

Complete Issue 5(3)

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



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

Recommended Citation

(1968). Complete Issue 5(3). Speaker & Gavel, 5(3), 78-108.

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 5(3)

Olson

speaker and gavel



volume 5, number 3

march, 1968

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. 66044
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 BEARD, State University of New York 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; BERNARD L. BROCK, University of Minnesota; 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 5	March, 1968	Number 3
The President's Page— <i>Leroy T. Laase</i>		78
Reduced Rates for Air Travel to the 1968 National Conference		79
CURRENT CRITICISM:		
Black Power Bends Martin Luther King— <i>Robert L. Scott</i>		80
Preparing for Leadership— <i>Lionel Crocker</i>		87
Short Histories for Initiation		90
Speech Training as Preparation for the U. S. Senate— <i>Carl Allen Pitt</i>		91
A Study of the Status of Intramural Forensics on the American College Campus— <i>Clayton H. Schug</i>		94
Student Council Report— <i>Bob Shields</i>		99
News from the Regions		100
Minutes of the National Council of DSR-TKA Meetings		101
Chapters and Sponsors		106

PLAN AHEAD!

Fifth Annual National Forensics Conference
George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
April 7, 8, 9, 10, 1968

Sixth Annual National Forensics Conference
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
April 6, 7, 8, 9, 1969

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

LEROY T. LAASE

During the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha meetings of the National Council at the recent Speech Association of America Convention in Los Angeles, considerable business was transacted. The minutes of these two meetings of the Council are reported elsewhere in this issue of *Speaker and Gavel*.

I should like to use this President's Page to call special attention of the membership to a few of the items deliberated upon by the Council.

The Treasurer's report and the proposed budget for the current year revealed the finances of the Society are in such good shape that the Council could approve an \$800 subsidy for the operation of the annual national conference. This subsidy, together with a decision to hold only one banquet during the forthcoming national conference in Washington, D. C., should reduce some of the burden on the host school and still result in lower total fees for participation in the conference. Also, by this action, the Society made clear that the forensic tournament and the student congress held during the annual spring conference are an integral part of the Society's program. We sincerely hope that this action will enable more chapters to attend and those attending to send more student participants to the national conference, April 7-10 in Washington, D. C.

The report from our National Conference Committee Chairman, Austin Freeley, indicates that he and George Henigan, Tournament Director from the host school, George Washington University, have made excellent arrangements for local hospitality, the tournament, and the congress. Rules for the tournament were published in the November, 1967 issue of the *Speaker and Gavel*. An article on the student congress appeared in the January issue. Such advance information as we have at this writing indicates a probable good attendance. Your president sincerely hopes that more and more chapters will plan ahead each year to make the annual national conference a featured event in their forensics schedule.

The biggest problem facing the National Council was the question of what to do about weak and inactive chapters. Thirty-seven chapters have initiated no new member during the last three years. Many chapters have not been represented at either regional or national meetings of the Society during these same three years. The Council, after careful deliberation, authorized that chapters not taking steps to comply with the standards set by the Constitution and Bylaws (Articles IV and V) by the time of the national conference in Washington, D. C. be declared officially "inactive" and removed from the list of "active" chapters. The Council has no desire to lose chapters, but it agreed that unless these delinquent chapters can be spurred into activity they should be dropped from the chapter rolls.

The Council regretfully accepted the resignation of Wayne Brockriede, Editor of the *Speaker and Gavel*, effective at the end of the current volume. At that time Editor Brockriede will assume another official obligation which made his continuation as editor impossible. Your president enlists the cooperation of the chapters in the search for a new editor. If you know of a faculty member in the Society who is especially qualified for the editorship, and who might arrange for the time necessary for its duties, would you please send his name together with a brief statement of his

publication experience for our consideration? Wayne Brockriede and his associate editors have done much to upgrade the quality of *Speaker and Gavel*, and we want this excellence maintained.

Your president and other elected officers will complete their current terms of office in July, 1969. Consequently, your president has appointed a nominating committee so they can work during the 1968 National Conference and publicize their nominees before the meeting of the National Council in Chicago, in December, 1968, at which time the election of new officers takes place. This nominating committee consists of Wayne Eubank, University of New Mexico, immediate past president of the Society, as chairman; Wayne Brockriede, University of Colorado; and Robert Weiss, DePauw University, currently an associate editor. The new officers to be elected in December, 1968, are president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and three council members at large. If chapters have anyone to suggest for any of these offices, they are urged to send the suggestions, together with supporting information, to any of the three members of the nominating committee.

We hope to see representatives from most of the chapters in Washington, D. C., April 7-10.

REDUCED RATES FOR AIR TRAVEL TO THE 1968 NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Allegheny Airlines has announced Group Travel rates which will be of special interest to chapters planning to attend the 1968 National Conference at George Washington University in Washington, D. C. They offer a 33½% discount for a group of ten or more persons traveling round trip on Allegheny Airlines. The group must originate from the same city and depart on the same flight served by Allegheny Airlines. The return trip may be made individually or as a group on any flight. In many cases it would be an easy matter for two or three chapters to form a group of ten or more and travel to the National Conference from a city served by Allegheny.

Allegheny Airlines is planning to mail the full details of this offer to all chapter sponsors. If the mailing has not reached you by the time you read this announcement you may write directly to Allegheny Airlines, Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15231 for further information.

AUSTIN J. FREELEY, Chairman
National Conference Committee

CURRENT CRITICISM

Edited by DONALD L. TORRENCE

BLACK POWER BENDS MARTIN LUTHER KING

ROBERT L. SCOTT*

The Meredith March in Mississippi, June, 1966, occasioned the confrontation of the slogans "Freedom Now" and "Black Power." In his most recent book, Martin Luther King, Jr., presents a dramatic account of the struggle among the organizations that took over the march after James Meredith was wounded by a shotgun blast. From the beginning, King testifies, he sensed a tension, an antagonism to white participation in the march, that he had not experienced during previous civil rights actions. At Greenwood, Mississippi, "SNCC country," Stokely Carmichael brought the Black Power chant into the open. Later at a conference of leaders to discuss the internal tensions, and especially the new slogan, King reports:

Stokely and Floyd [McKissick of CORE] remained adamant, and Stokely concluded by saying, with candor, "Martin, I deliberately decided to raise this issue on the march in order to give it a national forum, and force you to take a stand for Black Power."

I laughed. "I have been used before," I said to Stokely. "One more time won't hurt."

The meeting ended with the SCLC staff members still agreeing with me that the slogan was unfortunate and would only divert attention from the evils of Mississippi, while most CORE and SNCC staff members joined Stokely and Floyd in insisting that it be projected nationally. In a final attempt to maintain unity I suggested that we compromise by not chanting either "Black Power" or "Freedom Now" for the rest of the march.¹

King's account of what occurred and his discussion of the significance of the slogan are credible. His book, appearing a year later, must have been written so close to the genesis of the debate that it can be considered part of the event, not later wishful thinking. Furthermore, King's public statements during and since the summer of 1966 are consistent with what he says in the book.

On one judgment few are likely to disagree with Dr. King. The effort to keep the internal controversy from distracting attention from the questions of civil rights in Mississippi was not successful. "But while the chant died out," King writes, "the press kept the debate going. News stories now centered, not on the injustices of Mississippi, but on the apparent ideological division in the civil rights movement."² Every newspaper and popular magazine had features on Black Power, usually with sides drawn pro and con from among civil rights organizations and leaders.³ Martin Luther King was consistently presented as being against

* Mr. Scott is Professor of Speech, Communication, and Theatre Arts at the University of Minnesota.

¹ *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 31-32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³ See, e.g., "Negro Leaders Dividing—The Effect," *U. S. News and World Report*, July 18, 1966, pp. 31-34.

Black Power; that he symbolizes passive resistance helped translate the issue into violence versus non-violence. Anyone studying the evidence closely might question the propensity of the press to simplify the issue by enlisting King against Black Power, but no one can doubt that he was deeply troubled, and that while he was by no means as severe in his denunciations as was Roy Wilkins of the NAACP,⁴ he believed the slogan would do more harm than good for the Negro.

Debaters, of course, seek to change the responses characteristic of their audiences. Participating in debate, however, may generate forces that will modify the participant as well. He may be brought to recognize limitations in his own position as he seeks to defend it against criticism. His recognition may stem both from arguments brought to bear by those who oppose him and from his own examination of his commitments as he finds himself pressing them on others. If he would appeal to an audience, the response tendencies which the debater must take into account will make the audience not merely a passive body to be shaped but an active force in shaping the discourse.

