

Complete Issue 6(3)

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

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

Recommended Citation

(1969). Complete Issue 6(3). *Speaker & Gavel*, 6(3), 70-108.

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 6(3)

speaker and gavel



volume 6, number 3

march, 1969

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: \$2.00 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. CRIFE, 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, Indiana State 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: ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 46135.

Associate Editors: BERNARD BROCK, University of Minnesota; JOE ESTEP, University of Alabama; ROBERT L. SCOTT, University of Minnesota.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 6	March, 1969	Number 3
The President's Page— <i>Leroy T. Laase</i>		70
Nonviolence and Black Power: Civil Rights as a Mass Movement— <i>James F. Klumpp</i>		71
The Student Congress: An Evaluation and a Proposal— <i>Kenneth E. Andersen</i>		77
Revised Rules for the Congress		82
Proposed By-Laws of the Student Council		95
Region Four News		98
Schedule of Events, 1969 DSR-TKA Forensic Conference		99
Minutes of Meetings of the National Council		101
Chapters and Sponsors		106

PLAN AHEAD

Sixth Annual DSR-TKA Forensic Conference

University of Nebraska

Lincoln, Nebraska

April 6, 7, 8, 9, 1969

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

LEROY T. LAASE

When the National Council met in Chicago December 27 and 28, much business was conducted. Minutes of these meetings will be printed in the *Speaker and Gavel*. One item took a tremendous amount of the Council's time and its import is such that I feel duty-bound to make it the focus of the President's Page in this issue. I refer to the health of our chapters, which was already referred to in a more general manner in the President's Page of our November issue.

In 1968, the National Council was forced to drop seventeen delinquent chapters from the Society roll, and their institutions were so notified. Not one of these chapters had initiated any new members for three years and each was otherwise delinquent in its obligations to the National Society as specified in Article IV of the National By-Laws. Another seventeen chapters were given an extension of one year in which to meet this minimum constitutional obligation of the election of new members. Of these seventeen, only two have at this writing taken the necessary steps to remove their chapter from the delinquent list. Several others have indicated their intention to do so. Each of the chapters was warned last spring and is being reminded again that they must elect and initiate at least two new members before April 7, 1969 or accept the alternative of automatic deactivation. It is hoped that these chapters will respond to these pleas for the necessary minimal chapter activity to preserve their chapters.

The shocking news at this Council Meeting was that there are now an additional nine chapters who have not initiated any new members during the last three years, and which consequently face automatic deactivation in April, 1969 unless new members are elected and membership fees sent to the National Secretary before April 1, 1969. Each of these chapters is being notified of its delinquency and the course of action necessary to preserve an active chapter.

Almost equally alarming is the fact that twenty other chapters have made no initiations during the past two years. Unless these chapters initiate new members this year, they will automatically move into the delinquent list next year. If your institution is among these, we sincerely hope that you will not allow this to happen. Each such chapter is being advised of its precarious status with the hope that regular elections to membership, the filing of the membership application form, and the forwarding of the initiation fee to the National Office will be done this spring.

The question arises as to why institutions allow their chapters to become delinquent. There are those who think that these chapters represent "dead-wood" in the Society. This is most certainly not always, nor even generally the case. Most of these chapters have been very active in the past. Perhaps some have not elected and initiated new members because there has been a change in the Directorship of Forensics and with it the loss of the former Chapter Sponsor without designation of a new sponsor, a situation which may not become known to the National Office for as much as two or three years. Perhaps in some instances, eligible members have been elected, but the chapter has neglected to have the student fill out the application for

(Continued on p. 81)

NONVIOLENCE AND BLACK POWER: CIVIL RIGHTS AS A MASS MOVEMENT

JAMES F. KLUMPP

The concept of Black Power changed the focus of the Civil Rights movement from the nonviolent predominantly Southern movement to the aggressive nationwide movement. The developments in Civil Rights during 1968, the death of Dr. Martin Luther King and the relative quiet last summer in the cities, have raised several interesting questions about the two phases of the Civil Rights movement: Where do we go from here? What type of leader can be expected to head the Black Power movement in the future? Will the aggressive militancy increase or will the movement begin to consolidate its power?

In his book *The True Believer* longshoreman-philosopher Eric Hoffer offers a model for mass movements that may suggest answers to these questions. Hoffer's model both helps clarify the past relationship between the nonviolent and the Black Power phases of the movement and provides possible future directions for the Black Power movement.

Hoffer defines mass movement in terms of its essential characteristics: "All mass movements generate in their adherents a readiness to die and a proclivity for united action; all of them, irrespective of the doctrine they preach and the program they project, breed fanaticism, enthusiasm, fervent hope, hatred and intolerance; all of them are capable of releasing a powerful flow of activity in certain departments of life; all of them demand blind faith and singlehearted allegiance."¹

Central to this view is the complete subordination of the individual to the movement. To be a mass movement in Hoffer's use of the term, the movement must be the end and the means of all its members. When the movement becomes all important, it will breed fanaticism, and reinforce its domination over the individual by cultivating hope, hatred, and intolerance.

This paper compares the rhetorical approaches of Martin Luther King, leader of the nonviolent movement, and Stokely Carmichael, leader (at least in the early stages) of the Black Power movement, and relates the approaches to Hoffer's model. Both speeches examined urge support for the leader's particular methods of social change. King's speech, "Love, Law, and Civil Disobedience," delivered November 16, 1961, to the annual meeting of the Fellowship of the Concerned, explains nonviolence and self-suffering as a method of social protest. Carmichael's speech, "Black Power," delivered in Chicago July 28, 1966, emphasizes the virtues of black unity. The respective rhetorical approaches to individualism, self-sacrifice, and hatred are compared and then possible future directions for Black Power will be suggested based on Hoffer's model.

In a mass movement the relationship between the individual and the movement becomes very important. The first and most fundamental difference between the rhetorical positions of Martin Luther King and

Mr. Klumpp is a graduate student and teaching associate in the Department of Speech, Communication and Theatre Arts at the University of Minnesota.

¹ Eric Hoffer, *The True Believer* (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), p. 9.

Stokely Carmichael in their respective speeches lies in the approach of each to the relationship between the individual and the movement.

King suggests that his movement is merely a group of individuals and not a unified mass. Freedom is the keynote of King's movement—freedom for the individual. Perhaps the best definition of the individual freedom that the movement seeks is King's phrase "true person-to-person relationships."² The end of the movement is its dissolution; it is formed and operates only to gain individual rights for its individual members.

King contends that the means and ends of a movement must cohere³ and the emphasis on the individual in the means of the movement certainly is consistent with the emphasis on the individual in the ends of the movement. Civil disobedience is, of course, based on deliberate violation of unjust laws. King's criterion for a just law is whether or not the law "degrades the human personality."⁴ Such laws the individual can refuse to obey if he is willing to accept the punishment for his violation. According to King, even the decision of which laws to disobey is the individual's and not the movement's.⁵ Once the individual decides to protest, the confrontation that eventually leads to accomplishment of the movement's goals is between the individual who is engaged in the nonviolent struggle and the oppressing forces. The movement is only the collective body of individual actions moving toward the common individual goals.

In sharp contrast, Carmichael's speech is not a battle plan for individual action but for the action of the "black people." The individual is no longer the actor, the actor is the black people as an unit. Carmichael's speech is "about what black people have to do."⁶ His suggestion is that "It's time black people got together,"⁷ and once they are together they act as an entity. "We" is the subject of Carmichael's imperatives of action. Only twice in the entire speech does he get so individual as to use the second person singular "you" subject. When the white man is spoken to or moved against it is "we," the black people, that do the speaking and moving. Thus the black individual must cease to exist except as a part of the black people. The individual must forfeit his identity to the movement, just as Carmichael forfeits his own identity in this speech. In the speech Carmichael has no voice, rather the movement has Carmichael's voice.

Hoffer says that identification with the movement instead of with the self promotes self-sacrifice so necessary to a mass movement's methods. He writes:

² Martin Luther King, "Love, Law, and Civil Disobedience," in *Rhetoric of Racial Revolt*, ed. Roy L. Hill (Denver: Golden Bell Press, 1964), p. 354.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 347.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 351.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

⁶ Stokely Carmichael, "Black Power," delivered in Chicago on July 28, 1966, and printed by Chicago SNCC, reprinted in *The Burden of Race*, ed. Gilbert Osofsky (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 630.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 629.

To ripen a person for self-sacrifice he must be stripped of his individual identity and distinctness. He must cease to be George, Hans, Ivan, or Tadao—a human atom with an existence bounded by birth and death. The most drastic way to achieve this end is by the complete assimilation of the individual into a collective body. The fully assimilated individual does not see himself and others as human beings. When asked who he is, his automatic response is that he is a German, a Russian, a Japanese, a Christian, a Moslem, [or a black].⁸

King's movement violates Hoffer's criterion for a mass movement. The individual has to forfeit individual identity and individual judgment, Hoffer says. King did not require such forfeiture, Carmichael does. For Carmichael there are only black people and white people. There is no individual existence outside of this classification.

Hoffer says that the individual must become thoroughly submerged in the movement in order that self-sacrifice, a necessary result of a mass movement's approach, will be accepted by its members. Both of the Civil Rights movements require self-sacrifice, but the rhetorical strategies to induce self-sacrifice provide a second contrast between the two speeches.

King's speech contains a very obvious and well developed strategy for convincing the audience of the value of self-sacrifice. To King self-sacrifice is an actual method, the direct stimulus that is to accomplish the goal of integration. King says, "The non-violent say that suffering becomes a powerful social force when you willingly accept that violence on yourself . . . suffering may serve to transform the social situation."⁹ Thus since suffering is the direct method of the movement, the strategy of convincing the Negro to follow this method involves a justification of suffering. Suffering will be effective, King argues, because eventually people will recognize the justice of the end and the goodness of the means of the nonviolent movement. Faith in the future, faith that the goals are inevitable, is the reason the nonviolent are willing to suffer.

Suffering does not play the same role in Carmichael's movement that it plays in King's movement. While suffering is actually the direct stimulus in King's movement, in Carmichael's movement suffering is but an inevitable result of the confrontation that the mass movement uses to disrupt society. Thus King's strategy is passive, absorbing suffering, while Carmichael's is active, afflicting suffering.

In the Carmichael speech persuasive strategy urges aggressive confrontation with the white power structure and the black suffering is not mentioned. He says, "We have to define how we are going to move. . . . We have to build a strong base to let them know if they touch one black man driving his wife to the hospital in Los Angeles, or one black man walking down a highway in Mississippi or if they take one black man who has a rebellion and put him in jail and start talking treason, we are going to disrupt this whole country."¹⁰

Hoffer's model helps explain the different rhetorical approaches to suffering in the two speeches. In King's movement the emphasis on individualism destroys the ability of the movement itself to induce self-sacrifice without an overt rhetorical strategy. Hoffer explains the limitations individuality imposes on the willingness to suffer: "The unavoidable conclusion seems to be

⁸ Hoffer, p. 60.

⁹ King, pp. 349-350.

