their client. The most important of these six motions maintained that the committee had the right to consider only the constitutional requirements of age, citizenship, and inhabitancy. Powell refused to say anything to the committee other than that he was born in New Haven, Connecticut, in 1908, had moved to New York City when he was six months old, and lived at 120 West 138th Street. Although the select committee rejected his six motions, Powell had again succeeded in raising a fundamental issue. Since Article I, Section 2, of the Constitution lists only age, citizenship, and residence as requirements for holding the office of Representative, Powell maintained that he could be barred only on one of these grounds. He interpreted Article I, Section 5, "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members," to mean that the legitimacy of his election could be examined, but this point had not been challenged.¹³ In the area of the legal powers of the House there were no clear precedents. In 1900 the House excluded Representative-Elect Brigham H. Roberts, Utah Democrat, because he was an admitted polygamist.¹⁴ In 1933 it seated Representative-Elect Francis H. Shoemaker, Minnesota Farmer-Laborite, even though he had been convicted and sentenced to prison.¹⁵ The other cases of House action also failed to provide a clear precedent.

In its report of February 23 the Select Committee noted that Representative Powell had fulfilled the constitutional qualifications for office but was guilty of improper conduct. The committee recommended that Powell be seated and formally censured. Further, he should pay \$40,000 as partial restitution of misappropriated funds, and all prior seniority rights should

¹⁰ "Powell's Statement," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, XXV (Jan. 13, 1967), 50.

¹¹ "Powell Loses Chairmanship; Seat in Doubt," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, XXV (Jan. 13, 1967), 47.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ "Powell Strategy Raises Constitutional Questions," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, XXV (Feb. 17, 1967), 247-48.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 248.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

be removed. Finally, the committee recommended investigations of the activities of other representatives and House committees.¹⁶ This report which was the subject of the March 1 debate managed to deal with three of the four issues in the Powell case. Powell would be severely punished for his public wrongdoing. Since he would be seated, the constitutional question would not be resolved. The call for other investigations answered the charge that Powell had been singled out for punishment. This call in part answered the racial charge which could in fact only be fully denied if the House took no punitive action. These last two points were underlined by Representative John Conyers, Jr., Michigan Democrat, the Negro member of the Select Committee, who stated that he would discount personal and racial bias if the House did in fact investigate and punish other members.¹⁷

The context of the debate on the floor of the House, therefore, was whether to accept the report of the Select Committee. In opening the two-hour debate, Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler, New York Democrat, made three points. First, he asked "that we set all passions aside" and reach a decision on a strictly legal and rational basis.¹⁸ Second, the punishment called for in the report was severe.

Censure is a dreadful act to contemplate. Imagine, if you will, yourself walking down the aisle of this Chamber accompanied by the Sergeant at Arms, and in the well of the House listening to the strictures placed upon you by the Speaker in the presence of your colleagues.¹⁹

Third, Representative Celler noted not only that exclusion or expulsion would be an easy punishment in comparison to censure, but also that such action would lead the House into highly questionable constitutional considerations. He noted that both Madison and Hamilton in the Federalist papers had stated that the House did not have the right to set qualifications for its own membership.²⁰

The ranking Republican member of the Select Committee, Representative Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia, spoke in support of all three of these points and added a fourth. In opposition to exclusion he pointed out, "If we turn him out, his constituency will turn him back with an even greater majority."²¹ This well-taken point was one which failed to receive the consideration it deserved. At the end of the debate the question of what the House would do if Adam Clayton Powell were re-elected had not been answered.

Only one real attempt to deal with the problem posed by Representative Moore was made. Representative Clarence D. Long, Maryland Democrat, speaking against seating Representative Powell, said, "Any responsibility for returning Mr. Powell to his seat should rest on his constituents and the House should not assume in advance that they will not live up to that responsibility."²² While this solution was logically valid, it ignored the political realities of the situation. No objective political

¹⁶ *The New York Times*, Feb. 24, 1967, p. 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ U. S., *Congressional Record*, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 1967, H1919.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, H1920.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*, H1921.

²² *Ibid.*, H1922.

observer could claim that Harlem would not re-elect Powell if he were a candidate.

Representative Long went on to examine the constitutional arguments which had been advanced in favor of accepting the committee report. He pointed out that no court had ever considered previous exclusions.

Two strong doctrines, in fact, militate against such court consideration.

First is the doctrine of separation of powers; the Constitution provides that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members.

Second is the political questions doctrine. The courts will not handle questions inherently in the power of other coordinate branches at the same level of Government.²³

Except for reiterating that Powell met the constitutional requirements of age, citizenship, and residency, Representative Long's argument went unchallenged. As he himself had pointed out, no precedents provided guidance in this area. However, the supporters of the committee report might have called attention to the whole principle of judicial review. Review and often reversal of contempt of Congress citations suggests that the courts can review not only legislation but other actions of Congress as well.

The emotionalism which Representative Celler sought to avoid was nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the speech of Representative Watson, who had become a Republican since the removal of his seniority by the Democratic caucus in 1965.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not deciding the fate of one Adam Clayton Powell. Indeed, we are deciding the fate of this House of Representatives.

.
The public knows that Powell is guilty; the public knows that he is a fugitive from justice. The public knows that he has flaunted and flouted the courts of the great State of New York. The public knows that he is charged with defrauding the taxpayers of the United States of America. The public knows that he had the responsibility as a Member of this body to conduct himself in such manner as to reflect credit both upon this body and the people of this country. The public knows that he is not on trial; but, no, you and I are on trial. . . .

.
Mr. Speaker, much has been said here about "annihilation by humiliation." We cannot believe Powell can be humiliated. Is there a humiliating bone in the body of the man under discussion? Has he displayed any repentance or given any indication that he is regretful? Why, even at this moment, Mr. Speaker, as we are debating this agonizing and difficult issue, where is Adam Clayton Powell? As far as I know he is down in Bimini with a glass in one hand and a woman in the other. Can you think a man so calloused to his fate today can be humiliated? Certainly none could logically contend that.²⁴

In this highly emotive manner Representative Watson made one of the few explicit references in the entire debate to the underlying question in the Powell case: declining public confidence in Congress.

In keeping with Representative Celler's original request, none of the

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, H1923.

supporters of the committee report responded emotionally to the remarks of Representative Watson. One committee member, Republican Charles M. Teague of California, commented obliquely as follows:

Mr. Speaker, several Members on both sides of the aisle have told me within the last few days that they are satisfied that the recommendations of the select committee are sound and should be adopted but they were afraid that they could not vote to do so. They said that their mail was 100 to 1 to "throw the rascal out" and that under this kind of pressure, it would be most difficult for them to vote to seat Adam Clayton Powell even with the severe punishment we have suggested.

I am sure that we have all read John F. Kennedy's book "Profiles in Courage." Perhaps some small amount of courage might be required to vote to seat, censure, and punish Mr. Powell, but I suggest not much.²⁵

The most significant element in Representative Teague's remark is that it, like Representative Watson's statement, underlines the factor of the publicity which Powell's wrongdoing received. Both the well-reported hearings and Representative Powell's own lack of discretion had created public awareness and interest which manifested itself in forceful public demand for corrective action.

The longest speech of the debate was made by Representative Conyers, the Negro member of the Select Committee. In this speech Conyers reviewed again the constitutional arguments for seating Powell and went on to examine in detail prior cases of House censure for financial misconduct. These cases showed that in situations similar to the Powell case the House had found censure alone to be a suitable punishment. Conyers, in fact, objected to the proposed punishment beyond censure and suggested that the punishment and the public pressure for it were at least in part racially motivated. He concluded by calling attention to the special role which Powell plays in the American scene.

But there is something else about Adam Powell, the symbol of Negro America, a personal hero of mine, that makes this a tragedy that I cannot do other than make sure every Member on this floor is perfectly cognizant of before we, hopefully, vote for the previous question here today.

The Congressman Adam Clayton Powell is a false caricature of the Powell, to whom the churches, the synagogues, the labor unions and educational institutions—not just black Americans but all Americans—owe an unparalleled debt for the unexcelled legislation that has been in the House of Representatives under his leadership as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

It is Adam Clayton Powell who has steered through the Manpower Development Training Act, the antipoverty bill, the Juvenile Delinquency Act, the Vocational Education Act, the National Defense Education Act and all of these bills which have redounded to the benefit not only of Negro Americans but to the benefit of all Americans.²⁶

A short time after Representative Conyers finished speaking the two hours allotted for debate expired. Representative Celler's motion to end debate and vote on the committee report was defeated 202 to 222.²⁷

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1924.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1929.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 1941-42.

Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri Republican, then offered an amendment as a substitute for the committee report. The amendment flatly excluded Representative Powell from the Ninetieth Congress.²⁸ Two arguments were presented by Representative Curtis and others in support of this amendment. The first, the "throw the rascal out" argument, consisted of a review of the wrongdoings of Adam Clayton Powell. The second dealt with the legality of exclusion. Neither argument was developed beyond what had already been stated. Representative Curtis moved the previous question which was carried by a 263 to 161 vote. The amendment was agreed to by a vote of 248 to 176, and the amended report passed 307 to 116. On the key vote to accept the amendment the Democrats were about evenly split while the Republicans voted better than two to one in support of the amendment. The formal leadership of both parties voted with the minority.²⁹

As is often the case in legislative debating, the consideration and disposition of the case of Adam Clayton Powell in the House of Representatives settled little. While his lawyers are pursuing the matter in the courts, Powell with great ease won re-election in the special election to fill his vacant seat. Until such time as the courts act it will not be known if the House can exclude a member on grounds other than age, citizenship, residency, or validity of election. Reaction to the Powell exclusion demonstrates that a great many people consider the action racially motivated. While race did play a part, there is no way to know exactly how important a part. One answer to this question will be found in degree of diligence exercised by the House in exposing and punishing other wrongdoers. Already the Powell case has resulted in the introduction of almost one hundred different proposals for establishing a code of ethics, a permanent investigating committee, and/or standard procedures for punishing wayward representatives.³⁰ If something were to come of these proposals, a major step might be taken toward the restoration of public confidence in the Congress.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 1942.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, H1955-57.

³⁰ *The New York Times*, March 17, 1967, p. 13.

SPEAKER OF THE YEAR, 1966: EDWARD W. BROOKE



EDWARD W. BROOKE

The following citation was presented at the DSR-TKA Conference Banquet, March 31, 1967, by Professor James L. Golden, Ohio State University, Chairman of the Speaker of the Year Board:

The Speaker of the Year Board of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is proud to announce that the winner of the award for 1966 is Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts. Senator Brooke stands squarely in the tradition of other outstanding American leaders who have received this honor since Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha initiated the awards in 1949. Among those who have been named in recent years are John F. Kennedy, Billy Graham, Eric Sevareid, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Leroy Collins, and J. William Fulbright. These speakers, demonstrating wisdom and courage, have fulfilled the hope expressed by Aristotle when he said that rhetoric should strive mightily to make "truth and justice prevail."

Senator Brooke was born in Washington, D.C., in 1919. After attending the public schools in the District of Columbia, he received his B.S. degree from Howard University in 1940. During World War II he served as a 2nd Lieutenant in Italy where he won the Bronze Star for bravery in battle. At the close of the war he entered Boston University Law School, earning his L.L.B. degree in 1948 and L.L.M. degree in 1949. Fourteen years later he was awarded an honorary J.D. degree from Portia Law School in Boston.