King's position on Black Power is an outgrowth of give and take with others within his own organization, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—the parent of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and with leaders of other organizations dedicated to civil rights; he has been pressed in scores of news conferences, radio and television programs, and public forums to denounce or defend Black Power. In such circumstances it is not surprising that Dr. King's voice has begun to sound some fresh notes.

In the decade following the Montgomery bus boycott, Martin Luther King became a symbol of passive resistance. Not only his ends but his means engendered controversy. Those who opposed equal rights for Negroes found his means difficult to resist. Peaceful demonstration and quiet practice of civil rights could only be countered by actions that dramatized the truth of the charges that King and his followers brought to bear. Those who stood for equal rights saw that King's means were consistent with his ends and honored him for setting an example of the strength of forbearance in the presence of evil.

King's methods have been important to him; he discussed them often, both inside "the movement" and with groups outside. To an organization of Presbyterian ministers and laymen called the Fellowship of the Concerned, he said in 1961,

We cannot believe . . . the idea that the end justifies the means because the end is pre-existent in the means. So the idea of non-violent resistance . . . is the philosophy which says that the means must be as pure as the end, that in the long run of history, immoral destructive means cannot bring about moral and constructive ends.⁵

In the sparsely furnished office of the man who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, a picture of Mohandas Gandhi testifies silently to King's indebtedness; he is not apt to forget his debt nor abandon the lesson he has striven so valiantly to teach others.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 34. Wilkins denounced the idea of Black Power vigorously in his address to the NAACP convention in Los Angeles. See *New York Times*, July 6, 1966, p. 14, for excerpts.

⁵ "Love, Law, and Civil Disobedience," in *The Rhetoric of Racial Revolt*, ed., Roy L. Hill (Denver, Colorado: The Golden Bell Press, 1964), p. 347.

But King's ends and his means have been subjected to ridicule by the advocates of a new Negro militancy under the banner of Black Power.⁶ Freedom Now has taken on a hollow ring in the face of token integration. The end of integration itself has been argued as suspect by Stokely Carmichael who pictures it as siphoning off a few of the most able Negroes from the black community leaving the many remaining the poorer for their absence.⁷ Again, passive resistance, always difficult to practice, becomes more difficult as the militants remind Negroes that their passivity has always been praised as a virtue by white supremacists: "We feel that integration is irrelevant; it is just a substitute for white supremacy. We have got to go after political power," Carmichael argues.⁸ Some Negroes listened and at least applauded approval as H. Rap Brown went from city to city apparently fanning the fires of violence during the summer of 1967. "Stop looting and start shooting," newspapers reported him shouting to a crowd from atop a theater in riot-scarred Detroit. "The white man has declared war. We're in a rebellion."⁹

The immediate impact of Black Power on Martin Luther King is not difficult to discern. Part of the "white backlash" was a dwindling of contributions to the civil rights movement.¹⁰ Apparently anticipating the problem, in July, 1966, the SCLC sent a letter over Dr. King's signature to its list of supporters. It began, "This letter is not a fund appeal." King labeled the Black Power slogan as "an unwise choice at the outset" with "violent connotations" that have become injurious. After re-affirming his own and the SCLC's continued adherence to non-violence, he asserted that among the Negroes in Mississippi and Chicago with whom he had marched that summer "over 90% of these dedicated activists remained adherents of the time tested principles of non-violence and interracial unity." Most of the letter emphasized that conditions of racial inequality that spawned the frustration of violence continue.

In a letter over his signature in October, 1966, this time a fund appeal, Dr. King again disassociated himself and "the vast majority of Negroes" from Black Power (citing as evidence "a *Newsweek* poll" [August 22, 1966, p. 34]). But he subtly exploited the threat: "Yet it would be hazardous to be complacent or smug because the appeal of extremist black power is narrow. The allure of 'Black Power' in its extremist or moderate senses springs from real, not imaginary causes." The letter pressed the miserable conditions to be dealt with, but with more emphasis on the urban ghetto than regular recipients of fund appeals from the SCLC had seen in the past. The readers were given implicit alternatives: accept the festering sores that lead to violence or support a constructive, non-violent organization. The letter concluded, "We need your support. Will you join with

⁶ "At the CORE convention [July, 1966], middle-class Negroes were derided as 'black-power brokers,' 'handkerchief heads,' and 'Dr. Thomases' (Uncle Toms with attaché cases), and moderate Negro preachers like Dr. King were called 'chicken-eating preachers.'" *Time*, July 15, 1966, p. 16.

⁷ See, e.g., "Toward Black Liberation," *Massachusetts Review*, VII (Autumn, 1966), 647.

⁸ Cited in "SNCC Does Not Wish to Become a New Version of the White Man's Burden," *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, June 6, 1966, p. 3.

⁹ "Brown Presses Violence Theme," *Minneapolis Star*, August 28, 1967, p. 6B.

¹⁰ See, e.g., "A Major Turning Point Against the Negro Movement," *U. S. News and World Report*, October 3, 1966, p. 46.

those who are investing in democracy. It will yield no profit except the satisfaction of shaping a future of brotherhood, freedom and harmony."

But the impact of Black Power on Martin Luther King has been more than that of immediate rhetorical necessities, such as disassociating himself from the violence, and of opportunities, such as presenting the SCLC as an alternative. In King today there is more stress on building pragmatically economic and political strength and on using that strength, and there is a fresh emphasis on creating a sense of pride in Negro manhood. The change in direction was evident early in the furore over Black Power. A writer for *Newsweek* saw the turn taken: "Integration is out: the rallying cry for King's own campaign in Chicago is not 'integrate' but 'end slums'; the means, in effect, is Black Power without calling it that."¹¹

In the year that followed the turbulent summer of 1966, Dr. King made pride and power consistent with love and non-violence. His new rhetoric is brilliantly displayed in his report to the Tenth Anniversary Convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Atlanta, Georgia, August 16, 1967.¹²

There is in this address, as one soon learns to expect in reading and listening to Dr. King, the repetitions of sound and phrase which give his speech a richly melodic quality. He begins by saying that Negroes a decade ago were "harried by day and haunted by night by a corroding sense of fear and a nagging sense of 'nobodyness.'" But pressure has caused "the sagging walls of segregation to come tumbling down" (p. 1). Throughout the opening, "ten years ago" is a refrain varied occasionally with "a decade ago." At the end of the speech, when King charges his hearers to keep their faith and renew their courage in the weary strife, "let us be dissatisfied" and finally "let us remember" and "let us realize" bring the drumbeat to his peroration (pp. 16-17).

But added to these familiar elements, to the allusions and direct references to the Bible, are echoes of the language of Black Power. Anyone who has heard and read Stokely Carmichael's angry words to white America, "I just want you to get off my back," may be jolted by King's "In short, over the last ten years, the Negro decided to straighten his back up, realizing that a man cannot ride your back unless it is bent" (p. 2). Even the black nationalism that has made common cause with revolutionaries around the world is reflected in King's "the ghetto is a domestic colony that's constantly drained without being replenished. You are always telling us to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps and yet we are being robbed every day. Put something back in the ghetto!" (p. 6).

King's speech is a report on the past programs and future plans of the SCLC; it is also a refutation of the violent implications of Black Power, an absorption of the moderate implications of Black Power, and a challenge to a broadened task for those who have identified themselves with the civil rights movement. Underneath the subtle modifications of the language and the direct argument to these ends lies a well-wrought progression of thought in which each point prepares for the one that follows.

The speech opens appropriately with the stuff of a report. King uses the occasion of the tenth anniversary to stress past accomplishment, but

¹¹ *Newsweek*, July 11, 1966, p. 31.

¹² All references will be to the official version of the speech distributed by the SCLC, 334 Auburn Avenue, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia.

the past accomplishment is focused to highlight a picture of radical change to cut some of the ground out from under the militants who have challenged King and his methods: "The courage with which [the Negro] confronted enraged mobs dissolved the stereotype of the grinning, submissive Uncle Tom. He came out of his struggle integrated only slightly in the external society, but powerfully integrated within. This was a victory that had to precede all other gains" (pp. 1-2).

Although the 1966 report had included the story of the SCLC's expansion into the northern ghettos with "Operation Breadbasket," King's 1967 speech covers the work in Chicago and Cleveland in much more detail than that in the South. Such emphasis may be explained partially by recognizing that the delegates were more than well aware of the work in the South but needed to know more of the fresh accomplishments in the North, but even so, the stress on political and economic awareness and the molding of awareness into accomplishment occupies territory that the Black Power advocates saw as largely untouched by the drive for civil rights.