¹⁰ Carmichael, p. 631.

that when the individual faces torture or annihilation, he cannot rely on the resources of his own individuality. His only source of strength is in not being himself but part of something mighty, glorious and indestructible. . . . The destiny of one's religion, nation, race, party or family."¹¹

King does not have the advantage of such an absolute commitment to the movement. King's first strategy is to construct a cause—in this case justice. The success of the movement is inevitable, King argues, because people will recognize its justice. Justice will triumph over the oppression of the system. This strategy, however, separates the movement from the inevitable cause, so a second strategy is required to persuade the followers to suffer for the movement. King must, therefore, argue overtly for the power of suffering.

Carmichael can use the identification with the movement as the persuasive agency to induce self-sacrifice. The followers gladly sacrifice because they are subordinated to a cause. Therefore, Carmichael is spared the necessity for a direct rhetorical strategy to induce suffering.

If the unification of the individual and the mass movement becomes the key to self-sacrifice, how is unification accomplished? The difference between the positions of King and Carmichael on the ways of unity helps explain the presence of identification with the group in Carmichael's movement and the lack of identification in King's.

King's movement is based on love not hatred, and love is the theme of his speech. The rhetorical strategy used to urge love for all other men and still oppose the human institution of segregation is to create an oppressor as vague as possible. King notes, "one seeks to defeat the unjust system, rather than individuals who are caught in that system."¹² The most specific term that King uses to denote the segregationists is "reactionary forces in the South."¹³ It is easier to love one's oppressor if the oppression seems only a tool of some vague unseen force. Thus King can support the personalized "love ethic" while opposing the impersonal segregation system.

Carmichael is, however, preoccupied with hatred in his speech. He creates the white people as his devil. "The white people . . . force us to live the way we live,"¹⁴ he says. The white people are blamed for every wrong. This strategy clearly delineates the opposition to the black people and establishes a devil as a scapegoat for the black's problems.

Hoffer explains hatred as "the most accessible and comprehensive of all unifying agents."¹⁵ It helps separate the individual from himself and join the collective whole in mutual hatred. The object of the hate, the devil, is singular so that hatred can be unified and intense within the movement; is omnipotent and omnipresent so all the failures of the movement may be blamed on the devil and all successes be victories over the devil; and foreign so that it is clearly identified as outside of the movement.

King's movement has only love, no devil and no real hatred, but Carmichael's "white people" fits the model. "White people" form a corporate whole. Carmichael reacts strongly against the whites who supposedly sympathize with the movement. They are foreigners and "nothing but traitorous enemies."¹⁶ The white people are the cause of all Negro problems

¹¹ Hoffer, p. 62.

¹² King, p. 349.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 345.

¹⁴ Carmichael, p. 632.

¹⁵ Hoffer, p. 85.

¹⁶ Carmichael, p. 631.

and they are foreign because they are not black. "They oppress us because we are black,"¹⁷ Carmichael charges.

Having oriented the Civil Rights movement within Hoffer's mass movement model, perhaps now an answer should be offered to one of the black leaders' favorite recent questions: Where do we go from here? For the rhetorician the question is: What kind of leader and what kind of rhetoric would Hoffer's model predict from the black community?

In successful mass movements Hoffer recognizes three leadership types—the man of words who discredits the prevailing order, the fanatic who institutes the mass movement phase, and the man of action who consolidates the gains of the movement. Martin Luther King had many of the characteristics of Hoffer's man of words. Hoffer explains, "Mass movements do not usually rise until the prevailing order has been discredited. The discrediting is not an automatic result of the blunders and abuses of those in power, but the deliberate work of men of words with a grievance."¹⁸ It was King's efforts in the South that made the Civil Rights problem a salient national issue and discredited the white social structure. The Southern movement under King became a rhetorical device for discrediting the prevailing order.

If King was a man of words, Stokely Carmichael was the fanatic of the Civil Rights movement. Hoffer says of the fanatic:

When the moment is ripe, only the fanatic can hatch a genuine mass movement. Without him the disaffection engendered by militant men of words remains undirected and can vent itself only in pointless and easily suppressed disorders. Without him the initiated reforms, even when drastic, leave the old way of life unchanged, and any change in government usually amounts to no more than a transfer of power from one set of men of action to another. Without him there can perhaps be no new beginning.¹⁹

At the present time there is less evidence of a fanatic leader in the Civil Rights movement than at times in the past. Whether Carmichael's demise in the Black Power movement is due to his disconcern for the movement in favor of the Viet Nam cause, or to the Negroes' withdrawal of support from him is unclear. If the former is the explanation Hoffer's model offers an explanation: "Where mass movements are in violent competition with each other, there are not infrequent instances of converts—even the most zealous—shifting their allegiance from one to the other."²⁰ Carmichael did not really move to a *competing* mass movement but the zealotry with which he has opposed the Viet Nam involvement indicates that he may view the Viet Nam opposition as his new mass movement.

If the Negroes rejected Carmichael, the short-lived nature of the fanatic stage of the movement would suggest that if the movement is a true mass movement another leader will take Carmichael's place. The rhetorician may anticipate reactivation of the movement if Carmichael returns or a new leader of the Carmichael style emerges.

When (and if) the fanatic stage does begin anew, it will have greater intensity than before the present lull. Hoffer notes that self-sacrifice and

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 630.

¹⁸ Hoffer, p. 119.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

unity reinforce each other.²¹ Thus the movement intensifies as it feeds upon itself.

When the fanatical or mass movement stage of the movement is complete the man of action enters to consolidate the movement's gains. Hoffer writes: "[The man of action's] appearance usually marks the end of the dynamic phase of the movement. The war with the present is over. The genuine man of action is intent not on renovating the world but on possessing it. Whereas the life breath of the dynamic phase was protest and a desire for drastic change, the final phase is chiefly preoccupied with administering and perpetuating the power won."²² When the Civil Rights movement completes the fanatical or mass movement stage (it is, of course, very possible that Carmichael's demise indicates that this stage is complete) the rhetorician may expect a man of action who wields the newly won Black Power to overhaul the social structure. Such forces as Julian Bond or the new Negro coalition in Congress should be watched as possible agents of this stage of the mass movement.

Perhaps a paper applying the Hoffer model ought to end as Hoffer ends the preface of *The True Believer*: "The book passes no judgements, and expresses no preferences. It merely tries to explain; and the explanations—all of them theories—are in the nature of suggestions and arguments even when they are stated in what seems a categorical tone."²³

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 135.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

THE STUDENT CONGRESS: AN EVALUATION AND A PROPOSAL

KENNETH E. ANDERSEN

Articles dealing with the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha Student Congress have tended to treat the congress abstractly, arguing from principle or ethical presuppositions. Defenses of the congress activity have stressed its role as a realistic introduction to legislative processes, the opportunity to utilize a wider range of communication skills, its merit as a unique variation within the forensic diet and as the only unique feature of the DSR-TKA National Conference.¹ While valuable, the articles have not typically focused upon the specific impact of the student congress on the actual delegates themselves. It is my belief that, ultimately, the value of the student congress must be judged in terms of the value to the delegates. Membership in an honor society implies recognition; participation in the national conference should mean educational value. How else can the expenditure of funds and the time spent by faculty and students alike be justified?

Hence, this article examines the reactions of delegates to the last student congress held in Washington, D. C. and as a result of this examination a proposal for greater emphasis upon the role of careful evaluation is derived.

Although the student congress has been discussed at length in recent articles, rarely have these articles drawn upon data specifically collected as a measure of the effect of the congress upon the student participants. During the 1968 congress a questionnaire was distributed to all delegates together with a semantic differential to measure reactions to the congress. These instruments were completed by forty delegates and form the basis for the responses of students discussed below. The instruments utilized were not carefully polished and pretested. They were designed to elicit information and to tap attitudes and opinions in relatively "open-ended," unstructured ways. It was felt that this approach might provide guidelines for more carefully planned evaluation procedures at future congresses.

The data collected in the questionnaires appears internally inconsistent at times and the conclusions which can be drawn are not precise. Nevertheless they are interesting if at times troubling.

Since the amount and extreme diversity of the responses to the "open-ended" questions preclude full exposition of the data, conclusions will be presented in terms of four generalizations which were predicted to hold for the 1968 congress: 1) the student congress will be an expression of effective, intelligent, responsible communication; 2) the student congress will be a uniquely meaningful experience; 3) the congress is in need of better planning and preparation; and 4) the congress is in need of support.²

Kenneth E. Andersen (Ph. D. Wisconsin, 1961) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Michigan and former Director of Forensics and Sponsor of the Michigan Chapter. He has been actively involved in several student congresses and will be chairman of the 1969 congress at Lincoln.

¹ For example, see the series of articles in *Speaker and Gavel*, II (May and November, 1965).

² Kenneth E. Andersen, "Student Congress: Retrospect and Prospect," *Speaker and Gavel*, V (January, 1968), 51-54.

EVALUATION OF EFFECT

1. *Does the student congress serve as an expression of effective, intelligent, responsible communication?*⁹ Since this question involves value judgments for which criteria are difficult to operationalize, the answer is relatively indirect in terms of evidential support.

One indirect measure may lie in the response of persons outside of DSR-TKA to the congress. The most visible result of the congress is the record of the legislation passed in the form of bills and resolutions. Encouraged by a warm response to the copies of the legislation sent to various prominent officials after the 1967 congress on Red China, the mailing of the 1968 legislation was expanded. Copies with appropriate cover letters went to President Johnson, Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, House and Senate Majority and Minority leaders, Chairmen of relevant committees, etc. Although the responses betrayed some qualities of form letters, many letters such as those from Senators Mansfield and Dirksen commented specifically upon the legislation and the value of obtaining such reflections of informed student opinion. The State Department responded with a rationale for their current efforts while an assistant to the President spoke of Johnson's desire for peace and sympathy with the objectives of the legislative proposals. While such responses do not provide sufficient evidence to affirm that the congress serves as effective, responsible, intelligent communication, it does suggest that the congress serves our honorary well in terms of the notice taken by these national figures. This opportunity for a collective voice to be heard is valid motivation for a student to gain support for his views in the congress.

Responses of students on the questionnaires did not bear strongly upon this issue of the worth of communication. A few responses dealing with weaknesses of the congress suggested need for greater delegate preparation and knowledge both in terms of the topic area and knowledge of parliamentary procedure. Interestingly enough, six delegates voiced a feeling which one delegate noted as the need to "demonstrate the good taste and dignity that the occasion called for."

While this question of the quality of communication cannot be answered directly from the data collected, observation suggested that much communication was of high quality although the knowledge of parliamentary procedure was often wanting. Responses to the other questions will be suggestive as to an answer to this first question.

2. *Is the student congress a uniquely meaningful experience?* Clearly an answer to this question lies in the responses of the congress participants. For 83% of the delegates, this was the first DSR-TKA Congress participation. [Unfortunately no response was obtained concerning participation in other student congresses—an oversight which will be corrected in 1969.]

A meaningful experience suggests a degree of involvement. The question was asked: "What degree of emotional involvement did you have with the Congress? Did you become concerned about the outcome? Did you feel personal involvement, did it make a difference to you what happened to ideas, people, bills?" Thirteen people indicated very high involvement, 8 strong involvement, 15 moderate involvement, 3 indicated slight and 1 indicated no involvement.