In 1950 and 1952 Edward Brooke, now interested in public life, was defeated as the Republican candidate for representative to the lower house of the Massachusetts Legislature. During the presidential election year of 1960 he was his party's nominee for the office of Secretary of State, but lost in a close contest. These three successive defeats were then followed by three impressive victories—two as Attorney General in 1962

and 1964, and one as United States Senator. Despite the fact that his opponent represented the majority party, Mr. Brooke's victory margin in 1966 was 438,712, or 62% of the vote. Thus he became the first member of his race to win a popular election to the United States Senate.

Perhaps more than most of his contemporaries, Senator Brooke personifies the recent resurgence of the Republican Party. Discouraged by the results of the 1964 campaign, he wrote a provocative book entitled *The Challenge of Change*. In this work he chided his colleagues for "offering too little to too many beyond weary sterile slogans." The time has come, he said, for "the concept of positive, creative government" which scorns such meaningless generalities and platitudes as "free enterprise system," "Washington bureaucracy," "the sanctity of the individual," and the "danger of creeping socialism." While these clichés may "win cheers from the supporters and convince a candidate of his oratorical prowess," continued Mr. Brooke, "in the long run, they cause the skeptical and uncommitted to believe that the candidate is barren of ideas." He concluded his challenge with these words: "We need nothing so much as we need debate, criticism, and reappraisal." By focusing national attention on the plight of the Republican Party, and by inspiring moderate leaders to incorporate into their speeches fresh ideas which would attract intellectual talent, youthful energy, and minority groups, he contributed significantly to the restoration of a two-party system in our government.

If Senator Brooke symbolizes the hopes of those Republicans who want their party to become broader and more creative, he also epitomizes the aspirations of those civil rights leaders who feel that an individual should be measured by the strength of his intellect and character, not by his membership in a race. In his brilliant election night speech in November, delivered extemporaneously and without notes, he confidently asserted that "the people of Massachusetts judge you on your merit and your worth alone. The people of this state have answered all the George Rockwells and all those who would divide us." And he pledged himself "to merit the faith of the people in me as a man."

The national influence of our Speaker of the Year spans only a few years. Yet he has already built a reputation as a creative leader and articulate speaker who seeks bold, concrete solutions to difficult problems. Wisely he refuses to speak unless he has first studied a subject in depth. Lacking first-hand information on Viet Nam following his election to the Senate, he ignored secondary sources based upon Administration speeches and press releases, and journeyed to Saigon. Moreover, he sought permission to visit Hanoi. Even upon his return he refrained from discussing his trip until all of his facts were carefully analyzed. When Senator Brooke finally delivered his maiden speech on the crucial issue of Viet Nam, the *Washington Star* praised him as a man who "thinks before he speaks," and suggested that he possesses the rare political talent of changing an established position if the facts warrant it. The editor then concluded that Massachusetts "has picked itself a senator of which it, and the nation, can be justifiably proud."

The American people have responded warmly to Senator Brooke's political philosophy and to his worth as a man. Since his election he has received 350 letters a day, and 700 requests each month for speaking engagements. To many of these supporters Mr. Brooke is a circumspect leader who moves with caution, yet courage. To others he is an attractive

and appealing political figure who inspires minority groups to move forward by improving their mind, their body, and their ambition; and who urges them "to win allies, not conquer adversaries." To the members of the Speaker of the Year Board he is a man who has spoken with intelligence, responsibility, and effectiveness on vital issues of the day.

DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARD, 1966



THEODORE C. SORENSEN*

Born and raised in Lincoln, Nebraska, lawyer, lecturer, author, Presidential Special Counsel. His membership to Phi Beta Kappa, Order of Coif, Editor in Chief of the *Nebraska Law Review*, and the number one graduate of his class from the University of Nebraska College of Law: all are testimonials to his scholarship. During his undergraduate days, he was an outstanding participant in many forensic activities and credits this training as being particularly helpful in all of his activities since graduation. As Special Counsel to the late President John F. Kennedy, he assisted in the decision-making which affected both the United States and the world. He took an active part in phrasing Presidential messages and speeches. It is fitting that Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha honor him as one of its "Distinguished Alumni."

* The citation honoring Mr. Sorensen was presented at a Conference Banquet, March 30, 1967, by Professor Lillian Wagner, State College of Iowa, Chairman of the Distinguished Alumni Award Committee. Mr. Sorensen was unable to attend the conference and sent his regrets to Professor Leroy Laase in the following telegram: "Deeply regret my inability to receive in person an award I gratefully acknowledge. No other phase of my college career taught me the skills of analyzing a problem, organizing a solution, and articulating a presentation as much as debate and other Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha activities, and no other quality is more needed in the United States today than the kind of constructive and informed dialogue on current problems which your organization encourages. Best wishes to you and Don Olson."

Ted Sorensen

DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA
DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARD, 1966



DR. RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT*

Professor of Speech
Wayne State University

The author of numerous articles and textbooks in the field of speech, a much respected teacher and critic of oratory and debate, a peripatetic speaker of wide renown, and a distinguished professor of speech for more than forty years, Rupert L. Cortright has demonstrated an understanding of the ideals of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. He has served these ideals as Executive Secretary and President of the Speech Association of America and as Chairman, and later as Coordinator of Graduate Studies, of the Department of Speech at Wayne State University. Led by his belief in responsible speech, he has been a leader in community affairs, most notably in the Methodist Church which recently honored him for more than twenty years of service.

For all of these contributions, but primarily because he has inspired his classes and students with a love for the teaching and practice of public speaking, it is fitting that Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha honor Rupert L. Cortright as a "Distinguished Alumni."

* The citation honoring Professor Cortright was presented at a Conference Banquet, March 30, 1967, by Professor Lillian Wagner, State College of Iowa, Chairman of the Distinguished Alumni Award Committee. Professor Cortright distinguished himself further the following night at a second Conference Banquet by presenting an inspiring address on values of forensic activities.

FORENSIC RESULTS

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Rd. 7	Rd. 8	Totals
Brigham Young, Aff.	L	W	L	W	W	L	L	W	4-4
Wynder	10	10	4	10	12	10	7	13	76
Drake	9	10	10	11	13	8	8	12	81
Brigham Young, Neg.	W	W	W	L	W	L	L	W	5-3
Worley	11	11	12	8	12	10	7	13	86
Kalensky	12	10	11	7	12	10	7	14	83
John Carroll, Aff.	L	W	L	L	L	W	L	L	2-6
Schaff	9	11	7	9	10	9	11	12	78
Wolanski	8	10	10	11	11	11	10	8	79
John Carroll, Neg.	W	L	W	L	L	L	W	L	3-5
Coughlin	12	11	11	8	12	7	12	10	83
Kadzielski	10	12	13	7	11	8	11	11	83
Brooklyn Coll., Aff.	W	W	L	L	W	W	L	L	4-4
Rosenzeivig	9	7	9	10	8	11	9	9	72
Marrus	12	10	13	13	11	11	11	12	93
Brooklyn Coll., Neg.	W	L	W	W	W	W	L	L	5-3
Schwartz	14	10	13½	11	10	14	13	8	93½
Zuckerman	12	9	12	10	9	13	13	7	85
U. of Arkansas, Aff.	W	L	L	W	W	W	W	W	6-2
Jones	13	12	10	11	12	12	13	13	96
Millin	13	14	12	12	13	11	13	14	102
U. of Arkansas, Neg.	L	L	W	W	W	L	L	L	3-5
Strickland	11	11	13	9	11	10	10	10	85
Munson	8	9	11	11	13	12	9	12	85
Ball State, Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	W	2-6
Spaulding	7	9	7	9	9	8	8	10	67
Montgomery	8	10	11	10	9	9	9	12	78
Ball State, Neg.	L	L	W	L	L	W	L	W	3-5
Keating	10	9	10	8	11	9	9	11	77
Charles	11	7	11	8	9	10	9	10	75
U. of Illinois, Aff.	L	W	L	L	L	L	L	W	2-6
Haugen	8	10	11	7	9	10	10	13	78
Watkins	9	13	9	8	11	12	13	14	89
U. of Illinois, Neg.	W	W	W	W	L	W	W	W	7-1
Manning	10	12	10	10	9	9	11	11	82
Grice	12	14	13	13	10	12	15	7	96
U. of Calif., S.B., Aff.	W	W	W	L	L	W	L	W	5-3
Sedano	9	14	12	13	12	11	11	13	95
King	10	13	14	14	11	11	12	13	100
U. of Calif., S.B., Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	6-2
Lucas	10	13	13	13	11	10	11	10	91
Greelis	11	12	10	11	12	9	12	9	86
U. of Cincinnati, Aff.	L	W	L	W	L	W	W	L	4-4
Haverkamp	13	13	6	9	8	11	13	12	85
Murtaugh	11	14	7	8	7	10	12	13	82
U. of Cincinnati, Neg.	L	L	W	L	L	L	W	L	2-6
Brinker	8	11	8	10	8	8	9	11	73
Seal	10	12	10	11	9	10	10	8	80

School	RD. 1	RD. 2	RD. 3	RD. 4	RD. 5	RD. 6	RD. 7	RD. 8	Totals
Cornell Univ., Aff.	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8-0
Nottingham	W	10	9	12	11	10	13	11	87
Lloyd	W	13	11	13	12	12	13	12	95
Cornell Univ., Neg.	W	L	W	W	L	L	W	L	4-4
Gottfried	12	11	12	13	12	8	13	11	92
Card	13	10	10	11	10	10	12	13	89
Auburn U., Aff.	L	L	L	W	W	L	W	L	4-4
Peace	11	12	9	13	9	12	11	11	86
Shelly	10	10	9	14	10	11	12	12	88
Auburn U., Neg.	L	L	L	W	W	L	L	L	2-6
Edwards	8	11	10	7	12	10	7	10	77
Page	8	12	8	9	13	8	11	81	
Butler Univ., Aff.	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	7-1
Heinen	7	13	13	9	9	10	12	12	85
Wall	13	15	14	10	9	12	14	12	99
Butler Univ., Neg.	W	L	W	W	W	W	W	W	7-1
Flanigan	12	9	14	13	10	13	14	14	98
Kiefer	12	14	13	15	11	14	14	14	107
Iowa St. U., Aff.	L	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	5-3
Stringer	11	7	13	10	10	11	7	11	80
Hrabsky	11	6	13	10	11	11	10	10	82
Iowa St. U., Neg.	L	W	L	L	W	W	L	L	3-5
Stockdale	7	11	10	7	13	12	8	11	79
Holien	7	12	8	7	13	13	8	11	79
Colorado College, Aff.	L	L	W	L	L	L	L	L	1-7
Hyde	4	10	11	10	11	7	8	9	70
Sulzenfuss	5	10	6	8	10	6	7	8	60
Colorado College, Neg.	W	L	W	L	W	L	W	W	5-3
Marshall	12	10	11	10	10	11	11	11	85
Methner	12	7	12	13	11	11	9	9	84
E. Kentucky U., Aff.	W	L	W	L	L	L	L	L	2-6
Anania	9	9	10	7	7	10	7	9	68
Burrows	9	9	10	8	7	8	7	9	67
E. Kentucky U., Neg.	W	L	L	L	L	W	W	L	2-6
Kieffer	6	5	10	8	10	9	9	8	65
Day	7	7	11	9	10	9	12	9	74
U. of Mass., Aff.	W	W	W	L	L	W	L	L	4-4
Tripp	9	9	11	11	9	9	8	11	77
Smith	13	10	10	10	9	9	6	10	77
U. of Mass., Neg.	L	W	L	L	L	L	W	W	2-6
Zwilling	7	10	7	7	8	6	7	10	62
Putnam	8	10	6	8	8	7	8	8	62
Bridgewater, Aff.	L	L	L	W	L	L	W	W	3-5
Penrod	9	11	11	10	9	12	12	14	89
Royster	10	10	11	10	9	13	13	14	90
Bridgewater, Neg.	L	W	L	L	L	L	L	W	2-6
Deyerle	8	11	9	8	8	7	8	10	69
Jamison	12	10	7	7	8	9	7	9	69
U. of Mich., Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	W	2-6
Hirshin	10	10	11	11	12	7	10	9	79
McGill	10	13	10	10	14	10	9	10	86