To the story of accomplishment and progress echoing with overtones of power, King adds another argument preparatory to a direct attack on Black Power. Picturing a nation in which the Negro's plight has been more than economic and political exploitation but one of psychological debasement, King calls upon the listener to "upset this cultural homicide," to affirm "his own Olympian manhood," to confirm "his psychological freedom" with "a firm sense of self-esteem." In doing so he adopts a phrase which had become associated with ghetto militants, "Yes, we must stand up and say, 'I'm black and I'm beautiful! . . .'" (p. 9).¹³ King had often in the past appealed to self-esteem—his Christian sense of rightness set non-violence as the goal of a strong, dedicated man. But a pride in being black puts his drive for integration on a fresh basis, a little more like Stokely Carmichael's demand for a coalition of equal groups rather than an integration of selected individuals.

The lists of active accomplishments and the strong, proud identification with being black prepare the audience for the speaker's direct attack on violence. The first step in this attack is to define "legitimate power" as "the ability to achieve purpose" (p. 10); this step echoes the report of progress and promise just completed. The next step is to face the tension between "power" and "love":

What is needed is a realization that power without love is reckless and abusive and love without power is sentimental and anemic. Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is power correcting everything that stands against love. And this is what we must see as we move on (p. 10).

The tension is resolved in Christian love. The failure to resolve the tension, to cry for the revenge of "destructive and conscienceless power" is associated with the abhorrent reality of white supremacy (p. 11). This appeal is familiar to King's rhetoric: we must be better than they or sink even deeper to more shameful levels.

¹³ For an interesting account of Stokely Carmichael's use of "I am black and I am beautiful," in a speech in Tallahassee, Florida, April 16, 1967, see Elizabeth F. Phifer, "Carmichael in Tallahassee," *Southern Speech Journal*, XXXIII (Winter, 1967), 89.

After a thoroughly pragmatic attack on taking the idea of Black Power literally as revolution in America ("It is perfectly clear that a violent revolution on the part of the American blacks would find no sympathy and support from the white population and very little from the majority of the Negroes themselves" p. 13), King proposes a deeper revolution: the restructuring of American society, which he relates to the confrontation of Jesus and Nicodemus, "America, you must be born again!" (p. 16).

King recognizes the pull that radical philosophy, economic and political, has had on many bright, young Negroes growing cynical in the contradictions of American life.

What I'm saying to you this morning is that Communism forgets that life is individual. Capitalism forgets that life is social, and the Kingdom of Brotherhood is found neither in the thesis of Communism nor the antithesis of Capitalism but in a higher synthesis. . . . Now, when I say question the whole society, it means ultimately coming to see that the problem of racism, the problem of economic exploitation, and the problem of war are all tied together. These are the triple evils that are interrelated (p. 15).

Perhaps King never believed that his fight for integration was a fight to allow Negroes to be absorbed into a corrupt society, but his struggle with Black Power has made him emphasize the need for radical change. Whether this is an old or a new insight for King, he creates of it an opportunity to make a common cause with anyone, white or black, who will recognize that poverty, war, and hatred are symptoms of deep trouble that necessitate fundamental changes. Further he reaffirms his faith in non-violent methods on the familiar ground that violence will corrupt any change it brings.

Martin Luther King's address to the Tenth Anniversary Convention of the SCLC is an impressive document. In it the speaker displays a vocabulary freshened by its confrontation with Black Power and a program with more depth and breadth than the civil rights movement had known previously.

Of course no one, including Dr. King, can be certain of the influence of Black Power on his rhetoric. The SCLC had turned northward with Operation Breadbasket before the Meredith march; whether this drive would have assumed the importance it did in his 1967 report without the evident necessity of making some sort of response to Black Power is difficult to say. Further, Dr. King was disenchanted with the Vietnam war before the outcry of the well-known Black Power advocates.

In his 1966 report to the SCLC, Dr. King said, "But before we were able to depart from the 1965 Convention, the fires of Watts began to burn and with Watts a whole new era of the civil rights struggle emerged."¹⁴ In this earlier presidential address, King touched on Black Power several times, but in 1967 direct and indirect references to the idea fascinating many Negroes permeates his report.

No one who reads or hears King can doubt that he is being influenced by a man who is rooted deeply in strong commitments, commitments which are not apt to be sundered in the changing winds of events. Nor can one

¹⁴ "President's Annual Report by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Delivered in Jackson, Mississippi, August 10, 1966." [Mimeographed, SCLC].

doubt that here is a man who has exposed himself, and will expose himself, to the forces of change roaring about him. If indeed he has been bent in the debate over Black Power, bending may be a sign of strength; that which is bent may itself gain energy as a shaping force.

James Farmer, former director of CORE, writes that "the debate will rage on between cohesiveness and dispersion. Ascendancy of one camp or the other will be determined ultimately not by rhetoric, and not even by leadership, as much as by events. Events today seem to be racing to the side of the spirited new force—cohesion—and I think that is right and good for the black man at this historical juncture."¹⁵ Farmer is right in seeing the priority of events in shaping the future and in judging that these are destined to arouse stronger feelings of community among Negroes. The question is on what terms will Negroes be cohesive? Would Farmer be able to identify the "spirited new force" at all if it were not in the process of developing some sort of recognizable character, which is about the same thing as saying if it were not being articulated by leaders.

If the next step forward for Negroes in America is to come through the development of organized political and economic power which will tend to emphasize the black community as a community, the problem of who will lead and with what philosophy is crucial. Writing in 1963, before the Black Power crisis, Martin Luther King saw the past failure of Negroes to shape and use power:

Negroes have traditionally positioned themselves too far from the inner arena of political decision. Few other minority groups have maintained a political aloofness and a nonpartisan posture as rigidly and as long as Negroes. The Germans, Irish, Italians, and Jews, after a period of acclimatization, moved inside political formations and exercised influence. Negroes, partly by choice but substantially by exclusion, have operated outside of the political structures, functioning instead essentially as a pressure group with limited effect.¹⁶

The debate over Black Power has quickened King's concern for moving in directions he himself saw as necessary. Did he move soon enough? Is he moving quickly and substantially now? Does he judge the political acuity of his audience well: "By and large, Negroes remain essentially skeptical, issue-oriented, and independent-minded. Their lack of formal learning is no barrier when it comes to making intelligent choices among alternatives."¹⁷ It is too early to answer these questions, but it is not too early to recognize that a man who has been predominant in the civil rights movement for the past decade is in the process of adapting his rhetoric to take advantage of and to modify the new force generated by an increasing awareness of the limitations of the old programs and a heady desire for exercising power as a group.

Martin Luther King, resilient and enduring, presents an insight and poses a challenge to all Americans. If America is to endure it must show itself capable of bending and shaping new ways in a new world. Some of our citizens have proved their capability to persevere and adapt in the most trying circumstances. In the rhetoric of Martin Luther King, all of us have much to heed and much to hope for.

¹⁵ "Are White Liberals Obsolete in the Black Struggle?" *The Progressive*, January, 1968, p. 16.

¹⁶ *Why We Can't Wait* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 163.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

PREPARING FOR LEADERSHIP

LIONEL CROCKER*

John W. Gardner, former Director of the Carnegie Foundation, now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in President Johnson's cabinet, devoted his parting address when he left the Carnegie Foundation to "The Anti-Leadership Vaccine." The theme was that American education is not pointing in the direction of the education of leaders. A typical sentence is this: "The academic world appears to be approaching a point at which everyone will want to educate the technical expert who advises the leader, or the intellectual who stands off and criticizes the leader, but no one will want to educate the leader himself."

But leaders are being educated at this tournament. You debaters, discussants, extemporaneous speakers, and public speakers gathered here tonight are on the road to leadership. I know what I am talking about for here in my hands I hold a copy of the *Indianapolis Star* for Wednesday, November 8, 1967 which has the headline LUGAR TRIUMPHS BY 9,116. Richard C. Lugar was one of my debaters at Denison University. Let me give you a quotation from a newspaper story on Dick Lugar's victory in his candidacy for the office of mayor of Indianapolis: "He's articulate, intelligent, sharp. But he's not an egg head and proved in the campaign that he can communicate with anyone and that he's keenly aware of what's going on in Indianapolis." Intelligent individuals must be made articulate in order that intelligence may prevail.

Through experiences garnered in such tournaments as these you are learning how to be articulate. Your teachers of speech, your debate coaches, and your critic judges are working constantly on your ability to put ideas into words.

I like this definition of education formulated by Grayson Kirk, President of Columbia University: "The most important function of education at any level is to develop the personality of the individual and the significance of his life to himself and to others." Could the education you have been receiving in the speech classroom and in this tournament be any more to the point of this definition?