A semantic differential was employed with delegates asked to respond to the concept of "The Student Congress." Creativity and novelty dimensions of meaning were examined in two separate scales. The average of the

responses was 4.6 on a scale ranging from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 7. The dynamism dimension averaged 4.8 while the evaluative dimension averaged 4.5. Thus, while the congress was evaluated slightly positively in terms of all these dimensions, the differences in reaction on the various dimensions was not significant.

Analysis of individual responses indicates a high degree of polarization—some responses are extremely favorable, some extremely unfavorable. The differential was administered at the very height of the debate on Vietnam. Extreme frustration was being expressed by many concerning the legislative process, the chairman, the tyrannical majority, the stupid minority trying to block everything with stupid parliamentary procedure. Thus the differential results may reflect the emotional involvement and the actual “meaning” of the concept “The Student Congress” may be lost in this polarization of response.

It would be interesting to compare the results obtained with a delayed measurement taken two or three weeks after the close of the congress. Further, the semantic differential has not been widely employed to measure response of debaters or other forensic participants toward a specific activity at a specific time. Therefore the data cannot be compared to other measures on similar or contrasting forensic events.³

The answer to this question seems to be that the student congress provides an experience which produces a high level of involvement, that it does provide “experience” in a very meaningful sense, but the uniqueness of the experience needs further study.

3. *Does the congress need better planning and preparation?* The greatest amount of criticism voiced by students in response to questions concerning problems in the congress and ways to improve the congress centered on structural problems. One-third of the delegates simply listed the need for more time as the most critical factor. An additional 22% stressed the need for more time for legislative debate.

In response to this spontaneous reaction of over 50% of the delegates, the National Planning Committee has altered the schedule of the congress to provide more time for committee work. No solution has been found to increase the time for legislative debate but if this need continues to be felt, some adjustment may be undertaken. Further, as a result of experience with previous congresses, the rules for the forthcoming congress have been revised to reflect current procedures.

Nine of the 40 delegates signed a petition urging that the two party system in the congress be abolished and greater time spent on drafting and debating legislation, negating party caucuses and activities. Would the abolition of the party system be wise? Frustrated as many delegates are by the party system, this reality of parties and bloc alliances in the legislative process cannot be ignored. Purpose number 6 in the rules of the congress is “to promote realistic understanding of the operation of legislative procedures in a democracy.” The frustration of these students may mark a step in the accomplishment of that purpose.

In a sense to ask the question, does the congress need improved planning and preparation, is to answer the question affirmatively. Each year additional planning and changes in plans and preparation are undertaken. There

³ It might be interesting to undertake an extensive evaluation of student response to a variety of activities which are offered both in terms of such projective measures as the semantic differential and also over a period of time.

will always be need for improvement. And this need results in a proposal which ultimately concludes this article.

4. *Does the congress need support?* Students at every congress stress the idea of the value of continuing the congress. But it is interesting to note that delegates personally support the idea of the congress despite negative reactions to some elements associated with the congress. In 1968, 85% of the students indicated they would like to participate in a future congress if that were possible. Additionally, 80% felt that participation in a previous congress would lead to improved effectiveness in future ones. The effect of such repeated participation is reflected in the fact that major leadership roles are typically filled by the limited number of delegates returning from previous congresses. One delegate said, "I want to come back and make this mess work. My God! How does Congress ever get anything done, let alone anything worth-while."

This desire to participate correlates well with reactions to the congress: 50% indicated favorable or highly favorable reactions to the congress, 30% indicated mixed or neutral feelings, and 20% gave no response to the question or indicated unfavorable reactions.

The need for faculty support emerged indirectly in the responses. Over 50% of the delegates responding to questions about improving the congress volunteered ideas relating to prior preparation: the need for greater training in and understanding of parliamentary procedure before attending; greater help with analysis, research, and the drafting of advance bills; and particular help to those who plan to seek leadership roles.

Due to the effect of the riots in Washington last year, the congress lost the opportunity to double the largest participation of any of the previous three years, but it still attracted the greatest number of delegates since the merger of DSR-TKA.

Hence, it appears that the student congress is gaining strength. Student delegates do see the need for greater preparation for the congress, a need which must be met through the activities of the faculty sponsors.

SUMMARY AND A PROPOSAL

The student response to the 1968 student congress presents a complex problem in analysis. The single factor that emerges most clearly is that the congress develops high student involvement. Delegates come to care about the ideas, the people, the congress activity itself. Most seek an expansion of time for drafting and debating substantive issues. Delegates further see the need for continued support for the congress activity—both in terms of participation and provision for more careful advance preparation through training and direction offered by faculty.

Having directed three national student congresses it is my impression that the activity is growing in strength. It appears to be earning its place in the variety of activities offered at the national conference.⁴

But in 1969, I propose that greater attention be given to evaluation of the student congress in terms of the degree to which it is meeting the goals set forth in the rules of the congress. It is often difficult to translate purposes into concrete behavioral objectives as educators are increasingly realizing. But we should undertake such a process. More extensive evalu-

⁴ I personally would like to see the forensic progression tried either at regional or national conferences.

ation procedures should be undertaken with greater faculty and student participation. More careful prior planning for evaluation should and will be undertaken.

What can such careful evaluation procedures do? As an example, assume that the need for more legislative debate continues to be expressed. A variety of alternatives could be explored: limiting the number of bills for debate or perhaps expanding debate time. Perhaps bills could be initially drafted in committees and parties formed on the basis of reactions to those bills. After legislative debate some bills might be passed, others rejected. Committees could be reconstituted for more work on bills and a final legislative session could follow.

Essentially this proposal is to use the results of sustained observation, study, and evaluation of the student congress as a means of innovating new forms and patterns. Perhaps we have become too committed to a form that works (and it does) without providing a mechanism for new procedures to evolve from the old by anything other than the reactions of the directors of the activity. Some groups apparently spend as much as 50% of their time and attention on the "preservation" of the group, or so studies of on-going real-life groups have indicated. Such attention to developing new patterns and procedures may well hold the key to the continued maturation of and a greater richness in the student congress activity.

President's Page *(Continued from page 70)*

membership form and collect the initiation fee and/or forward them to the National Secretary. Such students, and in some instances, their chapter sponsor, may be under the mistaken notion that they have initiated new members during the last three years. Possibly in many instances Chapter Sponsors have mistakenly confused running an active forensic program with fulfillment of their full obligations to Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. Obviously, schools without chapters of DSR-TKA may have active forensic programs. An active forensic program is a prerequisite to, but falls short of the minimum obligation of a chapter for initiating "at least two new members during the past three years." Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is more than an organization which sponsors another national forensic tournament annually; it is a National Honor Society which gives recognition for outstanding achievement in forensics. Membership has significance for any student in his credentials just as does membership in Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, or any other National Honor Society.

Our next National Conference is scheduled to be held at the University of Nebraska, April 7, 8, and 9. Each chapter should receive a direct mailing of the information on the Conference. One way for delinquent chapters to preserve their chapters would be to send participants to this Conference. If such chapters have students who would qualify for membership before then, they can be initiated in the mass ceremony held at this convention. If any chapter needs membership application forms or other materials and information, they should write the National Secretary, Dr. Nicholas Cripe, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana.

The "moment of truth" has arrived for delinquent and near-delinquent chapters. Each institution must make its own choice. The responsibility for maintaining an active chapter rests at the local level on the Chapter Sponsor, members of the local chapter, and their college or university administration.

RULES OF THE NATIONAL DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA CONGRESS

As revised for the National Conference Committee of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha by Kenneth E. Andersen.

PURPOSES

1. To provide broad, intensive, and realistic educational opportunities for college speakers.
2. To increase opportunities for comprehensive investigation of and action on significant contemporary problems.
3. To promote the use of logical reasoning based upon the best available evidence in dealing with these problems.
4. To stimulate the participants to honest, original, creative effort.
5. To provide specific opportunities in the arts of public speaking, persuasion, discussion, and parliamentary debate.
6. To promote realistic understanding of the operation of legislative procedures in a democracy.
7. To employ the competition inherent in a free society to motivate students to their best efforts in attaining these objectives.

I. NAME

The name of this organization shall be THE NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA.

II. DATES OF THE MEETINGS

1. The business of this organization shall occupy three (3) consecutive days.
2. The dates for this meeting shall be concurrent with the National Forensic Conference.

III. POWERS AND DUTIES OF FACULTY SPONSORS

1. This organization shall be sponsored by the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.
2. Prior to each meeting of the Student Congress, the National Conference Committee of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha shall appoint the Congress Director(s).
3. The National Conference Committee shall have the following powers and responsibilities:
 - a. To revise these rules where necessary and desirable.
 - b. To decide upon and phrase problem(s) of significant contemporary interest which shall be studied and acted upon by the delegates attending the Student Congress; and to notify all member colleges of the problem(s) at least two (2) months prior to the Congress.
 - c. To discharge or delegate to the Congress Director and other faculty representative all other duties hereinafter specified.
 - d. To appoint one or more Faculty Members as Parliamentarian(s) to serve during the Student Congress with powers as specified hereinafter.
 - e. To appoint such other subordinate offices and committees as deemed

necessary and to delegate to such officers and committees powers and duties as deemed proper.

- f. To develop and publish the calendar for the Student Congress.

IV. GENERAL STRUCTURE

1. The official business sessions of the Student Congress shall be:
 - a. Caucuses
 - b. The Opening Legislative Assembly
 - c. Main Committee Meetings
 - d. Joint Conference Committee Meetings
 - e. Legislative Assemblies
2. The order and number of events, together with the exact times and places, shall be determined by the Congress Director.

V. REGISTRATION

1. Advance registration shall be completed not later than fifteen (15) days before the opening of the Congress. The advance registration shall include the names of all student delegates, their party affiliation (see Article IV, Section 1) and subtopic preference for committee membership (see Article VIII, Sections 1 and 2), and names of all nominees for Speaker of the Assembly, Clerk of the Assembly, Party Floor Leader, Party Whip, Chairmen Pro Tem of the Caucuses, and Temporary Chairmen of the Main Committees. Candidates for these positions must be certified by their faculty sponsors as qualified to discharge the duties of the office.
2. The Congress Director shall publish the closing date for Advance Registration and may require use of such registration forms as he shall determine.
3. At the final registration, each delegation shall confirm its Advance Registration. Changes in delegates shall be permitted only for serious causes. No additional nominations for officers or applications for committee assignments may be made at this time. Only students whose registration is confirmed during the final registration may take part in any of the activities of the Congress except by special permission of the Congress Director.