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Rd. 7	Rd. 8	Totals
U. of Mich., Neg.	W	L	L	W	L	L	W	W	4-4
Keskitalo	7	8	7	9	8	10	12	7	68
Wrigley	12	9	10	11	7	11	14	10	84
Mich. State, Aff.	W	L	L	L	L	L	W	W	3-5
Goldstein	12	12	11	10	9	11	9	13	87
La Vasseur	13	13	12	12	10	11	9	14	94
Mich. State, Neg.	W	W	L	W	W	L	L	W	5-3
Humphreys	10	13	9	14	13	10	13	10	92
Laycock	12	12	10	14	12	8	14	9	91
U. of Nebraska, Aff.	L	W	L	W	W	W	L	L	4-4
Hall	13	12	11	11	13	10	12	8	90
Sherman	11	14	12	12	13	12	13	8	95
U. of Nebraska, Neg.	L	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	6-2
Drodow	14	13	13	13	10	12	11	10	96
Erbach	10	13	13	12	11	11	9	11	90
George Washington, Aff.	W	L	W	L	W	W	W	L	5-3
Natovitz	10	15	12	10	12	10	14	8	91
Mason	12	13	11	11	12	10	14	9	92
George Washington, Neg.	W	W	W	L	W	W	L	L	5-3
Gianessi	12	12	13	10	14	9	12	13	95
Millard	14	15	13	10	13	13	12	13	103
Syracuse, Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	L	1-7
Dworkin	5	8	6	7	8	4	8	11	57
Stavis	6	7	4	5	7	4	7	7	47
Syracuse, Neg.	L	L	W	W	W	L	L	L	3-5
Bieleck	8	10	11	11	9	9	12	11	81
Tannenbaum	12	10	13	10	9	8	11	13	86
Emory, Aff.	W	W	L	W	W	W	W	W	7-1
Longino	13	12	14	11	13	14	13	15	105
Cahoon	14	12	10	15	14	14	13	15	107
Emory, Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8-0
Fronhel	12	15	13	13	13	13	12	13	104
McDaniel	14	14	12	11	13	14	14	12	104
Purdue, Aff.	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	W	6-2
Miller	13	11	10	12	11	11	12	11	91
Oberlin	11	9	11	13	12	12	14	11	93
Purdue, Neg.	L	W	L	L	W	W	L	L	3-5
Whitzere	10	9	10	9	10	12	10	10	80
Miller	11	10	13	9	11	7	10	11	82
U. of Minn., Aff.	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	W	7-1
Kirchmeier	11	12	11	14	12	12	13	10	95
Pedersen	12	13	10	12	10	13	13	12	95
U. of Minn., Neg.	L	L	W	W	L	W	L	W	4-4
Rigelman	12	13	15	13	10	13	14	13	103
Wallace	10	9	9	9	10	11	11	13	82
U. of N. Dakota, Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	0-8
Nelson	11	10	9	10	8	9	7	7	71
Drugan	9	11	8	12	7	10	8	8	73
U. of N. Dakota, Neg.	L	L	W	W	L	L	L	W	3-5
LaGrove	8	7	13	8	5	10	8	7	66
Weimer	7	6	12	9	4	10	7	9	64

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)												
SPEAKER AND GAVEL												
School												
Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Rd. 7	Rd. 8	Totals				
L	W	W	W	L	L	L	W	4-4	Capital U., Aff.	Schick	8	8
11	12	13	13	12	12	9	12	90	Fraser	9	10	9
10	10	9	9	10	10	7	11	78	Capital U., Neg.	Fahbusch	12	12
12	12	13	10	14	12	13	12	97	Zingale	L	W	12
10	10	9	7	10	10	8	13	76	Temple Univ., Aff.	L	W	12
8	14	13	11	13	13	9	9	77	Punschon	L	W	7
7	10	9	8	12	13	9	9	90	Sagoskin	W	W	8
W	W	L	L	L	W	W	W	5-3	Temple Univ., Neg.	W	W	10
10	9	7	10	14	12	13	8	75	Strange	W	W	10
12	13	9	10	12	12	13	12	97	Moore	L	L	12
L	L	L	L	L	W	L	L	2-6	Blizzard	L	L	7
7	7	11	9	12	9	10	8	73	Winkde	8	9	8
8	9	12	11	14	7	9	8	78	Mercer College, Neg.	W	L	4-4
8	8	12	13	11	11	12	12	87	Banks	W	L	8
9	7	10	10	11	10	12	12	79	Smith	W	L	9
W	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	3-5	Wabash, Aff.	W	L	8
10	10	11	12	12	6	12	12	83	Crook	10	10	8
10	10	13	11	13	6	10	11	84	Buroker	L	L	10
10	13	13	11	13	6	10	11	84	Wabash, Neg.	L	L	10
9	13	10	14	11	11	13	11	92	Martin	W	W	9
10	10	12	12	12	13	14	10	91	Bowen	L	L	10
L	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	2-6	Wiesbod	L	L	10
10	9	9	10	10	8	7	10	73	Russ	10	10	12
12	10	11	12	12	10	8	10	85	Western Mich. U., Neg.	L	W	6
6	11	12	10	10	9	9	8	75	Barrows	9	9	9
9	9	7	4	9	11	10	8	67	Elser	W	L	9
W	L	W	L	W	L	W	W	5-3	U. of S. Dakota, Aff.	W	L	10
10	9	8	10	12	12	12	12	85	Groeneveld	10	9	10
9	10	9	12	14	11	13	13	91	Broz	W	W	9
W	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	6-2	U. of S. Dakota, Neg.	W	W	9
9	10	12	10	14	9	11	10	85	Winkler	W	W	9
13	10	14	12	12	11	10	15	97	Meyer	W	W	13
W	W	L	W	L	L	W	L	4-4	U. of Kentucky, Aff.	W	W	10
10	11	11	12	9	13	13	9	87	Ockerman	10	11	10
12	14	15	12	8	14	15	11	101	Hastie	L	W	12
W	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	6-2	U. of Kentucky, Neg.	L	W	8
8	12	14	9	12	13	12	11	91	Futrell	9	11	9
9	11	13	13	14	14	13	13	100	Duncan	W	L	5-3
11	8	12	9	12	10	9	7	78	Tatler	11	11	11
12	9	14	11	10	9	8	8	82	Burtington	12	12	12
L	W	W	W	L	L	W	W	5-3	U. of Vermont, Aff.	W	L	5-3
9	12	12	11	12	10	10	11	90	Ingalls	10	12	10
10	12	14	13	10	10	11	11	91	Loizeaux	10	12	10
L	W	W	W	L	L	W	W	5-3	U. of Vermont, Neg.	10	12	10
10	13	14	13	13	14	13	13	102	Texas Tech. Coll., Aff.	L	W	6-2
10	13	14	11	14	14	12	14	107	Andrews	10	13	10
12	14	14	12	13	13	14	15	107	Moore	12	14	12



Extemporaneous Speaking

Superior

John Pound, New Mexico; Allyn Brosz, South Dakota; Steve Remsberg, George Washington
(not in picture: Thompson, Wichita State)



Persuasive Speaking

Excellent and Superior

Charles Humphreys, Michigan State; Olivia Gallegos, New Mexico; Bruce Rigelman, Minnesota; Bill Markin, Wabash; Greg Millard, George Washington; Judy Groen-veld, South Dakota (not in picture: Murray, California State at Long Beach; Wright, Colorado College)



First Place

Two-man debate

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Carl Lisman, Dr. Robert Huber, Nick Danigelis



Second Place

Two-man debate

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Steve Remsberg, Professor Robert Roberts, Carolyn Smith



First Place

Four-man debate

EMORY UNIVERSITY

**Bill McDaniel, Professor Woodrow Leake, Joe Longino,
Susan Cahoon, and Mark Frankel**



Second Place

Four-man debate

BUTLER UNIVERSITY

**Carl Flaningam, Sheryn Heinen, Dr. Nicholas Cripe, Don
Wall, Don Kiefer, Professor Ted Walwik**



Semifinalists

Two-man debate

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY: Fred Hasecke and Lynda Hasecke

ALBION COLLEGE: Fred McEldowney and Dave Landsburg



Fourth Place

Four-man debate

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Dick Ranta (coach), Cheryl Card, Michael McGee (coach), Richard Gottfried, Edward Nottingham (not in picture: Seth Lloyd)

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Rd. 7	Rd. 8	Totals
Texas Tech. Coll., Neg.	L	L	L	W	L	W	W	W	4-4
Trapp	9	12	8	13	11	15	7	13	88
Bradley	10	13	7	13	10	15	8	14	90
Wayne State, Aff.	L	L	L	W	W	W	L	W	4-4
Havrilla	9	12	12	12	10	11	9	12	87
Greco	10	13	13	15	11	12	11	14	99
Wayne State, Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	6-2
Robinson	11	12	13	13	14	8	11	11	93
Winston	13	11	14	11	10	6	12	12	99
U. of Wisconsin, Aff.	L	L	W	W	L	W	L	L	3-5
Cooper	8	11	12	11	11	12	12	8	85
Tennerman	10	10	13	10	11	11	12	8	85
U. of Wisconsin, Neg.	W	L	L	L	L	W	L	W	3-5
Resar	10	9	9	8	9	9	7	10	71
Rowland	11	8	8	8	7	11	8	7	68
U. of S. Calif., Aff.	W	W	W	W	W	L	W	L	6-2
Gropp	11	12	13	13	14	13	14	13	103
Gordon	12	11	14	14	13	13	13	12	102
U. of S. Calif., Neg.	W	W	L	W	W	W	W	W	7-1
Actis	15	13	9	14	11	14	13	14	103
Anderson	15	14	10	12	10	14	14	14	103
Xavier Univ., Aff.	W	L	L	W	L	W	W	L	4-4
Pfeffer	12	8	10	11	8	11	11	9	80
Winter	11	9	10	13	8	11	10	10	82
Xavier Univ., Neg.	L	W	W	L	W	W	W	W	6-2
Thesing	9	13	13	10	11	15	10	12	93
Joseph	8	9	14	12	9	14	12	10	88
Washington and Jeff., Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	0-8
Kretchman	5	9	7	9	7	6	8	8	59
Bake	7	9	8	9	6	7	10	6	62
Washington and Jeff., Neg.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	0-8
Koopman	9	11	11	14	11	8	6	12	82
Taylor	7	10	10	10	8	7	5	8	65
Indiana State U., Aff.	L	W	L	L	W	L	W	L	3-5
Jocaim	9	13	11	9	10	8	9	11	80
Metz	11	12	13	9	12	10	10	10	87
Indiana State U., Neg.	W	W	L	L	L	L	W	W	4-4
Rusk	8	11	13	7	9	10	8	11	77
Thayer	9	10	11	6	8	10	9	10	73