On another occasion President Kirk in speaking of the "Responsibilities of the Educated Man" declared that the first responsibility is to achieve clarity and precision in the spoken and written word. He notes that thought processes are linked intimately with expression. Clarity of thought and clarity of expression go hand in hand.

Now let's take a look at what is happening to you in your education in speech. Let me treat the subject from three points of view: (1) Speech liberates. (2) Speech integrates. (3) Speech stimulates.

Speech liberates.—Man has four vocabularies: the reading, the listening, the writing, and the speaking. For many reasons the spoken word vocabulary is the weakest of the four. Your engaging in forensics will help you

*Mr. Crocker is Visiting Professor at Indiana State University. "Preparing for Leadership" is an address Professor Crocker presented at a banquet of the annual speech tournament at Indiana State University, Nov. 10, 1967. The tournament was directed by Dr. Otis J. Aggert and attended by twenty-six colleges and universities and by more than 300 students.

break out of the shell of an inadequate vocabulary. One might ask the pointed question, "How many new words have you added to your vocabulary this season?"

Cicero said that the process of speaking has five aspects: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. I am sure you speakers have been liberated as you have thought about this season's proposition and found arguments. You have thought yourself empty and read yourself full. You have learned how to use the library. This liberates you. You have been taught how to organize your arguments to gain the best effect. You have improved your style. Lincoln's mastery of the English language liberated his thoughts. The development of your memory, so necessary in debating, liberates you. And control of your body in communication—the effective use of gesture, posture, and voice and speech liberates you.

Speech integrates.—Most of the student's time is spent listening to professors lecture. But in these tournaments you do the talking. There is a vast difference. There is very little opportunity in the college classroom for a student to tell what he thinks. But in these contests the student has an opportunity to bring together his knowledge of economics, government, sociology, and even theology. A proposition such as a guaranteed income demands integration from many fields.

How much integration goes on in the average classroom? I remember, as a student, being in an economics class where we were discussing economic theory. The professor asked for questions and comments. I said that I did not think the particular theory would work because of certain sociological factors. The professor reminded me that we were discussing economic theory in this course. Similarly, in a sociology class a professor detailed the terrible conditions in the slums. When questions and comments were asked for, I asked what we were going to do about the slums. The professor answered that we were not going to do anything about them for in this class we were concerned only with analysis. But the debater must take into account all factors and their bearing upon a solution. The debater is very conscious of plan and need. In thus integrating his materials the debater shows that he has not been vaccinated with the anti-leadership vaccine that Dr. Gardner mentioned.

Not only does the student speaker integrate his materials but he integrates with his environment. Conferences with his speech teacher, his debate coach, his fellow debaters and speech fellows help him to explore the boundaries of his experience. The speech teacher and the student become friends. Through speech activities the student becomes identified with his university. Part of the unrest on many college campuses is due to the lack of identification of the student with his environment. Imagine what a priceless friendship developed between the late William Norwood Brigance and such students as J. Jeffery Auer and John Black.

Speech stimulates.—Something inside you has brought you to these contests. No one forced you to come. To me this means that there are whispers inside of you that suggest that you have leadership qualities and aspirations. You want to prepare for the role you are to play in our democratic society. Listen to what Stewart Alsop says about political leadership and debating. In a recent column "The Affairs of State" he said this about the *Complete Politician*: "He was probably a champion debater in his college days, and almost certainly a BMOC. In the course of writing dozens of political profiles, this reporter has never come across

a major politician who was not a Big Man on Campus. And a remarkable number of major politicians were champion debaters—Lyndon Baines Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Richard Nixon, and Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen—to name four.”

Here in Indiana one is reminded of two influential political leaders who matured as debaters in this state, Albert J. Beveridge and Wendell Willkie. Beveridge went to DePauw University where he took all the prizes in speaking. He went on to become the leader of the march of the flag movement. At the turn of the century when America was taking the Philippines under her wing, Beveridge was the leading spokesman of the era. Wendell Willkie debated at Indiana University. After he had been defeated for the presidency by Franklin D. Roosevelt, he is reported to have said to Sinclair Weeks, “I can make money practicing law but I want to promote causes.” This desire no doubt stemmed from his interest in public affairs gained as a debater at Indiana University. Wendell Willkie is remembered as the “One World” advocate.

I wonder if Woodrow Wilson would have taken such an active interest in public life if he had not been a coach of debate at Princeton.

Call the roll of a few of the former debaters and teachers of debate now active in public affairs in Washington, D. C. Bundy debated at Yale; Muskie debated at Bates under Brooks Quimby; Karl Mundt was a teacher of speech and debate coach at Eastern State Normal School at Madison, South Dakota; I remember Wayne Morse bringing his debate teams to Ann Arbor from the University of Wisconsin. He continued to work with debate at the University of Minnesota where he studied law.

Of special interest to the student of speech and debate is the career of President Lyndon Baines Johnson. In April of 1924, his senior year in high school, Johnson and 14 other students from Johnson City journeyed to San Marcos to take part in the district meet of the Texas Interscholastic League. Johnson and his partner won third place in debate. At his graduation exercises he read the class poem. At San Marcos he was a member of the Harris Blair Debating Society. At the age of 22 Johnson took a position with the Sam Houston High School in the Department of Speech. Under Johnson's coaching Sam Houston High School won the city debate tournament, the first time this had happened. In the fall of 1930 Sam Houston was one of the five senior high schools in the city, with a faculty of 70 and a student body of almost 1,700. San Jacinto High School was the school to beat. In a city-wide meet, representatives from Sam Houston won either first or second place in every event that they entered. Johnson has said that this year spent at Sam Houston was one of the happiest of his life.

Hubert Humphrey gained prominence in Minneapolis through his radio and television programs and announcing. He was elected mayor, then senator, then vice president. In a letter to me on the value of his education in speech, he said, “No man in public life or public service can hope to be effective if he does not perfect a smooth and articulate style. It is extremely important for a young person who hopes for a public career to develop the basic techniques of public speaking early.” Notice that word articulate.

Let me tell you the story of John McDonald, one of our recent debaters at Denison University who was national student president of Tau Kappa Alpha when in college. John debated through high school and college.

He then went on to law school at Ohio State University. There he entered the moot court trials. After winning the local contest he went on to the regional where he met representatives of such law schools as the University of Michigan and Wayne State University. He was sent to Louisiana State University for the semifinals. He won there and was sent to New York City for the finals which he won. On completion of his law course he ran for the state legislature and won. He is the minority whip of the Ohio State Legislature. Recently, the Democrats of Ohio voted him the John F. Kennedy award for being the most promising of the young Democrats in the state of Ohio.

Let me close with this thought of Edmund Burke, the 18th-century author, debater, statesman, and political scientist. I am sure Edmund Burke would look with favor upon what we have been doing here these days. He said, "In a free country, every man thinks he has a concern in all public matters; that he has a right to form and a right to deliver an opinion upon them. They sift, examine, and discuss them. They are curious, eager, attentive, and zealous; and by making such matters the daily subjects of their thoughts and discoveries vast numbers contact a very tolerable knowledge of them and some a very considerable one. And this is what fills free countries with men of ability."

You men and women here tonight are contacting a very considerable knowledge of public questions. And what is more you are getting ready to take your part in the solution of these questions. You are preparing for public leadership.

SHORT HISTORIES FOR INITIATION

A year ago the National Council authorized the appointment of a committee to revise the short form of the Ritual. President Laase appointed Dr. Herold T. Ross, Dr. James McBath, and Dr. Nicholas Cripe to make the revision which was used for the Initiation Ceremonies held at the National Conference in Detroit. With a few suggestions for further revision, the new form was approved by the National Council.

The revised short form has now been put into print and will be available to all chapters which wish to use it. In the revision the historical sections which appear in both the original long and short forms have been omitted. Realizing that this material should be made available to all initiates, provision is made in the ritual for the distribution to them, following the ceremony, of copies of *A Short History of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha*.

Chapters, therefore, in looking forward to the spring initiations, should send to the National Secretary, Dr. Nicholas Cripe, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana, 46207, for three copies of the revised short form of the Ritual and a sufficient number of copies of the short histories so that all initiates may be handed a copy.

SPEECH TRAINING AS PREPARATION FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

CARL ALLEN PITT*

Many of America's most effective speakers have been members of the United States Senate. In order to learn more about the speech background of our senators and to discover which senators are considered outstanding by their colleagues, this writer mailed a two-page questionnaire to each member of the Senate. Although the response was somewhat limited, it did furnish information which should interest teachers of speech and, particularly, directors of forensics.