VI. CAUCUSES

1. At the time of Advance Registration, each delegate shall register as a member of one of the following parties:
 - a. Conservative
 - b. Liberal
2. At the time designated in the Calendar, each of the parties shall hold a Caucus for the purpose of selecting party candidates for Speaker and Clerk of Assembly, respectively, and for the purpose of electing a Party Floor Leader and a Party Whip.
3. Each Caucus shall be convened by a Chairman Pro Tem who shall preside over the Caucus until the candidate for Speaker of the Assembly has been selected. The Pro Tem officers shall be appointed by the Congress Director.
 - a. Delegates wishing to be considered for Pro Tem offices shall so indicate at the time of Advance Registration as provided in Article V,

- Section 1, and the Faculty Sponsor shall also submit a statement of their qualifications.
- b. The Chairman Pro Tem of each Caucus shall be selected from colleges not nominating candidates for the office of Speaker.
4. The Caucus shall proceed in accordance with the following rules:
 - a. No student may be nominated whose name has not been submitted in advance by the Faculty Sponsor of his college to the Congress Director as provided in Article V, Section 1, except that when the number of such properly certified candidates for an office is less than four, nominations for such office may be made from the floor, but in no case shall there be more than a total of four candidates for any one office. In all cases nominations shall be closed automatically after the nomination of a fourth candidate for any office.
 - b. Delegates placing names in nomination shall be allowed not more than five (5) minutes to describe the qualifications of their candidates.
 - c. Nominations may be seconded, but seconding speeches may not be given.
 - d. When all nominations for Speaker of the Assembly have been heard, each candidate shall be allotted five (5) minutes in which to state his views on the public problem(s) to be considered by the Congress and on the office for which he is nominated.
 - e. When all candidates have spoken, the vote shall be taken by roll call of the individual delegations.
 - f. If no candidate receives a majority on the first vote, the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes shall be voted upon again in a second roll call vote.
 - g. The Chairman Pro Tem shall act as timekeeper for the above speeches, and shall conduct the roll call vote(s).
 - h. When a candidate for Speaker has been elected, he shall immediately assume the chair as presiding officer of the Caucus.
 5. The candidate for Clerk shall be elected following the same procedures, except that nomination speeches will be limited to three (3) minutes and there shall be no campaign speeches by the nominees. When a candidate for Clerk has been elected, he shall immediately assume the duties of Clerk of the Caucus.
 6. The Party Floor Leader shall be elected following the procedure as described in Article VI, Section 4. It shall be the duty of the Party Floor Leader to seek to coordinate the efforts of the party in securing passage of the bills endorsed by party members.
 7. The Party Whip shall be elected following the same procedure as described in Article VI, Section 4. It shall be the duty of the Party Whip to assist the Party Floor Leader.

VII. OPENING ASSEMBLY

1. The Opening Assembly shall be called to order by the Temporary Chairman, who shall be a faculty member appointed by the Congress Director.
2. The Temporary Clerk, who shall be a faculty member appointed by the Congress Director, shall call the roll.
3. The Temporary Chairman shall preside during the election of the Speaker of the Student Congress. The election shall proceed in accordance with the following rules:

- a. Delegates nominating the candidates of the respective parties for Speaker of the Student Congress shall be allowed not more than six (6) minutes to describe the qualifications of their candidates.
 - b. Nominations may be made from the floor under the following conditions: A nominating petition signed by not less than twenty-five (25) percent of the properly registered delegates who have not signed nomination papers for more than one candidate must be filed with the Temporary Clerk. If the Temporary Clerk determines that the nomination petition is in order, the candidate may be placed in nomination as provided in Article VII, Section 3a and c.
 - c. After the nominating speeches for Speaker of the Student Congress have been made, the candidates shall be allowed three (3) minutes each in which to state their views to the Opening Assembly on the public problem(s) to be considered by the Congress and on the office of Speaker.
 - d. When the candidates have spoken, the vote shall be by roll call of colleges.
 - e. The candidate receiving the majority of votes shall be declared elected.
 - f. If no candidate receives a majority on the first vote, the two receiving the greatest number of votes shall be voted upon again in a second roll call.
 - g. The Temporary Clerk shall act as timekeeper for the above speeches and shall conduct the roll call vote(s) to determine the winning candidate.
4. The newly elected Speaker shall preside during the election of the Clerk of the Student Congress. The rules of this election shall be the same as those for election of the Speaker, except that nominating speeches shall be limited to three (3) minutes and that the candidates shall not speak.
 5. The Congress Director shall announce the assignment of delegates to their proper committees.
 6. The only other business which shall be in order at the Opening Assembly shall be the hearing of messages, communications, and announcements, a list of which shall have been prepared by the Congress Director.

VIII. MAIN COMMITTEE MEETINGS

1. At the time of Advance Registration for the Congress, the delegates may indicate preference on subtopics for committee memberships. Delegates without preference shall so indicate.
2. The Congress Director shall divide the delegates into as many Main Committees as may seem appropriate to the number of delegates registered in the Congress.
 - a. In determining the number of Main Committees on each subtopic, consideration shall be given to the number of expressed preferences, the size of the committees, and to the number and nature of Advance Bills submitted.
 - b. In assigning delegates to the Main Committees, the principle of proportional distribution according to Advance Party Registrations will be followed.
 - c. No more than one delegate from the same college will be assigned to the same committee.
 - d. In order to provide a workable distribution of membership on the

- several committees, the Congress Director shall have full and final authority to select delegates by lot to be placed wherever necessary.
3. Each Committee shall be called to order by a Temporary Chairman appointed by the Congress Director. The Temporary Chairman of each Main Committee shall be responsible for securing from the Congress Director copies of the Advance Bills assigned to his Committee.
 4. The Temporary Chairman shall preside during the election of the student Chairman and student Secretary for the Committee. He shall assume the duties of Temporary Secretary during this time.
 5. It shall be the essential purpose of each Committee to discuss the problem to which the Committee has been assigned and to develop a legislative solution to the problem stated in the form of a Bill which shall represent the consensus of the Committee.
 6. As the construction of a well-conceived Bill is to be the basis of the work of the Committee, the order of business shall be:
 - a. The definition and delimitation of the problem to which the Committee has been assigned.
 - b. The analysis of the problem. This shall include consideration of the causes of the problem and the establishment of criteria to evaluate proposed solutions.
 - c. The consideration of proposed solutions. The Committee shall determine whether one of the Advance Bills shall be used as a basis for their deliberations, or whether the Committee shall construct a new Bill.
 - d. The construction of a Bill which, in the considered judgment of the Committee, shall represent the best possible legislative solution to the problem.
 7. As soon as the essential content of a Bill has been decided upon, which must not be later than thirty (30) minutes prior to the adjournment of the last meeting of the Committee, the Chairman shall conduct the election of three (3) members whose duty it shall be to give the Majority Bill its final form and phrasing, and to represent the Main Committee at the meeting of the Joint Conference Committee. At least one of the three so elected shall be other than a member of the majority party of the Assembly and of the Committee.
 8. While at all times it shall be the objective of delegates to adhere to the highest standards of Parliamentary debate, the size of the Committee admits of greater informality than is possible on the floor of the Assembly; members shall be permitted to speak as often as they wish, subject to recognition by the Chairman, and to such limitations as may be decided upon by the Committee itself. The use of more formal Parliamentary procedures and voting should be as infrequent as possible in this informal situation.
 9. If for any reason a minority of the Committee shall find that it cannot support the Bill approved by the majority of the Committee, it may draft a Minority Bill and elect a single representative whose duty it shall be to represent the Minority at meetings of the Joint Conference Committee.

IX. JOINT CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

1. At the time designated in the Calendar, the Joint Conference Committee(s) shall convene. The number of such Joint Conference Committees

- shall be determined by the Congress Director, taking into account (a) the number and nature of the public problems considered by the Congress and (b) the number of delegates working in Main Committees. The election of members of the Joint Conference Committees shall be as provided in Article VIII, Sections 8 and 10.
2. Each Joint Conference Committee shall be called to order by a Temporary Chairman appointed by the Congress Director.
 3. The Temporary Chairman shall preside during the election of the student Chairman and student Secretary of the Committee.
 4. The Secretary shall immediately read or circulate the Majority and Minority Bills submitted by delegates representing the Main Committees. After the Bills have been read, the Chairman shall preside over the deliberations to determine whether one of these Bills shall be used as the basis for Committee action or whether the Committee shall construct a new Bill using these Bills as a basis.
 5. If in the deliberations it becomes apparent that there is a fundamental cleavage of opinion, the minority may withdraw. In such cases the minority delegates shall meet separately in another room where they shall elect a student Chairman and Secretary, and they shall be known as the Joint Conference Committee of the Minority. The Majority delegates shall be known as the Joint Conference Committee of the Majority.
 6. It shall be the duty of the Joint Conference Committee of the Majority to frame a Bill which shall express their views.
 7. It shall be the duty of the Joint Conference Committee of the Minority, if such a Committee be formed, to frame a Bill which shall express their views.
 8. Any delegate, whether or not he be a member of a Joint Conference Committee, who dissents from any portion of the Majority Bill and whose views are not satisfactorily expressed by a Minority Bill, may draw an amendment to be proposed from the floor of the General Assembly.
 9. Each Joint Conference Committee of the Majority or Minority shall elect one representative to the Steering Committee.

X. STEERING COMMITTEE

1. There shall be a Steering Committee composed of the Speaker of the Assembly, the Clerk of the Assembly, the Majority Party Floor Leader, the Minority Party Floor Leader, the Majority Leaders of the Joint Conference Committees, the Minority Leaders of the Joint Conference Committees, the Congress Director, and a faculty Parliamentarian who shall be Chairman of the Committee. This Committee shall:
 - a. Determine the agenda for meetings of the General Assembly. The Steering Committee shall have the power to limit the agenda, selecting from the Bills reported from the Joint Conference Committees, so that thorough debate on the measure(s) may occur.
 - b. Make available to all participants copies of Majority and Minority Bills prior to the legislative session for which they are calendared.
 - c. Receive and approve for placement on the agenda any resolutions, memorials, communications, or similar matters which individual delegates or Congress Committees wish to bring before the Assembly.
 - d. Designate the order in which the Committees shall report to the Assembly.

- e. Fix the total time allowed for debate on each Committee's Bill and amendments.
 - f. Formulate and present to the Assembly any resolutions, memorials, or similar matters which it feels should properly come before that body.
 - g. Meet with the Congress Director subsequent to the adjournment of the Congress or delegate to the Congress Director the function of editing and transmitting any Bills and Resolutions adopted by the Congress, to the President of the United States, the Chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States, to the Presidents of the participating colleges and universities, to the Editor of the *Speaker and Gavel*, or to such other organizations and individuals as shall be deemed appropriate, or as shall be specified by the Rules of the Congress or action of the Assembly.
 - h. All decisions of the Steering Committee regarding the agenda and time limits on debate shall be announced prior to the legislative session to which they apply.
2. All Committee action shall be subject to appeal to the Assembly.