First Emory University 15-1 420

Second Butler University 14-2 389

Third U. of Southern

California 13-3 411

Fourth Cornell University 12-4 363

TOP SPEAKERS

Cahoon	Emory	107	Actis	Southern California	103
Kiefer	Butler	107	Anderson	Southern California	103
Moore	Texas Tech.	107	Gropp	Southern California	103
Longino	Emory	105	Millard	George Washington	103
Fronhel	Emory	104	Rigelman	Minnesota	103
McDaniel	Emory	104			

RESULTS OF TWO-MAN DEBATE

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Totals
California St. College at							
Long Beach	L	W	W	L	L	W	3-3
Murray	10	13	14	14	7	11	69
Turner	10	14	15	13	7	10	69
Colorado College	W	L	L	W	W	W	4-2
Keener	13	10	10	11	13	12	69
Wright	14	11	12	12	11	13	73
Creighton University	L	L	W	L	L	W	2-4
Hutchinson	9	9	11	10	9	13	61
Bertrand	8	14	12	9	10	11	64
University of Denver	W	W	W	L	L	W	4-2
Philipsen	13	12	13	10	7	12	67
Bennett	14	10	15	10	7	13	69
University of Nevada	L	W	L	W	L	W	3-3
Bass	11	11	11	12	7	11	63
Conton	8	11	10	10	8	11	58
University of New Mexico	L	L	W	L	W	W	3-3
Gallegos	9	10	13	9	12	13	66
Pound	10	9	14	10	12	14	69
University of Oregon	W	W	W	W	W	L	5-1
Roberts	13	10	12	13	13	11	72
Mowe	13	13	12	11	14	11	74
St. Cloud State College	L	W	L	L	L	W	2-4
Shimeta	8	8	7	8	8	7	46
Polvi	8	10	9	8	8	9	52
University of South Dakota	L	W	L	W	W	L	3-3
Hydahl	9	8	12	10	10	12	66
Villone	9	10	12	12	12	13	71
University of So. California	W	W	L	L	W	W	4-2
Rush	14	13	11	12	13	13	76
Flam	14	13	12	12	14	15	80
University of Texas	L	L	W	W	L	W	3-3
Watkins	10	10	14	13	10	13	70
Doggett	12	11	14	12	8	13	70
University of Utah	L	L	W	L	L	W	2-4
Nielson	9	8	12	11	10	11	61
Thorup	12	8	13	12	11	12	68
Washington St. University	L	W	W	W	L	L	3-3
Bergstrom	10	11	10	11	7	10	59
Sorrels	12	12	13	13	7	11	68
Wichita St. University	W	L	W	L	W	L	3-3
Thompson	13	11	12	11	11	9	67
Shields	14	12	14	12	14	9	75
University of Alabama	L	W	L	W	W	W	4-2
Gilbert	8	12	7	11	9	12	59
Jackson	11	13	7	11	14	13	69
Bellarmino College	W	W	W	L	L	L	3-3
Goodwin	11	12	12	12	10	11	68
Lynch	11	13	11	11	11	12	69
Berea College	L	W	L	L	L	L	1-5
Holmes	8	9	8	10	6	4	45
Bowman-Pelfrey	9	14	13	8	6	4	54

RESULTS OF TWO-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Totals
Birmingham—So. College	W	L	L	L	L	L	1-5
Bowie	12	9	8	8	8	9	54
Mays	12	12	7	9	13	12	65
Clemson University	L	L	W	L	L	L	1-5
Campbell	8	8	10	10	5	7	48
Feige	9	9	12	11	5	8	54
Duke University	W	W	L	L	L	L	2-4
Murphy	12	12	13	12	13	9	71
Blake	11	13	11	11	12	9	67
Emory University	L	W	L	L	W	W	3-3
Bostick	10	13	11	9	13	12	68
Walters	10	12	11	10	11	13	67
University of Kentucky	W	L	W	W	W	W	5-1
Valentine	9	14	14	12	8	12	69
Page	11	13	13	14	9	13	73
University of Missouri	W	L	W	L	L	L	2-4
Brown	14	12	14	11	10	7	68
White	12	11	13	4	11	6	57
Murray State University	W	W	W	L	L	W	4-2
Jeffrey	11	12	10	9	9	12	63
Smith	10	13	13	10	8	13	67
University of Richmond	L	W	L	W	W	W	4-2
Finchen	(12)	12	13	13	13	13	64
Cox	13	12	13	13	12	14	77
Wake Forest College	L	L	L	W	L	W	2-4
Spencer	9	9	10	12	9	12	61
Abernathy	9	11	11	15	10	14	70
Washington Univ. at St. Louis	L	L	L	L	L	W	1-5
Freeman	12	8	10	7	10	9	56
Silver	10	9	12	10	11	8	60
University of West Virginia	L	L	L	W	W	L	2-4
Brewer	10	9	11	10	12	12	64
Watson	9	8	10	12	10	10	59
Albion College	W	L	L	W	W	W	4-2
McEldowney	9	11	10	13	13	13	69
Landsbury	13	10	12	14	13	15	77
Ball State University	L	L	L	L	L	L	0-6
Baumgart	12	10	10	11	13	8	64
Miller	11	10	9	7	8	8	53
Indiana University	W	L	L	W	W	L	3-3
Fisher	12	11	11	12	15	13	74
Reafsnyder	14	10	10	9	13	11	67
Manchester College	L	W	L	L	W	L	2-4
Keirn	8	10	9	8	6	10	51
Kehoe	9	13	10	9	7	11	59
Michigan State University	W	W	W	L	W	W	5-1
Newton	14	13	11	10	12	14	74
Brautigan	10	15	10	11	14	13	73
Notre Dame University	W	L	W	W	W	L	4-2
Raher	10	13	14	13	13	12	75
Rice	12	12	14	14	14	11	77

RESULTS OF TWO-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Totals
Purdue University	L	L	W	W	L	L	2-4
Wolf	10	11	9	12	11	12	65
Anders	9	11	11	13	10	12	66
Rose Polytechnic	W	W	W	W	W	L	5-1
Hartpence	14	15	10	12	12	11	74
Allen	14	13	11	13	12	12	75
Western Michigan University	W	W	W	W	W	L	5-1
Behe	11	12	8	10	11	10	62
Grambart	13	14	9	12	12	10	70
Univ. of Wisconsin at Madison	L	L	L	W	W	L	2-4
Gandre	8	11	13	9	7	7	55
Laskis	9	12	14	11	9	8	63
Wayne State University A	W	L	L	W	W	W	4-2
Dicks	13	11	12	14	11	11	72
Rosenthal	13	10	13	14	12	10	72
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee	W	W	W	L	W	L	4-2
Seiset	11	13	13	11	10	8	66
Maloney	14	13	14	12	10	11	74
Wayne State University B	W	W	W	L	L	L	3-3
Apple	14	11	11	10	10	10	66
Adams	14	11	13	10	10	9	67
Indiana State University	L	W	L	W	W	L	3-3
Grunden	9	10	12	12	10	8	61
Dolbow	10	12	13	11	12	10	68
American University	W	L	W	L	L	W	3-3
Birdsall	10	10	10	8	3	9	50
Entin	13	15	13	10	7	10	68
Capital University	L	W	W	W	L	W	4-2
L. Hasecke	8	12	12	13	10	12	67
F. Hasecke	13	13	13	15	12	11	77
George Washington University	W	W	W	W	W	W	6-0
Smith	12	13	13	11	12	12	73
Remsberg	12	12	12	13	11	12	72
Hiram College	L	L	W	W	W	L	3-3
Codrea	9	9	10	11	9	9	57
Moore	12	8	13	12	8	13	66
John Carroll	W	L	L	L	W	L	2-4
De Rubeis	12	10	14	9	11	12	68
Walton	11	9	13	9	9	10	61
Loyola Baltimore	L	W	L	L	W	W	3-3
Doonan	10	12	12	10	10	13	67
Fleming	8	11	12	11	10	13	65
University of Maryland	W	L	L	W	L	L	2-4
Borden	10	9	9	11	9	11	59
Jennings	11	12	10	13	11	12	69
Mount Mercy College	L	L	L	W	L	L	1-5
O'Conner	7	7	7	11	6	7	45
Birkbichler	6	9	7	10	5	8	45
Muskingum College	L	L	L	L	L	L	0-6
Marshall	9	13	7	9	8	7	48
Berkey	11	13	8	11	8	8	56

RESULTS OF TWO-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	Rd. 1	Rd. 2	Rd. 3	Rd. 4	Rd. 5	Rd. 6	Totals
St. University of N.Y. at							
Harpur	L	L	W	L	W	L	2-4
Rotkin	9	7	13	10	9	7	55
Gurman	10	8	15	11	11	9	64
Oberlin College	W	W	W	W	L	W	5-1
Arnold	13	13	12	11	12	11	72
Conner	14	14	14	10	13	14	79
Ohio State University	W	W	L	W	W	W	5-1
Keller	12	9	10	13	8	14	66
Woods	11	10	9	12	8	14	64
Ohio University	W	L	L	L	L	W	2-4
Queisser	13	9	10	8	11	10	61
Zimmerman	12	11	8	10	11	11	63
University of Vermont	W	W	W	W	L	W	5-1
Danigelis	12	11	14	12	10	12	71
Lisman	10	13	14	12	13	13	75

TOP SIXTEEN

6-0	George Washington, 145
5-1	Oberlin College, 151
	Rose Polytechnic, 149
	Vermont, 146
	Kentucky, 142
	Western Michigan, 132
	Ohio State, 130
4-2	Southern California, 156
	Notre Dame, 152
	Michigan State, 147
	Albion, 146
	Oregon, 146
	Capital, 144
	Wayne State, 144
	Colorado College, 142
	Richmond, 141

TOP SPEAKERS

Flam, Southern California	80
Conner, Oberlin	79
Cox, Richmond	77
F. Hasecke, Capital	77
Landsbury, Albion	77
Rice, Notre Dame	77
Rush, Southern California	76
Allen, Rose Polytechnic	75
Lisman, Vermont	75
Raher, Notre Dame	75
Shields, Wichita State	75

ELIMINATION ROUNDS OF TWO-MAN DEBATE

Octafinal Round

1. George Washington (A) defeated Colorado College (N) 2-1
2. Ohio State (N) defeated Western Michigan (A) 2-1
3. Oregon (N) defeated Richmond (A) 3-0
4. Albion (N) defeated Michigan State (A) 2-1
5. Wayne State (N) defeated Rose Polytechnic (A) 3-0
6. Vermont (N) defeated Notre Dame (A) 2-1
7. Southern California (A) defeated Kentucky (A) 2-1
8. Capital (A) defeated Oberlin (N) 2-1

Quarterfinal Round

1. George Washington (A) defeated Ohio State (N) 3-0
2. Albion (N) defeated Oregon (A) 3-0
3. Vermont (A) defeated Wayne State (N) 2-1
4. Capital (A) defeated Southern California (N) 2-1