The primary purpose of the study was to ascertain the types of speech training experienced by senators, formal and informal, in high school and college.¹ Five sections of questions were designed to elicit this information. Section A queried senators about the courses and activities in speech they had experienced while in high school. Section B inquired about college speech courses and speech activities. The senators' responses to these two sections of the questionnaire are presented in Table I.

The study of speech, particularly participation in speech activities, is quite evident in the secondary schooling of many of the U. S. Senators who replied to the questionnaire. Eight of the 18 who checked this section had taken a course in debate, and 14 had participated in debate activities. Fifteen of the 18 had studied public speaking in high school, either as a separate course or as a unit in an English course. On the college level, 12 of the 19 who responded had studied debate, 13 had studied public speaking, and four had studied oratory. All but three of those who completed these sections of the questionnaire had taken high school or college speech courses, and all but six had participated in forensic activities on either the secondary or the university level.

Section C sought facts concerning other forms of organized speech training senators had experienced. Of the six persons who responded to this section, two had belonged to groups like the Toastmasters' Club, two had taken private lessons, one had directed speech activities, and one had engaged in independent study of radio and television.²

Fourteen individuals responded to Section D, which sought data related to the senators' professional speech experiences other than those associated with campaigning for public office. Seven persons recorded experience as teachers, six as lecturers, three as radio or television announcers, two as actors, two as speakers before civic groups, and one as a lawyer.

Section E asked each respondent to evaluate the items he had checked in the first four sections by listing and ranking the three experiences which had helped him most as a senator. The results of this inquiry are tabulated in Table II.

* Mr. Pitt is Professor of Speech at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois.

¹ The *Congressional Directory*, *Who's Who in America*, and other standard references are helpful but do not penetrate the senators' background in depth. See Roger W. Stuart, *Meet the Senators* (New York: Macfadden-Bartell, 1963).

² A few senators wrote letters explaining their ideas concerning speech preparation and delivery.

TABLE I
SENATORS' HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE SPEECH EXPERIENCES

Courses Taken				Speech Activities			
High School		College		High School		College	
Public Speaking	9	Public Speaking	13	Debate	14	Debate	12
Debate	8	Debate	12	Extemporaneous Speaking	9	Extemporaneous Speaking	10
English (unit in Public Speaking)	6	Drama	5	Declamation	8	Oratory	7
Drama	4	Oral Reading	4	Drama	7	Drama	5
Oral Reading	4	Oratory	4	Oratory	6	Radio	5
Oratory	2	Radio	2	Oral Reading	3	Oral Reading	3

Forensic activities are included among the most helpful experiences. Three senators felt that debating was their most valuable experience, and two others ranked it among the three most valuable. Several senators thought that oratory, extemporaneous speaking, or coaching had been their most helpful experiences. Others thought that practical speaking in professional and civic groups had been most helpful.

A secondary purpose of this study was to discover which senators were regarded by their colleagues as the most outstanding speakers.³ Four questions were asked in this part of the questionnaire: (1) Who are the three most persuasive speakers in the Senate today? (2) Which three senators are the most effective in refuting an opponent on the floor of the senate? (3) Which three senators are the most effective in terms of conciliation and compromise on the floor of the Senate? (4) Who is the most effective speaker in the Senate today? Table III reports the responses of 14 senators.

The responding senators ranked Senator Everett Dirksen (Illinois) as the most persuasive speaker and as the most effective speaker overall. Senator Wayne Morse (Oregon) was ranked as the most effective in refuting an opponent, and Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana) was regarded as the most effective in conciliation and compromise. Two of these three senators have had considerable experience in forensic ac-

TABLE II
EXPERIENCES MOST VALUABLE TO THE SENATORS

First Choice		Second Choice		Third Choice	
Debating	3	Extemporaneous Speaking	3	Civic Affairs	1
Speaking Before Business Groups	2	Taking Private Lessons	2	Debating	1
Coaching Speech	1	Debating	1	Extemporaneous Speaking	1
Oratory	1	Practicing Law	1	Lecturing	1
Practicing Law	1	Teaching	1	Oratory	1
Speaking Before Church Groups	1	Training in Oratory	1	Work in Drama	1
Teaching	1				
Toastmasters' Club	1				

³ Several senators protested that this form of evaluation was most difficult.

TABLE III
SPEAKING EFFECTIVENESS OF SENATORS, AS JUDGED BY SENATORS

Most Persuasive Speakers		Most Effective in Refutation		Most Effective in Conciliation		Most Effective Overall Speaker	
Dirksen	10	Morse	6	Mansfield	9	Dirksen	10
Russell	5	Dirksen	5	Dirksen	7	Javits	2
Morse	4	Pastore	4	Cooper	2		
Church	2	R. Long	3	R. Long	2		
Javits	2	Mansfield	3	Randolph	2		
R. Long	2	Russell	2				
		Hruska	2				

tivities. Senator Dirksen, who was a debater in both high school and college, studied public speaking at the University of Minnesota, and he represented his university at the National Prohibition Oratorical Contest in Lexington, Kentucky. Senator Morse, who debated in high school and college, took college courses in debate and public speaking, and was a speech teacher. Although Senator Mansfield was neither a high school nor a college debater, he did study public speaking in college.

The findings of this study are subject to two limitations. First, the data come from a relatively small sample: only 26 of 100 senators returned the questionnaire. Completing the two-page questionnaire probably required more time than many senators were able to expend. Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois) wrote that his office received 1,000 letters per day and over 25 questionnaires per week.⁴

Second, the questionnaire required senators to make difficult value judgments about their colleagues. I had assumed that most members of the U. S. Senate took advantage of their opportunity to debate on the floor of the Senate and that they were familiar with the speaking abilities of their colleagues. Senator Joseph S. Clark (Pennsylvania) wrote a letter which questions this assumption:

It would be difficult to respond to part two of your questionnaire. Hardly any votes in the Senate result from persuasion in debate, even fewer in refuting an opponent on the floor. Conciliation and compromise are almost always conducted off the floor in the cloakrooms. . . . Our current procedures result in very few senators being on the floor listening to debate except just before the roll-call vote. Even then it would be rash to suggest that votes are often changed by an effective speaker or even dubious votes secured.

Despite these limitations, the study suggests that the speaking of a significant number of senators has been influenced by high school and college courses and activities in speech.

⁴ Despite the investigator's efforts to make the return address obvious, many returns were mailed to other institutions. Several were sent to the University of Chicago. Many were sent to the University of Illinois at Urbana. It seems possible that some returns were lost.

A STUDY OF THE STATUS OF INTRAMURAL FORENSICS ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE CAMPUS

CLAYTON H. SCHUG*

Most educators, presumably, and especially those of us in the field of forensics, believe that students on our college and university campuses should be provided with the opportunity to discover their interest, to test their ability, and to develop their potential in analyzing, supporting, and presenting ideas on current economic, political, and social issues.

The opportunity for this type of training has long been readily available to the superior student with ample time at his disposal who elects to devote himself seriously to our intercollegiate forensics program. However, some people believe that such programs should reach scores, if not hundreds, of additional students. Especially should our pre-law and pre-ministerial students, as well as those who plan to enter politics, government service, and the teaching profession, be exposed to at least a modicum of forensics experience, both competitive and non-competitive, informal as well as formal. Because of the extent of such an endeavor, the intramural program would appear to be practical and realistic—an intramural venture, that is, in addition to, not in place of, the intercollegiate program.

This essay, then, is an attempt to discover, by reviewing the literature in the field and by questionnaire, the status of intramural forensics on the American college campus.

An investigation of Arthur N. Kruger's *Classified Bibliography of Argumentation and Debate*, a bibliography of 400 pages covering well over 200 different periodicals, revealed that precious little had been published about intramural forensics.¹ As a matter of fact, it is probably safe to say that the published articles in this field can, literally, be counted on the fingers of a single hand. Henry G. Roberts, 30 years ago, expounded on the soundness of intramural debate,² followed several years later by F. W. Lambertson's description of the intramural after-dinner speaking contest at Iowa State Teachers College.³ During World War II, Wayne N. Thompson suggested intramural forensics as a solution to wartime forensics problems.⁴

The only comparatively recent article proved to be a revealing one. It was written by Don Williams, who described the intramural program at the University of Texas. According to Williams, "In the academic year 1953-1954 the largest number participating in any one contest was 14," but "in the fall of 1957, 30 campus organizations provided more than 300 entries in the four contests held during the first semester."⁵ Debaters

* Mr. Schug is Director of Forensics at Pennsylvania State University and faculty sponsor of the DSR-TKA chapter there.

¹ (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1964).

² "Intramural Debate, A Sound Investment," *Gavel*, XVII (March, 1935), 41-42.