XI. GENERAL ASSEMBLIES

1. The Speaker shall call the meetings to order; the Clerk shall call the roll, read the Minutes of the preceding Assembly, and all communications or announcements submitted by the Steering Committee or the Congress Director.
 2. The Speaker shall announce the order in which the committees shall report; and shall make any further necessary announcements regarding the division of time for debate or clarification of rules.
 3. Each Committee shall report its Bills and amendments in the following manner:
 - a. The Speaker shall announce the time fixed for debate on the Minority and Majority Bills.
 - b. The Majority Bill shall be read by a member of the Majority, who shall move its adoption.
 - c. The Majority Leaders, or delegates appointed by him, shall be allowed a total of not more than eight (8) minutes in which to explain and defend the Bill.
 - d. The Minority Bill, if there be one, shall be read by a member of the Minority, who shall move its substitution in place of the Majority Bill.
 - e. The Minority Leader, if there be a Minority Bill, or delegates appointed by him, shall be allowed a total of not more than eight (8) minutes in which to explain and defend the Bill.
 - f. Henceforth, delegates wishing to debate shall be allowed two (2) minutes each and the Speaker shall recognize favoring and opposing delegates in alternation insofar as possible.
 - g. Any delegate desiring to amend either the Majority or the Minority Bill shall present a written copy of his amendment to the Clerk not later than at the close of the time allowed the Minority Leader. At the conclusion of the Minority Leader's time, the Speaker shall ask if there are any proposed amendments not on the Clerk's desk. After this time, no more amendments may be received.
- (1) The Steering Committee or such members of the Steering Com-

- mittee who have been designated by the Steering Committee shall screen these proposed amendments and impartially consolidate such amendments as may be considered identical.
- (2) Having completed its work of screening the amendments, and taking into account the number to be considered by the Assembly, the Committee shall determine, and the Speaker shall announce, the time to be allotted to each amendment, including amendments to that particular amendment. When the allotted time has expired, the vote must be taken.
 - (3) Delegates who have submitted amendments to the Minority Bill may then be heard in the order in which they have submitted their amendments to the Clerk. If any amendments have been consolidated by the screening process, the Committee shall determine the order in which such consolidated amendments shall be heard.
 - (4) A maximum of three (3) minutes shall be allowed each proposer of an amendment in which to read, explain, and defend his proposed amendment.
 - (5) Amendments to amendments may be presented from the floor with the necessity of early presentaton in written form to the Clerk.
 - (6) If the Minority Bill is not adopted as a substitute for the Majority Bill, amendments to the Majority Bill shall be heard and acted upon in the same manner as provided for debate on the Minority Bill.
- h. At the expiration of time for debate on the substitute motion the vote must be taken, and it shall be on the motion to substitute.
 - i. Throughout the debate upon any given Bill and its amendments, the Speaker shall not recognize any delegate who has previously spoken unless no other delegate is requesting the floor.
 - j. The Speaker, or a delegate appointed by him, shall time the delegates during all debates. No delegate may exceed his time without consent of the Assembly by two-thirds vote.
 - k. The Speaker may ask the advice of the Parliamentarian, but the Parliamentarian shall act in an advisory capacity only.
 - l. If during the Legislative Assembly it seems to be desirable to refer a matter to a Committee, the motion to retire to committee shall be in order. Motions to refer to a specified Joint Conference Committee or to a Special Committee may or may not include instructions to the Committee. Unless a motion to refer to a Special Committee specifies the number of members, how the members are to be chosen, and who is to be chairman, these matters shall be determined and announced by the Speaker. A motion to refer an amendment to a Committee shall take with it the motion to which the amendment applies.
 - m. After all debate has been heard, or the time limits reached, or the previous question moved and passed, the Bill before the Assembly for adoption shall be voted upon by roll call as provided in Article XIV. It may be approved with or without amendment, or be rejected. If rejected, no new Bill on the same topic may be offered to the Assembly, but the Speaker may entertain a Resolution stating that the Assembly is unable to recommend action upon the problem at issue.

XII. MEMBERSHIP

1. Any college or university included on the current chapter roll of the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha or any college or university specifically invited by the National President of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha or by the National Council is entitled to send delegates to participate in the Student Congress.
2. Student delegates must be bona fide undergraduate students of the colleges they represent. They need not be members of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha in order to participate in the Student Congress meetings.
3. Each participating college shall be entitled to a maximum of four (4) participating student delegates at any one time except for students serving on the Evaluation Committee (see Section XVI). Not more than two (2) student delegates shall be assigned to the same subtopic of the public problem(s) under consideration.
4. Any college may send as many students as it wishes, to be designated as alternates or observers, but in that capacity they may not participate in any of the business of a Committee, Caucus, or General Assembly, except as defined in Article XII, Section 5.
5. The participating delegates representing a given college during the various Committee meetings need not be the same students for meetings of the Assembly. When a participating delegate and an alternate thus exchange status, it shall be at the discretion of the Faculty Sponsor of the college involved and written notification of this exchange must be submitted to the Congress Director and to the Clerk of the Assembly.

XIII. BILLS, AMENDMENTS, RESOLUTIONS

1. Advance Bills may be prepared by delegates before the Congress convenes to be submitted to the appropriate Committees at the time they convene as tentative proposals for the Committee to consider.
2. Delegates desiring to submit Advance Bills shall observe the following procedures:
 - a. Each college may submit one Bill for referral to each of the Main Committees.
 - b. Any delegate desiring to submit an Advance Bill shall submit ten (10) identical copies to the Congress Director not less than ten (10) days prior to the Congress. All such Bills must be drafted in accordance with the rules hereinafter specified.
 - c. Any delegate submitting an Advance Bill may circulate copies of his Bill to all chapters of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha in advance of the Congress.
 - d. The Congress Director shall sort the Advance Bills in terms of the Committee to which they are submitted and shall number them in order of their receipt.
3. All Advance Bills must be presented in the form hereinafter described:
 - a. They must be typewritten, duplicated, and double-spaced upon a single sheet of white 8½ × 11-inch paper.
 - b. The first line shall consist of these words: “Congress Bill Number _____.”
 - c. The second line shall consist of these words: “Referred to the Com-

- mittee on (herein state the name of the appropriate Committee).”
- d. The third line shall give the name of the student introducing the Bill together with the name of the college he represents.
 - e. Commencing with the fourth line, the title of the Bill must be stated, beginning with the words, “An Act,” and continuing with a statement of the purpose of the Bill.
 - f. The text of the Bill proper must begin with the words: “Be it enacted by the Student Congress of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha.” The material following must begin with the word, “That.” Each line of the material which follows must be numbered on the left margin of the page, beginning with “1.”
 - g. Every section shall be numbered commencing at one. No figures shall be used in the Bill except for the numbers of sections and lines. No abbreviations shall be used.
 - h. The following form is an illustration of the prescribed form for drafting bills:

Congress Bill Number _____

Referred to the Committee on

The Providing of Teachers and Facilities.

by John Doe of _____ University.

AN ACT to provide for the increasing of teachers’ salaries.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA
SIGMA RHO–TAU KAPPA ALPHA

1. Section 1. That the . . .

Section 2. That also . . .

4. Bills prepared by each Committee for recommendation to the Joint Conference Committee shall follow the same form as prescribed for Advance Bills with the following exceptions:
 - a. They shall not be limited as to length.
 - b. The second line shall consist of these words: “Referred to the Joint Conference Committee on (herein state the name of the appropriate Committee).”
 - c. The third line shall consist of the words: “Majority (or Minority) Bill by” followed by the names and colleges of the delegates supporting the Bill.
5. Bills prepared by each Joint Conference Committee for recommendation to the General Assembly shall follow the same form as prescribed for Advance Bills with the following exceptions:
 - a. They shall not be limited as to length.
 - b. The second line shall consist of the words: “Majority (or Minority) Bill by” followed by the Conference Committee on (herein state the name of the appropriate Committee)” followed by the names and colleges of the delegates supporting the Bill.
6. The proper form for amendments shall be one of the following:
 - a. “I move to amend by striking out the words . . .” or
 - b. “I move to amend by substituting the words . . .” or
 - c. “I move to amend by adding the words . . .” or
 - d. “I move to amend by inserting the words . . .” or
 - e. “I move to amend by dividing the . . .”

7. Bills passed by the General Assembly shall be signed by the Speaker and Clerk, and three (3) copies shall be delivered to the Congress Director.
8. In the event the Assembly fails to pass any Bill properly brought before it, no Bill may be offered to the Assembly. If the Assembly wishes to express itself with regard to matters other than those relating to the official Committee problems but within its proper range of action it may consider such motions as are approved by the Steering Committee in the form of Resolutions.

XIV. VOTING

1. In the Assemblies, the Committees, and the Caucuses each individual delegate is entitled to one vote. He is free to vote as he chooses without regard to how any other delegate or delegates cast their ballots.
2. Roll call votes shall be used in electing officers or in taking final action upon whole Bills. In the Assemblies all roll calls will be by colleges, and one delegate from each college should respond and report the votes of his delegation.
3. In all meetings of the Congress no delegate shall be privileged to change his vote after the vote has been declared by the presiding officer. Any change of vote prior to that moment shall be reported from the floor by the delegation making the changes. This should be made through the delegation representative.
4. In the event that official responsibilities require that a delegate be absent for a portion of a meeting, he may vote by proxy by submitting his vote to the Clerk or Secretary in written form, but only in the case of specific motions pending at the time of the delegate's departure. Such proxies shall be void if the motion to which they apply shall be changed in any manner.
5. In the Assemblies, Committees, and Caucuses the participating delegates shall be seated together in an area from which all others are excluded. Guests and observers shall be seated in an area clearly separated from that of the participating delegates. This makes possible more efficient conduct of business and accurate determination of votes.

XV. POWERS AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

1. The Speaker of the Assembly shall call the meeting to order; he shall preserve order and decorum; he shall name the one entitled to the floor; he shall decide all questions of order, subject to appeal to the Assembly; he shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings except where his vote would be decisive; he shall put questions; he shall certify to all Bills passed by the Assembly.
2. The Clerk of the Assembly shall have the care and custody of all papers and records; he shall serve as Clerk of the Steering Committee; he shall arrange in its proper order, as determined by the Steering Committee, all the business of the Assembly; he shall keep the journal of the Assembly; he shall conduct voting by roll call, and tabulate and announce the results; he shall receive and list in order of receipt, amendments to Bills; he shall certify to all Bills passed by the Assembly, and shall deliver three (3) copies of all such Bills, together with copies of the minutes to the Congress Director.
3. The Chairman of a Committee shall call the meetings to order; he shall preserve order and decorum; he shall name the one entitled to the floor;

he shall decide all questions of order, subject to appeal to the Committee; he shall not be required to vote, except where his vote would be decisive; he shall put questions; and shall conduct the election of members to the Joint Committee.

4. The Secretary of a Committee shall have the care and custody of all papers and records; he shall conduct all roll call votes, and tabulate and announce the results; he shall keep the Minutes of the sessions of the Committee, and shall give a copy of those minutes to the Congress Director.

XVI. COMMITTEE ON THE EVALUATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

1. There shall be a Committee on the Evaluation of Legislative Procedure composed of not more than ten (10) faculty and student members.
2. The function of this Committee shall be to evaluate the procedure, work, and effectiveness of the Congress, and to evaluate the performance of the student delegates.

XVII. MISCELLANEOUS

1. In the Assembly, the unqualified motion to adjourn is a main motion because its effect would be to dissolve the Congress *sine die*.
2. A table of parliamentary motions adapted for the Student Congress follows.
3. In cases not covered by these Rules, the presiding officer shall follow H. M. Robert, *Rules of Order* (Rev.). Scott, Foresman and Company, New York, 1951.
4. Awards to participants may be made in accordance with procedures established by the National Conference Committee.
5. The Congress Director shall, as provided in III, 8 of the *Procedures, Rules and Suggestions for the National Conference of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha* sit as a member of the Board of Review. If the Congress Director is disqualified the Co-Director, if one has been appointed shall serve in his place. If the Co-Director is disqualified, or if one has not been appointed, the Board shall proceed without him. The Board of Review has full and final authority to answer any questions and to settle any problems which may arise within any event of the National Conference.