Semifinal Rounds

1. George Washington (A) defeated Albion (N) 2-1
2. Vermont (N) defeated Capital (A) 2-1

Final Round

1. Vermont (A) defeated George Washington (N) 4-1

RESULTS OF PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

Contestant and School	Number of Superior Ratings	Rank		Percentage points	
		Round I	Round II	Round I	Round II
Adams, Muskingum	0	5 5 5	3 5 1	247	256
Adamson, Emory	3	2 4 2	5 3 4	273	262
Anders, Purdue	0	5 5 4	5 5 4	252	254
Birkbichler, Mount Mercy	1	3 3 5	5 5 5	256	233
Birdsall, American	0	4 5 5	5 4 2	253	253
Blizzard, Mercer	2	5 5 5	1 5 2	235	264
Brewer, West Virginia	0	4 5 5	5 5 5	240	243
Buroker, Wabash	1	3 1 5	5 3 3	263	255
Cooper, Wisconsin	0	5 5 5	4 4 3	245	257
Darrow, Muskingum	0	3 5 5	4 5 5	251	256
Drake (Kalensky), Brigham Young	3	1 3 3	1 5 5	270	258
Ferguson, Cornell University	2	2 4 5	5 2 5	254	261
Fischer, Bellarmine	0	5 5 3	5 5 5	245	242
Gallegos, New Mexico	5	1 1 1	2 2 1	278	278
Greelis, California, Santa Barbara	2	4 4 4	1 5 5	244	263
Groeneveld, South Dakota	5	5 2 2	2 1 1	262	281
Heaton, Washington & Jefferson	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	232	239
Humphreys, Michigan State	3	1 2 2	2 4 3	275	260
Hutchinson, Creighton	3	2 3 5	1 3 4	255	270
Jackson, Alma	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	229	230
Jannette, Wayne State	3	5 5 5	3 2 2	245	276
Jennings, Maryland	0	5 5 2	5 5 5	242	244
Jensen, Alma	0	5 5 4	5 5 5	244	248
Jochim, Indiana State	2	2 1 4	4 5 4	271	250
Kendig, DePauw	1	4 1 5	5 5 5	260	253
Kraft, Cornell College	2	1 2 5	3 3 5	269	257
Kurth, Ohio University	2	5 5 1	2 2 4	256	263
LaVasseur, Michigan State	0	4 4 4	4 4 5	252	259
Lucas, California, Santa Barbara	1	5 5 1	5 1 5	253	254
Markin, Wabash	5	3 1 1	2 4 1	270	277
Massey, Alabama	2	5 5 4	2 2 1	253	275
Meyer, South Dakota	1	2 3 3	3 5 5	264	248
Millard, George Washington	3	2 1 1	5 1 3	276	267
Murray, California St., Long Beach	3	4 2 3	5 1 3	270	264
Prince, Randolph-Macon	0	3 3 3	5 5 5	263	245
Rigelman, Minnesota	3	1 2 5	3 2 2	262	271
Rosenthal, Wayne State	2	5 4 5	1 1 5	252	258
Schwartz, Ohio University	0	5 5 2	5 5 2	254	257
Scully, Cornell University	3	5 3 2	1 5 5	265	246
Seiser, Wisconsin—Milwaukee	3	5 4 3	3 3 1	260	275
Sulzenfuss, Colorado College	0	3 5 5	5 4 3	247	253
Ward, Bellarmine	0	5 5 5	4 3 2	232	259
Wright, Colorado College	4	1 2 1	4 1 4	283	266

The following finalists were chosen on the basis of (1) total number of superior ratings; (2) total rank (if ratings are tied); and (3) total percentage points (if rankings are tied):

Callegos, New Mexico	Excellent
Groeneveld, South Dakota	Superior
Humphreys, Michigan State	Excellent
Markin, Wabash	Superior
Millard, George Washington	Superior
Murray, California State, Long Beach	Excellent
Rigelman, Minnesota	Superior
Wright, Colorado College	Excellent

RESULTS OF EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

Contestant and School	Number of Superior Ratings	Rank		Percentage points	
		Round I	Round II	Round I	Round II
Bergstrom, Washington State	1	1 3 1	5 5 5	267	247
Bertrand, Creighton	2	2 5 2	5 5 4	267	256
Borden, Maryland	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	241	246
Brosz, South Dakota	3	1 4 5	5 2 2	264	264
Brust, Ohio Wesleyan	2	1 3 5	3 5 2	262	260
Estep, Alabama	0	5 2 5	5 4 4	247	251
Fisher, Indiana	3	1 1 4	1 5 3	265	257
Gandre, Wisconsin	1	5 5 5	5 3 3	235	260
Garrett, Emory	2	1 1 2	4 5 5	269	251
Goldstein, Michigan State	2	5 5 2	4 2 1	256	265
Hoiem, Iowa State	0	5 5 3	5 5 5	245	238
Jewett, Nebraska	0	5 5 3	3 5 5	251	249
Keener, Colorado College	3	5 3 5	1 4 1	254	276
King, California, Santa Barbara	2	4 2 1	4 1 4	267	267
Laycock, Michigan State	2	4 1 5	4 2 5	263	261
Maloney, Wisconsin—Milwaukee	0	5 5 3	5 2 4	247	248
Methner, Colorado College	0	5 4 5	5 5 4	252	243
B. Moore, Temple	1	3 5 5	2 5 5	234	248
K. Moore, Hiram	1	3 5 4	5 4 5	265	251
Oberlin, Purdue	2	4 1 3	5 2 5	267	250
O'Connor, Mount Mercy	4	5 1 3	1 1 5	263	269
Pedersen, Minnesota	1	3 5 4	5 3 2	256	259
Polvi, St. Cloud State	0	2 5 5	5 5 5	253	242
Pound, New Mexico	2	3 1 1	2 4 3	273	264
Putnam, Massachusetts	1	3 4 5	5 5 5	259	246
Quiesser, Ohio University	0	4 5 4	5 2 3	261	261
Reafsnyder, Indiana	0	2 4 5	5 5 2	247	243
Remsberg, George Washington	3	5 2 3	3 3 1	261	273
Resar, Wisconsin	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	230	239
Roberts, Oregon	4	2 4 2	1 1 2	273	278
Sedano, California, Santa Barbara	1	3 5 1	2 4 5	259	258

RESULTS OF EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING (Continued)

Contestant and School	Number of Superior Ratings	Ratings		Percentage Points	
		Round I	Round II	Round I	Round II
Sieben, St. Cloud State	0	5 5 5	5 3 5	245	245
Sorrels, Washington State	1	5 5 4	1 5 4	257	260
Stavis, Syracuse	0	5 5 5	5 3 5	247	238
Stockdale, Iowa State	1	5 3 4	3 1 3	252	267
Strange, Temple	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	235	247
Tannenbaum, Syracuse	0	5 5 5	3 5 5	243	250
Thompson, Wichita State	6	1 2 1	1 1 1	283	281
Tripp, Massachusetts	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	244	235
Turner, California St., Long Beach	2	2 3 5	4 1 2	254	268
Watkins, Texas	2	2 4 2	2 5 1	256	268
Watson, West Virginia	0	5 5 5	4 5 5	231	249
Wiechel, Ohio Wesleyan	0	4 5 5	5 4 1	245	247
Winkle, Mercer	0	5 3 5	2 3 3	241	262
Winkler, South Dakota	2	4 2 2	3 5 5	265	245
Worley, Brigham Young	2	5 2 1	2 5 5	264	256
Zimmerman, Ohio University	0	5 5 5	5 5 5	226	229

The following finalists were chosen on the basis of (1) total number of superior ratings; (2) total rank (if ratings are tied); and (3) total percentage points (if rankings are tied):

Brosz, South Dakota	Superior
Fisher, Indiana	Excellent
Keener, Colorado College	Excellent
O'Connor, Mount Mercy	Excellent
Pound, New Mexico	Superior
Remsberg, George Washington	Superior
Roberts, Oregon	Excellent
Thompson, Wichita State	Superior

1967 DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA NATIONAL CONFERENCE STAFF

National Conference Committee

Austin J. Freeley, John Carroll University, Chairman
George A. Adamson, University of Utah
Jerry Anderson, Michigan State University
George W. Ziegelmuller, Wayne State University, **ex officio**

Tournament Staff

George W. Ziegelmuller, Wayne State University, Tournament Director
Michael Cronin, Wayne State University, Assistant Tournament Director

Two-Man Debate

Chairman: George F. Henigan, George Washington University
Co-Chairman: Ray Wilkes, Wayne State University
Committee Liaison: Austin J. Freeley, John Carroll University

Four-Man Debate

Chairman: Harold Lawson, Ohio State University
Co-Chairman: Carl Moore, Wayne State University
Committee Liaison: Jerry Anderson, Michigan State University

Extempore Speaking Contest

Chairman: Ted Walwik, Butler University
Co-Chairman: John Gregg, Wayne State University
Committee Liaison: George A. Adamson, University of Utah

Persuasive Speaking Contest

Chairman: Joseph O'Rourke, Wabash College
Co-Chairman: Melanie Dostal, Wayne State University
Committee Liaison: George A. Adamson, University of Utah

Student Congress

Chairman: Kenneth E. Andersen, University of Michigan
Co-Chairman: Ed Robinson, Ohio Wesleyan University

MINUTES OF THE OPENING LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

March 30, 1967

The assembly was called to order by the Chairman Pro Tem, Dr. Kenneth Andersen (Michigan), at 11:00 a.m. in the Sheraton Room of the Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel. Clerk Pro Tem, Dr. Edward Robinson (Ohio Wesleyan), called the roll. All thirty-four delegates were present.

Election of the officers proceeded. The Conservative candidate, Robert Smith of Wichita, was nominated by Donald Coffin of DePauw with additional support by Mike Prince of Randolph-Macon. The Liberal candidate, Terry Adamson of Emory, was nominated by Robert Borgmeyer of George Washington with additional support by Carol David of Ohio Wesleyan and Joe Estep of Alabama. Following the candidates' speeches, Terry Adamson of Emory was elected by a 19-15 vote.

After assuming the chair, the Speaker proceeded to the election of the clerk. Marie Massey of Alabama was nominated by Lee Hess of Michigan in accordance with a petition from the floor of the Assembly. Sharon Vondra of Michigan State was nominated as the Liberal candidate by Irish Scully of Cornell. Sharon Vondra was elected by a vote of 17-16.

Dr. Andersen made several announcements pertaining to room arrangements, changes in the schedule, obtaining copies of bills, and composition of the Steering Committee. Dr. Robinson announced that Ann Splete was chairing the Evaluation Committee which will conduct a questionnaire study on the Congress.

Speaker Adamson asked for the party leaders to identify themselves:

Liberal Floor Leader	Martin Weisman of Ohio Wesleyan
Liberal Whip	Joe Estep of Alabama
Conservative Floor Leader	Lee Hess of Michigan
Conservative Whip	Mike Prince of Randolph-Macon

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Vondra, Clerk

MINUTES OF THE SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

April 1, 1967

The Assembly was reconvened by Speaker Adamson at 8:30 a.m. Following roll call, the minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved as corrected.

Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, the majority floor leader, yielded to Don Racheter, Michigan, who moved the adoption of Bill #1 with the second by Martin Weisman.

Lee Hess, Michigan, the minority floor leader, yielded the floor to Vernon Jewett, Nebraska, who moved to substitute Bill #6 for Bill #1. The motion was seconded. The speaker yielded to questions which were answered by the co-sponsors Burton Beglo, North Dakota, and Lee Hess, Michigan.

The previous question was moved, seconded, and passed. The motion to substitute was defeated by a voice vote. The previous question was moved, seconded, and passed. Bill #1 was passed by a vote of 28-0 with one abstention.