³ "The Intramural After-Dinner Speaking Contest," *Gavel*, XXIV (March, 1942), 52.

⁴ "Intramural Forensics: One Solution to our Wartime Problems," *Forensics of Pi Kappa Delta*, XXIX (March, 1944), 61-64.

⁵ "The Intramural Program—a Means of Increasing Participation in the Speech Activities," *Gavel*, XL (March, 1958), 51.

served as preliminary judges; judges for the finals were selected from the faculty and the town. The success of the program was attributed, mainly, to two factors: "(1) a carefully planned design to encourage competition both among individuals and organizations; and (2) a continuing series of experiments endeavoring to discover the contest types and formats which attract maximum participation." "Whatever may be the merits of co-operative speech activities in other contexts," says Williams, "the sine qua non of the intramural program of the University of Texas is competition."⁶

A somewhat unique point system was used to determine the winners. Plaques and cups served as prizes. "The point system by which the organization winners are determined at the end of each semester," as explained by Williams, "was designed to strike a balance between 'quantity' and 'quality' of participation." Each entry was awarded five points; each finalist, 25 points; fourth place, 50 points; third place, 100 points; second place, 200 points; and first place, 300 points. Each semester one or two new contests were tested for popularity. Extempore, oratory, debate, and declamation attracted very few. A news analysis contest in which the contestants read items from a newspaper and then commented upon them had greater interest, and another event in which students were requested to give five-minute speeches on "gripes" concerning the University, proved to be popular. The two most popular contests, interestingly, were poetry reading and impromptu.⁷

This may well have represented the most successful intramural forensics program in the country. Now, however, a decade later, in this day of "acceleration," the intramural program at the University of Texas has taken on a very different look, one much like that of a number of others in which debate on a national topic, participated in by 20 to 40 students, is the sole contest. More specifically, this single event at Texas is a four-round, switch-side tournament, without awards, judged by members of the faculty, and participated in by all the members of the University of Texas debate squad.

The status of intramural forensics on the American college campus, apparently, is not now what it once was. The results of the questionnaire agree with the pessimistic conclusion drawn from the survey of literature.⁸

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<i>Questions</i>		<i>Replies</i>
1. Is there normally an intramural forensics program, or an intramural forensics contest of some kind, conducted annually on your campus?	Yes	57
	No	53
2. What entities participate?	Individual	47
	Sororities	10
	Fraternities	15
	Clubs	8

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁸ A total of 186 questionnaires were sent to the chapter sponsors of the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha Society; 110, or approximately 60%, were returned.

	Living Units	9
	Other	4
3. What is the basis for participation?		
	Individual	48
	Team	27
4. Approximately how many students actually participate annually?		
	1-10	6
	11-20	17
	21-40	21
	41-60	1
	61-100	6
	Over 100	5
5. What is the format?		
	Individual Speaking Events	43
	Debate	32
	Discussion	11
	Other	2
6. What topics are normally most successful?		
	Local Campus	18
	State, National, World	40
	Other	5
7. Are the contests judged?		
	Yes	57
	No	0
	By Faculty	50
	By Students	27
	By Others	3
8. Are awards of any kind given?		
	Yes	49
	No	7
	Trophies, etc.	37
	Cash	20
9. What is the average size audience per contest?		
	0	2
	1-10	17
	11-20	11
	21-40	5
	41-60	8
	61-100	8
	Over 100	3
10. Are the events broadcast or televised?		
	Yes	2*
	No	51
	Radio	2†
	TV	0‡
11. Who sponsors the program?		
	Forensic Group	32
	Student Government	2
	Other Student Group	4
	Speech Department	38
	Other	3

* Two more indicated "occasionally"

† One more indicated "occasionally"

‡ One indicated "occasionally"

12. Who manages and conducts the program?

Forensic Group	33
Student Government	1
Other Student Group	4
Speech Department	35
Other	1

13. What, approximately, is the total annual cost to the sponsoring group(s), including supplies, secretarial help, publicity, promotion, judges' fees, awards, etc.?

\$ 0	1
\$ 1-10	11
\$ 11-50	14
\$ 51-100	7
\$100-200	16
Over \$200	4

14. Under what term system does your school operate?

Quarter	8
Trimester	5
Semester	41
Other	2

15. How do you stimulate student participation?
 Announcements; handbills; posters; campus advertising; press release; letters; personally; recruiting; exhibit in student center; Admission Director calls attention of new students to program; presentation of program during orientation week in chapel; class motivation; require speech classes to attend; require advanced speech classes and speech majors to participate; excuse students from one class; special grade consideration; let student audience determine winners; awards; make it a direct route to intercollegiate debate squad; students compete for debate positions; and tradition.

A comparatively accurate composite picture, if one is permitted a number of unrefined calculations, can be drawn of intramural forensics on the campuses of those colleges which returned questionnaires. As the above responses indicate, approximately half of those replying have an annual intramural program or contest of some kind, in which the contestants participate on an individual basis somewhat more frequently than as representatives of sororities, fraternities, clubs, and living units combined, and, in turn, compete nearly twice as frequently as individuals than as teams. The median number of participants is in the neighborhood of 20. State, national, and world topics, rather than local campus issues, are found to be most successful by two-thirds of the colleges, while individual speaking events are used as frequently as contests in debate and discussion. Every contest is judged, faculty judges outnumbering student judges two to one. Awards of some kind are presented in over 87% of the instances, trophies serving as the award twice as often as cash. Normally, about 20 people on an average attend each event; seldom, if ever, is the event either broadcast or televised. The program, almost invariably, is sponsored and conducted by the forensic group in cooperation with the Department of Speech. Half of the schools spend less than \$50.

Few would consider the picture a glowing one, nor would any glitter be added when one considers that out of 110 schools 53 had no intramural program whatsoever. Furthermore, many, if not most, of the 76 schools who failed to reply may well have done so because they had no program

on which to report. Putting it yet another way, out of the 110 schools replying with a total enrollment of over 850,000, slightly more than 2,000 students participated in intramural forensics, or, approximately, one out of every 425.

The attitudes of the schools surveyed ranged from enthusiasm to discouragement and even disinterest. This range is represented by certain comments volunteered by those responding:

Next year this program will be boosted about 500% by student government support. . . . The need was never greater for student opinion to be channeled through these kinds of activities on campus.

Most of the participants are students in one of the advanced speech classes who are "volunteered" by their instructors. We have not been successful in getting many other participants. . . . We ran intramural debate for several years, then dropped it when it just took too much time and energy.

Up until this year—"yes." This year and as far as I can see in the future—"no." . . . Interest was very limited and participation unenthusiastic, which is part of the reason we dropped the whole effort. The other reason was that it took far too much of the debater's time and energy, and did very little good for forensics or the individuals involved as far as I could tell.

We used to have a fraternity intramural, but no longer.

We tried for three different years to arouse local interest in this type of activity, but received no response. Some year we may try again.

Unfortunately, discouragement and disinterest, rather than enthusiasm, appears to be the dominant mood as one analyzes the replies.

Several general conclusions seem to be warranted as a result of this study. First, the paucity of published articles in the field appears to indicate an indifference toward, and a lack of activity in, intramural forensics. Second, many failed to reply to the questionnaire, and of the approximately 60% who did, just slightly over half of them have an intramural forensics program, or as much as a single forensic contest. Third, participation is on a limited basis: relatively few participate, audiences are minuscule, and expenditures for the most part are minimal. Fourth, indifference and disinterest appears to be the prevailing mood and insufficient time and energy the prevailing cause.

STUDENT COUNCIL REPORT

BOB SHIELDS*

At the National Council meeting in Los Angeles I had the pleasure of reporting on Student Council activities since our last meeting in Detroit. I shall attempt to offer a shortened version of the report and to bring you up to date on other matters as well.

During the Student Council sessions last spring, three committees were appointed. The first, chaired by Susan Cahoon of Emory University, was assigned the task of drafting a new application form that would request comparable information from all applicants for the Student Speaker of the Year Award. The committee concluded its work in late November and the forms have now been sent to all chapters. For more information concerning nominating procedure, eligibility, et cetera please consult the November, 1967 issue of *Speaker and Gavel*.

The second committee also dealt with the Student Speaker of the Year Award. This committee was to prepare a brochure that was to be sent to all chapters. The assignment proved to be more difficult than anticipated. It appears that we will be unable to distribute the material before next year.

Bob Vallentine from the University of Kentucky chaired the third committee. Its task of drafting a Student Constitution is almost finished. If we are able to clarify some questions regarding the duties of the officers, we will be presenting the Constitution at the Washington Conference.