Adopted by the National Conference Committee of
Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, December, 1968.

Austin J. Freeley, John Carroll University, Chairman
George Adamson, University of Utah
Kenneth E. Andersen, University of Michigan
George F. Henigan, George Washington University
Donald O. Olson, University of Nebraska, ex officio

TABLE OF PARLIAMENTARY MOTIONS

MOTION	PURPOSE	May Interrupt	Mover Must Be Recognized	Second Required	Debatable	Vote Required	Amendable
PRIVILEGED MOTIONS							
To take a recess	To dismiss for a given time	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	Y
Question of privilege	To make request during debate	Y	N	N	N	Maj	Y
Call for orders of day	Force consideration of a postponed motion or mandated business	Y	N	N	N	Chr	N
INCIDENTAL MOTIONS							
Appeal decision of chair	Obtain vote reversing chair	Y	Y	Y	*N	Maj	N
Call for division of house	Ascertain the correct vote	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Raise a point of order	Correct a parliamentary error	Y	N	N	N	Chr	N
To divide a motion	Consider in separate parts	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	Y
To withdraw a motion	To remove from floor	N	Y	N	N	Maj	N
To suspend rules	To permit action contrary to standing rules	N	Y	Y	N	2/3	N
To rise for parliamentary inquiry	To ascertain proper procedure or status of business	Y	N	N	N	No	N
SUBSIDIARY MOTIONS							
To table	To defer action	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	N
The previous question	To close debate-force vote	N	Y	Y	N	2/3	N
To limit or extend limits of debate	To control length of time for discussion	N	Y	Y	N	2/3	Y
To postpone to a certain time	Defer action (maj) or to create special order (2/3)	N	Y	Y	*Y	*2/3	Y
To refer to a committee (May include members)	To allow consideration by a special group	N	Y	Y	*Y	Maj	Y
To amend (an amendment)	To clarify an amendment	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	N
To amend or substitute	To modify a motion	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	Y
To postpone indefinitely	To suppress action (kill)	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	N
MAIN MOTIONS							
The bill of resolution (to adjourn)	To introduce business (to adjourn the Assembly, <i>sine die</i>)	N	Y	Y	Y	Maj	Y
RENEWAL MOTIONS							
To reconsider	To reopen debate & consider	*N	*Y	Y	Y	Maj	N
Take from table	Return to consideration motion previously deferred	N	Y	Y	N	Maj	N

*Modified by circumstances as to nature of time, question, effect, etc.

PROPOSED BY-LAWS OF THE NATIONAL STUDENT COUNCIL OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

ARTICLE I. NAME

The name of the organization shall be the National Student Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha as designated in Article V, Section (1) of the Constitution of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSE

The purpose of the National Student Council shall be to serve in an advisory capacity to the National Council and the Board of Trustees and to advance the knowledge of and participation in the working of the Society on the part of student members.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

The National Student Council shall consist of the delegates from each of the chapters of the Society represented at the National Convention and the national President of the Society or someone deputized by him. Each chapter in attendance shall have one (1) vote in all matters which shall come before the National Student Council.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

Section 1) The officers of the National Student Council shall be the President, the First Vice-President, the Second Vice-President, and the Secretary.

Section 2) Duties of the Officers shall be as follows.

a) *The President* shall be the official head of the National Student Council. He shall have the duty of appointing the special and standing committees, such as may be created. He shall sit on the National Council (or may appoint or otherwise designate someone to act for him in this capacity) and represent therein the National Student Council. He shall preside at all meetings of the National Student Council. He shall carry out all duties such as normally befall the office of President.

b) *The First Vice-President* shall assume the duties of the President at such times as the President is unable to do so. He shall be chairman of the Student Speaker of the Year Committee and he shall co-ordinate the activities of all special and standing committees.

c) *The Second Vice-President* shall be chairman of the Publications and Public Relations Committee of the National Student Council. He shall fulfill all duties delegated him by the President.

d) *The Secretary* shall prepare and maintain a record of all meetings and correspondence conducted by the National Student Council. He shall also fulfill such duties as normally befall the office of Treasurer as well as all duties delegated him by the President.

Section 3) Election and Terms of Office

a) All members and officers of the National Student Council shall be elected for a term ending when the succeeding officers are duly sworn in.

b) All members and officers of the National Student Council shall assume office upon being duly sworn in.

c) All officers of the National Student Council shall be elected during the Society's Annual Convention by a majority vote of the delegates from the campus chapters in attendance. Each campus chapter shall have one (1) vote for each office. A simple majority of the delegates in attendance at the Annual Convention shall constitute a quorum at the elections meeting.

Section 4) Nomination of Officers

a) Nominations may be made from the floor by the delegates of the campus chapters at the time of election.

ARTICLE V. COMMITTEES

Section 1) *The Student Speaker of the Year Committee* shall be chaired by the First Vice-President of the National Student Council and shall perform such duties and comply to such organization as hereinafter stated in Article VI of these By-Laws.

Section 2) *The Publications and Public Relations Committee* shall be chaired by the Second Vice-President of the National Student Council. The President of the National Student Council and the Second Vice-President shall confer and appoint a member to the Committee from each Regional Division of the Society. The Committee shall be responsible for the submissions of the National Student Council to the Editor of the *Speaker and Gavel* and shall be responsible for communicating information on behalf of the National Student Council to the campus chapters.

Section 3) *The Executive Committee* shall be composed of the President, the First Vice-President, the Second Vice-President, and the Secretary. It shall be the responsibility of the Executive Committee to formulate policy for the National Student Council and to act in the name of the National Student Council at such times as the National Student Council is unable to meet.

Section 4) *Special Committees* shall be appointed by the President with the affirmation of the National Council.

ARTICLE VI. THE STUDENT SPEAKER OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Student Speaker of the Year Award shall be awarded on the basis of the following requirements and procedures.

Section 1) General Requirements for Nominees

a) Any undergraduate member of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha who is nominated in a *bona fide* manner while enrolled in his senior year of academic work is eligible for the Student Speaker of the Year Award.

b) A candidate for the award must be a participant in one of the major events (Four-Man Debate, Two-Man Debate, and Congress) at the National Conference at which the award is to be presented.

Section 2) Nominations

a) Students eligible for the award may apply directly to the

First Vice-President of the National Student Council or they may be nominated by one or more of the following organizations and individuals:

- 1) The sponsor of the chapter of which the student is a member;
- 2) The sponsor of a chapter at another institution;
- 3) The student members of any chapter;
- 4) A regional governor;
- 5) A member of National Executive Council;
- 6) A regional organization of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

b) The student will be required to submit information which will enable the Student Speaker of the Year Committee to evaluate his application.

Section 3) Selection of the Student Speaker of the Year.

a) The winner of the award shall be selected by a committee established under Article V, Section 1, hereinbefore. The committee shall be composed of four (4) faculty and five (5) student members of the Society and shall be chaired, as stated hereinbefore, by the First Vice-President of the National Student Council.

b) The four faculty members of the Committee shall be appointed by the President of the National Council.

c) The five student members of the committee shall include the first Vice-President of the National Student Council and four student members who shall be appointed by the President of the National Student Council. The President, in making such appointments, shall reflect diversity of the student membership of the Society.

d) The committee will apply the following criteria in making its selection and shall regard such criteria as being hereinafter listed in order of priority:

- 1) Comprehensive forensics record (win-loss computations, awards received, etc.);
- 2) Activities directly related to public speaking;
- 3) Activities indirectly related to public speaking;
- 4) Academic record.

Section 4) Applications for the Student Speaker of the Year Award must be received by the First Vice-President or by a person designated by him, at a given date and place which he shall make public to the Society either through the Editor of the *Speaker and Gavel* or through letter to each campus chapter. He shall make such information public to the Society not later than four months prior to the convening of the National Annual Convention.

ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENT

These By-Laws may be amended at any regular meeting of the National Student Council by a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote of the total National Student Council membership in attendance at conference, providing that the members have received written notice of the proposed amendment at least thirty days in advance of such meeting.

ARTICLE VIII. GENERAL

Section 1) Where parliamentary procedure for the National Student Council is not otherwise specified in these By-Laws, *Robert's Rules of Order, Revised*, shall govern.

Section 2) It shall also be the duty of the Secretary, at the close of each National Conference, to revise and bring up to date these By-Laws in accordance with such changes and amendments as may have been made during the preceding year. It shall then be the duty of the Second Vice-President to reproduce and transmit, at the expense of the Society, a copy of such By-Laws to all National Council and National Student Council Officers and to each campus chapter.

ARTICLE IX. ADOPTION

Upon ratification by two-thirds of the campus chapters represented at the Annual Convention of the Society at which these By-Laws shall be proposed, the By-Laws shall be deemed adopted by the National Student Council, effective at beginning of next Annual conference.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF REGION IV DSR-TKA DEBATE TOURNAMENT

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA-TUSCALOOSA

November 21-23, 1968

The Southern Regional (IV) Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha Debate Tournament was held at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa campus, November 21-23.

Directed by Annabel D. Hagood, the tournament was jointly sponsored by the Alabama Union and the Alabama Debate Squad.

With 22 schools and 38 teams participating, it was the largest in the history of Region IV tournaments.

The rotating Governor's Trophy, given to the best four-man team record, went to Vanderbilt University with a thirteen-three win-loss record.

The first place two-man team award went to the Vanderbilt team of Richard Knapp and Jim Walker with a perfect record of eight wins.

Edward Shohat and Wayne Silver of the University of Miami took the second place two-man team award with seven wins and one loss. Silver was named the top speaker with 213 out of a possible 240 speaker points.