Adoption of Bill #2 was moved by John Morrissey, State College of Iowa, who yielded to Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, for a second.

Lee Hess, Michigan, moved for the adoption of Substitute Bill #7. The motion was seconded. The bill was presented by Irish Scully, Cornell, who then yielded to questions.

Joe Estep, Alabama, spoke against the substitute bill, followed by Robert Borgmeyer, George Washington. Speaking for the substitute bill were Marie Massey, Alabama, and Lee Hess.

The motion to substitute was passed 20-9. Bill #7 was passed 19-14.

A ten-minute recess was called.

Upon resumption of business, Robert Aumaugher, Alma, moved to reconsider Bill #7. The Speaker set the motion to reconsider for such time as the Congress was ahead of schedule or during the period set aside for special orders.

Don Racheter, Michigan, presented Bill #3 and then yielded to Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, who seconded its adoption. The bill passed 30-0 with one abstention.

Dennis Kendig, DePauw, then moved adoption of Bill #4 with a second by Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan.

A motion by Mike Prince, Randolph-Macon, was made to substitute Bill #8 for Bill #4. The motion was seconded. After some debate, the previous question was moved and seconded, but the motion was defeated.

An appeal from the decision of the chair on the limitations pertaining to submission of amendments was lost.

After further debate Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, again moved the previous question. The motion again was defeated.

An appeal on the decision of the Steering Committee on the wording of line 10 in Bill #8 was made. The appeal was seconded and passed 13-2. The corrected wording read: "The Leadership of Communist China cannot now be clearly determined."

The previous question was moved by Robert Borgmeyer, George Wash-

ington, seconded, and passed. The motion to substitute was lost. An amendment to Bill #4 was made so that section 4 shall read: "That this bill shall not be enacted until such time as the United States diplomatic recognition of Communist China occurs." The amendment was seconded. An appeal from the decision of the chair who declared the amendment in order was made. The chair was upheld. Following a debate upon the amendment, the proposed amendment was defeated.

A vote was taken on Bill #4. It passed 20-4 with one abstention.

The adoption of Bill #5 was moved by Robert Borgmeyer, George Washington, and seconded by Charlotte Singer, Bates. The previous question was moved by Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, seconded, and defeated.

An amendment to add "such an offer of recognition should not be extended until a more moderate government comes to power in the People's Republic of China" was moved by Don Coffin, DePauw, and seconded. The previous question was moved by Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, seconded, and passed 19-5. The amendment was defeated 16-13.

An amendment to insert "contingent upon reciprocal recognition" was moved by Don Racheter, Michigan, and was seconded. Martin Weisman moved the previous question. The motion was seconded and passed. The amendment was passed.

The previous question on Bill #5 as amended was moved, seconded, and defeated. Lee Hess, Michigan, and Don Coffin, DePauw, spoke against and Robert Borgmeyer, George Washington, and Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, spoke for the bill. The previous question was again moved, seconded, and defeated. Mike Prince, Randolph-Macon, resumed debate on the bill.

A conflict in scheduling between time allotted for debate and the special orders was decided by the Assembly. A motion to take up Special Orders by Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, was seconded and passed 20-5.

Robert Borgmeyer, George Washington, moved the adoption of Special Resolution #1, urging withdrawal and increased effort to end the Vietnamese war. The motion was seconded. Robert Borgmeyer explained the resolution. Dennis Kendig, DePauw, spoke against the resolution. A motion to extend the time limits for debate was made by Robert Borgmeyer, seconded, and defeated. By a voice vote the resolution was defeated. A motion by Joe Estep, Alabama, for a secret ballot was seconded and passed 15-10. The Special Resolution was defeated 21-4 in the secret ballot.

Martin Weisman, Ohio Wesleyan, moved unanimous adoption of Resolutions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The motion was seconded. The resolutions were adopted unanimously.

Robert Smith, Wichita State University, moved to reverse the order of consideration of Bill #5 and reconsideration of Bill #7. The motion was seconded and passed. Robert Aumaugher, Alma, withdrew his motion to reconsider, as did the seconder.

An appeal of the decision of the chair on the expiration of time was made by Martin Weisman. The motion was seconded and passed.

Debate on Bill #5 was resumed. Don Racheter, Michigan, spoke for it. An appeal by Robert Smith, Wichita State University, on a decision by the chair that time had elapsed was made, seconded, and defeated.

Bill #5 was passed 16-11 with one abstention.

The Congress adjourned at 12:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Vondra, Clerk

CONGRESS BILL #1

A majority bill by Committee Number 4 on trade, tourism, and cultural exchange.

Don Racheter (ch.)—Michigan
Mary Jane Ferguson—Cornell
Sharon Vondra—Michigan State
Judith Climer—Ohio Wesleyan

An Act to increase trade with Communist China.

- Whereas: 1. Increased trade with Communist China will lead to a more favorable world situation and reduce tensions.
2. The present United States trade embargo with mainland China is ineffective since they presently do obtain goods from other Western countries.
3. Direct rather than indirect United States trade with Communist China would facilitate the restriction on the flow of strategic goods to China.

Be it Enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha that:

The United States initiate a policy of trade of non-strategic materials with mainland China. The restrictions regarding materials of strategic importance will be the same as those presently applied to our commerce with the Soviet Union. This trade shall be on a non-credit basis until such time as China is able to assume a position of sufficient fiscal responsibility.

CONGRESS BILL #7

A majority bill by Committee Number 2A on admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Marie Massey—Alabama
Irish Scully—Cornell
Bob Smith—Wichita State
Mike Prince—Randolph-Macon

An Act to provide for admission of Red China to the United Nations.

- Whereas: 1. Communist Chinese stipulations for its admittance to the United Nations would entail the following:
- The removal of the Chinese Nationalist government from Taiwan.
 - Replacing that government with a Chinese Communist government.
 - The expulsion of the Chinese Nationalist government from the United Nations.
 - That the Security Council and General Assembly seats be given to the Communist Chinese, and
 - Radical reorganization of the United Nations.
2. Such admission would constitute a threat to the present United States foreign policy, in that:

- a. It would mean the removal of the Seventh Fleet from Pacific waters.
- b. It would mean the termination of what the Communist Chinese call "our aggressive military presence" in Asia.
3. Such admission would not meet with the approval of the African and Latin American nations that voted against it in the last United Nations Assembly.
4. It would endanger the possible Russian-American détente.

Be it Enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha that:

Section 1: The United States continue the policy of opposing the admission of Communist China into the United Nations until such time as a revisionist government shall nullify these stipulations and be willing to accept membership under Article IV. At such time, the United States would remove all verbal and voting opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

Section 2: The nations of Red China and Taiwan would be recognized as separate nations in the United Nations. Taiwan will retain its seat as a Security Council member but shall not be considered as a representative of mainland China. Red China will enter the United Nations as a regular Assembly member and as the legal representative of mainland China.

CONGRESS BILL #3

A majority bill by Committee Number 4 on trade, tourism, and cultural exchange with Communist China.

Don Racheter (ch.)—Michigan
 Mary Jane Ferguson—Cornell
 Sharon Vondra—Michigan State
 Judith Climer—Ohio Wesleyan
 Vernon Jewett—Nebraska
 Barton Beglo—North Dakota

An Act to provide tourism and cultural exchange with Red China.

Whereas: 1. The United States has a responsibility for its citizens' welfare as they travel abroad.

2. There are benefits to be gained by citizens and cultural exchange between the United States and China.
3. Unauthorized and unregulated travel in Communist nations by United States citizens has led to unfortunate incidents.
4. Present United States restrictions on travel apply to citizens travelling in Communist China (U. S. Codes 1185 and 1544).

Be it Enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha that:

The policy of the United States shall be to establish a bilateral citizen and cultural exchange agreement with Communist China provided that:

- a. The equality of the privileges of both parties be guaranteed.
- b. The sections of the United States Codes (particularly 1185 and 1544) would not apply to citizens traveling under the provisions of this agreement.
- c. The operations of both parties be in accord with the statutes and codes of international law.

CONGRESS BILL #4

A majority bill by Committee Number 3 on United States policy toward Communist China participation in treaties dealing with disarmament, nuclear weapons, space, and territorial disputes.

Everett Dickson (ch.)—Cornell

Dennis Kendig—DePauw

Richard Garrett—Emory

Joseph Jaglowicz—Bellarmine

Terry Adamson—Emory

An Act to encourage better relations with the People's Republic of China.

Be it Enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha that:

Section 1: The United States should move to establish more direct links of communication with the People's Republic of China.

Section 2: The People's Republic of China should be invited to participate in all international conferences dealing with topics of disarmament and weapons control.

Section 3: The present form of "Ambassadorial Talks" should be replaced by open negotiations and conferences between the United States and the People's Republic of China, of which an official record should be maintained and made public.

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #2

- Whereas:
1. The Student Congress benefits greatly all participants.
 2. The Student Congress is a relief after a season of tournament debate.
 3. The Student Congress creates a vital awareness of the importance of debate by:
 - a. The use of persuasion within groups such as the assembly.
 - b. The use of logic and reasoning in committees.
 - c. The use of strategy both in and out of caucus.

Be it Resolved by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha that:

The Student Congress continue its important function in the annual conference of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.*

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #3

- Whereas:
1. Those persons serving in the positions of Speaker, Clerk, and party floor leaders and whips have demonstrated outstanding abilities and given generously of their time and energies.
 2. These persons have enabled this assembly to be a viable, effective legislative instrument.

Be it Resolved by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha that:

We unanimously commend their work during this Congress.

Speaker: Terry Adamson—Emory

Clerk: Sharon Vondra—Michigan State

Liberal Floor Leader: Martin Weisman—Ohio Wesleyan

* All Congress Resolutions were proposed by the Committee on Miscellaneous Resolutions: Irish Scully (Cornell), Mary Jane Ferguson (Cornell), and Judith Climer (Ohio Wesleyan).

Liberal Whip: Joe Estep—Alabama

Conservative Floor Leader: Lee Hess—Michigan

Conservative Whip: Mike Prince—Randolph-Macon

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #4

- Whereas: 1. The Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel has been cooperative and helpful in handling the numerous arrangements necessary for the smooth functioning of this Congress.
2. The accommodations and services available at the Sheraton-Cadillac have contributed to the proper functioning of this Congress, in accordance with the high standards of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha.

Be it Resolved by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha that:

We extend our thanks to the hotel administration and staff.

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #5

- Whereas: Wayne State University has contributed greatly to the success of the entire Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha Conference by its hospitality and the availability of its campus facilities.

Be it Resolved by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha that:

On behalf of all the participants in the Conference, we extend our gratitude for the hospitality of Wayne State University.

CONGRESS RESOLUTION #6

- Whereas: Dr. George Ziegelmüller, Dr. Kenneth Andersen, Dr. Edward Robinson, and Mr. Mike Cronin have made this Student Congress possible by their time, energy, and devotion to the Congress both in its planning and functioning.

Be it Resolved by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha that:

We extend our sincerest recognition of, and gratitude for, their efforts.

CONGRESS BILL #5

A majority bill by Committee Number 1 on diplomatic recognition of Communist China by the United States.

Robert Borgmeyer (ch.)—George Washington

Mike Sieben—St. Cloud State

Joe Estep—Alabama

Robert Aumaugher—Alma

Charlotte Singer—Bates

Richard Dean—DePauw

Susan Phillips—Ohio Wesleyan

Paul Boysen—State College of Iowa

An Act favoring diplomatic recognition of the People's Republic of China.