Dr. Austin Freeley, Chairman of the National Student Conference Committee, requested a recommendation concerning a student social hour at the Washington Conference. After discussing the matter with DSR-TKA members attending the Southern California and Stanford tournaments, I reluctantly concluded that students would prefer a free evening in Washington rather than planned group activity.

Let me close by encouraging you to participate in our upcoming student sessions and to consider campaigning for a Student Council office. The National Conference can be even more exciting and rewarding if you are involved in student politics. If you are interested, it is never too early to start aligning interests and forming coalitions.

* Mr. Shields, a DSR-TKA member from Wichita State University, is the current DSR-TKA Student Council President.

NEWS FROM THE REGIONS

Edited by ROBERT O. WEISS

REGION II

Acting Regional Governor Peter E. Kane sent a questionnaire to all 29 chapters in the region in early October. All but four chapters eventually replied to it. Of the 25 chapters which responded, 17 indicated that they either definitely planned or would make every effort to attend the National Conference in Washington, D. C. this year. This number is a substantial improvement over the two or three school representation which this region has had in the last two years. Because of the large number of chapter sponsors who will be there, Governor Raymond Beard plans to attend the National Conference and hold the annual regional business meeting at that time. It is hoped that a meeting of chapter sponsors present can lead to the establishment of a regional tournament.

REGION III

The Region III Forensic Conference was held at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, November 18-19, 1967, under the direction of Stanford P. Gwin, Director of Debate at the University of Virginia.

Six rounds of power-matched four-man debate were held. First place was won by Washington and Lee University. The George Washington University was second. First place in Persuasive Speaking was won by Greg Millard of George Washington. Bobby Deister of American University was runner-up. Extemporaneous Speaking was won by John Barremore of Washington and Lee, with Rusty Meyer of Washington and Lee in second place.

The 1968 Region III Forensic Conference will be held at the University of Maryland.

REGION V

The annual conference of Region V chapters took place on November 10, 1967, at Indiana State University at Terre Haute. Meetings were held for chapter sponsors and for student representatives. The speaker at the noon banquet was Dr. Herold T. Ross, National Historian of DSR-TKA.

At the meeting of student representatives, Donald Coffin, of DePauw University, was elected president. John Crook, Wabash College, was chosen to be first vice president, in charge of promoting relations among the chapters. Pete Miller, Ball State University, is the new second vice president. He will produce the regional student newsletter. Cyndy Sasko, University of Illinois, was elected secretary.

REGION VIII

Bernard L. Brock, the new Governor of Region VIII, reports that the region has maintained about the same activity level as in previous years. He has talked with many of the sponsors in active chapters in the region, and a number of them plan to attend the National Conference in Washington.

The University of Minnesota hosted the Region VIII DSR-TKA Tournament on February 9 and 10, 1968. Both debate and individual events were included in the tournament, with a round-robin schedule in debate.

MINUTES OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF DSR-TKA MEETINGS

The meeting was called to order by President Laase in the New York Room of the Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, California, at 3:15 p.m., December 27, 1967. The following members were present for part or all of the session: Laase, Cripe, Kane, Brock, Griffin, Moorhouse, Buehler, Eubank, Freeley, Hance, Brockriede, McBath, Walwik, Ewbank, Fest, and Henigan.

Council minutes for the Wayne State meeting were accepted as printed in the May, 1967 issue of *Speaker and Gavel*.

The Secretary reported that DSR-TKA had been exempted from federal income tax under section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code because it is organized and operated for educational purposes. The exempting letter was dated November 7, 1967.

In response to letters sent from the Secretary's office, the Council voted to place the following chapters in regions noted: Bellarmine to V, Western Kentucky and the University of Kentucky to IV, all chapters in the state of Louisiana from VI to IV.

On behalf of the Standards Committee, the Secretary reported that 108 chapters had failed to submit a chapter report, that 43 chapters had failed to initiate two members in the past three years. They are:

Allegheny	Davidson	Oregon State
Alma	Earlham	Pomona
Amherst	Emory and Henry	Rochester Inst.
Bellarmine	Hampton-Sidney	Rockford
Beloit	Harvard	St. Mary's
Boston U.	Hawaii	Southern Methodist
Brigham Young	Loyola	Southwest Missouri
Brown	MIT	Stanford
Carleton	Maryland	Texas Tech
Case Institute	Mississippi	Tufts
Clark	Missouri	Tulane
Colgate	Mundelein	Washington, St. Louis
Connecticut	SUNY (Fredonia)	Williams
Cornell College	SUNY (University Hgts)	
Dartmouth	Oklahoma	

Brock made, Brockriede seconded, Council passed a motion that "each chapter not initiating a member for three years or more be notified by the President by registered letter that at the Washington Conference the Council will apply the provisions of the constitution relating to chapter activity."

Brockriede submitted his report on the healthy status of *Speaker and Gavel*. Brockriede's resignation as editor, effective June, 1968, was accepted with thanks for a job well done. Eubank made, Moorhouse seconded, Council by unanimous vote passed a motion that the new editor be selected for a four-year term.

Hance submitted the Treasurer's report as follows:

Treasurer's Report—July 1, 1966–June 30, 1967

INCOME			
Initiations	\$3,010.00	(Budgeted: \$4,000.00)	
Investment Income	2,911.27	(" : 3,500.00)	Note I
Special Investment Income	360.00	(" : 360.00)	
Keys	905.70	(" : ?)	
Special Gifts	80.00	(" : 200.00)	
Charters	0.00	(" : 100.00)	
Miscellaneous	1,179.74	(" : ?)	Note II
	<u>\$8,446.71</u>	(" : \$8,160.00)	
	-905.70 (keys)		
	<u>\$7,541.01</u>		<u>\$8,160.00</u>

DISBURSEMENTS			
<i>Speaker and Gavel:</i>			
November Issue	\$ 768.00	(Budgeted: \$1,000.00)	
Remaining Issues	2,420.71	(" : 2,300.00)	
Editorial Expenses	300.00	(" : 300.00)	
Keys	653.33	(" : ?)	
Printing and Postage	288.02	(" : 250.00)	
President's Office	200.00	(" : 200.00)	
Secretary's Office	1,025.00	(" : 1,000.00)	
Treasurer's Office	200.00	(" : 200.00)	
Maintenance of Records by			
Allen Press	379.00	(" : 750.00)	
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	164.78	(" : 500.00)	
Awards:			
Speaker-of-the-Year	276.04	(" : 250.00)	
Distinguished Alumni	10.00	(" : 75.00)	
Trophy for NFL	100.60	(" : 100.00)	
SAA Life Membership Payment	200.00	(" : 200.00)	
Student Council	25.00	(" : 100.00)	
Historian's Office	200.00	(" : 200.00)	
Miscellaneous	4.00	(" : 50.00)	
	<u>\$7,533.50</u>	(" : \$7,800.00)	
	-653.33 (keys)		
	<u>\$6,880.17</u>	(" : \$7,800.00)	

Balance for the Year: \$660.84

Note I: Putnam Fund final dividend (\$270.47) reinvested; not cash.

Note II: Balance on National Conference of \$1,124.27 sent to Treasurer by the Director of the National Conference.

Hance submitted the proposed budget for 1968. After certain amendments noted in this report the budget was accepted as follows:

Proposed Budget: 1967-68

INCOME	
Initiations	\$3,500.00
Investment Income	5,100.00
Keys	(?)
Special Gifts	150.00
Charters	200.00
Miscellaneous	(?)
	<hr/>
	\$9,950.00

DISBURSEMENTS	
<i>Speaker and Gavel:</i>	
November Issue	\$1,000.00
Remaining Issues	2,400.00
Editorial Expenses	300.00
Keys	(?)
Printing and Postage	300.00
President's Office	200.00
Secretary's Office	1,000.00
Treasurer's Office	200.00
Maintenance of Records by Allen Press	450.00
Dues and Expenses re. Association of College Honor Societies	200.00
Expenses re. SAA Committee on Debate-Discussion	125.00
Membership Certificates	200.00
Awards:	
Speaker-of-the-Year	275.00
Distinguished Alumni	50.00
Trophy for NFL	100.00
SAA Life Membership Payment	200.00
Student Council	100.00
Historian's Office	200.00
Miscellaneous	70.00
General Conference	800.00
Association of College Honor Societies Booklets	50.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,220.00

Eubank made, Kane seconded, and Council passed a motion that *Speaker and Gavel* subscription rates be raised from \$1.50 to \$2.00 and that subscription cards be carried in the last two issues of each volume.

Brock made, Hance seconded, and Council passed a motion that the Council reaffirm the policy of continuing to send free copies to school libraries of deactivated chapters until the charter is revoked.