Third place went to Mary Fisher and Lewis Page of Auburn University, also with a seven-one win-loss record.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Sixth Annual Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha National Conference

Sunday, April 6, 1969

- 6:00– 8:30 p.m. Registration, Nebraska Center
9:00 p.m. General Assembly and Announcements,
Center Auditorium

Monday, April 7, 1969

- 7:30– 8:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast, Center Cafeteria
8:00 a.m. Buses leave Center for the City Campus
8:30 a.m. Round I, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round I, 4-man debate, City Campus
8:30–10:00 a.m. Student Congress, Party Caucuses, Nebraska Center
10:00 a.m. Round II, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round II, 4-man debate, City Campus
10:30–11:30 a.m. Student Congress, Opening legislative assembly,
Center Auditorium
11:30 a.m. Round III, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round III, 4-man debate, City Campus
11:45–12:45 p.m. Student Congress Main Committee Meetings,
Center
1:00 p.m. Buses leave City Campus for Center
1:30 p.m. Round I, Persuasive Speaking, Center, East Campus
2:00 p.m. Drawings for Round I, Extemporaneous Speaking,
Center
2:30 p.m. Round I, Extemporaneous Speaking, Center,
East Campus
3:00 p.m. Student Executive Council Meeting, Center
National Executive Council Meeting, Center
4:30– 6:00 p.m. Student Congress, Main Committee meetings, Center
6:00– 7:00 p.m. Model initiation, Center Auditorium
8:30 p.m. Faculty Social Hour—Place to be announced
Student Social Hour—Place to be announced

Tuesday, April 8, 1969

- 7:30– 8:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast, Center Cafeteria
8:00 a.m. Buses leave Center for City Campus
8:30 a.m. Round IV, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round IV, 4-man debate, City Campus
8:30–11:00 a.m. Student Congress, Main Committee meetings, Center
10:00 a.m. Round V, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round V, 4-man debate, City Campus
11:15–12:45 p.m. Student Congress, Joint Committee meetings, Center
11:30 a.m. Round VI, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round VI, 4-man debate, City Campus
1:00 p.m. Buses leave City Campus for Center
2:30 p.m. Round II, Persuasive Speaking, Center, East Campus
Student Executive Council Meeting, Center
National Executive Council Meeting, Center
Student Congress, Steering Committee, Center

- 3:00 p.m. Drawing for Round II, Extemporaneous Speaking, Center
3:30 p.m. Round II, Extemporaneous Speaking, Center, East Campus
4:30 p.m. Meeting of chapter faculty sponsors, Center
Election of student officers, Center
7:00 p.m. Conference banquet, Center

Wednesday, April 9, 1969

- 7:30– 8:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast, Center Cafeteria
8:00 a.m. Buses leave Center for City Campus
8:30–12:00 Noon Student Congress, Legislative Assembly, Center Auditorium
8:30 a.m. Octa-final round, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round VII, 4-man debate, City Campus
10:00 a.m. Quarter-final round, 2-man debate, East Campus
Round VIII, 4-man debate, City Campus
11:30–12:00 Noon Buses leave City Campus for Center
11:30 a.m. Semi-final round, 2-man debate, East Campus
12:00– 1:30 p.m. Lunch
12:30 p.m. Drawings for Finals, Extemporaneous Speaking, Center
1:00 p.m. Finals, Extemporaneous Speaking, Center
Finals, Persuasive Speaking, Center
2:00 p.m. Final Round, 2-man debate, Center
3:30 p.m. Announcement of Results and presentation of Awards, Center Auditorium
4:00 p.m. Adjournment

MINUTES OF NATIONAL COUNCIL DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

The opening meeting of the National Council was convened at 3:10 p.m. December 27, 1968, in the Sheraton-Chicago Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, by President Laase. Members present at meeting were: Laase, Hance, Cripe, Brock, Griffin, Weiss, Trapp, Adamson, Walwik, Beard, Eubank, Ewbank, Golden, Henigan, Lynch, Pelliam, Wagner.

President Laase's report emphasized that efforts to get a response to presidential letters to delinquent chapters have met with little success. He also reminded the council that the failure of active chapters to initiate eligible members was creating a financial problem for the fraternity.

Dr. Kenneth G. Hance submitted the following Treasurer's Report for 1967-68 and proposed budget for 1968-69. Adamson moved, Griffin seconded Treasurer's Report and budget be accepted. Adopted after discussion of pro's and con's of deficit probability.

DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA TREASURER'S REPORT

July 1, 1967-June 30, 1968

INCOME

Initiations	\$3740.00	(Budgeted: \$3500.00)
Investment Income (cash)	2942.46	(" : 3520.00)
Charters	150.00	(" : 200.00)
Special Gifts	-----	(" : 150.00)
Miscellaneous	4.50	(" : -----)
	\$6836.96	(" : \$7370.00)

DISBURSEMENTS

<i>Speaker and Gavel:</i>		
Four Issues	\$3790.35	(Budgeted: \$3400.00)
Editor's Office	300.00	(" : 300.00)
Printing and Postage	389.74	(" : 300.00)
President's Office	200.00	(" : 200.00)
Secretary's Office	1077.05	(" : 1000.00)
Treasurer's Office	200.00	(" : 200.00)
Historian's Office	200.00	(" : 200.00)
Maintenance of Records by Allen Press	437.76	(" : 450.00)
Dues and Expenses re. Assn.		
College Honor Societies	253.53	(" : 200.00)
Expenses re. SAA Committee		
on Debate-Discussion	168.19	(" : 125.00)
Membership Certificates	402.94	(" : 200.00)
Awards:		
Speaker-of-the-Year	250.00	(" : 275.00)
Distinguished Alumni	32.12	(" : 50.00)
Trophy for NFL	148.83	(" : 100.00)
SAA Life Membership Payment	-----	(" : 200.00)
Student Council	176.41	(" : 100.00)

National Conference	800.00	(" : 800.00)†
Miscellaneous	42.75	(" : 70.00)
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$8869.67	\$8170.00 †
Gross Deficit:		\$2032.71
Refund on National Conference:		1305.87
		<hr/>
Net Deficit:		\$ 726.84

†Payment of \$800.00 to National Conference added to original budget proposal, making a Budgeted *deficit* of \$800.00.

DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA PROPOSED BUDGET: 1968-69

INCOME

Initiations	\$3800.00
Investment Income (cash)	3000.00
Charters	100.00
Special Gifts	(?)
Miscellaneous	50.00
	<hr/>
	\$6950.00

DISBURSEMENTS

<i>Speaker and Gavel:</i>	
Four Issues	\$3400.00
Editor's Office	300.00
Printing and Postage	300.00
President's Office	200.00
Secretary's Office	1000.00
Treasurer's Office	200.00
Historian'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	150.00
Membership Certificates	400.00
Awards:	
Speaker-of-the-Year	250.00
Distinguished Alumni	25.00
Trophy for NFL	100.00
SAA Life Membership Payment	200.00
Student Council	100.00
National Conference	800.00
Miscellaneous	50.00
	<hr/>
	\$8325.00

Probable *Deficit* without National Conference Balance and Refund: \$1375.00
 (National Conference Refund in 1968: \$1305.87)

Trustee Buehler's report read by McBath. Accepted.

TRUSTEE REPORT—PART I		CAPITAL HOLDING	
BID PRICE DECEMBER 24, 1968		DIV. INCOME	
Broadstreet M. Co.	755 shares	\$12,692.55	\$ 369.95
Diversified M. Corp.	2401 shares	26,170.90	852.35
Putnam Income Fund	2630 shares	27,615.00	1104.60
Selected American	1104 shares	14,020.80	720.00*
			15.00**
TOTAL		\$80,499.25	\$3,061.90

*Based upon \$60.00 monthly withdrawal plan of which nearly \$500 is capital.

**Fractional c.g. shares at end of year.

In round numbers, we are worth \$80,500—Bid Price

\$87,000—Asking Price

Dividend Income—Annual \$3,000.00 of which \$500.00 is capital.

Data based upon Standard and Poor Stock Index December, 1968

The Putnam Fund number of shares is my estimate. The number of shares from the other funds supplied by Kenneth Hance.

TRUSTEE REPORT—PART II COMMENTS

Dollar-wise our financial future looks pretty good, but inflation is hurting us. If the present economic trend continues our dividend income may increase four or five percent annually. I have drastically revised my thinking of three years ago when I was seriously considering using our capital gains bid monthly withdrawals. We now have a \$3,000 annual subsidy of which about \$500 is capital. This is a handsome gift from the past. We must, however, keep the future in mind and to drain more from our capital is unrealistic. This would weaken our capital structure and make us more reluctant to stand on our own feet. As trustee of the society, and as one who spent a quarter of a century building this capital structure, I cannot subscribe to further depletion of capital funds, at least not until we have made a serious effort to get needed funds through other means such as initiating more people or adjusting fees partly commensurate with inflation, or both. Since Pearl Harbor, we have in reality cut fees from \$10.00 to about \$4.00 and have more than doubled our services. I note that out of 183 listed chapters only 95 chapters reported initiations in 1966-67 and 88 failed to report initiations in 1967-68. Only a little more than half of the chapters are reporting initiations. Of those reporting 19 initiated only one member in 66-67 and 12 schools listed only one last year. Of course, I don't advocate initiating the unqualified. But on a population basis of participants in Forensic competition we are electing only one in eight compared to the practice of thirty or forty years ago. The above statistics disturb me, yet I find much joy and satisfaction when I see what some schools and chapters sponsors are doing.

Don Olson, Nebraska, recognized to discuss National Conference. Reported on status of event to be held on University of Nebraska campus, April 6-9, 1969.

Minutes for National Conference, Washington, D. C. as published in May issue *Speaker and Gavel* approved. Secretary reported on delinquent and possible delinquent chapters. Secretary to notify all chapters on danger list due to insufficient initiates.

HAVE NOT INITIATED IN 3 YEARS

Arkansas	Connecticut	UNY-Univ. Hts.
Boston	Dartmouth	North Carolina
Bridgewater	Davidson	Oklahoma
Brigham Young	Elmira	Tulane
Brown	Loyola	Wash. U.-St. L.
Bucknell	Memphis	Waynesburg
Case	Middlebury	Weber
Colgate	Missouri-OK soon	

HAVE NOT INITIATED IN 2 YEARS

Alma	Lincoln	Oregon
C. W. Post	Loyola-Md.	Richmond
Denver	Montana	Rutgers
Duke	Morehouse	San Francisco
Hamilton	UNY-Wash. Sq.	Utah State
Hanover	Notre Dame	Vanderbilt
Idaho		

HAVE INITIATED—NOW OFF DELINQUENT LIST

- Cornell College (April 14, 1967)
- Oregon State (May 1, 1968)

Nomination of Woodrow Leake for membership-at-large in Wake Forest chapter approved.

The Historian's Report was presented by Weiss in the absence of Dr. Ross. Accepted and Council voted a special "note of appreciation and commendation" to Dr. Ross for a job well done. Council voted to send copy of history with each membership acceptance.

Editor's Report on *Speaker-Gavel* with emphasis on desirability of articles of quality submitted. It was suggested that students be encouraged to prepare papers for submission. Report accepted.

Student President's Report explaining Student Speaker of the Year Award accepted.

President Laase appointed a Regional Governor's Role Committee consisting of Walwik, chairman, Moorhouse, and Henigan to report at Nebraska meeting.

The Standards Committee recommended chapter membership be extended to Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida, Dean Graunke, sponsor, and to the University of Delaware, Patrick C. Kennicott, sponsor. Recommendations approved.

The Speaker of the Year Committee Report by chairman Golden accepted. Eubank moved, Hance seconded, that Speaker of the Year Committee be authorized to give one or more posthumous awards each year, if so desired. Passed.

Eubank presented Nominating Committee slate of James H. McBath, President; Austin Freeley, Vice-President; Kenneth G. Hance, Treasurer; Theodore J. Walwik, Secretary. Eubank moved, Adamson seconded, slate be approved. Passed.

Meeting adjourned 6:15 p.m.

The second meeting of the National Council convened in Sheraton-Chicago Hotel, Saturday evening, December 28, 1968, at 7:35. The following coun-

cil members were present for some or all of the meeting: Laase, Hance, Cripe, Moorhouse, Griffin, Lynch, Henigan, Blyton, Beard, Wagner, Trapp, Walwik, Ewbank, Eubank, Freeley, Weiss, Kane, Hagood.

The first item of business was the presentation of the Alumni Awards Committee report by Chairman Wagner. Report accepted.