- Whereas: 1. Intercourse between nations is conducive to peace and mutual understanding.
2. The present non-recognition on the part of both parties tends to limit this mutual understanding and endanger the peace of the world.

Be it Enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha that:

The President of the United States with the consent of the Senate should publicly offer to extend reciprocal diplomatic recognition contingent upon reciprocal recognition by the People's Republic of China while maintaining diplomatic recognition and defense commitments to the Nationalist Republic of China as a separate entity on Taiwan.

Terry Adamson
Speaker

Sharon Vondra
Clerk

REGION EIGHT HOLDS TOURNAMENT

Region Eight held a regional tournament on February 10 and 11, 1967, at the University of Minnesota. Professor Robert L. Scott directed the tournament, and the University of Minnesota provided the awards. Participating schools included University of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee), St. Cloud State College, University of North Dakota, University of South Dakota, University of Minnesota, Mankato State College, and St. John's, a guest school.

South Dakota received the first place debate trophy, although Minnesota and St. John's tied South Dakota on wins and losses (9-3). St. John's won both oratory and extemp, and South Dakota was second in both events.

In the business meeting, Regional Governor Harold M. Jordan suggested that regional sponsors elect a governor more actively engaged in forensics. John Wenburg of the University of South Dakota was elected new Regional Governor for Region Eight. The chapter sponsors also seemed favorably disposed to continuing the regional tournament at Minnesota, and they discussed possible changes in format.

PLAN AHEAD!

Fifth Annual National Forensic Conference

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

April 7-10, 1968

Sixth Annual National Forensic Conference

University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska

April 6-9, 1969

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING SHERATON-CADILLAC HOTEL, DETROIT, MICHIGAN

Thursday, March 30, 1967

The meeting was called at 2:43 p.m. on March 30, 1967. Present for all or some of the session were: Laase, McBath, Cripe, Flam, Adamson, Moorhouse, Wagner, Wenburg, Golden, Eubank, Hagood, Wetherby, Griffin, Ewbank, Jr., Kane (for Beard), Brockriede, Freeley, Ziegelmüller, Walwik, Henegan. The minutes of the Chicago meeting were approved. President Laase made several explanatory remarks relating to procedures of the banquet Thursday evening, the meeting agenda, and suggestions he plans to introduce later on the constitutional changes relating to the election of DSR-TKA national offices.

Secretary nominated Mr. George Allen, by Otis Aggertt of Indiana State University, Mr. Judson Ellertson and Byron Jared Townsend, Muskingum College, by Tom Ludlum, Capital University for member-at-large memberships. Discussion bypassed for a time to hear report by George Ziegelmüller, conference host. President appointed Tex Eubank chairman and council nominated Hagood, Walwik, Adamson, Griffin to interpret constitutional meaning of membership-at-large

Lillian Wagner reported for the Alumni Award Committee.

Jim McBath reported for the Ritual Review Committee (HT Ross, Chairman). Ross compiled suggestions in revision of the ritual used this afternoon. It will then be finally reviewed. McBath-Moorhouse moved to authorize the use of the current version. It was adopted.

Jim Golden, chairman, Speaker of the Year Committee, noted rule requiring the Speaker to be present. None of the top four candidates this year *could* attend. The problems of implementing this policy seem insuperable.

Kane-Golden moved to rescind the action of last year's Council requiring the presence of the Speaker of the Year at a Banquet, and to authorize the committee to establish a new policy. Adopted.

Freeley reported 89 institutions present. The largest conference yet. Especial thanks to the local tournament director; the judging assignments remain a problem. Brockriede, Editor *Speaker-Gavel*, cited a continuing need for copy of all sorts: committee reports and requests for opinion; regional activities and information. Material is needed early and often. The desire to maintain standards is still retained. He requested reactions from anyone. The new cover was noted. Laase commended the editorial staff for an excellent job.

Lillian Wagner offered a proposal for action to work with publications of forensic Societies.

Eubank reported for the constitution committee:

"1. It is the opinion of this committee that despite some ambiguity in the Constitution concerning eligibility for membership-at-large the constitution is, nevertheless, sufficiently clear to justify the opinion that no undergraduate student is eligible for member-at-large.

"2. It is the opinion of this committee that the student in question meets the requirements for undergraduate membership, and the committee regrets that he does not represent a chapter of DSR-TKA. Further, the

committee suggests that the National Council would be willing to receive a recommendation for member-at-large for this person after his graduation from college.

"3. The committee recommends that a special committee be appointed to review the qualifications for active and "at-large" memberships."

This report was given unanimously adoption.

Wetherby-Wagner moved membership-at-large for B. M. Townsend and Jed Ellerton. Adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Friday, March 31, 1967 Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. Those present for all or some of the sessions were: Laase, Cripe, McBath, Griffin, Moorhouse, Wagner, Golden, Wenburg, Hagood, Wetherby, Kane, Ewbank, Jr., Freeley, Adamson, Brockriede, Hance, Eubank, Flam.

The discussion of the initiation ritual revision indicated general approval. It was moved and seconded that an initiation kit be prepared for sale and distribution to local chapters.

Wetherby moved, Ewbank, Jr. seconded, that a chapter installation ritual be prepared by Ross ritual committee.

Hance gave the Treasurer's report.

DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

Treasurer's Report—July 1, 1966—March 27, 1967

INCOME			
Initiations	\$ 480.00	(Budgeted: \$4,000.00)	
Investment Income	1,706.17	(" 3,500.00)	
(Including Special Investment Income: \$60 per month)		(" 360.00)	
Keys	(114.70)	(" ?)	
Special Gifts		(" 200.00)	
Charters		(" 100.00)	
Miscellaneous	50.97	(" ?)	
	<u>\$2,351.84</u>	(" <u>\$8,160.00</u>)	

DISBURSEMENTS

Speaker and Gavel:			
November Issue	\$ 768.00	(Budgeted: \$1,000.00)	
Remaining Issues	489.80	(" 2,300.00)	
Editorial Expenses	225.00	(" 300.00)	
Keys	(216.24)	(" ?)	
Printing and Postage	205.74	(" 250.00)	
President's Office	150.00	(" 200.00)	
Secretary's Office	775.00	(" 1,000.00)	
Treasurer's Office	150.00	(" 200.00)	
Maintenance of Records by Allen Press	324.33	(" 750.00)	
Historian's Office	150.00	(" 200.00)	
Dues and Expenses re. Assn.			
College Honor Societies	202.10	(" 200.00)	
Expenses re. SAA Committee on			
Debate-Discussion	116.92	(" 125.00)	
Membership Certificates	45.94	(" 500.00)	

Awards			
Speaker-of-the-Year	200.00	("	250.00)
Distinguished Alumni		("	75.00)
Trophy for NFL		("	100.00)
SAA Life Membership Payment		("	200.00)
Student Council	25.00	("	100.00)
Miscellaneous	4.00	("	50.00)
	<u>\$4,048.07</u>	("	<u>\$7,800.00)</u>

Freeley moved, Griffin seconded that Student National President or his designated representative from the Student Council offices be allotted up to cost of round trip tourist airplane fare from college site to conference site to attend the December meeting of DSR-TKA National Council. Approved.

Necessity of making judges available to relieve key personnel was discussed. Hagood moved, Brockriede seconded, to endorse in principle the hiring of additional judges from the National Treasury and for Freeley to explore possibilities and report at December meeting. Passed. Wetherby objection noted.

Griffin moved, Wagner seconded, that Secretary take necessary action to get DSR-TKA declared tax exempt, and that necessary expenses be approved in advance. It was passed.

Ewbank, Jr. reported ACHS meeting, University of Michigan, February 23-25, 1967.

The Council discussed President Laase's comments of the evening before regarding election of National Council and suggested that McBath as Vice-President explore sentiments of chapter sponsors at Sponsor's Meeting.

Ewbank moved, Wagner seconded, that Emerson College be granted membership. It was adopted. Ewbank, Standards Committee, proposed additional criteria for maintaining chapter standards. Griffin seconded.

Standards Committee Report

"Since our December meeting, petitions for chapter charters have been sent to the University of Tampa, LeMoyne College (Syracuse, N.Y.), State University of New York at Buffalo, Fordham University (Bronx, N.Y.), and Rose Polytechnic Institute. Correspondence with the Lorain County Community College (Elyria, Ohio), has been continued to ascertain the accreditation status of this institution. The University of Bridgeport has also received copies of the petition. Other institutions which have expressed initial interest, but thus far have failed to follow up with a request for petitions include Pace College, City College of New York, College of Mt. St. Vincent, and St. Joseph's College of Philadelphia.

"One completed petition has been received from Emerson College, Boston, Mass., and has been circulated to the committee. Favorable recommendation has been recorded by Blyton and Ewbank. Pelham has not responded.

"At the December meeting of the National Council this committee was charged with drawing up a set of guidelines by which the status of weak chapters could be assessed without waiting for the chapter to reach the ultimate of inactivity described in the constitution. At this time the Committee, acting in the absence of one of its members, is prepared to recom-

mend the following additional criteria for maintaining active status of our chapters:

1. Filing the chapter report requested annually by the Secretary.
2. Attendance at either the regional or national conference one year of every three.

"Procedurally, the Secretary should, soon after the deadline for filing annual reports, send a second request to those chapter sponsors whose reports are not on file, naming a second deadline and warning that failure to file will be cause for referral to the Standards Committee and probably suspension of the active status of the chapter. Where such referrals are made, the Standards Committee will write to the appropriate person at the institution (Department Head, Dean, or President) informing him of imminent suspension and urging return of the completed annual report. If, then, the report is not filed by a stated deadline the Standards Committee will inform the President of the institution that its charter has been suspended. At this point the initiative transfers to the institution to seek reinstatement of its active status. If no such action is taken within one year, the Standards Committee will recommend that the National Council request the return of the charter.

"In case of non-attendance the warning process can be similar, developing into the same action by the National Council following non-attendance at either of the conferences during a year and failure to supply an adequate explanation, or the failure to attend one of the conferences during the following year even with an explanation.

"The committee is about to address itself also to the problems of assuring that individual members meet fully the requisites for membership."

It was adopted.

Wagner moved to investigate possibilities of publishing organizational journals in one bound volume; referred to committee for expanded services.

Laase read communication from Larry Wood, past Student President; Council agreed that this is not a matter for DSR-TKA consideration.