Buehler submitted the Trustee's report. Eubank made, Griffin seconded, and Council passed a motion that the Trustee be authorized to institute a systematic withdrawal plan of approximately 6% on capital funds.

Freeley reported on the 1968 Conference at the Willard Hotel and George Washington University, Washington, D. C., April 7-10, 1968. Walwik made, Kane seconded, and Council passed a motion that but one banquet be held and that it be held Tuesday night. Walwik made, Moorhouse seconded, and Council passed a motion that the National Conference Committee explore the possibilities of a faculty sponsors luncheon on Monday, April 8.

Meeting adjourned until 7:30 p.m. Thursday, December 28.

Respectfully submitted
Nicholas M. Cripe, Secretary

The second meeting of the National Council was called to order by President Laase at 7:35 p.m., Thursday, December 28, in the Columbus Room of the Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles. The following members were present for some or all of the meeting: Laase, Cripe, Hance, Buehler, Freeley, Ewbank, Eubank, Weiss, Shields, Moorhouse, Henigan, Adamson, Walwik, Hagood, Kane, Brock, Shirley, and Fest.

Freeley made, Moorhouse seconded, and Council passed a motion that the National Conference be allocated a substantial fund by the National Council each year. Freeley made, Walwik seconded, and Council passed, with Buehler abstaining, a motion that \$800 be allocated by the National Council to the National Conference Committee for the 1968 meeting in Washington, D. C. Freeley made, Walwik seconded, and Council passed a motion that if possible to do so, a buffet luncheon at additional cost be included in the 1968 National Conference.

Ewbank gave a report on the Association of College Honor Societies. Ewbank moved, Hagood seconded, and Council authorized \$50 for the purchase of 200 copies of the Information Booklet of the Association of College Honor Societies. Ewbank made and Henigan seconded a motion that \$400 be pledged for ACHS film. Hagood made, Buehler seconded, Council passed a motion that Ewbank's motion be referred to a special committee for study. President Laase appointed Ewbank, chairman, Hance, and Cripe to the committee to study the ACHS film.

Ewbank, for the Standards Committee, made, Kane seconded, and Council passed a motion to grant charters to Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania; and to the University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut. Kane made, Ewbank seconded, Council passed a motion to postpone action on a charter for Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana, until the April meeting.

Eubank, for the Special Constitution Committee, presented recommendations of the committee on amendment relating to at-large membership. Eubank moved, Freeley seconded, and Council passed by unanimous vote an amendment to the Constitution as follows:

Article IV, Section 1, paragraph b: "Persons who meet the requirement for election to membership, *and who are no longer resident undergraduates*, may be elected as members-at-large by recommendation of any campus chapter and approval of the National Council." (The portion of the sentence which is in italics was added to the present paragraph b.)

Governors' reports were received from Lynch (I), Kane (II), Henigan (III), Wetherby (IV), Walwik (V), Moorhouse (VII), Brock (VIII), Adamson (IX), and Griffin (X). No report was filed by Weir (VI).

Freeley moved, Ewbank seconded, and Council passed the following resolution: "Resolved: That Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha join with other professional speech associations in calling upon the major candidates for the Presidency of the United States and other high public offices to meet in public debate during the campaign of 1968."

Robert Shields presented the report from the Student National Council. Three committees had been established to develop details of the Council Student Speaker of the Year Award. The first, chaired by Susan Cahoon (Emory University), drafted a questionnaire to be used in nominating a candidate for the award. The second, chaired by Bob Vallentine (University of Kentucky), is working on a revision of the constitution of the

Council to expand descriptions of the duties of its officers. The third, chaired by Rick Flam (University of Southern California), is drafting a brochure explaining the Award and activities of the Student Council for distribution to the members. The report was for information only and was received with appreciation. A summary was requested for inclusion in the *Speaker and Gavel*.

Reporting for Historian Herold Ross, Robert Weiss stated that the revised ritual and the short history of DSR-TKA have both been printed and are available from the office of the Secretary. The History is intended for each new initiate, to be given to him at the time of initiation. Sponsors are requested to secure sufficient copies. Moorhouse made, Kane seconded, and Council passed a motion that the Secretary be instructed to distribute to each chapter four copies of the Ritual, six copies of the History, and at least one copy of the up-dated Constitution (either printed separately or included in the *Speaker and Gavel*, with offprints ordered).

Thorrel Fest (reporting for Lillian Wagner) noted that nominations for the Distinguished Alumni Award had closed before Christmas. Six persons have been nominated. The award is granted to nominees who receive affirmative votes from four of the five committee members. A continuing file is kept and previous nominees are reviewed annually by the committee. Fest commented that there was a wide variation in the quality of nominees, as well as in the supporting material supplied to the committee. The report was received with thanks.

The Speaker of the Year Board report was made by Paul Boase for James Golden. The Board sought answers to two questions: Is it permissible to declare no winner in any given year? Is it permissible to reach outside of the United States for a special award? Kane made, Hance seconded, and Council passed the motion that no award is necessary if the Board feels that none is warranted. Moorhouse moved, Kane seconded, and Council authorized the Board to designate a special award at their discretion for such a person as Norman Thomas or Abba Eban.

A motion was passed approving Dr. Emory Lindquest as a member-at-large from Wichita State.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Nicholas M. Cripe, 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.	H. G. Behler
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.	Arthur W. Rovine
CM	Cornell, Mt. Vernon, Iowa	Walter F. Stromer
CN	Creighton, Omaha, Neb.	Rev. Robert B. Barges, 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, Colorado	Glen Strickland
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	Emerson, Boston, Mass.	John C. Zacharis
EE	Emory and Henry, Emory, Va.	H. Alan Pickrell
EF	Emory, Atlanta, Ga.	James Z. Rabun, Glenn Pelham
EG	Evansville, Evansville, Ind.	Lynne J. Mlady
FA	Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	Donald E. Williams
FB	Florida State, Tallahassee, Fla.	Gregg Phifer
GA	Georgia, Athens, Ga.	Richard C. Huseman
GB	George Washington, Washington, D. C.	George F. Henigan, Jr.
GC	Grinnell, Grinnell, Iowa	William Vanderpool

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
HA	Hamilton, Clinton, N. Y.	J. Franklin. Hunt
HB	Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, Va.	D. M. Allan
HC	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	Marian Smith
HD	Hanover, Hanover, Ind.	Stanley B. Wheeler
HE	Hartford, Hartford, Conn.	Malthon Anapol
HF	Harvard, Cambridge, Mass.	Harry P. Kerr
HG	Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	Dean Ellis
HH	Hiram, Hiram, Ohio	Frank Ilersich
HI	Howard, Washington, D. C.	Paul M. Tendler
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	James Weaver
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	Jack Kingsley
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, Wisc.	John Lewinski
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.	J. Robert Olian
MJ	Miami, Oxford, Ohio	Bernard F. Phelps
MK	Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.	C. William Colburn
ML	Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.	Jerry M. Anderson
MM	Middlebury, Middlebury, Vt.	Dale DeLetis
MN	Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.	Bernard L. Brock
MO	Mississippi, University, Miss.	Ray A. Schexnider
MP	Missouri, Columbia, Mo.	Phil Emmert
MQ	Montana, Missoula, Mont.	Robert Boren
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
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

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
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.	Franklin Modisett
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.	Thomas Kane
PE	Pomona, Claremont, Calif.	Gerald Dugan
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.	E. James Goodwin
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.	Brad Bishop
SF	San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif.	Henry E. McGuckin, Jr.
SG	University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.	Kathy Corey
SH	South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.	Merrill G. Christophersen
SI	South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.	Hal R. Upchurch
SJ	Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.	James McBeth
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.	Faye D. Julian
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.	Joseph E. Vannucchi
UB	Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	George A. Adamson
UC	Utah State, Logan, Utah	Rex E. Robinson
VA	Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.	Randall M. Fisher
VB	Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	Robert Huber
VC	Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.	Stanford P. Gwin
VD	Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, Va.	E. A. Hancock
WA	Wabash, Crawfordsville, Ind.	Joseph O'Rourke, Jr.

Code	Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
WB	Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, N. C.	Merwyn Hayes
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. Ziegelmüller
WI	Waynesburg, Waynesburg, Pa.	A. M. Mintier
WJ	Weber State, Ogden, Utah	John B. Hebestreet
WK	Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.	Marguerite G. Petty
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 Henderlinder
WO	Westminster, New Wilmington, Pa.	Walter E. Scheid
WP	West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.	William L. Barnett
WQ	Whittier, Whittier, Calif.	Gerald G. 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	Gerald H. Sanders
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 66044

Return Postage Guaranteed

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