Governor's Reports were received as follows:

- I. John Lynch—recommend continuation of Boston chapter, Robert Shrum new sponsor, and of the Brown chapter. Has had no response from Connecticut
- II. Ray Beard—reported no reply from Colgate but that NYU at University Heights rebuilding its program.
- III. George Henigan—no response from Hampden-Sydney
- IV. Joseph Wetherby's Report—Lincoln Memorial very weak. Davidson shows strength.
- V. Theodore Walwik—perturbed by Loyola of Chicago and Almano response.
- VI. Rex Weir—absent
- VII. Mel Moorhouse—questions about Washington at St. Louis and University of Oklahoma chapters.
- VIII. Bernie Brock—absent
- IX. George Adamson—absent
- X. Robert Griffin—all's well

Ewbank, Standards Committee presented several schools for chapter consideration. Council voted a charter to State University of New York, Cortland. Action was deferred until National Conference in April on Mansfield State College, Valdosta State College, and St. John's University. Ewbank moved, Freeley seconded, that all application chapters be invited to National Conference, passed. Ewbank moved, McBath seconded that Council reaffirm endorsement of AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles and to implement this endorsing by refusing to grant charters to institutions who are on the AAUP list of censured institutions. Passed.

Freeley moved, Wagner seconded that National Conference fees be \$10-\$13, \$10-\$12 if over 500 entries for National Conference. Passed.

Moved, seconded, and passed that 1970 National Conference be held at University of Alabama, March 25-31, 1970.

Henigan moved, McBath seconded, that member-at-large fee be waved and local chapter purchase key for member. Passed.

Meeting adjourned 9:38 p.m.

Chapters and Sponsors

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Alabama, University, Ala.	Annabel D. Hagood
Albion, Albion, Mich.	D. Duane Angel
Alma, Alma, Mich.	Robert W. Smith
American, Washington, D. C.	Jerome B. Polisky
Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.	Jack Gregory
Auburn, Auburn, Ala.	Marsha Trew
Ball State, Muncie, Ind.	David W. Shepard
Bates, Lewiston, Maine	Brooks Quimby
Berea, Berea, Ky.	Margaret D. McCoy
Birmingham-Southern, Birmingham, Ala.	Robert A. Dayton
Boston University, Boston, Mass.	
Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.	C. F. Evans, Jr.
Bridgewater, Bridgewater, Va.	Roger E. Sappington
Brigham Young, Provo, Utah	Jed J. Richardson
Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N. Y.	Donald Springen
Brown, Providence, R. I.	
Bucknell, Lewisburg, Pa.	Frank W. Merritt
Butler, Indianapolis, Ind.	Nicholas M. Cripe
California State, Long Beach, Calif.	Jack Howe
Capital, Columbus, Ohio	Thomas S. Ludlum
Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio	Donald Marston
Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	Richard L. LaVarway
Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio	Rudolph F. Verderber
Clemson, Clemson, S. C.	Arthur Fear
Colgate, Hamilton, N. Y.	H. G. Behler
Colorado, Boulder, Colo.	George Matter
Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.	James A. Johnson
Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.	Joseph Seacrist
Cornell, Ithaca, N. Y.	Arthur W. Rovine
Cornell, Mt. Vernon, Iowa	Walter F. Stromer
Creighton, Omaha, Neb.	Rev. H. J. McAuliffe, S.J.
C. W. Post College of L. I. Univ., Greenvale, N. Y.	Arthur N. Kruger
Dartmouth, Hanover, N. H.	Herbert L. James
Davidson, Davidson, N. C.	Rev. Will Terry
Denison, Granville, Ohio	W. R. Dresser
Denver, Denver, Colorado	Glen Strickland
DePauw, Greencastle, Ind.	Robert O. Weiss
Dickinson, Carlisle, Pa.	Herbert Wing
Duke, Durham, N. C.	Joseph Cable Weatherby
Eastern Kentucky State, Richmond, Ky.	Aimee Alexander, Robert King
Elizabethtown, Elizabethtown, Penn.	Jobie Riley
Elmira, Elmira, N. Y.	(Mrs.) Betty G. Gardner
Emerson, Boston, Mass.	John C. Zacharis
Emory and Henry, Emory, Va.	H. Alan Pickrell
Emory, Atlanta, Ga.	Glenn Pelham
Evansville, Evansville, Ind.	Lynne J. Mlady
Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	Donald E. Williams
Florida State, Tallahassee, Fla.	Gregg Phifer
Georgia, Athens, Ga.	Richard C. Huseman
George Washington, Washington, D. C.	George F. Henigan, Jr.
Grinnell, Grinnell, Iowa	William Vanderpool

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Hamilton, Clinton, N. Y.	J. Franklin Hunt
Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, Va.	D. M. Allan
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	Marian Smith
Hanover, Hanover, Ind.	Stanley B. Wheeler
Hartford, Hartford, Conn.	Malthon Anapol
Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	Dean Ellis
Hiram, Hiram, Ohio	Frank Ilersich
Howard, Washington, D. C.	Leroy Giles
Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	Scotti Hecht
Illinois, Urbana, Ill.	Joseph W. Wenzel
Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.	E. C. Chenoweth
Indiana State, Terre Haute, Ind.	Otis J. Aggertt
Iowa State, Ames, Iowa	James Weaver
Iowa, State College of Cedar Falls, Iowa	Lillian R. Wagner
Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	Gene Eakins
John Carroll, Cleveland, Ohio	Austin J. Freeley
Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas	Donn W. Parson
Kansas State, Manhattan, Kansas	Jack Kingsley
Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	Gifford Blyton
Kings, Wilkes Barre, Pa.	Robert E. Connelly
Knox, Galesburg, Ill.	Donald L. Torrence
Lehigh, Bethlehem, Pa.	H. Barrett Davis
Lincoln Memorial, Harrogate, Tenn.	Earl H. Smith
Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, La.	Harold Mixon
Loyola, Baltimore, Md.	Stephan W. McNiernay
Loyola, Chicago, Ill.	Elaine Koprouski
Manchester, North Manchester, Ind.	Ronald L. Aungst
Mankato State, Mankato, Minn.	Larry Schnoor
Marquette, Milwaukee, Wisc.	John Lewinski
Maryland, College Park, Md.	Jan M. Fitzgerald
Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.	Ronald Matlon
Memphis State, Memphis, Tenn.	Charles Wise
Mercer, Macon, Georgia	Mrs. Gerre G. Price
Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	J. Robert Olian
Miami, Oxford, Ohio	Jack A. Samosky
Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.	C. William Colburn
Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.	Ted R. Jackson
Middlebury, Middlebury, Vt.	Dale DeLetis
Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.	Bernard L. Brock
Missouri, Columbia, Mo.	James Gibson
Montana, Missoula, Mont.	Robert Boren
Morehouse, Atlanta, Ga.	Robert Brisbane
Morgan State, Baltimore, Md.	Harold B. Chinn
Mount Mercy, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas A. Hopkins
Murray State, Murray, Ky.	James Albert Tracy
Muskingum, New Concord, Ohio	Judson Ellerton
Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.	Donald O. Olson
Nevada, Reno, Nev.	Robert S. Griffin
New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.	William O. Gilsdorf
New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.	W. C. Eubank
New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, N. M.	Walter F. Brunet
New York (Univ. Hts.), New York, N. Y.	Norman Puffett
New York (Wash. Sq.), New York, N. Y.	David Leahy
North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.	
North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.	Troy T. Baker

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.	Thomas B. McClain
Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.	Leonard Sommer
Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio	Daniel M. Roher
Occidental, Los Angeles, Calif.	Franklin Modisett
Ohio, Athens, Ohio	Ted J. Foster
Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio	Harold Lawson
Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio	Ed Robinson
Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.	Paul Barefield
Oregon, Eugene, Ore.	W. Scott Nobles
Oregon State, Corvallis, Ore.	Thurston E. Doler
Pacific, Forest Grove, Ore.	Albert C. Hingston
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.	Miceal P. Carr
Pennsylvania State, University Park, Pa.	Clayton H. Schug
Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas Kane
Purdue, Lafayette, Ind.	John Monsma
Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.	Howard I. Streifford
Randolph-Macon, Ashland, Va.	Edgar E. MacDonald
Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.	Richard W. Roeth
Richmond, Richmond, Va.	Max Graeper
Roanoke, Salem, Va.	William R. Coulter
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y.	Joseph Fitzpatrick
Rutgers, New Brunswick, N. J.	E. James Goodwin
St. Anselm's, Manchester, N. H.	John A. Lynch
St. Cloud State, St. Cloud, Minn.	William R. McCleary
St. Lawrence, Canton, N. Y.	Robert N. Manning
Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.	Brad Bishop
San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif.	Henry E. McGuckin, Jr.
University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.	Kathy Corey
South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.	Merrill G. Christophersen
South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.	Hal R. Upchurch
Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.	James McBath
Southern Methodist, Dallas, Texas	Virginia Gandy
Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, Mo.	Don Stanton
Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.	Bettie Hudgens
Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.	Kenneth E. Mosier
State Univ. of N. Y. at Albany, Albany, N. Y.	Jeanine Rice
State Univ. of N. Y., Harpur College, Binghamton	Eugene Vasilew
Susquehanna, Selinsgrove, Penn.	Larry Ausustine
Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y.	Paul R. McKee
Tampa, Tampa, Fla.	Hugh Fellows
Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.	Ralph Towne
Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.	Norma C. Cook
Texas, Austin, Texas	J. Rex Wier
Texas Technological, Lubbock, Texas	P. Merville Larson
Tulane, New Orleans, La.	Lester J. Keyser
Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.	Joseph E. Vannucchi
Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	George A. Adamson
Utah State, Logan, Utah	Rex E. Robinson
Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.	Randall M. Fisher
Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	Robert Huber
Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.	Stanford P. Gwin
Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, Va.	E. A. Hancock

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Wabash, Crawfordsville, Ind.	Joseph O'Rourke, Jr.
Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, N. C.	Merwyn Hayes
Washington, St. Louis, Mo.	Herbert E. Metz
Washington, Seattle, Wash.	Dr. Donald Douglas
Washington and Jefferson, Washington, Pa.	Robert J. Brindley
Washington and Lee, Lexington, Va.	William W. Chaffin
Washington State, Pullman, Wash.	Janice Miller
Wayne State, Detroit, Mich.	George W. Ziegelmueller
Waynesburg, Waynesburg, Pa.	Deborah M. Blackwood
Weber State, Ogden, Utah	John B. Hebestreet
Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.	Marguerite G. Petty
Western Kentucky State, Bowling Green, Ky.	Randall Capps
Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, Mich.	Charles R. Helgesen Deldee Herman
Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio	Clair Henderlider
Westminster, New Wilmington, Pa.	Walter E. Scheid
West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.	William L. Barnett
Whittier, Whittier, Calif.	Gerald G. Paul
Wichita State, Wichita, Kansas	Mel Moorhouse
Willamette, Salem, Ore.	Howard W. Runkel
William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.	Donald L. McConkey
Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.	Winston L. Brembeck
Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.	Raymond H. Myers
Wittenburg, Springfield, Ohio	Ernest Dayka
Wooster, Wooster, Ohio	Gerald H. Sanders
Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.	B. Wayne Callaway
Xavier, Cincinnati, Ohio	Flynn Greenberg
Yale, New Haven, Conn.	Rollin G. Osterweis
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.