Chinn letter on pledge club discussed. Jay M. Davis, Harpur, approved for member-at-large (provided proper papers and money forwarded). The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Nicholas M. Cripe,
National Secretary

Chapters and Sponsors

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
AA	Alabama, University, Ala.	Annabel D. Hagood
AB	Albion, Albion, Mich.	D. Duane Angel
AC	Allegheny, Meadville, Pa.	Nels Juleus
AD	Alma, Alma, Mich.	Robert W. Smith
AE	American, Washington, D. C.	Jerome B. Polisky
AF	Amherst, Amherst, Mass.	Thomas F. Mader
AG	Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.	Jack Gregory
AH	Auburn, Auburn, Ala.	Jim Vickrey
BA	Ball State, Muncie, Ind.	David W. Shepard
BB	Bates, Lewiston, Maine	Brooks Quimby
BC	Bellarmine, Louisville, Ky.	Rev. Joseph Morgan Miller
BD	Beloit, Beloit, Wisc.	Carl G. Balson
BE	Berea, Berea, Ky.	Margaret D. McCoy
BF	Birmingham-Southern, Birmingham, Ala.	Sidney R. Hill, Jr.
BG	Boston, Boston, Mass.	
BH	Bridgewater, Bridgewater, Va.	Roger E. Sappington
BI	Brigham Young, Provo, Utah	Jed J. Richardson
BJ	Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.	James R. Johnson
BK	Brown, Providence, R. I.	
BL	Bucknell, Lewisburg, Pa.	Frank W. Merritt
BM	Butler, Indianapolis, Ind.	Nicholas M. Cripe
CA	Capital, Columbus, Ohio	Thomas S. Ludlum
CB	Carleton, Northfield, Minn.	Ada M. Harrison
CC	Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio	Donald Marston
CD	Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	Richard L. LaVarnway
CE	Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio	Rudolph F. Verderber
CF	Clark, Worcester, Mass.	Neil R. Schroeder
CG	Clemson, Clemson, S. C.	Arthur Fear
CH	Colgate, Hamilton, N. Y.	Carson Veach
CI	Colorado, Boulder, Colo.	George Matter
CJ	Colorado, Colorado Springs, Colo.	James A. Johnson
CK	Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.	John W. Vlandis
CL	Cornell, Ithaca, N. Y.	John F. Wilson
CM	Cornell, Mt. Vernon, Iowa	Walter F. Stromer
CN	Creighton, Omaha, Neb.	Rev. Robert B. Barga, S.J.
CO	C. W. Post College of L. I. Univ., Greenvale, N. Y.	Arthur N. Kruger
DA	Dartmouth, Hanover, N. H.	Herbert L. James
DB	Davidson, Davidson, N. C.	Rev. Will Terry
DC	Denison, Granville, Ohio	W. R. Dresser
DD	Denver, Denver, Colo.	Roy V. Wood
DE	DePauw, Greencastle, Ind.	Robert O. Weiss
DF	Dickinson, Carlisle, Pa.	Herbert Wing
DG	Duke, Durham, N. C.	Joseph Cable Weatherby
EA	Earlham, Richmond, Ind.	Howard Gongwer
EB	Eastern Kentucky State, Richmond, Ky.	Aimee Alexander, Robert King
EC	Elmira, Elmira, N. Y.	(Mrs.) Betty G. Gardner
ED	Emory and Henry, Emory, Va.	H. Alan Pickrell
EE	Emory, Atlanta, Ga.	James Z. Rabun, Glenn Pelham
EF	Evansville, Evansville, Ind.	Lynne J. Mlady
FA	Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	Donald E. Williams
FB	Florida State, Tallahassee, Fla.	Gregg Phifer
GA	Georgia, Athens, Ga.	Merwyn A. Hayes
GB	George Washington, Washington, D. C.	George F. Henigan, Jr.
GC	Grinnell, Grinnell, Iowa	William Vanderpool
HA	Hamilton, Clinton, N. Y.	J. Franklin Hunt

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
HB	Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, Va.	D. M. Allan
HC	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	Jacob Miller
HD	Hanover, Hanover, Ind.	Stanley B. Wheeler
HE	Hartford, Hartford, Conn.	Malthon Anapol
HF	Harvard, Cambridge, Mass.	Harry P. Kerr
HG	Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	Orland S. Lefforge
HH	Hiram, Hiram, Ohio	William Clark
HI	Howard, Washington, D. C.	Leroy E. Giles
IA	Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	Ernest Ettlich
IB	Illinois, Urbana, Ill.	Joseph W. Wenzel
IC	Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.	E. C. Chenoweth
ID	Indiana State, Terre Haute, Ind.	Otis J. Aggertt
IE	Iowa State, Ames, Iowa	E. M. Bodaken
IF	Iowa, State College of Cedar Falls, Iowa	Lillian R. Wagner
IG	Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	Gene Eakins
JA	John Carroll, Cleveland, Ohio	Austin J. Freeley
KA	Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas	Donn W. Parson
KB	Kansas State, Manhattan, Kansas	Ted J. Barnes
KC	Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	David McCants
KD	Kings, Wilkes Barre, Pa.	Robert E. Connelly
KE	Knox, Galesburg, Ill.	Donald L. Torrence
LA	Lehigh, Bethlehem, Pa.	H. Barrett Davis
LB	Lincoln Memorial, Harrogate, Tenn.	Earl H. Smith
LC	California State, Long Beach, Calif.	Reta E. Gilbert
LD	Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, La.	Harold Mixon
LE	Loyola, Baltimore, Md.	Stephan W. McNiernay
LF	Loyola, Chicago, Ill.	Donald J. Stinson
MA	Manchester, North Manchester, Ind.	Ronald D. Aungst
MB	Mankato State, Mankato, Minn.	Larry Schnoor
MC	Marquette, Milwaukee, Wis.	Joe Hemmer
MD	Maryland, College Park, Md.	Jon M. Fitzgerald
ME	Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.	Ronald Matlon
MF	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.	Richard Kirshberg
MG	Memphis State, Memphis, Tenn.	Charles Wise
MH	Mercer, Macon, Georgia	Helen G. Thornton
MI	Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	Frank Nelson
MJ	Miami, Oxford, Ohio	Bernard F. Phelps
MK	Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.	Kenneth E. Andersen
ML	Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.	Jerry M. Anderson
MM	Middlebury, Middlebury, Vt.	C. D. Brakeley
MN	Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.	Bernard L. Brock
MO	Mississippi, University, Miss.	Ray A. Schexnider
MP	Missouri, Columbia, Mo.	Phil Emmert
MQ	Montana State, Missoula, Mont.	Ralph Y. McGinnis
MR	Morehouse, Atlanta, Ga.	Robert Brisbane
MS	Morgan State, Baltimore, Md.	Harold B. Chinn
MT	Mount Mercy, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas A. Hopkins
MU	Mundelein, Chicago, Ill.	Sister Mary Antonia, B.V.M.
MV	Murray State, Murray, Ky.	James Albert Tracy
MW	Muskingum, New Concord, Ohio	Judson Ellerton
NA	Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.	Donald O. Olson
NB	Nevada, Reno, Nev.	Robert S. Griffin
NC	New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.	William O. Gilsdorp
ND	New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.	W. C. Eubank
NE	New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, N. M.	Walter F. Brunet

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
NF	New York, Fredonia, N. Y.	Roy Hill
NG	New York (Univ. Hts.), New York, N. Y.	Jack Hasch
NH	New York (Wash. Sq.), New York, N. Y.	Harold R. Ross
NI	North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.	Donald K. Springen
NJ	North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.	Don Orban
NK	Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.	Thomas B. McClain
NL	Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.	Leonard Sommer
OA	Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio	Daniel M. Roher
OB	Occidental, Los Angeles, Calif.	Norman Freestone
OC	Ohio, Athens, Ohio	Ted J. Foster
OD	Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio	Harold Lawson
OE	Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio	Ed Robinson
OF	Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.	Paul Barefield
OG	Oregon, Eugene, Ore.	W. Scott Nobles
OH	Oregon State, Corvallis, Ore.	Ralph W. Peterson
PA	Pacific, Forest Grove, Ore.	Albert C. Hingston
PB	Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.	Miceal P. Carr
PC	Pennsylvania State, University Park, Pa.	Clayton H. Schug
PD	Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Robert Newman
PE	Pomona, Claremont, Calif.	Hans Palmer
PF	Purdue, Lafayette, Ind.	John Monsma
QA	Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.	Howard I. Streifford
RA	Randolph-Macon, Ashland, Va.	Edgar E. MacDonald
RB	Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.	Lee R. Polk
RC	Richmond, Richmond, Va.	Bert E. Bradley, Jr.
RD	Roanoke, Salem, Va.	William R. Coulter
RE	Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y.	Joseph Fitzpatrick
RF	Rockford, Rockford, Ill.	Jeanette Anderson Hoffman
RG	Rutgers, New Brunswick, N. J.	James Wood
SA	St. Anselm's, Manchester, N. H.	John A. Lynch
SB	St. Cloud State, St. Cloud, Minn.	William R. McCleary
SC	St. Lawrence, Canton, N. Y.	Robert N. Manning
SD	St. Mary's, San Antonio, Texas	James Brennan
SE	Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.	Linda Hall
SF	San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif.	Henry E. McGuckin, Jr.
SG	University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.	Orlando G. Baca
SH	South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.	Merrill G. Christophersen
SI	South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.	John R. Wenburg
SJ	Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.	John DeBross
SK	Southern Methodist, Dallas, Texas	Harold Weiss
SL	Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, Mo.	Holt Spicer
SM	Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.	Bettie Hudgens
SN	Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.	Kenneth E. Mosier
SO	State University of New York at Albany, Albany, N. Y.	David Fractenberg
SP	State Univ. of N. Y., Harpur College, Binghamton	Peter Kane
SQ	Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y.	Paul R. McKee
TA	Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.	Ralph Towne
TB	Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.	Robert L. Hickey
TC	Texas, Austin, Texas	J. Rex Wier
TD	Texas Technological, Lubbock, Texas	P. Merville Larson
TE	Tufts, Medford, Mass.	Trevor Melia
TF	Tulane, New Orleans, La.	Alex B. Lacey, Jr.
UA	Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.	A. G. Kershner, Jr.
UB	Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	George A. Adamson
UC	Utah State, Logan, Utah	Rex E. Robinson

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
VA	Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.	Randall M. Fisher
VB	Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	Robert Huber
VC	Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.	John Graham
VD	Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, Va.	E. A. Hancock
WA	Wabash, Crawfordsville, Ind.	Joseph O'Rourke, Jr.
WB	Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, N. C.	Franklin R. Shirley
WC	Washington, St. Louis, Mo.	Herbert E. Metz
WD	Washington, Seattle, Wash.	Robert Halle
WE	Washington and Jefferson, Washington, Pa.	Robert J. Brindley
WF	Washington and Lee, Lexington, Va.	William W. Chaffin
WG	Washington State, Pullman, Wash.	Arthur B. Miller
WH	Wayne State, Detroit, Mich.	George W. Ziegelmueller
WI	Waynesburg, Waynesburg, Pa.	A. M. Mintier
WJ	Weber State, Ogden, Utah	John B. Hebestreet
WK	Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.	Bruce Markgraf
WL	Western Kentucky State, Bowling Green, Ky.	Randall Capps
WM	Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, Mich.	Charles R. Helgesen
		Deldee Herman
WN	Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio	Clair Henderliden
WO	Westminster, New Wilmington, Pa.	Walter E. Scheid
WP	West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.	William L. Barnett
WQ	Whittier, Whittier, Calif.	George Paul
WR	Wichita State, Wichita, Kansas	Mel Moorhouse
WS	Willamette, Salem, Ore.	Howard W. Runkel
WT	William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.	Donald L. McConkey
WU	Williams, Williamstown, Mass.	George G. Connelly
WV	Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.	Winston L. Brembeck
WW	Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.	Raymond H. Myers
WX	Wittenburg, Springfield, Ohio	Ernest Dayka
WY	Wooster, Wooster, Ohio	Harry Sharp
WZ	Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.	B. Wayne Callaway
XA	Xavier, Cincinnati, Ohio	Rev. Vincent C. Horrigan, S.J.
YA	Yale, New Haven, Conn.	Rollin G. Osterweis
YB	Yeshiva, New York, N. Y.	David Fleisher



SPEAKER and GAVEL

Allen Press, Inc.
P. O. Box 368
Lawrence, Kansas

Return Postage Guaranteed

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